

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Thursday, 16 November 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:31 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*

### **FAIR TRADING (TICKET SCALPING) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (10:33):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fair Trading Act 1987. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (10:33):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to introduce the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill, a bill that will protect families, event organisers and music and sport enthusiasts against the scourge on society that ticket scalpers have become. This legislation is long overdue and the government have truly dropped the ball on this issue. They have failed to hear the complaints of thousands of South Australians who are well and truly sick and tired of being ripped off by ticket-scalping bots, as they have come to be known.

They are sick of spending hundreds of dollars on inflated ticket processes and prices, and they are sick of being turned away from events because they have been sold, or they have been afraid of being sold, fake tickets online. This is a real concern for a lot of people.

Technology is now involved with this ticket-scalping process, and I mentioned the ticket bots. Ticket scalping is changing from what we perhaps knew back in our day, a long time ago, when a ticket scalper was pictured as someone standing outside a stadium or a concert, opening up their jacket and offering to sell you a couple of tickets and cash would exchange hands. That may still occur, but they are very much in the minority now. What happens now is that these ticket bots and this growth in technology have a very big impact on what is going on here.

What we are seeing is that organisations are setting up ticket bots, which have a very big impact on what we are doing. They swoop in and scoop up a big lot of tickets. People who are going on to purchase them—regular, everyday people in the community, much like myself and my family, who would go online to buy a ticket—are unable to purchase the tickets because the organisations that run the ticket bots have swooped in and got them all. They then sell them through an online platform at an overinflated price.

Scalping has been a problem along the way. In fact, Ed Sheeran and Adele, two big rock stars, recently teamed up to try to combat the scourge of scalping. We know that tickets for the AFL, cricket and any big sporting events can be in the firing line for scalpers and the organisations that run these ticket bots. If this piece of legislation is passed, it could help end this practice before summer. We hope that both sides of this house can come together to make this happen. We think it will be good for South Australians who want to go to events and not pay overinflated prices.

This bill makes it an offence to advertise a ticket for resale at a price that is more than the original supply cost of the ticket plus 10 per cent. It provides a substantial maximum penalty for breaches of the antiscalping laws: a \$22,000 fine for an individual or a \$100,000 fine for body corporates. These penalties will apply to both the advertising of tickets for resale and the actual resale of tickets above original acquisition costs. It will also be an offence to engage in prohibited

conduct in relation to the use of a ticketing website. As I said, that is where this practice really has grown.

No longer is it someone standing outside an event just offering a few tickets for sale as a cash exchange. This is now big business, where ticket bots set up by organisations swoop in and bypass the security of the original seller, grab big numbers of tickets and resell them online at an excessive price for events that are in high demand. It prohibits people who want to go to these events, including South Australian families, from getting these tickets at a fair and reasonable price. As I mentioned before, a lot of big artists are very aware of this and do not want their fans to have this inflicted upon them. That is why we are bringing this bill forward.

The bill also addresses the ticket-scalping software responsible for purchasing large numbers of tickets as soon as they become available and the advertising of these tickets for resale at inflated prices, as I have just mentioned. It will also prevent bots from cheating the system by purchasing more tickets than ticketing sites allow. The majority of ticketing sites have disclaimers, allowing people to know how many tickets they can purchase at once to prevent this. However, due to the cleverness of these ticket bot operators, they circumvent the software and they swoop in and grab hundreds of tickets.

Often, online sales will be limited to perhaps four tickets per purchase but, as I said, these ticket bots circumvent that. So, when you and I go online and try to purchase tickets to an event or a concert, we can only get four, yet they end up scooping up hundreds and hundreds. Another aspect of the bill is the ability for the minister to declare that a specified event organiser must give public notice of the total number of tickets that are to be made available by authorised sellers for general public sale. This is just to give ticket purchasers a perspective of how many tickets are available for this event so that when hundreds go online it will be identified that this practice has taken place.

Fans should know how many tickets are available for an event, which is why the minister will have the powers to enable public disclosure of ticket numbers. These changes are based on amendments made to the New South Wales Fair Trading Act, which passed the parliament in New South Wales and was assented to on 24 October 2017. The New South Wales Minister for Innovation and Better Regulation, Matt Kean MP, described the changes as:

...going a long way towards protecting genuine fans trying to purchase tickets to sporting events or music concerts.

The major sporting codes have also been very supportive of this New South Wales legislation, which is why we have followed suit. The AFL, Cricket Australia, the SACA and rugby league have all indicated that the New South Wales model is the way to go to stop the scourge of scalping, which is what we want to do here for the South Australian people. The Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place has raised the issue. We have had a number of conversations about the actions that need to be taken and we think this is a very positive step forward.

Combating ticket scalpers and protecting families is a priority for the opposition. We know that South Australians have to battle some of the highest electricity prices in the world, excessive water prices and high fees and charges here in South Australia. We know that this state Labor government will do all it can to dip its hands into the pockets of South Australians at every turn. They have increased the emergency services levy, taking money from South Australian families and businesses. In fact, the \$306 million that they have most recently taken from the people of South Australia will go back into the pockets of South Australians under Marshall Liberal government. We believe very firmly in this. We believe very firmly in not taking, but making sure people have this money in their pocket to spend in our economy.

SA Labor has also tried to take money out of our pockets, of course, we know, through the car park tax, which we did defeat, and then recently there was the SA state bank tax, which we fought. Eventually, the government realised they were just wrong and the Premier and Treasurer walked away from this yesterday.

**Ms DIGANCE:** Point of order: relevance to the bill that has been introduced.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Just sit down for minute. We are going to listen to the member very closely. Continue.

**Mr WINGARD:** The member for Elder asks the relevance. The relevance is the money that we want to put back in the pockets of South Australians. That is what we want to do and this will again—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**Mr WINGARD:** —prevent scalpers taking money from people and selling tickets at exorbitant prices, like the Labor Party has done taking money from people as far as the heavy taxes that we have talked about. I was talking about the state bank tax that takes money out of the pockets of South Australians specifically because the state bank tax that the Labor government wanted to implement was a tax on South Australians—not on the people of New South Wales, not on Victorians, not on Western Australians, not on Northern Territorians—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my right!

**Mr WINGARD:** —it was a tax on South Australians. South Australian people were going to have to pay that tax—no other state, just South Australia. That point needs to be made clear. That is why here, with this piece of legislation, we are benefiting South Australians. That is what we on this side of the chamber are all about. It is about the cost of living. South Australians are doing it tough, and we want to do everything we can to make sure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sit down. I am going to ask members to observe the standing orders, which we have and which the house tries to enforce to be fair to all the members when speaking. I would like to ask members to respect the member for Mitchell while he is on his feet introducing his bill, and then you can all have a turn if you want to stand up later. Member for Mitchell.

**Mr WINGARD:** As I was saying, we want to make sure that there is more money in the pockets of South Australian families and businesses. That is the way we are going to grow this economy. If we can get businesses to have more money in their pockets, they will go out and grow their businesses, employ more people and that will provide jobs for South Australians. That is how it is going to work.

Any cost of living measure that we can implement that can be better for South Australians is a good thing. That is what this bill will do. This bill will prevent scalping. It will stop people having to pay exorbitant prices for tickets to big events in South Australia. We want to do everything we can to discourage this practice. The Labor government on the other side have had this raised with them and they have sat on their hands and failed to do anything. On this side of the chamber, from opposition, we are moving this bill to help with this situation, to help with the excessive cost of living that people are feeling in South Australia.

Again, I mentioned the heavy fees, charges and levies that this state Labor government keeps imposing on people. I was talking about the state bank tax, which again, specifically from the state Labor government, was earmarked for South Australians and South Australians alone. This was not a tax that was going to influence New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and all the other states. This was just another impost on the people of South Australia—families and businesses—and that is what is our choking our state. We need to find every way we can do it. This is a great piece of legislation that will help do that at a small level, but every piece counts.

We need to prevent people from having to pay exorbitant prices by introducing a smart piece of legislation, using smart technologies to make sure that we catch out the people who are swooping in. I mentioned the ticket bot situation where people are coming in, scooping up big tickets and then selling them online at exorbitant prices. It is not so much about the people standing outside events selling tickets at a price for cash that we picture ticket scalping to be—we want to crack down on that too—but the real issue comes with these ticket bots and these organisations that are coming in, using

technology to get a whole heap of tickets and then onselling them online, forcing people to go to these websites and pay exorbitant prices. That is not what it should be about.

We know that South Australian families are missing out. They are missing out on going to the Big Bash and they are missing out on going to concerts. As I mentioned, performers such as Adele and Ed Sheeran also agree that ticket scalping is a scourge. We want to make sure that, when these events do come to South Australia, South Australians can afford to go and can access tickets at a fair and reasonable price. That is what we are about: it is about the cost of living.

Unfortunately, those on the other side have missed the vote on this. They do not understand what people are feeling in regard to what is going on out there. The question is whether those on the other side of the house even care about what South Australians are feeling and experiencing out there. That is what we want to do; that is our intention on this side of the house. This bill is a great example of how we can do that, and we want to make sure that we are using smart measures to help people out in South Australia.

It has been going on for a while, and we know that there has been a call for those on the other side of the house to do something, but the minister has sat on his hands and has not acted. Over the last four years that I have been in this place, nothing has been done. It is beholden on us to move this piece of legislation—similar legislation has been passed in New South Wales and it has been well received there by all the sporting codes and the entertainment industry—to make sure that we can prevent this from happening. It is really impacting right across the board.

Concerts are very big here in South Australia, and sporting events—the Big Bash is one—and, when there is a hot ticket in town, organisations are coming in, swooping in and getting a lot of tickets. In fact, they are working the system as well to actually drive people to their websites to purchase tickets. That leaves people quite sceptical, and quite scared as well, that they are going to pay exorbitant fees and charges for the tickets and well over and above the face value of the ticket.

There is also the concern that they might get a bogus ticket, a ticket that will not be accepted, and that they will get to the gate or the arena, hand over their ticket and will not be allowed in. That is a real fear for a lot of South Australians. It is a very fair and real point. This legislation will help in that area; it will make people feel more confident. They will be able to buy tickets at the fair and reasonable advertised price and these companies will not be able to exploit South Australians as they have done in the past.

On this side of the house we want to do all we can, as I said, to help South Australians, to make sure that these ticket prices stay at a fair and reasonable price and to make sure that South Australian families get the opportunity to go to these events when they come to town. We know it is hard to get big events here at times, but when we do we want to make sure that South Australians have the opportunity to go to these big events. As I said, it is a smart measure. Sometimes it just needs some clever thinking and some smart play, as opposed to just trying to throw money at a solution and getting a solution in that way.

We need to look at the outcomes when we move these sorts of pieces of legislation or any legislation in this house. We need to ask ourselves: what are the outcomes we are trying to achieve here? As I have made it very clear here today, the outcomes that we are trying to achieve are to make sure that South Australians are paying a fair and reasonable price to go to events and that companies are not exploiting South Australians and forcing them to pay higher prices by scalping the tickets online.

That is why today I am proud to introduce this private member's bill to address the concerns of the South Australian public. People are sick and tired of being ripped off by ticket bots that force sports and concert fans to pay outrageously inflated prices. Equally, I am here to move this bill today to support the people who are sick and tired of the inaction of this state Labor government on the scalping issue.

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

**PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:49):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:50):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I advise the house that this is in response to the report of the Auditor-General of 17 October 2017 that was tabled in parliament. In that report, which was provided by the Speaker of the house and the President of the Legislative Council to their relative chambers on 29 September, he outlined in his executive summary some commentary in relation to recommended amendments to the tabling process, but also the flexibility of the Auditor-General reporting to parliament, and government's accountability to other matters that should be investigated.

In particular, he requested firstly to allow the Auditor-General to table a report even when parliament is not sitting by allowing the report to be delivered to the Speaker and President at any time and have this report to be taken to be published one clear day after it is received. This would allow the report to be public and therefore available to members of parliament and the public. This is a process that is already currently allowed under the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Act 2011, where supplementary reports can be delivered even if the parliament is not sitting.

Secondly, his recommendation was to allow the Auditor-General to prepare other reports relating to matters required to be dealt with in an annual report, not just those supplementary to matters required. This, he says, would allow the Auditor-General to report immediately on new matters for the current year in a supplementary report. This would also bring those matters to the attention of parliament without waiting for the following year's report.

In considering whether these amendments were worthy of attention and inquiry as to whether the government were going to act on this, it was clear that they were not, which is typical, frankly, of their lack of transparency and preparedness to ensure that probably one of the most crucial statutory bodies, that is, the Auditor-General's Department, on the operations of the government must have and must be properly armed with the adequate legislative capacity to ensure that there is timely and full disclosure of the results of their inquiries to the people of South Australia. It is their money and it is their operation, and they need to have this made available.

Of course, we have consulted with the Auditor-General. He advised in that consultation that there is another small point to be considered. It is really a matter of logistics. In the provision of the annual report, rather than a prescribed date for the provision of it, the Auditor-General is committed to that being within 100 days at the end of the financial year. This would essentially provide for members of parliament to receive it by 8 October each year, but would also allow for the provision of publication, printing and so on. Of course, that is a sensible matter to be added, and members will note that that has been incorporated in the bill now tabled.

The questions, can I say, that are the subject of the Auditor-General for inquiry, either on his own initiative or under instruction from the Treasurer of the state, are quite varied, not just the financial accountability of funds applied by government departments but all the practices and procedures, and we find that the work of the Auditor-General's Department has been quite diverse. It has certainly been very helpful to the parliament. As I say, it is a statutory body, which is a very important part of accountability of government.

We thank both the Auditor-General and his team for the work that they undertake all year and for the many supplementary reports that he has provided to assist us, not the least of which has been the inquiry in relation to government advertising and the application of the rules that relate to that. We thank them for the work they do. We need to be able to have timely publication of the work that they do.

There is a motion in the other place to deal with the management of publication of any reports that may come after parliament rises this year, which may make provision for the next few months. We think it is important that it be done. We encourage the government to support it and we ask that they do so by at least the next four days of sitting so that the Auditor-General can be properly instructed to be able to fulfil his duties as per his request.

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

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2017.)

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (10:56):** The Liberal Party will be supporting this bill this morning and, in doing so, would like to use the opportunity to point out some of the flaws that have been happening, throughout metropolitan Adelaide in particular, through the so-called transition period or the changes to the Planning Act that have been managed by the member for Enfield, the Deputy Premier. I think this government has a lack of understanding about the need for proper planning of changes to density in our suburbs in particular.

We see that in the inner suburbs in electorates like mine in the seat of Unley, and in electorates like the Leader of the Opposition's seat of Norwood. I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the stance he took on the Life Care proposal. It was a ludicrous situation. Two years after the minister's office signed off on a community-consulted, council-consulted DPA for the City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters—they need to get around to shortening the name of that council one day; they have been amalgamated for quite a number of years—

**An honourable member:** Since 1997.

**Mr PISONI:** Since 1997, I have been informed. Perhaps they should change it for their 21<sup>st</sup> anniversary. We had the situation where there was a full consultation process, and I congratulate the council on their input in that consultation process and I congratulate the residents. We saw the same thing happen in Unley, one of the first councils off the block to work with the government's plans for the 30-year plan in South Australia.

Just two years after the minister signed off on a three-storey development in Joslin, he proclaimed the ministerial DPA to allow developments of retirement villages and any related infrastructure, which could be restaurants, gyms, other apartments, to be approved outside the DPA in record time. Boy, did that set off some community backlash, and that community backlash was well justified. Nobody is opposed to development, nobody is opposed Adelaide growing and Adelaide providing facilities needed for different sectors of the community—in this case, the senior sector of the community.

Nobody is opposed to those types of developments, but people want considered and balanced development. They want the ability to have input. If we go back to the whole intention of the changes to the Development Act, the new Development Act, that were moved in this place by the Deputy Premier, it was all about having up-front consultation about height limits and other particular characteristics of neighbourhoods and having that consultation at that end so that it would give certainty not only to the residents but also to the development community.

That has not happened, so we have a situation where people can make significant investments in the family home in an area that has been signed off by the minister as an area that is of character, a character zone; in other words, it is recognised as having character. Yet the minister can, with the stroke of a pen, ignore that consultation process, ignore that very provision that he signed off on just a few years earlier and allow a situation where anything goes.

Remember that the three-storey development that is there now does not have frosted windows looking out onto people's homes. It is an extraordinary situation. Try doing that in your own development or extension at home. I know that, when we put one up at the family home a number of years ago, we could not even have an opening window lower than 1.5 metres from the floor level,

and the window had to be frosted; yet, if you go to that development now, to the three-storey stage 1 of that development, you will see clear windows and balconies looking into people's backyards.

It does have an impact on the very thing that South Australians—community leaders in South Australia, everyday South Australians—talk about as one of the valued things about South Australia, that is, our standard of living. This poor planning process led to the situation we saw with the Life Care development that forced the member for Newland to react to the discontent about the Deputy Premier's planning rules in his own electorate—and we concur. Dr Richard Harvey has picked up the same issues: the poor management of development planning in Adelaide and the lack of consideration for managing things such as traffic.

It is all very well to have an ambition to reduce the use of cars in the metropolitan area, but the facts are—and we see this with families as the children get older—that you can start off as a one or two-car family but, by the time your kids are in their late teens and their early and sometimes late 20s and still living at home, there could be four or five cars for that one house. I note that in his bill the member for Newland referred to the impact of traffic on subdivisions. The fact that a government backbencher has brought this bill to the parliament is more evidence of the shortcomings of the planning overhaul that the Deputy Premier brought to the parliament and the people of South Australia. Of course, the member for Newland supported those changes.

I am also very cynical about the late timing of this bill coming to the parliament. We have one more sitting week and it has to go through two chambers, and there could be amendments proposed in the other chamber. We know that it is very ambitious for a private member's bill to get through within a six-month period, let alone a two-week period. I would be shocked. I am sure that the constituents of Newland would be disappointed if they learnt that the member for Newland was aware of this issue only in the last few weeks. It would be neglect. He could have put it in government time if they were serious about getting this bill through in record time.

That is a challenge for the government: how serious are they about this? Is this just another cynical exercise by the Labor government creating an illusion of action after 16 years—like all the government advertising we are seeing on television is attempting to do at the moment—an illusion that things are actually happening and that this government is working for its constituents? I remind the constituents of Newland that the government has failed them. The member for Newland has failed them, and this is just one example of how he has failed to deliver for his constituents in Newland.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:06):** I thank the member for Unley for his kind words. It is unfortunate that irony or sarcasm cannot be written into *Hansard*. Be that as it may, I certainly thank the members of the opposition for their support for the bill. It is a bill that has come about simply because no bill—even one that underwent such thorough review and consultation as the planning act changes did—is going to be able to anticipate every effect that can possibly occur. The very rare situation that has occurred in my electorate is that there are two particularly large blocks in an otherwise small suburban cul-de-sac. That has brought this about and, of course, has brought this bill to the parliament. Again, I thank the opposition for their support. I look forward to its speedy passage through the upper house and through this house.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:07):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Again, I thank the house for its indulgence, and I look forward to its support in the upper house.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) (EMERGENCY SERVICES PROVIDERS)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2017.)

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:08):** This is an important bill brought to the house by the member for Stuart. I commend him for doing so, and I hope that we can reach a vote on it today and that all members will support it.

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

### **ELECTORAL (GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2017.)

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:09):** This is an important bill brought to the house by the member for Bragg. It responds to what has been an atrocious abuse of public trust and public funds by this government over the last year, over the last three years, since the last election and over the last 15 years, frankly. This is a government that barely one in three South Australians voted for, yet they have managed to spend over \$100 million since I have been in the parliament on advertising themselves—more than \$30 million in the most recent year on telling the people of South Australia how good they are. It is a disgrace.

We have examples of the government, not content with destroying South Australia's confidence in their electricity supply, and the reliability of the electricity supply, and then coming up with a half a billion dollar solution to cover their shame, then wanting to spend millions of dollars of the South Australian taxpayers' money telling the taxpayers about their solution. My goodness, \$400 million for diesel generators, but we can spend millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on advertising them.

Millions of dollars of taxpayers' money has been spent by this government on advertising their Transforming Health strategy—Transforming Health, which became so synonymous with failure and cuts to services that the Premier no longer calls the government's policy that. They say that Transforming Health is done, yet we have pictures of the Premier not only advertising his own electricity solution but advertising Transforming Health.

We have cinema advertising and electronic advertising. It is impossible to open an app on your phone these days without having very pleasant ads about how much money the government is spending on government schools. There are a lot of things in the government's Public Education Action Plan that the opposition supports from the announcements a couple of weeks ago. But \$1.8 million in advertising encouraging people to talk to their local schools about their children 'becoming themselves' is not a wise use of money in the education space. A lot of good things could be done with \$1.8 million.

There was a \$40,000 ad on pages 2 and 3 of *The Advertiser* the other day that talked about 'children becoming themselves'. It was very nice, but we are talking about taxpayers' money that could have been spent on other things in the education system. But the education minister and the government thought to spend it on ads telling people that government money was being spent on the education system and using taxpayers' money to do so, so that is what they have done instead.

The most appalling aspect of government advertising, though, is very clearly that which is in fact political advertising paid for by the taxpayer and not by the Labor Party. It has long been a tenet of principal administration in South Australia that if you have a reason to use taxpayers' funds for government advertising then it must be non-political. For the most part, I think there are plenty of things that we spend government money on, at a federal and a state level, that the members of the public would not have a concern with.

'Every cigarette is doing you damage,' is a public health education campaign using taxpayers' funds at a federal level over a number of years that saw a marked impact on the health and wellbeing of the people of Australia. Smoking rates dropped and the message that 'every cigarette is doing you damage' is a clear evidence-based message that was worthy of public funds and has seen solid outcomes. It is a message that people remember. Messages about drug education sometimes can be controversial, and the concept of advertising safe driving can have positive impacts on the



community, positive health outcomes and positive outcomes for the wellbeing of the South Australian community.

When you have a politician's face and, particularly in television advertising, a politician appearing and talking about their own campaigns, as was the case with the Premier talking about their electricity campaign and the Premier talking about the health campaign, you have descended into political advertising. This is not just the opposition saying this. This is a long-held principle that has been understood by people on both sides of the chamber for many years. The Auditor-General says so, parliamentary inquiries have said so and the government's own advertising rules have said so.

The fact that this government chooses deliberately, despicably, to flout those rules, to flout those conventions, is a wilful act of a government that is determined to use taxpayer funds for their personal preferment, their political ambitions and their desire to stay in power. It is a disgrace. It is a disgrace that should not be countenanced. It is a disgrace that will be addressed by the member for Bragg's bill in this case. There are a couple of challenging issues here, and one is the question of retrospectivity.

We think it is important that this government takes note of this bill because it is the opposition's intention to put this bill into law if we are elected to government on 17 March next year. This bill includes a provision that as of 1 November 2017—as of 15 days ago—every advertisement promulgated and paid for by taxpayers under government advertising will be caught so that, if the government puts any more of those 'Jay Weatherill for health and electricity' ads on the television, they will be in breach of this bill, and the government advertising will be looked at by the Electoral Commissioner and potentially taken into account for the purposes of penalty on their public funding.

The Labor Party stands on notice that the people of South Australia and all political parties in South Australia, other than the South Australian Labor Party, believe that the Premier should not be appearing in his own ads at taxpayers' expense effectively spruiking for the re-election of the Labor government. We are in a situation where the expense on political advertising from 1 July this year through to the election day on 17 March is, in fact, capped. Only a certain amount of money can be spent on political campaigns in this election.

It is a novel concept dreamt up, in fact brought forward, by this Premier, yet that cap is dwarfed by the amount of taxpayers' money—not paid for by the unions and the Labor Party—pushing forward political ads for the Labor Party in the period from 1 July. When we introduce bills that have a starting date, the principle is that the starting date for the application of the bill should be after the announcement of the bill. That is why we cannot go back to 1 July this year. If we did, we might find that the Labor Party had spent more through taxpayers' dollars than they did through Labor Party dollars on their own political ads.

That is a disgrace. That is a matter for the government to be judged on. This bill will take it from 1 November. Hopefully, that will save the taxpayers of South Australia some money because the government will decide that they are concerned that they might lose the election. They are concerned that this may become legislation, assuming that they are not going to support it now, in April or May next year, and they do not want to have to pay that fine.

Hopefully, this will improve their behaviour. The fact that it has to be brought up in the first place is a real disgrace, and it is an indictment upon the credibility of this government. Anything they have to say about public administration or fairness in advertising, political advertising or campaigning is undermined by the behaviour they have exhibited in recent years. Mike Rann used to complain about government advertising under the Brown, Olsen and Kerin governments.

The hypocrisy demonstrated by Labor Party members elected to the parliament in 2002 or 1997, back when Mike Rann used to complain about far less egregious uses of government advertising, is palpable. I will give you this commitment: a Liberal government led by Steven Marshall will not ever use government members spruiking themselves and get the taxpayers to pay for it. What is more, we will make it punishable through financial sanction by this bill that the member for Bragg has brought forward.

I commend this bill to the house. I hope that government members will reflect on it and vote for it so that the public of South Australia can go to this election confident that this government is not going to waste any more of their money on political advertising. I suspect that the government may not do that, so we call on the Independent members of this parliament to support it. Hopefully, today or next Thursday we get to a vote—hopefully today so that it can go through the Legislative Council next week. I commend the bill to the house, and I commend the member for Bragg for bringing it.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:20):** I rise to support the Electoral (Government Advertising) Amendment Bill brought to this house by our deputy leader, the member for Bragg. This is an incredibly important principle, and I support everything the member for Morialta has just said on this topic as well. It is easy to think that the government is out of control on this issue, but the unfortunate reality is that the government is completely in control on this issue. The government knows exactly what it is doing.

Former premier Rann and the current Premier are very deliberate with regard to leading their teams in the expenditure of taxpayers' money to promote their Labor Party policies and agendas. This is not what taxpayers' money is meant to be there for; there are rules and regulations already in place that the government continues to ignore, continues to scoff at. It seems that every year the Auditor-General comes up with some finding in regard to this area, saying that the government is behaving inappropriately.

For me, the most stark example is the government's current energy plan. The government itself has budgeted money to advertise its plan in addition to the \$550 million of taxpayers' money that it wants to spend on its plan, a plan to fix the problems the government itself has created. This whole issue of government advertising is disgraceful. I believe it is \$2.6 million that the government has budgeted to advertise its energy plan, \$2.6 million of taxpayers' money that could very well be spent in far better ways on behalf of the taxpayer.

How many community groups, how many interest groups, how many other areas of policy would benefit from \$2.6 million of expenditure going towards their programs and interests and the positive things they need? Remember, this advertising the government pursues is on top of the media coverage that already exists. The media spends an enormous amount of time delving into, sharing information about, asking questions about, and sometimes supporting or sometimes not supporting government positions, government policies, government expenditure.

Why on earth is there a need for the government to be spending—outside of rules and regulations that already exist—taxpayers' money to promote its agenda, as well? The answer to that is very straightforward. When the government advertises, it puts only the government's side of the story forward. The government is not being questioned by journalists, its members are not in an interview, live on radio, with someone from the opposition with a range of perspectives being put forward, being questioned. When the government does its own advertising that is just it, it gets to shamelessly pump out its own message using other people's money.

As the member for Morialta pointed out, we are seeing, quite sensibly, restrictions on expenditure going to elections in South Australia because that is an environment where, again, there is a level playing field. All political parties, all candidates, can spend up to a cap to promote their cause with regard to trying to get elected. The government is quite happy to participate in capping expenditure to promote a government cause when it is in the confines of a level playing field, yet when it is not a level playing field, when it is in government, when only the government has access to taxpayers' money to spend, it does not want any caps at all.

The government does not want any rules. It does not want anything whatsoever to bind it. They want to be able to spend as much money as they possibly can, putting their view forward. This is a very shameless thing. There are rules and regulations in place about when a member of parliament, particularly a member of the government, can have their image or their voice or their name used in any way in regard to advertising. The Auditor-General regularly says that the government is flouting those rules, yet the government continues to do it.

So where are we at? The member for Bragg, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, has put this bill forward so that we can address this and bring another layer of regulation, rule-setting and law-making into this parliament which the government then might abide by. It is in stark contrast to

what the government wants to do which is just to continue to break all the rules. We are bringing this in very fairly and in a very open-minded way so that, regardless of who is successful at the next election, the government would be bound by these rules that we bring in.

We are not silly. We understand that if we are elected next time around, we would be bound by this legislation which we bring forward now. It is not only about trying to give the government a hard time and trying to close a government loophole and trying to stop them from wasting taxpayers' money, but hypothetically if we were elected, we would continue to do it. No, absolutely not. It is nothing like that. We are saying that if we were elected, we would also stick with these sorts of guidelines and rules, and that is why the opposition is bringing this forward. We believe it is what is best for South Australia. We believe it is what is best for South Australians and their money.

Keep in mind that every single cent that this government spends, whether it is on their own advertising or whether it is over half a billion dollars of taxpayers' money to fix the electricity crisis that the government itself created, in all these types of expenditure the government is spending other people's money. The government is spending South Australian taxpayers' money. We on this side of the house are all about trying to reduce the cost of living burden that this government has forced on South Australians over the past 16 years.

We want people to have more money in their pockets and for the tax they are obliged to pay to the government to be spent wisely by the government. This is very much about making sure that taxpayers' money is spent wisely and that as little money as possible is taxed on South Australians. I guarantee that you could ask any South Australian in any corner of the state—go from the Adelaide GPO all the way to any of the New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, Northern Territory or Western Australian borders—not one person would say, 'Yes, I am happy for the government to charge me taxes and then to use that money to advertise the government's own agenda.' You will not find a person who thinks it is a good idea.

People understand that their tax money needs to go to government programs, whether it is a very positive program in a portfolio or whether it is on energy, as it is at the moment with the government spending half a billion dollars to fix its own stuff-ups. People understand that their tax will go to government programs. They do not want their money to be spent by government, Liberal or Labor, on promoting its own agenda. They are fed up, sick and tired with the state government having done that for 16 years and getting bolder and giving less regard to the rules that already exist every day and every month that goes on, as this current government is doing.

This is a very good bill. It would be absolutely shameless of the government to refuse to allow this to come to a vote. If the government honestly believed that spending so much taxpayers' money on the government advertising its own agenda was the right way to go, then the government should allow this bill to come to a vote and they should put themselves on the record, member by member, saying that they actually believe this is the right way to spend taxpayers' money. If they do not believe that it is the right way to spend taxpayers' money, then they should allow it to come to a vote as well.

The most shameless thing the government could do would be to try to push it off, kick the can down the road and hope that this can all be avoided, that it disappears and does not have to be dealt with before the next election so that they are not on the record as having to say, 'Yes, we support it because we accept that what the opposition is proposing is the right thing to do,' just as much as they do not want to be on the record saying, 'No, we do not support it,' because they do not really want to be on the record anywhere clearly articulating that they think that what they do is right when they know what they do is wrong.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

*Motions*

#### **GLENTHORNE FARM**

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (11:30):** I move:

That this house:

- (a) acknowledges the importance of Glenthorne Farm as an environmental asset for South Australia and in particular its role in providing vital open space in Adelaide's southern suburbs;
- (b) recognises the Liberal Party's vision to create Glenthorne national park, preserving Glenthorne Farm, O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, Marino Conservation Park, Hallett Cove Conservation Park and the Field River Valley for future generations, while creating a recreational precinct focused on Majors Road at O'Halloran Hill; and
- (c) calls on the government to fast-track the opening up of Happy Valley Reservoir so it can be enjoyed by South Australian families for recreational pursuits, including fishing, sailing and kayaking.

Last year, the Liberal Party of South Australia launched its vision outlining a desire to create Glenthorne national park in the heart of Adelaide's southern suburbs. The proposed national park would forever protect the often under threat Glenthorne Farm and would also enhance surrounding existing areas of open space, including Happy Valley Reservoir and its surrounds (O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, Marino Conservation Park and Hallett Cove Conservation Park), as well as protect and revitalise the Field River Valley, which is a mixture of public and private land that runs south of Glenthorne Farm behind Trott Park and Sheidow Park before reaching the sea at Hallett Cove beach.

While Glenthorne Farm remains the anchor site of the proposed national park and the focal point of a locally driven and long-term campaign to save that 208 hectares of farmland from urban sprawl, I do believe that it is important to ensure that all the areas of open space adjoining Glenthorne Farm can be encapsulated in this national park as we create an environmental precinct and a corridor. We know that these corridors are so important for the creation and enhancement of biodiversity between the hills and the sea—the hills behind Happy Valley Reservoir, moving through that reservoir site and into Glenthorne Farm, O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park to the north, the Field River Valley to the south and then, on the coast, Hallett Cove Conservation Park and Marino Conservation Park.

We know that science tells us that small envelopes of land, while valuable to protect by themselves, become so much more valuable to overall biodiversity when linked together in a connected environmental site, and that is the vision the Liberal Party of South Australia has for Glenthorne national park. It is the connection of these areas of open space from the foothills at Happy Valley and even extending behind the Field River Valley behind that into Chandlers Hill and Aberfoyle Park and moving right through to the beach, to the estuarine environment and the dune environment at Hallett Cove beach.

Some of those existing areas of land are well cared for at the moment. There are active friends groups looking after the Lower Field River. That is a friends group which I actively got involved with as a founding member in 2006 and which really led me to become a member of the local council and then to this place in 2014. We have a very active friends group at Hallett Cove Conservation Park, another at Marino Conservation Park and another at O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. We know that these are people who for many years have put their own resources, both in time and often financially, into caring for the local natural environment in the southern suburbs.

We know the value of looking after these existing open spaces, and the Liberal Party want to put more effort, more resources and more coherency of governance into looking after these sites. That is why we have said that not only will we look at protecting Glenthorne Farm and saving it from the ongoing threat of urban sprawl—and I will talk more about Glenthorne Farm shortly—but we also want to invest in these other very important elements of open space which are already protected. Some of them have been protected for many decades by South Australian legislation.

We want to bring them under one management framework. We see that framework being best constituted as a national park, and we want to manage it as one incredibly important landscape of open space within metropolitan Adelaide. The value of open space cannot be underestimated within a metropolitan environment, both for wildlife—birds, insects, animals and flora—and also for the people who live near that open space. We are privileged in Adelaide to have lots of open space within our metropolitan environment, but that open space often is not invested in. It often is not looked after as much as it could be.

There is an opportunity to put a stake in the ground and say, 'When it comes to Adelaide's southern suburbs, we are going to look after this extensive tract of open space from the hills to the beach. We are going to protect it for future generations, and we are going to create a really vibrant,

ecological environment which will be good for biodiversity but will also be good for the people who live around that area.' I am sure that people will come from further afield to enjoy it. In particular, those suburbs that immediately surround it are so important to connect with nature and ensure that they do not just become part of urban sprawl.

The people living there, young and old, can have areas of open public space in which to enjoy recreational activities and be able to connect with nature and their ecology within the urban environment. We know that cities are often characterised as places for people, but they should and can also be characterised as really great places for nature as well. I have a vision—a vision which the Liberal Party shares—that Glenthorne national park can be not just a national leader, but perhaps a world leader in what a great national park can look like within the metropolitan environment.

It is not something that will happen overnight; in many ways, it is a blank canvas, particularly the Glenthorne Farm part of our proposal. It will take a generation or several generations to maximise the environmental benefit and impact of this site, but in the longer term we can certainly get a fantastic environment connected with local communities. We can bring local communities into that site and get them to love that site. The best way to protect natural environments is to get people to love those natural environments. Get them to fall in love with them, and they will value them and they will invest in them. They will invest their time and resources, they will protect them and they will revitalise them.

That is our overarching vision for Glenthorne national park. It is worth dwelling for a moment on Glenthorne Farm itself. It is 208 hectares of open space (farmland) with quite a chequered history. Glenthorne Farm has a history going back to early European settlement in this state. It was the first home of Major O'Halloran, South Australia's first police commissioner, in the 1830s through to the 1840s, so it has a substantial historical significance to South Australia as well. There are also some significant heritage buildings on site, which could have significant adaptive value in the future. Sadly, they are falling to rack and ruin, or at least some of them are at the moment, but there is opportunity to look after those, to revitalise them and have that farm homestead, or what remains of it, as an anchor point within our plan for the national park.

As I mentioned, Glenthorne Farm has a chequered history. The land itself ended up being used by the CSIRO for several decades and then, in the early 2000s, it was transferred to the University of Adelaide, which has had stewardship of that land ever since. The University of Adelaide was given that land by a previous Liberal government. There was a transfer of funds, which enabled the land to be purchased by the CSIRO and a very significant deed was placed over that land, which, unfortunately, the University of Adelaide has really struggled to be able to fulfil.

I think it is a case of someone being given a gift that perhaps they did not really want and they did not have a series of plans that went alongside that gift, so they were left holding the baby and I do not think they really wanted to become parents. They have not embraced a really strong vision for the land. They have had it rented out ever since. As I said, they have let heritage buildings go to waste and have not at all done what is necessary to maximise the value of the Glenthorne Farm site.

That is something that I know the local community is disappointed about and that I think the wider environmentalist movement in South Australia is also disappointed about, that is, the University of Adelaide's inability to articulate and execute a vision which was in line with the deed for that site. We know that on a number of occasions the university has canvassed selling off portions of the land. I know that in the past the Labor government have opposed that and stopped it from happening, with a significant groundswell of angst and campaigning from the immediate community and also a community of stakeholders from further afield across the state.

While it is vested within the University of Adelaide with the current lack of plans for that site, there remains that threat. It is a blank canvas for the environment, but it could also be a blank canvas for development. It would be land that would be easy to develop, and I know that developers drive past that land and they look at it. No doubt they use Google Maps to measure it up and think, with an element of salivating mouths, that they could actually exploit the land for significant development opportunities.

The Liberal Party have said that we do not want that happening to that land. We do not want to see development on that land. It must be preserved. It is open space. Open space to that extent

is rare to find in a metropolitan environment, and of course we know that once open space is lost to development open space is lost forever. So Glenthorne Farm should be protected, it should be protected under a national parks structure and it should be created for environmental restoration purposes and for the community to enjoy for recreational opportunities.

I want to pay tribute to the Friends of Glenthorne. I have mentioned other friends groups this morning, but I want to pay tribute in particular to the Friends of Glenthorne, who have had access to that property only once per month and who have done a significant amount to restore elements of that area's environment. But also, more than that, they have been the figureheads of driving forward the protection of that site and they have really fought time and time again to protect it.

The people I want to pay particular tribute to include Alan Burns, who has been heavily involved in that group; Dr Pam Smith; Pete Smitherman over the years; Martin Schumacher; and many other members of that group who have toiled away for quite some time. I want to pay tribute to my colleague the member for Mitchell. Much of that site falls in the area of South Australia he has stewardship of in this place. He has worked very closely with me as the local representative for that area as we have worked together to articulate that vision.

I also want to look very briefly at the third part of my motion, which calls on the government to fast-track the opening up of Happy Valley Reservoir for recreational opportunities. This has been something that the Liberal Party has been keen to see, not just at Happy Valley, but it has supported the opening up of a number of our reservoirs across the state. It happens interstate and it happens overseas. We know that the science tells us that passive recreation certainly does not impact on water security.

Of course, we know that much of our water in metropolitan Adelaide is sourced from the River Murray, not exactly the cleanest source of water but obviously, through modern purification techniques, it is lifted to drinking water quality and beyond, and there is absolutely no indication that recreation on reservoirs impacts water quality. In fact, having people involved in activity around reservoirs creates a system of passive surveillance, which in turn creates safer environments. To me, that is a very important part of the recreational opportunities that lie with Glenthorne national park, the reservoir and also the recreational opportunities that lie along Majors Road, including a possible soccer precinct, a BMX precinct joining the existing model aircraft club, the archery club and the pistol shooting club.

The vision articulated by the Liberal Party of South Australia to preserve and revitalise Glenthorne Farm and the surrounding reserves as a national park is an exciting one. It is a flagship environmental project. I hope it is one that the Labor Party will embrace as well so that we can see that vision fulfilled and a fantastic environmental outcome delivered for South Australians.

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:46):** I begin by putting on the record my congratulations to the member for Bright on his hard work in this policy development on this side of the house. I know that he will make a fantastic and very diligent minister for the environment in a future Liberal government. This is about the vision that we are seeing here on this side of the house, and this is how you make good policy that is in the public interest because you do what is right for the people of South Australia. As I said, I would like to make a few comments about the importance of open space and the importance of open space in providing liveable communities in South Australia.

Open space provides opportunities for formal and informal sport, recreation, as well as cultural endeavours. Open space helps preserve our natural environment and provides much-needed habitat for wildlife. An open space in close proximity to urban centres increases the livability and enhances property values in those centres. They also provide environmental educational opportunities, as well as mental health and physical benefits that impact positively on health care and healthcare costs. Open spaces play an important role as the lungs of our communities that offset, of course, air pollution.

Advantages come from open space. Creating a policy framework that looks at capturing open space is so important, but it has been lacking for the last 15 years from this Labor government. In fact, their policy has been quite the opposite. Their policy has been to encroach on open space, create congested living for residents of South Australia and to see urban sprawl continue unabated. Communities that take the time to care for their open spaces and natural areas I believe find a

reciprocal benefit that goes with it. Their open spaces lead them to a better way of life. In my own community, where there is so much open space around Mitcham and the Mitcham Hills, the number of people you see walking through the national parks and reserves, participating in Trees For Life and Landcare, all enhance the value of the community and people's outlook on their community.

The Liberal Party appreciates the importance of protecting open space. We understand that these areas must be preserved for future generations, and we recognise that conservation is an investment in the wellbeing of our community. That is why we are conservative, and conservatives believe in conservation. Unfortunately, those opposite do not always share this view. As I stated earlier, those opposite have overseen a rapid decline in open spaces throughout metropolitan Adelaide, a result of their preoccupation with selling anything that is not nailed down to pay for the damage of 15 years of economic mismanagement.

That is what it is all about: it is about selling land to pay the interest on the debt. That is what we are seeing at Daw Park and the Repat and the desire to sell that land. We have seen it across the board. We even saw, several years ago, this government looking in a pre-budget bid in about 2010 to privatise the Wittunga Botanical Gardens—an absolute shame. That was canvassed by those opposite. This government loves to sell because it does not know how to create.

This Labor government have repeatedly demonstrated their complete disdain for the importance of native understorey in our urban ecosystem. A great example of this at the moment is the Glenside development, one of the most telling examples. Eighty-three significant trees are the collateral damage in the Treasurer's desperate search for a few extra dollars to help his budget bottom line. The gaping hole along Greenhill Road is a constant reminder of our community's loss. The latest threat to our natural environment is the proposal to allow housing and retail development on the 208-hectare site at Glenthorne Farm.

Glenthorne Farm, as the member for Bright indicated, is an important environmental asset of considerable significance to southern Adelaide. It is a revegetation site and a corridor for wildlife. It is imperative that we protect it for future generations. That is why the deed of sale to the University of Adelaide in 2001 explicitly stated that the land will not be used for urban development. That is why the state Liberal Party has made a very firm commitment that we will return Glenthorne Farm into a national park, wrapping several other open spaces in the southern suburbs into one very large national park, a national park that is not only about conservation but also about recreation.

It is a flagship environmental commitment. We have a clear vision for the environment. We will protect our open space. The Glenthorne national park will bring together existing areas of conservation: the Hallett Cove Conservation Park and the Marino Conservation Park as well as the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, Happy Valley Reservoir and the Field River Valley. It will provide national park status to more than 15,000 hectares of open space, bigger than Belair National Park, which is in my electorate. That will provide public ownership of this space for the entire community to enjoy.

Wildlife and vegetation corridors will be given the support they need to survive. Extensive weed eradication and revegetation projects will be carried out, creating an urban forest that will be enjoyed for generations to come, and a recreational precinct will be created. I went out doorknocking through Happy Valley with Steve Murray, the Liberal candidate for Davenport, and Aaron Duff, the Liberal candidate for Hurtle Vale in Happy Valley on the other side of the reservoir. We talked to local constituents about the ability and desire for us to open up the Happy Valley Reservoir for recreational use.

The community think it is a wonderful idea, and so many people say, 'I don't know why we haven't thought of that before.' The Friends of Glenthorne Farm have been fighting to protect this area for more than 21 years for improved community access and activities. The Friends of Glenthorne Farm Community Vision 2015 reports details the many activities they hope may one day be realised on this new precinct, including a large-scale nature playground for families, picnic areas, walking and cycling trails linked to surrounding parks, produce markets, tourism attractions and much more.

We share their vision. We want to work with the community to deliver a vision for the communities that people live in, people and communities who want to enjoy their lifestyle, their

Adelaide, their South Australia. The Friends work tirelessly so that future generations can enjoy open spaces that I believe we have for too long taken for granted. I certainly look forward to working with them as a member of the Liberal team to achieve this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to protect and revitalise this open space and turn it into an environmental and recreational precinct.

In the few moments that I have left, I would like to talk about some of the work done in my own community, particularly by the Friends of Belair National Park, including their president, Mark Pedlar, and Tina and Wayne Gallasch, who are on the committee, as well as all the other volunteers who do so much fantastic work in the Belair National Park. A couple of months ago I had the privilege of inviting the shadow environment minister, the member for Bright, to go on a walking tour of the park, which you can do every Tuesday and Sunday, to show him the great work that the Friends do, and to let the Friends know that we appreciate what they do for us.

If it were not for the Friends of Belair National Park, the Friends of Brownhill Creek or any other reserves and nature parks across South Australia, the government and its agencies would not be able to fulfil its mandate for weed eradication, pest eradication and dealing with feral animals. We owe a debt of gratitude to the many volunteers who participate in the friends groups, who ensure that the national parks and reserves are maintained in as good condition as they can be, free of eradication.

Also, in recent weeks I had the pleasure of attending the final Green Army project graduation which was, of course, a federal government initiative and one which the federal member for Boothby championed in the 2016 campaign. The last Green Army initiative was in Brownhill Creek Reserve and it was fantastic to work with people like Ron Bellchambers and Professor Wayne Myers, who are so dedicated to the preservation of Brownhill Creek, to lift the whole reserve and to create a focus on the importance of Brownhill Creek to the Mitcham Hills community and the significant role it plays in Karna history.

The skills that the volunteers have achieved through the Green Army project have been fantastic. In the patch that they have been working on in Brownhill Creek, they have really lifted that whole reserve in the eradication of feral pests and weeds. As I said before, the work that our volunteers do across-the-board is to be commended and on this side of the house I thank all the volunteers and friends of all our parks and reserves across South Australia for their hard work and dedication.

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:55):** I rise today also to speak on the motion put before the house by the member for Bright, and I acknowledge the great work that he has done, as follows:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the importance of Glenthorne Farm as an environmental asset for South Australia and in particular, its role in providing vital open space in Adelaide's southern suburbs;
- (b) recognises the Liberal Party's vision to create Glenthorne national park, preserving Glenthorne Farm, O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, Marino Conservation Park, Hallett Cove Conversation Park and the Field River Valley for future generations, while creating a recreational precinct focused on Majors Road at O'Halloran Hill; and
- (c) calls on the government to fast-track the opening up of Happy Valley Reservoir so it can be enjoyed by South Australian families for recreational pursuits including fishing, sailing and kayaking.

I mentioned the great work that the member for Bright has done and it has been a pleasure to work alongside him. This precinct technically fits in my patch, as far as the state is divided up at the minute. However, as the member for Bright and I always say, our electorates are there for the community and communities cross over. We see this space as wonderful space that our community can use.

They have open days at Glenthorne Farm once a month or so, weather permitting. I think I have been up there half a dozen times and we have not been able to access the site because it has been too wet and too slippery. The fence that is around the farm is a very significant sign of the frustration that there is with Glenthorne Farm, in particular. People drive past it all the time and they cannot access this site. What the Liberal Party has put forward, again led by the member for Bright, is an absolutely brilliant plan to turn this space into a national park.



The member for Bright and I often hold listening posts around the Hallett Cove area, the Seacombe Road area, around our local communities and even at the Marion shopping centre. People love to talk about this policy, this idea and this vision for South Australia and the opportunities it creates, both from a recreational sense and also from a potential sporting sense. There are some great sporting clubs tucked away up there that people do not really know much about. This has exciting potential for the people of the south.

When you look at it from the bigger picture, it is in the member for Bright's and my backyard. I acknowledge that, and we are lucky to have it right there for our local communities, but this is a policy that has far greater reach. As the biggest national park in the metropolitan area, it will draw people from Adelaide and across South Australia to come and use this park, with the opportunity of walking trails and bike trails. I know the mountain bikers are very keen to work in this space as well.

I have had a lot to do with the O'Halloran Hill recreation team and a group of people I will talk about a bit later, who do a lot of work in removing weeds. Their frustration is that they get school groups up there and they come and do some work, but they are not drawn back to this space. It does not entice people in. The policy that we have put forward, again under the stewardship of the member for Bright, I think is incredibly exciting and has so much upside it is not funny.

As I said, I have been up there a number of times. Local people who live around the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, which is the northern aspect, often have concerns about grasses overgrowing at this time of the year, around summertime, and they believe that in this whole bigger picture it will be looked after and taken care of. The park rangers looking after that area will be well resourced to make sure that this is a space that is open and accessible and there for people to use.

The member for Bright has talked about developers licking their lips as they drive past and see this vast parcel of land. If you get onto the internet and look through Google Maps, you can see how big a space it is. The concept of linking all these spaces together and making them one big facility is absolutely fantastic, as is the journey that we can go on with this. The member for Bright also pointed out very astutely that this is not something that is going to happen overnight. This is going to be a growth project that the community will be able to come along with and share in the journey.

We look at the young people in the local areas. A lot of great schools are in and around this area the member for Bright and I share. It is something that they are going to be able to start with as reception students, even kindy students, in the local area and grow through the development of this project. I think that they are going to relish it all the way along. When they are parents, they will be able to take their kids there and talk about the part they played in developing this precinct that overlooks Adelaide.

From a sporting perspective, there are a number of sporting groups there I would like to acknowledge. As I said, they are very much tucked in there. There is the archery club and the pistol club. I have spoken about the archery club in this place before. I have walked the course, but they did not give me a bow and arrow, which is probably a good thing. I am not so good with a bow and arrow (I have not done that since we did it as a subject at school), but it was wonderful to walk the course, and the views from this location are absolutely exquisite. I highly recommend that people get up there and have a look.

When I was walking the course and taking in the views, I realised how much this space and the opportunity there has been overlooked by this current government. It has been left to sit there and has not been opened up for people from right across South Australia to access. The opportunities are absolutely immense. In fact, the guys from the archery club were telling me that they had the police and fire games there a number of years back. The Americans came and competed, and they were just blown away by the views off Majors Road over the city and the coast. They thought that it was one of the most special places and a little bit of a secret. Alongside that, I mentioned the pistol club, which does a marvellous job.

Some of the walking trails through there at the moment have just been serviced by local volunteers, as we have been talking about. They are fantastic walking trails. With a bit more love, care, community help and support, they will be fantastic. We know that the state BMX centre is proposed to be there. We know that there are some concerns about the soil, so we are really keen

to hear more from the government about this because the prospects were good. We are keen to follow through and see where that ends up. I know that the council now has a bit of concern around the money involved, so we will see where that takes us.

Riding for the Disabled is there as well and do a marvellous job. They are a great group of people who take people with disabilities riding. The passion and the smiles on their faces is just sensational. It is another part of this precinct that can be incorporated. There is vision for a soccer precinct and a driving range, too, so it really has great scope to be opened up for all the people of South Australia to be allowed to access this.

The history of the place has been mentioned briefly. I mentioned that Riding for the Disabled has a long history with horses. Of course, the military took ownership of this land in the early 1900s, I think it was, and of course the Australian Army trained troops and horses there as part of the Light Horse Brigade, as far as I am aware, so Glenthorne Farm has some great history. Of course, the first police commissioner, Mr O'Halloran, lived up there as well.

This is a great opportunity for South Australia and a wonderful vision. For so long, this precinct has sat there untouched, and people have been locked out. I think that the surrounding communities will just love having this opportunity literally in their backyard. As I said, it is wonderful for the entire state. Some of the people I have worked with very closely on the O'Halloran Hill site in particular include Mr John Bollinger. He really has been fantastic and does a marvellous job—he had me and Michelle Lensink from the other place up there removing weeds. Don Webster is also part of the Friends of O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park.

I said that Michelle Lensink from the other place and I were up there pulling weeds. The group works tirelessly to kill off the olive weeds, and I commend them for all the work they do in that vicinity. The other group that has long been a campaigner for this is the Friends of Glenthorne Farm. It is a very small but passionate group that has made a lot of noise about this over a number of years, but it has never been able to get any traction. Lo and behold, along comes the member for Bright and we engage with a few people in the community. I was lucky enough to get involved and follow along with the vision the member for Bright had from the work he had been doing over a long period of time.

We have come forward with this plan that this group has really never seen before and was probably unable to envisage because of its size. I remember that I was with the member for Bright the day we told Alan Burns about the vision and plan we had, and he broke down in tears. This is something he had always wanted but had never been able to implement. Again, I commend the member for Bright; he brought Mr Burns to tears not by upsetting him but because of joy, which showed on his face. It is truly admirable.

The scope we have for this is incredibly exciting. I could talk for a lot longer, but the member for Bright has covered a lot of the important points. This is a very exciting policy and it is one that the Marshall Liberal team is very keen to progress and deliver for the community of South Australia. It is something the local southern region will really embrace, as well as the whole of the state, having this precinct there that people can access, walk through, take in and really feel a part of. It is a great vision for South Australia's future, and we look forward to working with the community to deliver this.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:06):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 23  
Noes ..... 17  
Majority ..... 6

AYES

Bedford, F.E.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hildyard, K.A.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Caica, P.  
Digance, A.F.C.  
Hughes, E.J.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Close, S.E.  
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.  
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)

## AYES

Key, S.W.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Rankine, J.M.  
Vlahos, L.A.

Koutsantonis, A.  
Piccolo, A.  
Rau, J.R.  
Wortley, D.

Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Snelling, J.J.

## NOES

Bell, T.S.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Knoll, S.K.  
Redmond, I.M.  
Treloar, P.A.  
Williams, M.R.

Chapman, V.A.  
Goldsworthy, R.M.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Sanderson, R.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.  
Wingard, C.

Duluk, S.  
Griffiths, S.P.  
Pengilly, M.R.  
Speirs, D. (teller)  
Whetstone, T.J.

## PAIRS

Gee, J.P.  
Marshall, S.S.

Tarzia, V.A.

Weatherill, J.W.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

**VICKERS VIMY AIRCRAFT**

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:12):** I move:

That this house urges the state government work to secure the future of the Vickers Vimy aircraft and other associated memorabilia contained at Adelaide Airport to work towards placing it on a site that is more publicly accessible and in an optimum environment for its survival in the future.

I think it is some eight months since I first spoke about this subject in the house. It took 28 days for the Vickers Vimy to get from England to Australia but it has taken eight months to get a motion heard in this house. I am not sure what that tells you.

My interest in this matter was sparked by a column by Lainie Anderson in the *Sunday Mail* on 7 May this year when she started talking about this with the headline 'The shame of a hidden chapter of our history', which was in reference to the aircraft the Vickers Vimy GEAOU (or in slang, God 'Elp All of Us). It was the first aircraft to fly from England to Australia. It landed on 10 December 1919. It is interesting that at a time when we are talking about direct flights from Perth to London in 17 hours with no stops, this aircraft took 28 days. It won the prize. It had 24 stops from the time it left until the time it got to Darwin, which won the prize.

It then had another 10 stops to Adelaide. At one stage it broke down near Charleville and was there for seven weeks while they manufactured a propeller in the bush to get the aircraft going again. It was a remarkable feat of aviation, not so many years after flying commenced, if you go back to Louis Bleriot and particularly after that appalling event which we commemorate, World War I. This was the year after. In fact, Keith and Ross Smith had not seen their mother for five years because they had been away at the war and then flew this aircraft back to Australia.

My interest in this goes back quite a way. I am indebted to Mr Steven Heading, who provided me with the book on the Vickers Vimy written by Peter McMillan. More to the point, it was written on the flight in 1994 to remember this 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary. For many years, as a young man I used to admire the plane. I have a great interest in aviation. I used to admire the Vickers Vimy aircraft at Adelaide Airport. It was highly visible in the building in the earlier days and I used to spend quite a bit of time going in and out and having a look.

With the redevelopment of Adelaide Airport, it has become something of a hidden gem. Indeed, aviation experts around the world cannot understand why we have this aircraft sitting there and not on display in a museum or somewhere else. Various places have been promoted. I do not

want to talk long on this matter because I understand it may well get support from the other side and I would like to further it. It is just so important for Australia's history and world aviation history that this aircraft is moved to a better position.

There are some issues to do with moving it, but nothing is impossible. We have the technology to send people to the moon—men to the moon, in this case—so we should be able to do something about this. Lainie Anderson quoted Alex Spencer from the Smithsonian in Washington, who said he considered that it is one of the most important artefacts of aviation history in the world, and we have it sitting in Adelaide down at the Airport, shielded from public view to all intents and purposes, and doing nothing.

It is also important to remember that four other planes also took part in the 1919 race to Australia. All four crashed and two of the crews were killed. The aviators, Keith and Ross Smith, had Wally Shiers and Jim Bennett with them on this trip. They were intrepid. They were less than an arm's length from the tips of the propellers. The noise must have been abysmal. They suffered full exposure to the weather, whatever the weather happened to be. It is rather different from flying in a 787 to London from Perth with wi-fi and all the comforts of home. These were great adventurers. They were particularly brave men and they deserve the recognition they got.

Some years ago—I suspect it was probably back in the sixties—there was a gentleman living at American River on Kangaroo Island called Bill Whitbur. Bill was a renowned aviation mechanic. As I recall, he actually built aircraft engines and was an engineer of all sorts of wonderful things. We live in a shrinking world. We live in a world that is changing so quickly that many of us cannot keep up with it. I am not talking about people in here. Many people are reluctant to keep up with the way the world is going, but my view is loud and clear: it would be a great move for this state to do something about this wonderful aircraft and put it into a position where it can be viewed by everybody.

Schoolchildren, wherever they go, would be able to visit it. They can go there now, I know, but it is right out of the way at Adelaide Airport. It needs a more prominent position. Suggestions were made that it could go into the terminal somewhere—I am not sure about that—or out the front in a specially sealed section. It has to be atmospherically controlled. It has to be protected from the sun. It is a very old aircraft, obviously. It is nearly 100 years since it flew out here which, in itself, is outstanding. It would be a great centenary project for South Australia. I am very bipartisan on this matter. I think it is just so important.

I commend Lainie Anderson for the work she did on this and for picking up and doing a Nuffield study on it. She will be very pleased that it finally got up. She asked me a couple of times about when it was happening and I simply said that, in the vagaries or the bizarre way that this house works from time to time, I did not even know it would get up. I am even more pleased that it has made it to the floor of the house on this second to last sitting week of the year.

Some of us in here only have three days to go; some of us know we are going and others do not know they are going but will be, I might add. I think it is something that we should deal with in a move towards ensuring our aviation history. The Vickers Vimy bomber should be properly housed for future generations to talk about and admire. They had nothing: they did not have radar; radio was embryonic, if at all; and, as I said, they had open cabins. I do not want to take any more of the house's time. I think you know where I am coming from. I urge all members to support the motion and I look forward to its speedy passage.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:20):** I rise to announce that this side of the house will be supporting this motion. We are doing so for two specific reasons: one is that it is the right thing to do; the second is that we believe the member for Finnis needs a legacy, and this is the most important issue he has ever brought to this parliament since he has been here.

The 1919 Vickers Vimy aircraft is the historic craft piloted by the Smith Brothers, Captain Sir Ross and Lieutenant Sir Keith, in the 1919 Great Air Race to Australia. A British heavy bomber aircraft developed and manufactured by Vickers Limited, a significant British engineering company housed in Sheffield, the Vimy was developed during the later stages of the First World War to equip the Royal Air Force. The Vimy was designed by Reginald Kirshaw (Rex) Pierson, Vickers' chief designer. Reginald Pierson was responsible for the Vickers Vimy heavy bomber during World War I,

and the first aircraft to cross the Atlantic non-stop. He was chief designer of the Vickers Wellington bomber of World War II.

During the interwar period between the end of the First World War (1914-18) and the beginning of the Second World War (1939-45), the Vimy set several notable records for long-distance flights. Perhaps the most celebrated and significant of these was the first non-stop crossing of the Atlantic Ocean, which was performed by John Alcock and Arthur Brown in June 1919. Other record-breaking flights were flown using this type from the United Kingdom to destinations such as South Africa and Australia.

The 1919 Great Air Race to Australia was celebrated across the globe. In March 1919, four months after the war was over, the Australian government announced that it would give a £10,000 prize for the first successful flight from England to Australia. This was not an inconsiderable amount in that day and age. Despite the obvious dangers, as was highlighted by the member for Flinders, this appealed to some airmen not yet discharged who were awaiting repatriation home. There were plenty of war surplus aircrafts available, and six crews eventually took part; however, only two crews finished. The winning team consisted of the brothers Ross and Keith Smith and their mechanics, James Bennett and Wally Shiers. They embarked from England on 12 November 1919 and reached Darwin on 10 December—an incredible journey of 28 days.

Subsequently, Both Ross and Keith were immediately knighted, whilst sergeants W.H. Shiers and J.M. Bennett, the mechanics, were commissioned and awarded bars to their Air Force medals. The amazingly engineered Vimy aircrafts continued to operate after the conflict, as late as the 1930s, in both military and civil capabilities. The aircraft used in the 1919 Great Air Race to Australia was subsequently bequeathed to the nation and is now housed at Adelaide Airport.

For those who remember the old airport, it is still in the same location. It was relevant at that stage because many people walked past it to access the terminal in what was an airport from a different age. Since that time, it has been housed in the same location and I doubt whether too many people say hello to it or go to look at it, or indeed even know it is there. The aircraft, its associated artefacts and the memorial building in which it is housed are subject to the Vickers Vimy aircraft housing and display agreement of 17 March 1998 between the commonwealth government and Adelaide Airport Limited.

I just want to stop here if I can and just mention—because I know no-one will mind this—another great supporter of this aircraft and a supporter of it being relocated to another more appropriate location is the federal member for Hindmarsh, Steve Georganas, who has a very close relationship with Adelaide Airport Limited and has worked very hard on behalf of the constituents on issues that are associated with that. He certainly comes into the fray with respect to what is an appropriate location for this very important plane to be housed.

For the information of the chamber, Steve has written many letters on behalf of his constituents, as have I, and I believe the member for Ashford certainly has done the same. The state Minister for Veterans' Affairs recently indicated his support to the member for Ashford in response to a constituent email. So there has been widespread support across all spheres of government and bipartisan support across the chamber for this particular issue to be resolved.

I am pleased to advise that the aircraft is being well maintained and that the Adelaide Airport Master Plan 2014 states that the historic aircraft is currently housed in a purpose-built, climate-controlled facility on Adelaide Airport land, which we know and which I have mentioned, and that Adelaide Airport Limited will continue to ensure that it is routinely monitored, maintained and restored in accordance with the commonwealth requirements with its relocation elsewhere on the airport site under very serious consideration.

The master plan also outlines that when the Vickers Vimy aircraft is moved to its new location, its relocation will require a suitable environmentally-controlled facility to control light, humidity and temperature, as a prerequisite, and will be subject to specialist engineering advice, as was highlighted by the member for Finnis. I have been advised that at a planning coordination forum held on 11 May 2017, which are consultation forums required by the commonwealth involving state and local governments, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure was advised that Adelaide Airport is considering potential options for the relocation of the aircraft to within the Airport

terminal building or a proposed future expansion of the building, which anyone who has been down to the airport can see is well and truly underway.

I will get back to where I started. I support the member for Finniss's motion. This will be his legacy and I trust that should AAL's plans eventuate, it will enable in excess of 8 million passengers annually, excluding visitors and greeters, the opportunity to view this wonderful piece of aviation and Australian history. I commend the motion to the house.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:27):** I will speak very briefly but fully in support of the motion moved by the member Finniss. It is an extraordinary tale, the tale of the first-ever flight from England to Australia in that particular aircraft, the Vickers Vimy. Incidentally, the only Vimy ever to enter service in the RAAF was this particular one as it registered as A5-1. The flight itself was absolutely astounding, as the member for Finniss has outlined, such a short time after the first flight.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** The member Finniss alleges that he was not born at that particular time but, because it was such a long time ago, records are very sketchy, so we cannot confirm or deny that. It was an epic flight all the way from England to Australia, just 16 years after the first flight, which, members might recall, lasted a matter of seconds. Off the top of my head, I think the Wright Brothers' first flight lasted 12 seconds. To go from a 12-second first flight and in 16 years be flying in under 28 days from England to Australia is quite an extraordinary feat.

I think their journey from England to Australia was 17,000 or nearly 18,000 kilometres. The obviously rudimentary navigational tools were I think just a compass and maybe a sextant. It would have been very hard to navigate and done basically by dead reckoning. The proof of their ability to navigate was actually overflying HMAS *Sydney*, which was located between Indonesia and Australia and it was in the event that they had to ditch into the sea. It was the longest overseas section of their flight. In the event that they had to ditch into the sea, the government posted HMAS *Sydney* in that location.

The Smith brothers and the rest of the crew (Sergeant Bennett and Sergeant Shiers) were so good in their navigation that they flew right over the top of HMAS *Sydney* and dropped a message, to the captain, in a pickle jar. Given such rudimentary instrumentation, just the navigation itself is an amazing feat, let alone the mechanical ability of keeping what is now considered a comparatively fragile aircraft in the air over such a long distance. In fact, one of the engines blew up on arrival in Australia. It actually took longer to fly from Darwin to Sydney than it did to fly from London to Darwin because of the repairs they had to make: one to the propeller and one to the engine, and I think the engine repair took 50 days.

It was a remarkable feat, an incredible piece of Australian aviation history and a globally significant piece of aviation history. I am very pleased that it is maintained by the Airport in very good condition, but I would dearly love to see it in a far more prominent position.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Civic Park.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Civic Park at Tea Tree Gully has been suggested by Madam Deputy Speaker. While that would be very pleasing to me personally, I do not think that is the ideal spot for it on account of the fact that it is so important to the state that it should be in a place where as many people as possible can see it, and the Airport is the ideal place. Personally, I would like to see it inside the terminal, perhaps just outside where you walk through security so that, as you walk through security, you are confronted with what is a relatively large aircraft, especially for its time.

I do not know if that is possible, given that it is such an old aircraft now. The requirements to keep it in good condition might be such that it needs its own enclosure. I am certainly very keen for that to happen and to make it a far more available piece of history. I remember that, as a child, every time we went to the Airport, usually to pick up my grandmother, we made a point of visiting the aircraft. I think often I was more excited to see the aircraft than I was to see my grandmother, but that may have something to do with her trying to force-feed me extract of malt.

As I said, it is an amazing piece of history, and I absolutely support it being moved to an appropriate position. I commend the member for Finniss for bringing this motion before the house.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:32):** I rise to support the member for Finniss in his motion:

That this house urges the state government work to secure the future of the Vickers Vimy aircraft and other associated memorabilia contained at Adelaide Airport to work towards placing it on a site that is more publicly accessible and in an optimum environment for its survival in the future.

I congratulate the member for Finniss on bringing this motion and compliment him on his patience. It is some eight months since the motion was first moved, and it has taken all that time to get to the debate. I appreciate and acknowledge the support this motion has received from both sides of this chamber.

It is really important to recognise the important things in our short history in this country, and the Vickers Vimy that is currently situated at Adelaide Airport, albeit hidden away, is one of those. The Vickers Vimy was a heavy bomber that was developed in the later stages of World War I. It flew very few operational flights because, of course, once it was developed the war was virtually over. It really hit its straps through the 1920s and was a big part of the Royal Air Force during that time. It was developed in an attempt to break the stalemate that had emerged on the western front in the trench warfare in the second half of World War I.

As I said, it was not much used, but it certainly was intended for use as a bomber, and technology was moving very quickly in those days. Apart from the fact that the first bombs were dropped over the side by the navigator, things moved very quickly. It was powered by twin 360-horsepower Rolls-Royce engines and had a maximum speed of 100 mph. I know cars that will go quicker than that.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**Mr TRELOAR:** I knew, member for Colton, that you would come in with something. I could not resist, especially on a Thursday morning. It was quite an extraordinary aircraft in its day. As other members have said, it set a number of long-distance flights, including being the first aeroplane to fly non-stop across the Atlantic Ocean. The one at Adelaide Airport became famous because it was flown in 1919 from England to Australia over 28 days with 24 stops. I understand that its longest stop was for repairs in Australia.

A prize of £10,000 was issued for the first flight from England to Australia. Of course, it is history and it has gone into folklore that brothers Ross and Keith Smith were able to claim that prize. Others entered, and some crashed along the way; some were killed. Ross and Keith arrived safely, from that expedition at least, claimed the prize and became famous as a result. They were knighted and became Sir Ross Smith and Sir Keith Smith.

The fascination for biplanes continues. These days, people love to go and see old aircraft. Given that in two years' time it will be the centenary of that flight from England to Australia, wouldn't it be nice to find a permanent and suitable home, one where people can visit it and see it? I know reasonably well a young man by the name of Michael Crettenden, who is a crop duster by trade these days and also a firebomber. He cut his teeth as a very young pilot of 19 years of age flying tourists in a biplane, a Tiger Moth in Victoria, so I know he would have great interest in this.

I think it is important, as I said earlier, to value those things that are of historical importance to us; the Vickers Vimy aircraft at Adelaide Airport is one of them. Another one that comes to mind is the Tacoma fishing vessel. I would put that in the same—

**Mr Pengilly:** Owned by the Haldanes.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Owned by the Haldane family. It was the precursor to the modern tuna industry, and I would put it in the same category as this. Ultimately, I hope that we can find permanent homes for both these craft.

I recommend the motion, support the motion and wish it well. I am sure that eventually, as a result of this motion no doubt, the government will be urged to find a home for this. I just hope that, in the design of wherever it is that they find a place for this at Adelaide Airport, they do not have the same person responsible for it as the one who designed the drop-off and pickup point there. As a weekly user of it, I can tell you, Deputy Speaker, it is a shemozzle and it is going to get worse. As air

traffic into Adelaide Airport increases, it is going to get worse. That is another story, but it is the bane of my life and that of many others who use Adelaide Airport.

I look forward to seeing this in its own space and being accessible to the public. As I said, I really treasure this part of our Australian history.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:38):** I thank everybody in the house who has spoken on this motion. I am very grateful for the support from both sides of the house. It is an important issue. Where this goes, I am not quite sure, but we will wait and see; we will persevere with it. The member for Flinders and I fly regularly back and forth for parliamentary sitting weeks (I go by ferry sometimes), and I know that the member for Mount Gambier and I are quite often at the Airport, so I guess you would call us frequent flyers. With the very best intent, we do not do long hauls like some members of this place do on pretty regular occasions. It is a critical part of our aviation history.

I will be talking to my good friend Pat Crowther, who flies for Aerotech and is fascinated with aviation. He is quite an outstanding pilot, and he is one of the pilots who operate the water bombers during the summer. I am sure that the gentleman the member for Flinders referred to may also—I do not know. I am pleased to get this off the ground—that is probably the wrong terminology. I am pleased to get the motion up in the house. It may well be the last time I have a win in this house before I depart, so I am very pleased and I thank everyone for their support. I look forward to the vote.

Motion carried.

### **ELECTRICITY POLICY**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:40):** I move:

That this house notes the government's electricity policies have delivered the highest rate of electricity disconnections, the most customers on hardship programs and the highest average electricity debt per capita in the national energy market.

Let's see if this private member's motion has the same unanimous support as the previous one; somehow I doubt it.

According to statistics from the Australian Energy Regulator, South Australia had the highest proportion of disconnections in the nation. In fact, from January to March more than 2,500 South Australian residential customers were disconnected. This state also has the highest proportion of customers on hardship programs. There is no doubt that many households in South Australia are doing it tough, and I am going to focus on them for a minute and then move on to business and implications for our wider economy.

With summer here—but it will quickly turn back into winter again—the situation that South Australians face, those who are on either hardship programs or who have moved on to disconnection, is truly alarming. It reminds me of a time a number of years ago when I was an attendance officer for the education department and picked up a family every morning and took them to school. They had had their electricity cut off. The difficulty that those young, early primary school kids faced really brought it home to me that when somebody's power or water is cut off it exacerbates and accelerates the spiral down in terms of poverty and, from a parent's point of view, the ways in which they can escape the situation they are in; often, that can lead to substance abuse or other activities.

No running hot water in a house, due to the hot-water service being electric, meant that these kids were having cold showers, if indeed they were having showers at all. McDonald Park Primary School was fantastic in its response: the kids would rock up, a female staff member would organise hot school showers, there would be spare clothes at the school and, whilst the changeover of clothes occurred, the old clothes would be washed.

It is not an easy situation that the state government finds itself in—I understand that. We have rules and regulations around the energy market that limit some of the responses I am sure the state government would like to make in terms of getting power prices down. This is where I think some leadership actually needs to occur, not necessarily in the argy-bargy of this house, but certainly with AEMO and changing some of the regulations or mechanisms the energy market has put in place and getting agreement with other states. Some of those relate to generation of power.



The state government is concerned that if it enters the market as a generator, as a third or fourth provider of power, that can discourage other private investment in that market. I understand that. It is going to be interesting, now that the government has said that they are going to purchase these backup generators, how that is going to play in. In my mind, \$110 million to lease generators for 13 months was a very expensive option. Of course, you can argue that when the lights go out across the state, the entire cost to the state will be more than that, but it is \$110 million for these generators to sit there for 13 months.

They cannot be turned on to bring the price of power down. Even if it hits its cap of \$10,000 per megawatt, these generators cannot be turned on and return a dividend to the state. We pretty much have to sit there and watch the other providers generate pretty sizeable profits when it comes to that. If there is no blackout, these generators are going to sit there for 13 months at a cost of \$110 million and not even be turned on. That is \$8.5 million every month for the 13 months. It is a very expensive backup option. Again, it takes funds away from other areas.

In terms of now purchasing these backup generators, which will run on diesel, I am led to believe that they will take 80,000 litres of diesel per hour. If that is correct, it is a sizeable amount of diesel going into these generators. I wonder whether the people who actually have an understanding of what 80,000 litres per hour would look like would want to live around the location of those generators at this point in time. After the 13 months, they are going to be taken out and relocated to a more permanent base.

Millions of dollars are being spent on the connection, the site plans for where they are at the moment and running the cables to connect these generators into the grid. It is a huge expense for 13 months to then relocate them somewhere else. I believe that the cost of the purchase is \$360 million. We are going to lease them for 13 months at \$110 million, and then we are going to purchase them after the 13 months for \$360 million. If that is true, it is \$470 million for these generators.

The questions I have go back to my original statement. If the rules prevent the government from turning these things on to lower the price of power, then it is not a power plan: it is a blackout plan. It is a blackout plan to prevent blackouts; it will do nothing to drive the price of power down. The only real way of driving the price of power down, in my mind, is to work with AEMO and COAG to get these rules changed so that we can have some autonomy around generating power in this state.

One of the very simple things that could be done would be to talk about bid-in price. To understand the energy market, these companies bid in at a certain price at five-minute intervals, but they know what the demand is. If the state gets close to its demand on what is produced in South Australia, it can very quickly work out that it can bid in at the highest capped rate and make a sizeable amount of profit for its shareholders, but that profit comes at the expense of South Australians, who are paying the price.

They know the system and they can game the system based on the usage versus the capability or capacity in South Australia at that time, and can bid in at certain intervals at a much higher price. Of course, within the five minutes they can withdraw an offer and resubmit it at a higher rate. Again, that allows some gaming of the system to maximise profits. Those rules need to be changed. We need to look at how South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania can work as one part of the energy market and actually start transferring electricity at bid prices equal to that as one jurisdiction.

One of the problems we have is that everyone thinks we have a national energy market, but we do not: we have five separate and individual markets. They come together with certain rules around it, but they are individual in their nature. We need to be looking at options within the rules to get that price of power down so that South Australia does not have the highest number of disconnections or the highest average electricity debt per capita. These are the real things that need to happen.

In terms of \$470 million diesel generators, which will be converted to gas, this house needs some assurance and clarity about whether that can actually generate power for South Australia or whether the rules are going to prohibit it, or whether the state government is going to on-sell it to a third or fourth provider so that it can generate electricity and pay the state government a lease or

rental fee for those facilities that the people of South Australia have purchased. These are the real questions we should be debating in here. We should be up-front and honest with each other and work together so that the people actually benefit.

At the moment, there are some question marks around the forward prospects of generating electricity in this state, and I am one of the very few who understand that we have to have more generation here. Some of the ideas around getting more generation in South Australia are the right things to do, because that is how you have a competitive market, but you cannot have the state government using taxpayers' money to have a very expensive blackout plan that does not put electricity into the grid to lower the price for everyday South Australians. With those final remarks, I conclude my comments.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:52):** I will say from the outset that I think the member for Mount Gambier has said quite a few sensible things. I did not agree with everything he said, but I thought a lot of what he said was pretty sound, and I congratulate him on that—in fact, to the extent that I wish he had not resigned from his party—because their policy would be a lot sounder if they incorporated what he said today. As I said, that is not to say I agree with everything he said, but I certainly think it is a shame he resigned from the Liberal Party. That was his own decision in the face of the support that was being provided by the now leader.

I rise on behalf of the government to respond to this and begin by saying that the state government is acutely aware of the impact the failure of the National Electricity Market has had and continues to have on South Australian energy consumers. Indeed, the member for Mount Gambier himself spoke about that, saying that we do not have a national electricity market; we have several different marketplaces across the nation. I put the reason for there not being a national electricity market squarely at the feet of the federal government, which has shown no leadership in this area in this nation since it has been in government.

That is a horrible and sad thing, but it being a horrible and sad thing has meant that as a state we have had to do things we would not have necessarily had to do if there were an effective and coherent energy marketplace in this country. We know that coal-fired power stations across Australia are shutting down and an absence of a coherent national energy policy has led to underinvestment in the much-needed new energy sources. This is what I cannot understand sometimes about the Liberals. They bark and they bay at the marketplace and say the marketplace will sort things out.

Well, it needs some security. The marketplace needs some security and certainty, and in the absence of a national policy we have seen people and organisations reluctant to invest in the new technologies that are required. South Australia seems to be a little bit different. While we cannot manage the national marketplace, we can make sure that there are measures in place, and checks and balances in here, that have an incentive for some organisations and companies to invest in South Australia. We are seeing that.

The other thing we have to draw to people's attention is that the member for Mount Gambier comes from a party, although he is not a member of it now, which privatised the state's energy assets, which has led to a lack of competition between the few energy companies which operate in South Australia. It appears that the system we have in place backs the incumbents without the ability to be able to attract new operators into that marketplace.

Deputy Speaker, given the lack of energy competition which is pushing up electricity prices, the South Australian government, as you would be aware, has unveiled a comprehensive energy plan to take charge of the state's energy future to deliver reliable, affordable and clean power to South Australians. I am very proud that we have done that. It is a coherent plan. We have said we cannot rely on anyone else. We cannot rely on the commonwealth. We can only rely on ourselves to remedy as best we can the situation that we are have, knowing full well that we could manage it a damn sight better if those other areas were addressed, in particular the commonwealth's negligence, for want of a better term, in the area of national energy policy.

Our plan in South Australia builds Australia's largest battery to store energy from the wind and sun as part of a new \$150 million Renewable Technology Fund which supports clean, dispatchable and affordable power. It builds a government-owned 250 megawatt gas-fired power

plant to provide emergency backup power and system stability services and, in the meantime, procures temporary backup generation.

I was very impressed with the presentation that was made to the Public Works Committee on this matter. It taught me a lot more about how it will operate and how effective it will be. The member for Finnis was on it because he is a much better contributor than the person who replaced him on the Public Works Committee. I am being kind to you today—two legacies so far: Public Works Committee and the other one.

Getting back to the point that I am trying to make, the changes that we have made in this state also introduce new ministerial powers to direct the market to operate in the interests of South Australians, which is a very important piece of legislation, and to underpin our plan as and when it is required for the minister to intervene. We have also incentivised increased gas production to ensure that more of our state's gas is sourced and used in South Australia.

We have also introduced an energy security target to ensure our power system uses more clean, secure energy generated in South Australia and, last but not least, the use of government purchasing power through its own electricity contract to attract new electricity generators to increase competition in the marketplace. As a member of this government, I am proud of the fact that we are doing something in this particular area. I am very pleased that we have gone down this road because if we had not, no-one else was going to do it.

The energy plan is a key priority and the South Australian government is fast-tracking its rollout. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet received about 90 expressions of interest to build battery storage and 31 for the 250 megawatt power plant. The expressions of interest evaluation process is progressing rapidly. The South Australian government has now short-listed potential candidates and technical specifications and draft contract terms have also been finalised.

The Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Act 2017 was proclaimed on 26 April 2017 and will ensure that in times of an electricity supply emergency, as I mentioned earlier, the minister will be able to make directions to protect the needs of South Australia. With that, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

#### *Bills*

### **STAMP DUTIES (FOREIGN OWNERSHIP SURCHARGE) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Message from Governor*

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

#### *Petitions*

### **MODBURY HOSPITAL**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 300 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to restore vital emergency and surgical services to Modbury Hospital, expanding its role within the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and, in particular, seek to reinstate the High Dependency Unit at Modbury Hospital, and to fast-track the introduction of the Emergency Extended Care Unit.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

South Australian Film Corporation—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Rules made under the following Acts—  
Magistrates Court—Criminal—Amendment No. 64

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Local Government—Mobile Food Vendors

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

Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee—Annual Report 2016-17  
Commissioner for Children and Young People—Annual Report 2016-17  
Council for the Care of Children, The—Annual Report 2016-17  
Guardian for Children and Young People, Office of the—Annual Report 2016-17  
Ombudsman Act 1974, 2007-17: A special report to Parliament under section 21 of the

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

Health Advisory Council—  
Berri Barmera District Health Annual Report 2016-17  
Coorong Health Service Annual Report 2016-17  
Eastern Eyre Annual Report 2016-17  
Loxton and Districts Annual Report 2016-17  
Mallee Health Service Annual Report 2016-17  
Mannum District Hospital Annual Report 2016-17  
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Annual Report 2016-17  
Naracoorte Area Annual Report 2016-17  
Penola and Districts Annual Report 2016-17  
Port Augusta, Roxby Downs and Woomera Annual Report 2016-17  
Port Lincoln Annual Report 2016-17  
Renmark Paringa District Annual Report 2016-17  
Waikerie and Districts Annual Report 2016-17  
Pharmacy Regulation Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:04):** I bring up the 590<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Roxby Downs Area School children's centre development'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Ms VLAHOS:** I bring up the 591<sup>st</sup> report of the committee, entitled Meningie Area School Building Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Ms VLAHOS:** I bring up the 592<sup>nd</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Supplementary report: additional works to the Flinders Medical Centre Neonatal Unit redevelopment project'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time*

**PAYROLL TAX**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06):** My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer apologise for last week threatening small business in South Australia with an increase in payroll tax?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:06):** The opposite is true. The people who should be apologising are the Liberal Party, for blocking tax cuts for small business. In fact, such is our commitment—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Such is our commitment to payroll tax cuts that we brought legislation in. Such is our commitment to payroll tax cuts, we wanted to make it law. But unfortunately, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Unfortunately for us, the shadow minister—the shadow treasurer, led by the Leader of the Opposition—blocked those tax cuts. You have to ask yourself: what kind of Liberal votes against tax cuts for small business? What kind of Liberal blocks tax cuts of up to \$10,000 for South Australian small businesses? The person who is required to apologise to South Australian small business is the Leader of the Opposition. He owes every single one of those 3,900 small businesses who were being offered tax cuts in law an apology. He's the one who blocked them. He's the one who said no. He's the one who wanted to delay them. He's the one who would rather, of course—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —side with the banks. When you think about the banks, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You can tell by the yelling how frustrated he is about all this, Mr Speaker. You can tell by the high-pitched noise, Mr Speaker, in his voice how upset he is about the way he has behaved. All the conventions of the parliament have been thrown out the window by the Leader of the Opposition, and members opposite have followed him quite happily over that cliff.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The constant interjections and the constant shouting into the parliament show that they have no alternative, whereas the government is getting on with what it is we attempted to do in the budget bill. What we are doing, administratively, is making sure that the small businesses—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —that the Leader of the Opposition attempted to block can be passed on to those small businesses. I will be writing to all those small businesses telling them that I wished this was a law, but unfortunately the Liberal Party, led by the Leader of the Opposition, blocked them. Shame on the opposition! Shame on the Liberal Party!

**The SPEAKER:** Before the supplementary, I call to order the members for Unley, Elder, Colton, Fisher, Morialta, Stuart, Adelaide, Mitchell, Schubert and Chaffey, the leader and the deputy leader. I warn the leader, the deputy leader and the members for Elder, Mitchell, Morialta and Schubert, and I warn for the second and the final time the leader, the deputy leader and the members for Morialta, Mitchell and Schubert.

## PAYROLL TAX

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer now admit that he always had the money to provide tax relief without his massive state bank tax?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:09):** That's not true.

**The SPEAKER:** When a question is phrased in the terms, 'Will the Treasurer now admit,' I think I will give the Treasurer a lot of scope on that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That statement is not true, but it is no surprise given the source that it is coming from. We have had to now wind down those surpluses so the banks can avoid paying their fair share of tax. The opposition are quite happy to see the banks get this tax cut at the expense of South Australian taxpayers. So, if you think about it, what they are actually doing is socialising the cost of their tax bill to the taxpayer. The opposition have said, 'We like all the spending in the budget. We don't want you to stop any of the spending in the budget. We just don't like how you are paying for it. We don't like the revenue.' What they say then is, 'Pass on these tax cuts, but don't tax the banks.' So they want the taxpayer to subsidise the Australian banks again.

My dad always told me that you are judged by those whose company you keep—now, \$6 billion worth of profit, sacking 6,000 people. On this side of the house, we are on the side of the angels. We are not the ones who are there defending organisations that are facing charges of anti-money laundering accusations, assisting in terrorism financing, and rate rigging—that's who the opposition stands with. We stand with the people of South Australia.

We wanted to pay for tax cuts for South Australian small businesses out of taxes that the Australian banks are not paying and that they should be paying, and the opposition have blocked that along with the tax cuts for South Australian small businesses. So we have to find means with which to offer those tax cuts by running down public surpluses, that is, using taxpayers dollars that could be spent on health, on education, on other services that the opposition want to give back to the banks. That's their legacy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You can tell by the interjections the frustration of the members opposite about the way this entire tactic by the Leader of the Opposition has been conducted. By the entire way that they have conducted themselves, they have not come out of this at all. This isn't a win for the Liberal Party. This isn't a win for the opposition.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: the Treasurer's commentary on the opposition is clearly debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, it would be debate if the question weren't phrased as, 'Will the Treasurer now admit.' It's not exactly a question seeking information, is it? Perhaps you're expecting a confession. I say, because the question—

**Mr Knoll:** How many Hail Marys are you going to give him?

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer doesn't say the rosary.

**Ms Chapman:** How do you know?

**The SPEAKER:** He's orthodox. The question gave the Treasurer a whole lot of scope—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Precisely—and that reminds me: the member for Adelaide is warned a first and a second time, but not for that very useful interjection. Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The opposition's frustration at the way they have conducted themselves is understandable given the litany of errors by the Leader of the Opposition—whether it's telling everyone to vote Labor not once but twice, whether it is by the way he ran the Wokinabox, but, importantly, by siding with people like the Australian banks. The Australian banks, according to the commonwealth Treasury, forgo about \$4 billion of GST that should be in the pool available to the states to spend on hospitals, schools and roads. We attempted to rectify that through a major bank levy.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is on two warnings.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton should have been warned on the previous occasion and now is.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We tried to rectify that. Unfortunately for us, despite having said on multiple occasions that the Leader of the Opposition would support the major bank levy and the budget bill, he folded. Even though we have since heard a confession that he never liked even the commonwealth government's major bank levy but kept that secret and didn't tell anyone that he opposed the commonwealth government's major bank levy because, I suspect, he was afraid of any retribution from the commonwealth government.

It just goes to show the pattern of behaviour. The moment the ANZ were to go visit the Leader of the Opposition, he backed off immediately and said he would be opposing the budget bill, despite having said on numerous occasions previously he would be supporting it. It speaks volumes about who he is.

### PAYROLL TAX

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** Supplementary to the Premier: given the Treasurer's repeated statement today of his threat to write to small businesses indicating that there will be increased payroll taxes—

**The SPEAKER:** Can we get to the question.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —as a result of no state bank tax, will he direct the Treasurer not to write to intimidate small business?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:15):** I thank the deputy leader for her question. I could imagine that the Treasurer may wish to communicate with small business people in South Australia to explain precisely what has happened in the South Australian parliament. He would be well within his rights to draw to their attention that this government sought to give them a payroll tax deduction and that the parliament in its wisdom decided to block that. In any event, the Treasurer has decided, in what I think is a sensible decision—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —to nevertheless find an administrative means of passing on those payroll tax cuts. Of course, this raises a—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This is not something that one would have expected, given that the Leader of the Opposition said this on 26 June:

There's a 175-year history where the government's budget of the day gets passed. There was an extraordinary situation set up in the 2014 election because that was an election which I think gave a clear mandate to our position to scrap the car park tax. That isn't the situation in this instance.

So we were well within our rights. We were well within our rights to rely upon what the Leader of the Opposition said about passing this set of measures to make sure that our budget was passed in full. We are entitled to assume that because it came out of the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition. Then of course he had one visit from a bank and he shifted his position.

This is what the people of South Australia can come to expect in the next four years if he was ever standing in this position. That is, somebody powerful leans on him and he shifts his position, just like he did on the 50 per cent renewable energy target when Malcolm Turnbull got on the phone and leant on him and said, 'Scrap the 50 per cent renewable energy target.' Powerful interests. What happens when Sally Zou picks up the phone and says, 'I want a return on my investment'? What will happen next?

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** Before the supplementary, I call to order the Treasurer, the member for Hammond, the member for Heysen and the Minister for Agriculture, and I warn for the first time the members for Heysen and Unley and the Minister for Agriculture, and I warn for the second and the very last time the member for Unley. Deputy leader.

#### PAYROLL TAX

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** A further supplementary, if I may, to the Premier: given the Premier's answer, is there any intention of the government to increase the payroll tax?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:18):** It was just announced today that we are not increasing payroll tax. That was the move done by the Legislative Council and the members opposite. We will be administratively offering ex gratia relief to small businesses. So what we expressed in the budget bill, which was a tax cut to 2½ per cent for people with payrolls of up to \$1 million and then scaling up to \$1.5 million, those tax cuts will remain in place in an ex gratia form. The only people who voted to abolish that tax cut were members opposite when they blocked it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** One more utterance from the member for Schubert outside standing orders and he will be departing.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As the Premier said, the whole idea of legislating the payroll tax cut was so that small businesses didn't have to pay the higher amount and then wait on a rebate in order to improve their cash-flow position and give them incentives to go out and employ more people, because there is a lot of momentum behind the South Australian economy—I have seen the unemployment figures today.

What we're seeing through the measures that we put into the parliament is that we had a process of a rebate, where businesses were paying the higher rate and then getting rebates. What we want to do now is make sure that they are paying the lower rate going forward forever so they can keep that extra money in their pockets all year round and use it when they need it. But what the opposition did was block that measure, and they blocked it on behalf of five Australian banks after saying that they would support it.

We don't trust the opposition in the parliament to support this measure because on so many occasions—22 June, 23 June, 24 June, 25 June, 26 June—on repeated occasions, on numerous occasions, the Leader of the Opposition said that he was supporting the budget bill because of long precedents held. He said he was going to support the budget as it was. He said that over and over and over again. Then he had one meeting with one bank and flipped. We have measures—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order: standing order 98, debate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland is called to order and warned. The member for Chaffey is warned a first and second time, and the member for Hammond is warned a first time. I will listen to the Treasurer's remarks.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We announced this morning at a press conference that we would be, (1), passing on the payroll tax cuts that the opposition blocked in the upper house to South Australian small businesses despite the attempts of the opposition to block that. By passing those tax cuts, unfortunately we have to do it by ex gratia relief rather than do it legislatively because the opposition can't be trusted to pass the legislation because of the way they have breached the conventions. Given the amount of times the opposition have said that they would support budget bills and money bills—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: the minister is still debating.

**The SPEAKER:** What was the question?

**Mr GARDNER:** The question was from the—



**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** The question was—

**The SPEAKER:** No, I will take it from the member for Morialta; he's making the point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** The minister was talking about the opposition's point of view on a matter, and previous statements on a matter.

**The SPEAKER:** What was the question?

**Mr GARDNER:** The question was: will he be reducing payroll tax? The minister was referring to what the opposition said.

**The SPEAKER:** It is germane to that, what happened in the voting on the budget, so I don't uphold that point of order.

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** When the budget was blocked by the opposition blocking the tax cuts to South Australian small businesses, we had to work out very quickly whether we asked businesses to pay that in arrears because we have no legal framework in place other than me offering every single individual business an ex gratia relief payment. That is, we will say, 'Pay the money and then we will pay it back to you.' The commissioner for taxation has come up with a scheme that allows us to offer this in an ex gratia way so South Australian businesses won't be penalised for what the opposition did to them in the other place.

The problem we have with legislating this measure is that the opposition on numerous occasions has said that money bills are sacred, that government should pass their money bills; it is their right. As the Premier quoted, the Leader of the Opposition said there is a 175-year history where the government's budget of the day gets passed. On 25 June, Mr Marshall said that the government of the day should be able to pass its budget bill, have supply to run mechanics of government. To his credit, he said this on 23 June, 'I'll criticise anybody who increases tax, but it's a budget measure, so it will go through.' That's what he said, the Leader of the Opposition.

When we try to attempt to repair the damage done to the budget by members opposite by blocking these tax cuts and revenue measures—it wasn't the only revenue measure they blocked. They also blocked a measure on a foreign surcharge for foreign investors in residential properties. So we now have to introduce legislation again today. The problem is, given what the Leader of the Opposition has said, what if Sally Zou rings up the Leader of the Opposition and says, 'I've donated \$800,000 to the Liberal Party; I want you to block this measure.' We are running a risk with a reckless leader who is untrustworthy and is a risk to the people of South Australia.

**Mr Whetstone:** The old guttersnipe.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wright is warned. The member for Chaffey, he has been required to withdraw this remark before, and yet in the next sitting week he is doing it again. That really calls for a naming, doesn't it?

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Not really, sir, I wouldn't think so.

**The SPEAKER:** I have always been attracted, as you know, by mandatory minimum sentencing. I would have thought the member for Chaffey would be leaping to his feet. I require him to withdraw and apologise for the remark he just made across the chamber.

**Mr Whetstone:** I withdraw and apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** No, it would be good if he stood erect and said it.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I withdraw and apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. That time the house could hear the member for Chaffey.

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order: standing order 127, the Treasurer was imputing improper motive. He should withdraw and apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, what was the imputation?

**Mr GARDNER:** The imputation was, sir, that the opposition was making policy based on a phone call with any one individual, for their best interest.

**The SPEAKER:** Was?

**Mr GARDNER:** Was making policy decisions based on a phone call with an individual for their interest—clearly imputing improper motive.

**The SPEAKER:** I think it was expressed in a hypothetical way—what if?

**Mr GARDNER:** I realise there was much going on in the chamber, but I encourage you to have a look at the *Hansard*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland is warned a second and final time and so is the member for Hammond.

**Mr MARSHALL:** To provide further evidence, earlier in his contribution the Treasurer clearly impugned my—

**The SPEAKER:** No, he doesn't impugn it. He might impugn you, but he imputes proper motive.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Improper motive.

**The SPEAKER:** Improper motive.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Sorry, sir, you are quite right. He imputed improper motive when he said that we took one phone call from one bank and changed our position on this. When I said, 'Withdraw,' he said, 'Never.'

**The SPEAKER:** When?

**Mr MARSHALL:** In the chamber, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I am sorry, what was the last bit?

**Mr MARSHALL:** I asked him to withdraw and he said, 'Never.' The reality is—

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

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

**Mr MARSHALL:** I asked the Treasurer to withdraw that comment and apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** Standing order 125 says that a member may be required to withdraw offensive or unbecoming words, as I just required from the member for Chaffey.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elder is warned for the second and final time. I would ask the Treasurer to withdraw the imputation.

A Member may not...impute improper motives to any other Member.

Is the Treasurer saying that one phone call from one bank required—caused—is that the imputation?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The imputation, Mr Speaker, is that there were public statements before any lobbying by the Australian Bankers' Association. After the Bankers' Association, the banks lobbied the Leader of the Opposition and he changed his position. That's all I said, Mr Speaker. It is a fact. The opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The disorder.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta will be seated.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** On the point of order, sir, I recall the Treasurer making that very same comment many times in this house before and it has never been challenged before. How can they argue that it is improper now, when previously they have never objected to it?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland has taken a bogus point of order and will leave the chamber for 15 minutes under the sessional order.

*The honourable member for Newland having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** The imputation in the way the Treasurer has explained it is permissible in the argy-bargy of politics. If the opposition want to bring me a rush of *Hansard* saying 'one call from one bank' I will deal with that when I see it.

#### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:29):** My question is for the Minister for Energy. What is the budgeted operating cost for the nine diesel generators for each of the next two summers?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:29):** I will check and get back to the house.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is on a full set of warnings. He is consistently interjecting.

#### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:29):** Supplementary for the same minister: how much diesel will be purchased for the operation of the diesel generators during each of the next two summers, and what is the budget for the diesel?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:30):** There are two questions there: one is how much diesel will we purchase and what is the budget for it? I said that I will check the budget for you and get back to the house. How much diesel is a requirement for APR, who will be managing the operation of the generators? I will check with them to see what storage is at the site. I understand that they have about four hours of operating storage on site, which can be refilled as required.

Obviously, we are hoping that the market can provide sufficient thermal energy not to require the generators to operate during the summer period. If they do, they don't operate during the peaks, which could mean only half-hour, one-hour or two-hour periods. I will check and, when I get that answer, I will get back to the house.

#### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:30):** Supplementary: given that the minister said that there will be approximately four hours of fuel for operating the generators, does that mean that after four hours—assuming the tanks are full at the start of the four hours—one full fuel tanker per hour will need to be delivered to the site and discharged to the site every hour?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:31):** That question makes no sense. APR can have sufficient storage on site to run these generators continuously. I doubt that they will operate them continuously. Ultimately, like you do with any other fuel source, you can have fuel sources shipped in, trucked in, brought in as needed to restock, to refuel to maintain continuous operation. I doubt very much that there would be any need for continuous operation.

Ultimately, we will make sure that we have sufficient reserves to make sure that we can maintain system security over the summer. It is much better to have state-owned generators as a supply backup rather than relying on the private sector. I do note the policy difference between the

opposition and the government: the government wants a state-owned generator; the opposition want more privatisation.

### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:32):** Supplementary: in his last and his previous answer, the Treasurer said that there would be four hours' worth of operational fuel stored on the site. The question is: does that mean that, at the end of that four hours, one full road tanker of fuel will need to be delivered every hour, and discharged every hour, to keep those generators operating?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:32):** Yes, the generators will need fuel to operate, and we will make sure that they have sufficient fuel to operate.

### SMALL BUSINESS

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Can the minister update the house on the impact state government programs are having on employment prospects in South Australia?

**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) (14:32):** I thank the member for Light for his question. I have had to remind the house on several occasions that economic policy in South Australia seems to be a battle between the optimists and the pessimists. There is a great deal of transformation going on in the national and state economy: old industries are going and new industries are forming to take their place. Big business in particular is offshoring jobs, and small business is rising to the challenge of replacing those jobs. In fact, I can inform the house that when I was in India last week, I was advised in Bangalore—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** There they go. I was advised in Bangalore—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert will depart under the sessional order for 20 minutes for repeated interjections.

*The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** I was advised while I was in Bangalore that those very good friends of the Leader of the Opposition, the ANZ bank, employ 7,000 people, Indian citizens, in Bangalore—7,000 Australian jobs now transferred to Indian jobs in Bangalore. They are the good friends of the Leader of the Opposition. The NAB has announced that 6,000 jobs are to go, and I wonder which country they will be going to? Small business is having to pick up the challenge of replacing those jobs.

Against the backdrop of pessimism that followed the federal government's decision, the Liberal Coalition's decision, to abandon the automotive manufacturing sector, some opposite were jumping up and saying that unemployment would be 10 per cent, 12 per cent, 15 per cent, that the end of the world was nigh. The figures out today tell a very, very different story—a very different story indeed.

The state government responded to these challenges over the last four years by introducing a number of measures. We created Investment Attraction SA, we implemented a small business development fund and refocused our export strategy. I can update the house on some of those strategies in the context of a trend unemployment rate now of 5.6 per cent, slightly above what many would assume to be the non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment or the natural rate and a quite different outcome to that predicted by those opposite.

The \$10 million Small Business Development Fund commenced on 1 July. It benefits councils in the north of Adelaide, and to date 131 business start-ups in Adelaide have shared in nearly \$6 million worth of grants with 400 jobs. Investment Attraction SA, established just two years ago, has commissioned 23 projects worth nearly \$1.8 billion, delivering \$6.24 billion worth of benefit and nearly 6,500 jobs. No wonder this week's Business SA survey of expectations for the September

quarter showed that confidence had increased 4.1 points over the past quarter to 85.1 in a climate where national confidence had declined by 13.3 per cent.

There are other things underway. The Industry Advocate has lifted participation in state government projects by local SA businesses, from around 50 per cent to nearly 90 per cent, thousands of jobs. Our export strategies have seen exports increase to \$15.6 billion in the 12 months to June 2017, with jobs up to 72,000 from 68,000—another 4,000 jobs. There is quite a lot of good news out there and it is being driven by small business, the very people the government is trying to help. In summary, small business is full of optimists, and that must be driving pessimists absolutely crazy.

### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:37):** My question is again to the Minister for Energy. Has the government secured a gas contract to operate the generators under government ownership, when purchased and relocated?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:37):** No, we haven't as yet, but we will be in the market for it. Thankfully, our government has policies that support exploration and extraction of gas, unlike members opposite, who want to ban it in some parts of South Australia. Given what is occurring with Santos today, you would have thought that they would have had more pro-investment policies than policies that would perhaps, I don't know, weaken South Australian companies that are headquartered here in South Australia.

We have not secured that contract yet, but we do have a \$48 million PACE gas grant program out in the market. That program is to try to incentivise more gas out of the ground. I note that has been actively explored in the South-East of South Australia. Indeed, in the Cooper Basin we have seen a very good take-up from South Australian companies, and companies that are operating here on that PACE gas.

Part of the requirements of the PACE gas grants, as members would be aware, is that a company takes a PACE gas grant to explore and extract gas. If they are successful and strike gas, that gas is then hypothecated for South Australia; that is, it must be offered to South Australian generators first, which includes our generator. Then, once they are satisfied, if there is surplus gas after that it can go to South Australian industries, industries like Kimberly-Clark, industries like Adelaide Brighton Cement, industries that are gas intensive, that employ South Australians and that do not need moratoriums and bans on gas that will make the cost of running their businesses more expensive—which is what members opposite are proposing. Once they are satisfied, if there is surplus gas then, we will make it available on the domestic market.

This government is committed to the extraction of gas, having our locally headquartered companies like Beach and Santos thrive and do well because they employ South Australians; they are headquartered here. It is good to have those companies headquartered here in South Australia, and what they don't need are reckless policies by the Leader of the Opposition to ban unconventional gas in some parts of this state, which sends all the wrong messages for investors into South Australia.

### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:39):** A supplementary, sir. Given that the minister has said he has not secured a gas contract to operate the generators on gas, how is it that he can confirm that he has already decided to purchase the generators when he has no gas to run them?

*The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:39):** Yes, my very good friend the Minister for Tourism, who enjoyed a great night last night watching the Socceroos and their tremendous victory, just pointed out the obvious absurdity of the question the shadow minister asked. When you buy a motor vehicle, you don't secure 20 years' worth of petrol on the purchase. You go buy it on the market, but you don't buy it in advance of buying the car, do you? This is the logic of

members opposite. It really is getting pathetic. No wonder the shadow minister has been demoted, no wonder he has been benched.

### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:40):** Supplementary, sir: if the government is unable to secure gas to run these generators, will the minister rule out running them on diesel after the first two summers?

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:40):** Standing orders don't abide hypothetical questions because—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley will withdraw from the chamber under the sessional orders for the maximum penalty of one hour.

*The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I would say he will be missed, sir, but that would be unparliamentary because it wouldn't be true. South Australia has abundant gas reserves and the Premier has spoken to the main operators in South Australia, as has the Prime Minister, about maintaining sufficient emergency reserve through the COAG process. We have spoken to the pipeline operators about making sure there are contingent reserves in place for our generators over summer. If the shadow minister is saying that we should be procuring our gas in advance of the allocating where the generators will be before we decide the site, that would be a mistake.

We will, under the proper processes of our procurement, once we relocate the generators, be planning this over a 12-month period, even longer. We will secure the gas that we need. If the opposition is saying that there is a shortage of gas, why are they banning unconventional gas in the South-East? But again, this is about thinking ahead before you ask a question. Imagine the proposition now swirling around in his head. He says there is a shortage of gas. Why is the Liberal Party policy to ban exploration of gas? Again, that is why he has been benched, that is why he has been demoted, that is why he doesn't hold press conferences anymore.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir: debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order.

### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:42):** A supplementary: will the minister rule out running the generators on diesel after the first two summers?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:42):** One, they are not diesel generators, they are gas-fired generators if they run on another fuel.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Mr Speaker, I would ask the member for Chaffey to withdraw the accusation that it is a lie.

**The SPEAKER:** Did the member for Chaffey say that the Treasurer uttered a lie?

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Yes, I did. It's a Labor lie, sir.

*Members*

### MEMBER FOR CHAFFEY, NAMING

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is accordingly named.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, I move that he be heard in explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey, you have an opportunity to explain and apologise.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** The accusation that the Treasurer has just made, as I have explained, is a Labor lie.

**The SPEAKER:** Okay, the Leader of Government Business.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:43):** I move:

That the explanation not be accepted.

Motion carried.

*The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:*

#### MEMBER FOR CHAFFEY, SUSPENSION

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:43):** I move:

That the member be suspended from the service of the house.

Motion carried.

#### Question Time

#### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:44):** I am waiting for the minister to finish his answer. Will he rule out using the diesel generators on diesel after the first two summers?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:44):** We want to run these generators on gas. In fact, we don't want to run these generators very much at all. We want the market to provide sufficient power for us. I know the opposition have an aversion to state-owned institutions. They have an aversion to state-owned enterprises. They have an aversion to the state-owned generator that they are planning to privatise before we have even bought it. That is a record—an absolute record. We will be running this on gas as quickly as we possibly can.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney now sought advice from Dr Russell on whether any disciplinary action has been taken against any person in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet following the hiring of Veronica Theriault as Chief Information Officer as he undertook to do on 2 November and, if received, will he inform the house?

**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) (14:45):** I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, I have been pursuing these matters and I do have some information, which I would be happy to share with the house. I am aware that the deputy leader has asked a number of questions on this topic. If my memory serves me correctly, I have asked for those particular matters that were asked in the past to be the subject of specific answers, which will be brought forward as soon as possible. This is the information, in any event, to share with you.

First of all, the hiring and firing of staff within DPC is obviously a matter for the chief executive, as it is for any other department. In this case, I have been informed that the position of the Chief Information Officer was advertised with a closing date for applications of 26 May this year. Following a competitive selection process, the new CIO was appointed on a three-year contract. Apparently, it became clear shortly after she commenced her role on 3 August this year that there were serious questions about her capability and her conduct.

As a result, I am advised that she was directed in correspondence dated 8 September 2017 to remain absent from duty. The chief executive, Dr Russell, terminated the executive's appointment, effective on 19 September, pursuant to section 54(1)(d) of the Public Sector Act. A contractor engaged by the former CIO—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order: I appreciate the Attorney is now giving us some historic history of Ms Theriault, but—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, but the point of order is?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —my question was very specifically—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, they are all very specific.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —has anyone in the department had disciplinary action in respect of her hiring and firing, not what has happened to her. This has all been in the paper. He has given a ministerial statement on it. We know all that.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, alright.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Thank you, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Perhaps the Deputy Premier could speed up his approach to the question.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I would be happy to attempt that. I was simply trying to set the scene. As you know, Mr Speaker, it's very—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Okay. In that case, I will take the remainder of the question on notice.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48):** Supplementary: whilst appreciating the Attorney has indicated that he is waiting on some advice on questions previously asked, can he provide to the house any details of which independent body is actually undertaking the review of the public sector hiring practices?

**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) (14:48):** I thank the honourable member for her question. As you would be aware, occasionally—I don't think my time has started again—

**The SPEAKER:** We lose all sense of time when you are on your feet.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The question that was asked by the deputy leader contained one relevant word that I'm not sure had previously been used in the conversation about this, which was the word 'independent', which implied in the question that I had asserted somewhere that some external agency or somebody else might in fact be involved in this. I have not said that and that is not the case.

What I am advised is that, following the episode that I was going through in some detail before, which I know members probably don't want me to repeat, the chief executive, Dr Russell, established an immediate review into the recruitment process, that being an internal review by people within his agency. Subsequent to that review, he directed that—and this is my advice as to exactly what his directions were consequent upon that—all future senior appointments would be subject to detailed police and security checks. Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Will the Deputy Premier be seated. The leader took a point of order only 10 or 15 minutes ago saying that the Treasurer was imputing improper motives to him. He is now challenging the Deputy Premier in saying, 'What have you got to hide?' If that isn't imputing improper motives, I don't know what is. Deputy Premier.



**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am doing my best to inform the house to the best of my ability. Anyway, as I said, Dr Russell conducted this review. He has indicated, and instructed accordingly, that across the public sector there needed to be a very rigorous identification of work history, qualifications and referees prior to employment being offered, in line with the mandatory requirements outlined in the new Guideline of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment: Recruitment, which came into effect on 6 July this year. This includes, importantly, a forensic investigation of candidates' social media profiles, which I am informed can sometimes be quite revealing.

**Mr Gardner:** He made a joke.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I'll just leave it at that. Also, there were communications across DPC to ensure selection panel members are conversant with the selection process, including due diligence obligations. If there are further matters that I can assist the deputy leader with, I am very happy to do it, but as I said, I have specifically spoken to Dr Russell. I have said, 'Look, the deputy leader is extremely interested in this topic.'

I have had my staff extract the *Hansard* containing the questions, and I have stressed to Dr Russell how I thought it was important that we provide written answers to those questions as soon as possible. At the end of question time, I undertake to go back to my office and ask my staff to follow up on exactly where all those answers are.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52):** Supplementary: will the Attorney-General authorise the opposition to have a briefing with Dr Russell on this matter?

**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) (14:52):** I can't speak for Dr Russell, but I will certainly raise that with him. I think we should give him the opportunity to provide the answers that have already been sought, but I'm sure that should there be matters that remain unclear after that, if the opposition let me know what they are, we would be happy to clear them up.

#### CHILDREN'S UNIVERSITY ADELAIDE

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:53):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How has the South Australian government supported our higher education sector to contribute meaningfully to the lives of children in South Australia?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:53):** The other night I attended an event—and I urge any member of parliament who is invited to this in future, if they are available, to go. It was one of the most heartwarming events I have attended, and as you would imagine, in my job I attend many. Earlier this year I was in a position to give a grant to the University of Adelaide to run the Children's University. It was about a \$100,000 grant.

The other night was the graduation for those students. I will just read the names of the schools involved. They were Burton Primary School, Ingle Farm East Primary School, Lake Windemere B-7 School, Para Hills West Primary School, Paradise Primary School, Paralowie R-12 School, Riverdale Primary School, Salisbury North Primary School and Salisbury Downs Primary School.

Part of what was so heartwarming about the event and so important about the whole project is that, as you can tell, they are schools in relatively disadvantaged areas. There are lots of hardworking families living there—not particularly affluent, not particularly well-heeled—and not once was that mentioned as part of the graduation.

Those students were treated as they should be, which is that they are entirely entitled to be in the Bonython Hall and receiving a graduation certificate. They wore their mortar boards; in fact I felt terribly underdressed because everyone on the stage was wearing their full academic gowns and hats and I wasn't. All the children looked fantastic. What this program does is it takes primary school

children and offers a series of activities that they are able to be involved with that are educational in nature, for example, going to the Art Gallery.

There are a number of organisations that are co-sponsors of this project and they open up their facilities to have the students come in and the University of Adelaide auspices it. So, off they go to a place like the Art Gallery and they undertake some educational exercises while there and they log the number of hours that they are engaged in this project. At the graduation, we were celebrating not only the students who had completed 30, 35 hours but, from the memory, one of the students completed 300 hours of activities they had collected over the last couple of years.

Importantly, the activity that they undertake matters: it's educational and it's good for the students, without question. But, as I alluded to at the beginning, what is particularly important for students in primary schools—where traditionally after going to high school in the same area they are less likely to go on to university than in more affluent areas, although that is changing rapidly—is that those students see that university is part of their future, and if not university then some form of ongoing education.

I commend the University of Adelaide for engaging in this. It is an Australia-wide project. Some 2,000 students graduated this year across Australia. For the University of Adelaide, as the more prestigious of the universities—it certainly has Bonython Hall, which gives a certain aura—to choose to be engaged in such a project was quite magnificent. As you would imagine, the students conducted themselves brilliantly; they were very proud. There were some 600 people there. They were the family and friends of those students, who had shown up to cheer their child going across the stage at the Bonython Hall and, I suggest, for many of those children, not for the last time.

#### **WHYALLA HIGH SCHOOLS AMALGAMATION**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Education. What community consultation was undertaken before the government's announcement to amalgamate the Whyalla high schools into a new school and how many stakeholders were supportive of the idea and how many were opposed to the idea?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:57):** As members may recall, the idea of having a feasibility study into the amalgamation of the three high schools was in the budget last year and so activity has been undertaken in Whyalla, including extensive discussions with all three schools. The feasibility study recommended that there be a new site that all three schools would then come onto.

I am very pleased that as part of the recent announcement we have been able to provision for that to be paid for and that we will be able to have this single high school. The reason that I am pleased about that is that, first of all, having three high schools in a town that isn't as large as it was when we first established the educational offerings makes sense. It also means that all of those students will have access to a brand-new school with brand-new facilities right on the cutting edge of the kind of equipment and technology and learning spaces that students need and deserve in the modern economy, and nowhere more so than in Whyalla.

I am also pleased because it is my view that having a school that goes only to year 10 and then requires students who want to go on to consider moving schools is not the best design for a high school system that expects all of our students to finish high school. The message that it is okay to stop at year 10—which was certainly the case when I was at school a very long time ago—is not okay now. We only have this legacy remnant of a system that said, 'We will have a whole lot of kids finish in year 10 and then we will just have a high school for the last two years for those who essentially want to go on to university.' That is the old days. That is gone in our education system.

To be able to make the physical manifestation of that I think is absolutely essential because it sends a very clear message to students, parents and employers that high school is for the full five years, that you will finish year 12, that you will get your certificate and you will be learning in an environment that will train you in all the skills that are required for the modern economy, which include, of course, not only the STEM skills but also higher order thinking skills (HOTS), the capacity to analyse, to think critically, to think creatively, to problem solve and to work in group dynamics. Our older school facilities are not as well designed for that.

I think it's wonderful for Whyalla that we are able to make this investment. I am sure that there are probably some people who have some sentimental attachment to the old form of schooling who grieve that. What I can say is that we will make sure that we do this in a way that is very respectful of all three school communities. We will be very mindful of the need to dispose of the land, the sites, when it comes to that, in a way that's productive and constructive for Whyalla. We will make sure that we are servicing the needs of all the students who are going to high school in Whyalla.

#### **WHYALLA HIGH SCHOOLS AMALGAMATION**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:00):** Supplementary: when will the formal consultation with the existing three school communities be undertaken as required by the act if they are indeed to amalgamate or close?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:00):** We are currently working out a project plan for that. We will be in a position to make an announcement relatively soon.

#### **WHYALLA HIGH SCHOOLS AMALGAMATION**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:00):** Supplementary: given that the minister referred to the disposal of the land of the existing high school sites, does the \$100 million promise include the price of any land sale there, or is the \$100 million that has been allocated independent of the sale of that land?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:01):** My recollection is that we are talking about a PPP, so that's about the way in which we pay for occupying the site in the future. The disposal of the land is not about getting money back for the education system primarily. What it's about is making sure that Whyalla as a city doesn't have empty wastelands.

What we need to do is work with the community and work with the local government so that we use that land and those buildings in the best way possible. That might be different for each of the three sites, of course. We just want to make sure that Whyalla, in its sensitive time, as it's coming into its new era—it's a very exciting era for Whyalla—that the high school work is constructive and doesn't cause any concern about abandoned sites.

#### **NORWOOD MORIALTA HIGH SCHOOL**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Education in a similar vein. Can the minister clarify this: will Norwood Morialta High School benefit additionally from any proposed sale of the Rostrevor campus land, or are the proceeds of the sale of that land slated to go towards the school's \$30 million grant, or will the money from that sale be returned to general revenue?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:02):** In principle, the sale of land—if there should be any—does not go back to general revenue. In principle, it's spent on education. Members will be aware that with the voluntary amalgamation process we have been very fortunate to have a position from Treasury that has enabled us to not even wait for the sale of the land but to have the market value agreed upon and provided to the site where the amalgamation is occurring.

However, it is premature to talk about exactly what will happen with Norwood Morialta. We have been pleased to be able to identify a significant amount of money but, as the member would be well aware, we are currently in the process of discussing with the University of South Australia where their Magill precinct idea takes them in reference to a move, or a consolidation, or an upgrading of Norwood Morialta. I am not in a position to discuss that publicly any further until we have had those conversations.

#### **NORWOOD MORIALTA HIGH SCHOOL**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:03):** Supplementary: does the \$30 million grant that has been announced for Norwood Morialta include any money from the sale, potentially, of the Rostrevor land campus, or is that \$30 million guaranteed even if the Rostrevor campus is not sold?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:03):** The \$30 million is not contingent on anything, the \$30 million that has been identified. We are not in a position to talk about whether there will be any land sale.

#### **STUDENT APPRENTICESHIP BROKERS**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Education. With what is the government replacing the school-based apprenticeship brokers, who I understand have been told that their jobs will finish in January?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:04):** I think that is premature. The department is currently working through a proposal. There is a conversation about whether the title of apprenticeship broker is the appropriate title. There are apprenticeship brokers who are funded through the commonwealth, and at the moment what the department is working through is whether there is a better pathways role that those current brokers can play in order to make sure that not only are they part of securing apprenticeships for students but that they are plugging students into multiple future work options and future study options.

While I am very, very proud of the results that we have in this state for students completing high school, as I think I said only this week (although the days do blur in this place), we are the best of all the states in the completion of our high school certificate. Nonetheless, we don't have 100 per cent of our students finishing, and we should all have that as a goal.

The role that the current apprenticeship brokers and possible future pathways workers can play in providing alternatives for students who aren't at the moment seeing themselves as continuing school is very important. There is no reduction from central office in the number of permanent staff being employed in the program, and I am yet to see the final iteration of the work that will be occurring.

#### **STUDENT APPRENTICESHIP BROKERS**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:05):** Supplementary: have the people working as apprenticeship brokers in South Australia's DECD schools been told that their roles and their jobs will no longer be there after January?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:05):** I will confirm with the department because they manage the people, as we have discussed ad nauseam in this place, but we are not losing the number of positions from head office. We are still in a discussion about the way in which it will finally be constructed.

#### **COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Further to the question asked on 1 November this year, will the minister now explain to the parliament why the government has suspended section 5 of the child and young people act 2016, obliging state agencies to protect, respect and seek to give rights outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child? You were coming back with an answer.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:06):** Indeed, but that was partially in the absence of the Attorney-General on that day, if you recall. My understanding is that the Attorney-General's Department has almost completed or, perhaps, in fact completed the regulations required for the commencement of that act, and it will take place shortly.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **AUTISM INTERVENTION PROGRAM**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:06):** I rise today to speak about the Autism Intervention Program at Blackwood Primary School and Blackwood High School. Autism SA reports that autism, and related disorders, is the most common primary disability across all NDIS trial sites, representing one-third of participants nationally. Growth in diagnosis in South Australia has been a consistent

trend for many years, with Autism SA's 2015-16 annual report noting that there were 1,195 new diagnoses in the state during this period, representing a nearly 10 per cent increase on the previous year.

The growth in prevalence is placing greater pressure on families, educational institutions, service providers and government to meet the unique and evolving needs of people on the autism spectrum. In my community, the Autism Intervention Program at Blackwood Primary School and Blackwood High School has been important part of helping to meet the needs of local students dealing with autism. It is a program that has strong support and has always been held in high esteem when I speak with parents and teachers at the schools. That is why the recent decision by the state Labor government to close the Autism Intervention Program has left many families in my electorate feeling distressed and frustrated.

In the Autism Intervention Program, up to eight students per class were supported by staff with expertise in autism spectrum disorder. Each class was assigned a full-time teacher and school services officer. The schools are equipped with modern facilities, including purpose-built autism intervention classrooms, each with a quiet withdrawal room that opens onto a secure outdoor courtyard. All rooms have access to interactive whiteboards, laptops and iPads, and rooms are equipped with a variety of specific equipment to cater for individual sensory and learning needs.

The investment in Blackwood Primary School and Blackwood High School has been significant. The benefits of the program have been considerable. Testimonials on the school website highlight the value and extraordinary success of the learning environment at Blackwood. Parents comments include, and I quote:

One has to be part of the wonderful environment that is the AIP to understand that, no matter what, our children will be able to be who they are, without judgement, to take a breath, stretch their wings, and grow into the people they want to be.

Another quote on the website by a school parent says:

After just a few weeks at AIP (he) has started to sing again...He was like a bird freed from his cage. I think many of the kids at AIP feel like cage birds before they get to AIP.

That is the resounding endorsement of the parents of children in the AIP program at Blackwood High School and Blackwood Primary School. That is why the government's decision to close AIP at the schools in my electorate has been met with shock, frustration and, indeed, considerable distress. I have been contacted by a number of parents, staff and administrators, who are deeply concerned about the government's decision to transition AIP students back into the regular classroom in 2018.

I have had primary school parents from feeder schools in my electorate contact me who were hoping to have their child start at the Blackwood High School year 8 AIP but have been told their child can no longer attend the program. Now there are parents who are looking for other mechanisms to support their children through their learning development. Parents in my community are frustrated by the lack of communication and consultation over the changes. I cannot understand the government's decision. In 2010, Labor made an election commitment to build two autism-specific units on state school grounds—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is too much noise in the chamber. I cannot hear the member for Davenport.

**Mr DULUK:** —which were to be located at Blackwood High School and The Heights School in Modbury, in your own electorate, Deputy Speaker. It was not until 2013 that the Autism Intervention Program was opened after three years and a large amount of money had been invested in infrastructure, equipment and developing workforce capacity and capability to deal with the demand from the students. The DECD July 2014 annual report notes:

...additional specialist training was provided to all program staff, DECD educational psychologists, speech pathologists and disability coordinators involved in preparing enrolment packages for the Autism Intervention program.

Yet, only a few years later, the government has decided to close the program. It is a decision that does not make sense to a lot of families, teachers, administrators and specialists who have contacted me to express their dissatisfaction.

Yesterday, I asked the minister to explain why the government has made the decision to close the program at Blackwood. Unfortunately, the minister was unable to provide much detail, except to say that the issue raised with the minister was the effectiveness of the use of the money and effectiveness of the program on site. That position by the minister would seem to be at odds with the personal experience of those involved in the AIP at Blackwood. I certainly look forward to a more fulsome response from the minister as promised yesterday, as do the families and school community in my electorate.

### **COLONEL LIGHT GARDENS RETURNED AND SERVICES LEAGUE**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:12):** I rise to speak about a vibrant, inclusive club in the heart of Colonel Light Gardens, namely, the Colonel Light Gardens RSL. The Colonel Light Gardens RSL is steeped in history, having been formed in 1927 and first meeting at the Institute building on West Parkway, Colonel Light Gardens, before moving to the Rechabite Hall on Prince George Parade due to the influx of members in 1947 post World War II.

Currently, there are close to 350 financial members of various classifications, being that of service, affiliate, associate and community. The club, while experiencing a decline in membership, like so many, has prevailed since its peak of over 1,000 members of ex service men and women when there was strictly only one kind of membership category. The club generously plays host to many community groups and RSL-associated organisations, being a hive of activity, hosting in total 42.

Many of these clubs that use the facility pay little or no rent and just simply make a donation of their choice. Some of the clubs that gather are the Senior Citizens' Club, Probus Club, Tool Club, Veteran Car Club, the Prostate Club, Legacy, many local schools, residents' associations, sporting and dance clubs and the Colonel Light Gardens mothers and babies group, just to name a few. There is strong involvement with the local primary schools, Colonel Light Gardens Primary School and St Therese Catholic primary school.

The Colonel Light Gardens RSL is generally open from 3pm, five days a week, serviced by five bar and six kitchen staff, ably supported by a group of passionate and dedicated volunteers. The club holds dinner on Friday nights, with over 160 attending on a regular basis. The kitchen offers a choice of six main meals and three specials, at around \$18 a meal, with salad or a hot buffet selection. The facilities are substantial, with a large hall that can accommodate up to 200 people, a club area for around 80, a committee room and a large open verandah, which is licensed and overlooks half of what was formerly the bowling greens and now is used happily as a children's play area or other function areas.

I have had the pleasure of attending the club on many occasions, such as a fun-filled quiz night, a social evening, where I met probably the oldest member, Tom, and an interactive transport forum, and meeting and speaking with the local residents' association, as well as chatting with members of Trinity Anglican church.

Annually, Colonel Light Gardens RSL commemorates the service of veterans with a very moving dawn service attended by around 1,500 attendees as well as Remembrance Day, Long Tan Day (now known as Vietnam Veterans Day) and Australia Day. This year's ANZAC Day service was affirmed by a huge crowd of people gathered together as dawn broke to the sound of morning bird calls and the haunting music of the bagpipes. This reflective remembrance service was finely carried out by the passion of the dedicated volunteers of the Colonel Light Gardens RSL, and I look forward to attending many more to come.

Also in honour of our ANZACs, in recent times the club has installed a new dedicated memorial for the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of ANZAC. There are new photos of the Mitcham Camp, and memorabilia is continually rotated and improved with additional uniforms on display. This year's Remembrance Day service was an event that not only encouraged the community to remember all those people who sacrificed their lives for our freedoms but also saw three RSL clubs combined at Mortlock Park to deliver the service.

Many stories were told of the 33,000 soldiers who trained at the Mitcham Camp during World War I and the 21 brave nurses who lost their lives in the line of duty on Bangka Island. There was also an overnight experience for the schoolchildren as they slept out in tents in a simulated training

camp. The combined endeavours of the Mitcham council and the excellent coordination of the Remembrance Day service by Colonel Light Gardens RSL, Mitcham RSL and Blackwood RSL, along with the engaging interactive displays by Women's Memorial Playing Fields, the Cheer-Up Hut, Violet Day and the yesteryear display, offered a moving and inclusive community event in memory of those who sacrificed their lives for us.

To the Colonel Light Gardens RSL: I congratulate you on being a welcoming, warm and inclusive community club, a hub of activity where anyone can feel that they belong and where they are always welcome. Your sense of community is a unique offering. Thank you for all you do and may you continue to thrive and serve the community.

### **MOUNT GAMBIER RETURNED AND SERVICES LEAGUE**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:17):** It is with pleasure that I rise to talk about the Mount Gambier RSL, which celebrated its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary on 15 July this year. Of course, I and many others were in attendance. The Mount Gambier RSL was established in 1917 and in 1921 was established at the corner of Bay Road and Commercial Street. In 1946, with the return of servicemen from World War II, discussions were held about shifting from that site and land was purchased at the corner of Commercial Street and Wehl Street, opposite Vansittart Gardens.

The site was not developed. It was decided to redevelop the current site at the corner of Commercial Street and Bay Road, which is right on the main corner, at a cost of £52,000. It was subsequently opened in 1957, where the RSL stayed for 30 years. In 1987, a very heavy rain storm came through Mount Gambier. Water came into the RSL, dripping down the walls, and discussions were again underway to make a move. Another factor for the relocation from the main corner was that the RSL was at the top of two flights of stairs, making it difficult for ageing members as well as those who prepared food for functions.

In 1989, a deal was done with a prominent businessperson to relocate to Sturt Street. The RSL rented a very small section of a building. In 1992, discussions commenced about introducing pokie machines to generate income for the RSL, with the machines arriving in 1994. A 10-year plan was developed in 1994 to buy out the existing owners of the building so that the RSL could eventually own the whole site. This was achieved over a three-stage project, with the RSL slowly purchasing out the existing owners. Today, the Mount Gambier RSL would be one of the biggest RSLs in South Australia and the longest serving in regional South Australia. Unfortunately, the RSL has faced some financial challenges due to decisions made many years ago.

I give praise to the committee of the RSL and the president, Bob Sandow vice president, Chris Smaling; and vice president, Peter Bruhn, and committee members Malcolm Driscoll, Marg Whitfield, Rod Wewer, Ian Summers, Trevor Ruth, Dale Fox and Peter Zukauskas, with the management group that runs the RSL Peter Zukauskas, Sam Dwyer, Kelly Copeland and Tracey Allen. The RSL is pleased that since announcing its financial woes, with the outstanding support of locals within the Limestone Coast region it is starting to stand on its own two feet. However, some decisions of many years ago still haunt the RSL today.

**An honourable member:** What about the state government?

**Mr BELL:** I was getting to that. I give credit to the state government. On 21 September 2017, the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place, on behalf of the state government, announced the intent to provide a secured loan of \$200,000 to the RSL. Unfortunately, at this point in time that money has not come through, but I know the RSL is working tirelessly to meet the demands required, and I still give much credit to the state government.

I also give credit to the Mount Gambier city council, which lifted a land management agreement on the Ferrers Street car park, a disused section. That can now be sold at a value of about \$300,000 which, again, will provide much-needed relief to the RSL. The city council has also provided rate relief by way of 50 per cent reduction in their rates for a two-year period. I am very confident that the current board of the RSL, with the expert leadership we are now seeing, has the RSL back on track. We just need that last little hurdle of the \$200,000 to come through, and I am pretty sure it will.

On Monday, Dan Tehan held a fundraiser, raising \$15,500, and I commend Dan for coming over and doing that. With that, I conclude my remarks.

### WHYALLA HIGH SCHOOLS AMALGAMATION

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:22):** I rise today to talk about the dramatic fall in wholesale electricity costs in South Australia, a very dramatic fall which obviously upsets those opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HUGHES:** —as well as the fact that we have become a very significant net exporter of electricity.

**Mr DULUK:** Point of order. I am outraged by the member for Giles' slur and I ask him to withdraw. I share his desire for lower electricity prices.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sad to hear you are outraged.

**Mr HUGHES:** It is very good to hear that indeed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Back to your grievance.

**Mr HUGHES:** I was going to talk about electricity but, given that one of the questions asked in question time, along with some supplementary questions, concerned the new high school proposal in Whyalla, I have decided to pick up that subject instead. It is a subject that is close to my heart not just as the member for Giles but also as someone who is the father of three children who, until fairly recently, went through the public education system in Whyalla.

There is a real need for a new high school in Whyalla, a new high school co-located with the university and the TAFE to create what I believe will be an amazing educational precinct. The simple fact is that we have just over 1,000 high school students in Whyalla scattered over three sites. We have two junior high schools feeding a senior high school, and one of those junior high schools has just over 100 students. This is not a sustainable proposition, and it is a proposition that disadvantages students in Whyalla.

The shift to a new high school, accommodating all our public high school students in Whyalla, will be a major step forward. I am not aware of anywhere else in the state in the public education system that has that model of junior high schools feeding into a senior secondary college. Tasmania had that system, and it was a really bad system. They had some of the worst results in the nation. There is often a range of factors at work, but the fact that you had this transitional arrangement in your high school years seriously disadvantaged students, especially some of the most vulnerable students.

The shift to a larger one-site high school in Whyalla will open up a range of opportunities that are not available at the moment. Some of that is just a pure numbers game. If you have a larger school, you are able to provide far more specialised services and far more specialised supports, so it will be to the benefit of all the high school students in Whyalla. Last year, there was extensive consultation with the school communities about what we should be looking for when it comes to the future of high school education in Whyalla.

I am pleased to say that the three principals and the chairs of the school councils have all come out in support of this worthwhile proposal. I touched on the fact that it will be co-located with the University of South Australia and the TAFE facility, so that will be one of the few places in the country where you have an educational precinct of that nature. The pathways and the linkages that will be provided will open up a whole raft of opportunities for students in Whyalla. One of the other things worth touching on is the fact that adjacent to the new site will be SABRENet.

SABRENet will allow that new high school to lock into a system that has speeds on average 100 times greater than the average speeds with the NBN. That in itself will open up all sorts of opportunities for the students and teachers at the new facility. It is important that we address some particular concerns that some parents have when it comes to bullying and other issues, and they are legitimate concerns, but they are far easier to address in a school with far more services and far



more support—a school with state-of-the-art facilities that will be a massive step forward from where we are now.

Time expired.

#### TELSTRA

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:27):** After all those lovely positive speeches, I am afraid I am rising to do a genuine grievance about my recent adventures with Telstra. I have a history going a long way back with Telstra. Way back when I set up my legal practice in Stirling, I was going to move into premises being vacated by a local accountant who was a good friend. We each made inquiries. One of us inquired about what it would cost to get a new telephone service put on and the other inquired about what it would cost to transfer the existing Commander two-line automatic to the new occupant.

When we did that, it turned out that it was only going to cost \$1,500 to put a new service in, requiring the removal of the old service and putting the new one in, but \$3,500 to change the name on the address and just keep the service exactly as it was. I thought that did not make much sense, so I rang them to see if we could do something more sensible. But, no, we could not. That was the point at which I should have stopped using Telstra altogether.

However, I have had a couple of trips overseas, not many, but I have yet to get a phone to work for me through Telstra while I am overseas. On one occasion when I went overseas, I was the shadow attorney at the time. I had bookings all week in London to do various things with the various people involved in crime reduction. I had all these appointments made before I left. I went over there, having made the arrangements at the Telstra shop that I would have a phone that worked, yet nothing could make the phone work.

When I came home, some investigation disclosed—and for this I got a written apology from David Thodey, the then CEO—that Telstra had received the payment that it always got month upon month from Treasury and Finance for my account and, having received it while I was overseas, they paid it to someone else and cut off my phone with no notice, so I had no phone while I was overseas. More recently, I went overseas and discovered that the phone still would not work.

I thought I had made all the arrangements. I had been to a Telstra shop and had done everything I could think of to get the phone so that it would work. I went overseas and could not get the phone to work. When I came home, upon inquiry they said, 'Oh, your phone was locked.' I had taken it to a Telstra shop specifically. I am not a technological person, so I had written down very carefully everything I had to do, but nothing I had to do could unlock the phone.

So this time, when I went to the CPA conference last month, I thought, 'You beauty. I am going to handle this.' I went to the Norwood Telstra shop. First of all, I got a fairly disinterested young lady. She clearly would have been more interested if I had been a six-pack guy, but she was not interested in old ladies.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Older ladies.

**Ms REDMOND:** Older ladies—I am older than you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no such thing as an old lady.

**Ms REDMOND:** She was not terribly interested and she just gave me a quick flick verbally to say, 'Just do this.' I said, 'The last time I went, my phone was locked.' She said, 'Yes, it might be locked', so she then handed me over to another person, who said they could unlock it. Yes, it had been locked and now they were able to unlock it.

'Terrific, what else do I have to do?' He said, 'What you can do is purchase international day roaming.' I took the little brochure that was given to me, a little printout, for an international day pass and I read about it. I went home and rang the number that was advised and spoke to a very nice young man in the Philippines. I do not often expect to get very good service from people in the Philippines, but a young man named Alyne Yoon gave me his employee number and, indeed, sent me a confirming email about the arrangements, so there I was thinking I was set. When I got to my first port of call, which was in Canada, I had the joy of a text from Telstra saying:

Welcome to Canada. As this is an eligible day pass destination, if you use your mobile you will be charged \$10 a day for your day pass. This includes unlimited standard calls, here and to any other country, plus 100 MB of data to use a day. For more details go to this...

and so on. I tried to make a phone call back to the office, but it said, 'No, sorry, international roaming is not available from this service. Your account is currently suspended.' Then of course I tried to ring because it said, 'For more information, please contact us on +61,' and the number. I rang that number, but of course it said to me, 'No, you can't make an international phone call on this phone. It doesn't work.'

I checked all the data settings I had written down, as per the long conversation with young Alyne from the Philippines, and then two days later they called me. First of all, they rang me but then told me, having rung me, that no-one was available to speak to me. They had made the phone call. No-one was available to speak to me, but they would call back five minutes later. They called back five minutes later only to advise that they would hang up because they had not assisted me. I tried again, of course, to make another international call, but again I had the response, 'Sorry, international calls are not available from this number.'

Everywhere I went I was receiving another mobile text message. I did get some text messages. I had one from Mike Smithson, while I was away. I had one successful phone call, an incoming phone call on my first night in Vancouver, from a young man in Perth from a Telstra call centre to find out whether I was happy with the package I was currently on with Telstra. I explained where I was and that he had woken me after I had finally got to sleep after a 27-hour journey, but we had a very pleasant and quite lengthy chat.

He would have been unaware at that stage because I had not had the chance to make any phone calls. Of course, when I did, I never ever had a successful phone call in spite of every arrangement I had made throughout my journey with them. I had written down everything I had to do. I had written it down on a hard copy. I had written it down in the phone. I had tried every available option to try to get assistance, but to no avail. I thank the house for its indulgence in allowing me to at least vent on this particular issue.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Unlike the rest of us, you are continuing to try to do that. We all buy international phones with international SIM cards and have international numbers.

### **BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:34):** Yesterday morning, with the member for Taylor I co-hosted a morning tea in Parliament House for community members who sought to raise our awareness of borderline personality disorder. I first learned what it was like having a family member with BPD from a resident, Karen, who was a carer for her daughter. She talked me through some of her devastating journey. Karen is an amazing woman who is determined to raise awareness about BPD and seek support for those living with the condition and their families. It is this commitment, energy and determination that led to our awareness gathering yesterday.

Very briefly, borderline personality disorder is defined as a complex mental illness that can make it difficult for people to feel safe in their relationships with others, to have healthy thoughts and beliefs about themselves and to control their emotions and impulses. Having BPD is a condition of brain and the mind. People living with borderline personality disorder may experience distress in their work and family and social life and may harm themselves. They can be at increased risk of suicide and frequently have contact with a number of agencies and service providers, including hospitals and health services, Drug and Alcohol Services SA, SA Ambulance Service, SAPOL, prison services, general practitioners, NGO community services and housing services.

Currently, between 2 per cent and 5 per cent of Australians are affected by borderline personality disorder at some stage in their lives. Symptoms can often appear between early teens and early adulthood. A complex mental illness that is often misunderstood, those living with BPD often feel stigmatised and frequently discriminated against. While the causes of BPD are not well understood, we do know that biological, social and environmental factors likely play a role. Furthermore, for some people, factors will also be related to childhood experience of trauma and neglect.

Yesterday, Dr Martha Kent OAM explained to us that people living with borderline personality disorder can recover. Talking therapies are improving the lives of those living with the condition. With proper intervention, treatment and support, the prognosis for people with borderline personality disorder is positive. One of the government's priorities is to ensure that all people living with BPD receive the most appropriate treatment and support and are not excluded from mental health services. The member for Taylor, in her former role as minister for mental health, recently released the Borderline Personality Disorder Implementation Plan.

The goal of the BPD Service is to assist in recovery, improve quality of life and minimise the personal and social impacts of people living with BPD. The key focus areas for the BPD service are: case management, access to relevant therapies and support for families, and clinical workforce training. People living with the condition and their families will benefit from this service, as it will improve the quality of life for people experiencing this debilitating illness. A specialised mental health service is the first step towards improving outcomes. The service will collaborate with other front-line agencies including SAPOL, Correctional Services, Housing and Education.

The action plan and its goals include fewer emergency department presentations and reduced hospital admissions; lower rates of substance abuse, self-harm, suicide and restraint; more people recovering and reduced rates of relapse; and lower health and social costs. An evidence-based evaluation of the service's effectiveness in meeting community need will be conducted in its first two years. I am pleased to be part of a government that is putting in place a framework for the delivery of this important service.

Evidence shows that new therapies now mean that borderline personality disorder is a treatable and curable illness with low relapse rates of around 5 per cent to 15 per cent. This means that with the right help and support most people with borderline personality disorder can achieve recovery. At our morning tea yesterday, I met Aaron, who told us of his journey with BPD and how, facing many challenges, today he is employed and studying law part-time. The story of his journey is inspirational.

I offer my sincere thanks to our speakers—Sharon Law (researcher), Tony (carer), Karen Bailey (carer), Aaron (consumer), Dr Martha Kent (clinician)—and to all those who attended in their various roles of consumers, carers and support practitioners. I also thank the members of parliament who came along to learn more about this condition and to assist those in our community affected by this mental health condition: the Minister for Health, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas; the Hon. Russell Wortley, President of the Legislative Council; the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC; the member for Fisher (soon to be Hurtle Vale); the member for Morphett; and the member for Florey.

Time expired.

*Ministerial Statement*

**MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN**

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:40):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:40):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith and passage of a bill through all stages without delay.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

*Bills***STAMP DUTIES (FOREIGN OWNERSHIP SURCHARGE) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:42):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:42):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill amends the Stamp Duties Act 1923 to introduce a foreign ownership surcharge on the conveyance or transfer of an interest in residential property to a foreign person, corporation or trust, executed on or after 1 January 2018, including landholder acquisitions. The surcharge will be set at a rate of 7 per cent of the dutiable value conveyed, but it will only be payable with respect to the extent of the interest in the residential property. The surcharge will be in addition to the normal stamp duty that is payable.

The definition of a foreign person includes natural persons, corporations and trusts. A foreign natural person is a person who is not an Australian citizen or a permanent resident. Generally, a company is a foreign company where it is incorporated outside Australia or where 50 per cent or more of its shareholding is held by other foreign persons or companies in aggregate. A trust will be a foreign trust where the trustee of the trust is a foreign individual or company, or where the trust itself is established for the benefit of, or is controlled by, foreign persons and companies.

This bill is similar but not the same as the measure that was in the Budget Measures Bill that was blocked in the other place. This measure has a new rate of 7 per cent, rather than 4 per cent, in an attempt to make up for some of the shortfall in revenue lost from the defeat of the Budget Measures Bill. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

## Explanation of Clauses

## Part 1—Preliminary

## 1—Short title

## 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

## 3—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions of the terms *foreign person* and *foreign trust*.

A natural person is a foreign person if the person is not—

- an Australian citizen within the meaning of the *Australian Citizenship Act 2007* of the Commonwealth; or
- the holder of a permanent visa within the meaning of section 30(1) of the *Migration Act 1958* of the Commonwealth; or
- a New Zealand citizen who is the holder of a special category visa within the meaning of section 32(1) of the *Migration Act 1958* of the Commonwealth.

A corporation is a foreign person if it is incorporated in a jurisdiction that is not an Australian jurisdiction or a person who is a foreign person or a trustee for a foreign trust (or a number of such persons in combination)—

- holds or hold 50% or more of the corporation's shares; or
- is or are entitled to cast, or control the casting of, 50% or more of the maximum number of votes at a general meeting of the corporation.

A trust is a foreign trust if the beneficial interests of the trust are fixed and a beneficial interest of 50% or more of the capital of the trust property is held by 1 or more foreign persons. A discretionary trust is a foreign trust if a trustee under the trust, a person who has power to appoint under the trust, an identified object under the trust or a person who takes capital of the trust in default is a foreign person.

The clause also inserts related definitions of *wholly foreign owned corporation* and *wholly foreign owned trust*.

#### 4—Insertion of Part 3 Division 9

This clause inserts a new Division into Part 3 of the Act.

##### Division 9—Foreign ownership surcharge

##### 72—Surcharge for foreign purchasers of residential land

Proposed section 72 makes provision for a *foreign ownership surcharge* payable in respect of a dutiable instrument executed on or after 1 January 2018 if the instrument effects, acknowledges, evidences or records a transaction whereby an interest in residential land is acquired by a foreign person or a person who takes the interest as trustee for a foreign trust. The surcharge, which is equal to 7% of the value of the interest acquired by the person, is to be taken to be duty payable on the instrument and is payable in addition to duty otherwise payable under the Act.

The proposed section includes a requirement for the Commissioner to refund a foreign ownership surcharge to a person where, within 12 months of the acquisition of the relevant interest, the person ceases to be a foreign person or the trust for which the person is trustee ceases to be a foreign trust. The refund is payable only if the interest is retained by the person when the person ceases to be a foreign person or the trust ceases to be a foreign trust.

There is also a requirement for a person who acquires an interest in residential land effected, acknowledged, evidenced or recorded by an instrument to which the section applies to pay the surcharge if the person becomes a foreign person, or the trust for which the person is trustee becomes a foreign trust, less than three years after the acquisition. A person who is liable to pay duty in these circumstances must notify the Commissioner that the person has become a foreign person, or that the trust has become a foreign trust, within 28 days.

The criteria for determining whether land is residential land are the same criteria that apply under section 71DC. Land will be taken to be residential land for the purposes of the section if—

- the Commissioner, after taking into account information provided by the Valuer-General, determines that it is being predominantly used for residential purposes; or
- the Commissioner, after taking into account information provided by the Valuer-General, determines that although the land is not being used for any particular purpose at the relevant time the land should be taken to be used for residential purposes due to improvements that are residential in character having been made to the land; or
- the Commissioner, after taking into account information provided by the Valuer-General, determines that the land is vacant, or vacant with only minor improvements, that the land is within a zone established under the planning and development law of this State that envisages the use, or potential use, of the land as residential, and that the land should be taken to be used for residential purposes due to that zoning (subject to the qualification that if the zoning of the land indicates that the land could, in a manner consistent with the planning and development law, be used for some other purpose (other than for primary production) then the vacant land will not be taken to be used for residential purposes).

#### 5—Insertion of section 102AB

This clause inserts a new section into Part 4 of the Act (Land holding entities).

##### 102AB—Surcharge where foreign person or group acquires interest in residential land

Proposed section 102AB provides for the payment of a foreign ownership surcharge in relation to transactions entered into on or after 1 January 2018 that are dutiable under Part 4. The surcharge is payable by a foreign entity if the entity, or a group of which the entity is a member, notionally acquires an interest in residential land. A *foreign entity* is a foreign person or a foreign trust. The amount of the surcharge is 7% of the value of the interest notionally acquired by the entity, or 7% of the entity's interest in the interest notionally acquired by the group, in the residential land. Section 102AB includes requirements for the payment of a refund where an entity that has paid the surcharge ceases to be a foreign entity within 12 months of the relevant notional acquisition. The refund is payable only if the relevant interest is retained when the entity ceases to be a foreign entity. As with section 72, there is also a requirement for an entity to pay the surcharge if it becomes a foreign entity within three years of the notional acquisition of an interest in residential land by

the entity, or by a group of which the entity is a member, as a result of a transaction to which the section applies.

The criteria for determining whether land is residential land are the same as the criteria that apply under section 71DC and proposed section 72.

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:44):** I do not think there has ever been a bigger contrast between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party here in South Australia. Again, at every single opportunity, we see the Labor Party wanting to increase the tax burden on the people of South Australia, whereas people on this side of the house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sit down. I remind members of the standing orders. The Treasurer was heard in silence. The house needs to offer that respect to every member on their feet when making a contribution. Therefore, I will have to get the bad book out as the leader continues his speech, and some of you already have ticks and crosses.

**Mr MARSHALL:** As I was saying, I think it is great for democracy that the people of South Australia at the next election will have a choice—a choice between a high-taxing, dysfunctional Labor administration and a lower taxing alternative. The Liberal Party of South Australia wants to lower taxes, deregulate here in South Australia and drive growth in our economy, growth in our exports and growth in investment here in South Australia. What we see at every single opportunity is those opposite always trying to stick their hand in the pockets of the taxpayers of South Australia.

We have had to rescue the taxpayers from opposition on multiple occasions. As you would recall, Madam Deputy Speaker, at the last election the government took a proposal to the people of South Australia to put a car park tax on people coming into car parks. This was completely rejected by the people of South Australia: I think the Labor primary vote was 36 per cent at that election. So we came to the new parliament after the budget was handed out in 2014 and we worked with the crossbenches in that other place to make sure that that would not proceed.

In that instance, the government did the right thing. They removed the offending part of that budget measures bill, and they allowed the rest of that budget measures bill to go through. We also note that the government, addicted to increasing taxes—it is in their DNA—before the last election said that they would never put a land tax on the family home, even though it had been canvassed by some of the members opposite.

The then Treasurer, the now member for Playford, the potential aspirant for the seat of Florey until recently, said that if they were going to put that tax onto the family home then they would discuss it with the people of South Australia, come clean with the people of South Australia and take it to an election. Did they do that? Absolutely not. In the first budget handed down immediately after the 2014 election, they removed the remission on the emergency services levy and thereby put that massive ongoing tax onto the family home.

The Liberal Party's position on this tax is also very clear. We are going to restore the \$360 million that this government has wrenched from the people of South Australia because we in the Liberal Party believe that people, given the money in their pocket, will make better choices to improve their lives. The Labor Party of course prefer to take that money from households and from small business to put in the Treasury coffers because they think they know what is best in terms of government expenditure. Of course, we know that that is not the case.

Fast-forward to the budget that was handed down in June this year. There were some very unacceptable parts of that budget, in particular, the imposition of this major bank levy, the so-called state bank tax. We know that this tax was never going to create one single job for South Australia. We know that it was actually going to drive investment dollars out of South Australia. This government has presided over the economy now for almost 16 years: it is a very fragile economy in South Australia. The very last thing we need in South Australia is another body blow to investor confidence in South Australia by removing that certainty.

When we asked questions about this in the house, the Treasurer was pretty clear on this issue; he was being pretty frank. He said, 'We're going to tax anybody who is not paying enough tax in this state.' We have asked him repeatedly to outline who these other people in South Australia are

that are not paying enough tax. Let's provide some early warning to these people because certainty is a critical aspect in trying to attract investment in South Australia. All this government has done is increase uncertainty and drive investor dollars out of South Australia. They have done it with their failed management of the Gillman precinct and they have done it with their failed management of the new courts precinct or the new prisons project here in South Australia. There have been so many examples.

Most recently, of course, we have the gross mismanagement of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site in South Australia. The government first announced this project back in 2007, yet a decade later we still have no clear picture of what the government is going to do. What we do know is that they gave an exclusivity arrangement to one company about a year ago. Then, after that company spent plenty of money on putting their bid into place, what did the government do? Again, they created that level of uncertainty, and this is what is driving down investor confidence in South Australia.

We heard the Premier today in the parliament suggesting that I had changed my position on this Budget Measures Bill, which was previously before the parliament. In fact, I was always opposed to any increases in taxes, but the Premier is quite right: it is a precedent in this place, it is a practice in this place not to oppose budget measures bills. Having said that, the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place has catalogued all the examples of where the Labor Party has amended budget measures bills, both in government and in opposition over the last 35 years that he has been in this place. I refer the members opposite to his excellent contribution in that chamber—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That's a long time.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Thirty-five, yes; I see you acknowledging that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He was 12 when he arrived.

**Mr MARSHALL:** That's right; he is looking very good. I think the parliament has been good for his longevity. The reality is that it was an extraordinary move for the Liberal Party to seek to amend this Budget Measures Bill, but we did not do it without due consideration. We did it because we believed that it was a decision that was in the best interests of all South Australians. Sticking this major bank levy in place here in South Australia, differentiated from any other state in Australia, was not the right thing to do if we were serious about growing our economy. We on this side of the house are serious about getting this state moving after essentially treading water with 16 years of failed Labor administration.

So we said to the government, 'Remove the provisions for the state bank tax and allow your full Budget Measures Bill to go through.' What we had thereafter was an incredible series of threats made by the Treasurer and by this government. First they said, 'There's just no way we can provide this payroll tax concession without this money going through.' Of course, this turned out to be inaccurate. The Under Treasurer confirmed to a parliamentary inquiry that the payroll tax concession could be provided as an administered item of the government, as it had been previously. However, the Treasurer failed to point that out to the people of South Australia. He said that the Liberal Party wants to block the tax. Well, this was just completely and utterly inaccurate but it is what we have become used to with this government.

Then they said that we will not be able to have the stamp duty concessions. Again, this was not accurate. Now we have the Treasurer coming into this place today saying, 'Well, we are going to provide the payroll tax concessions and we are going to provide the stamp duty concessions, and we are going to do it administratively,' just as the Liberal Party has been saying for several months. But more than that, the Treasurer and the Premier have gone to some lengths to suggest that they are so wedded to this idea of making these payroll tax concessions permanent that it must be legislated. It was their ardent belief that it must be legislated.

I say to the Treasurer today that if he is so wedded to this concept of it being made permanent on the statute, the Liberal Party is not standing in your way. From day one, the Liberal Party said that there was only one offensive component to the Budget Measures Bill. Now the Treasurer and the Premier have moved away from their position that they want to enshrine this in legislation because

somehow it could be tinkered with otherwise. Maybe the government has changed its position long term with regard to these concessions because they have certainly been out threatening businesses.

Only last week, the Treasurer was on the record saying that he was going to write to every single small business in South Australia and say that payroll taxes would have to go up if he could not get his bill through. Well, the bill has not gone through. He has not gone through with his threat and he has not persisted with his bullying techniques, and what we have before us today is, of course, this revised attempt for this government to save face. It has been a humiliating time for this Treasurer and for this Premier in South Australia. But the good news is that the people of South Australia have again been saved from another new tax being imposed upon them from the Labor Party.

Another thing I would say at this point is that we were in a very clear position regarding our party's position many months ago. The crossbenchers in the other place were also very certain of their position many months ago. Unfortunately, this whole issue has been dragged out either because of incompetence—that is, the Treasurer's numeracy skills: he could not count the numbers in the other chamber; there are 22 and you need 11 to get your bill passed—or for some reason he just wanted to threaten the people of South Australia over such a long period of time. Either way, he has not been successful. He has egg all over his face and today we find ourselves back in this chamber now looking at a new bill, the Stamp Duties (Foreign Ownership Surcharge) Amendment Bill.

Despite the fact that we have only been presented with the bill in the last few minutes, we can count the numbers on this side of the house and we know that we would not be able to stop this foreign ownership surcharge even if we wanted to. But, true to our word, over the last six months we have made it very clear that we would not be holding up any part of the Budget Measures Bill, apart from, of course, the state bank levy. We will allow this to pass. We do not like any increases in taxes.

I note that when this was first floated as a potential source of additional revenue in South Australia, the Treasurer's comments were very different from what they have been this year. In June 2016, when the budget was being framed and other jurisdictions around the country were putting on these foreign ownership surcharges, the Treasurer in South Australia ruled it out. He said, 'We won't be doing this in South Australia. This would be xenophobic.' He said that there was no way South Australia would participate. He said, 'We want to drive investment from foreign owners here in South Australia,' yet, less than 12 months later, he has done a massive backflip because he is addicted to taxes. Not only is he addicted to taxes and wanting to put this in place but he is now, within days, wanting to increase it even further.

We said that if the budget was introduced we would not stand in its way. We guaranteed the supply of the government. We did not like the budget measure which related to the state bank tax. The government had their opportunity to remove it but they did not. We will scrutinise the bill further in the other place. We will announce our tax policy in plenty of time before the next election. We look forward to the government handing down its Mid-Year Budget Review. We would be grateful if the Treasurer gave us some indication as to when that could potentially be. After that, we will be in a position to assess the financial legacy that the government elected in March next year will inherit. We will announce the reforms that we will make to finally turn this state around, make it strong again and get it back on track.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (15:59):**

Today, the ABS reported the trend unemployment rate at 5.6 per cent, the lowest in five years, representing 26 continuous months of employment growth. Of course, that has occurred at a time when we have consumed the loss of one of the largest industries within one of the most significant sectors in our economy: the car industry within the manufacturing industry. As we crafted the plan back in August 2014 and put it in place, obviously we had to deal with the challenges of that transition.

Midway through that period, when our unemployment rate got as high as almost 8 per cent, we had those opposite predicting double-digit unemployment and suggesting that our economic plan was not working. We recommitted to that plan, we invested in it, and what we see today is the effect of that plan on the South Australian economy—thousands and thousands of South Australians in work, having a purpose and providing for themselves and their families because of the policies of this government: investing in the industries of the future, securing the defence contract, securing the IT jobs, the high-tech manufacturing jobs, the food and tourism and wine jobs, the education sector jobs, the jobs that are creating a sense of purpose for South Australians.



Incredibly excitingly, it is taking us into a leadership role in renewable energy and the low-carbon economy, which is attracting attention from around the world. When Elon Musk said that he wanted to partner with South Australia because it was taking a risk and he wanted to be a partner in its clean energy future, he was sending a message around the world, to risk-takers around the world, that, if you are an entrepreneur with an idea, come to this state because it is a state that will support you and allow your business to grow.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Many of those businesses are beating a path to our door, and that is the reason why we are seeing this surge—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —in growth in employment in this state. If we had listened to those opposite, if we had accepted their economic recipe for this state, we certainly would be facing double-digit unemployment. That is the spectre that haunts this state if they were to make the decision to allow those opposite to govern after March 2018. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition has airbrushed history with his blithe suggestion, 'Oh, yes, this was always our position, to oppose the bank tax.' It is absurd that he advances that. He said that he would support the bank levy, then the banks lobbied him, then he said that he would oppose the bank levy. That is the order of events and it is manifestly clear on the public record.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport is called to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** If the Leader of the Opposition would like his words thrown back in his face, I am more than happy to do it. Marshall: 'The budget will be going through in the next month or so, and we have a tradition in the South Australian parliament that the government of the day—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Listen further.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —passes its budget. I think this sets up a real showdown at the next election where we think we are going to get a higher taxing Labor government or a lower taxing Liberal government. Let the people of South Australia make their decision at the ballot box in March next year.' Marshall: 'Oh, look, this is the Premier's budget,' in answer to a question about the bank tax.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: the Speaker has pointed out time and time again that even reading material into *Hansard* requires the members to be addressed by their title or their electorate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sure we could rectify that part of it.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The Leader of the Opposition: 'Oh, look, this is the Premier's budget. It will pass the parliament, but I think it sets up a very interesting showdown at the next election.' If there is any doubt that he was talking precisely about the bank tax passing, the Leader of the Opposition says: 'I think, with the car park tax, that was something that we took to the last election. We believe we had a mandate, Labor only getting 36 per cent of the vote. But the tradition in the South Australian parliament is that the government of the day passes its Supply Bill and ultimately its budget.'

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Further, the Leader of the Opposition:

There's 175-year history where the Government's Budget of the day gets passed. There was an extraordinary situation that was set up in...2014...because that was an election which I think gave a clear mandate—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** He continues:

—to our position to scrap the car park tax. That isn't the situation in this instance.

So the Leader of the Opposition was drawing a distinction about why he was permitted to oppose the car park tax and said, in contradistinction, that the bank tax sat in a different position. The Leader of the Opposition, instead of coming here and honestly owning the fact that he changed his mind—and in a moment I will go to why that might be the case, why he may not be coming in here and honestly owning up and taking responsibility for these matters—he comes in here and pretends it was always his position that he was going to block the bank tax, and somehow draws a distinction between the Supply Bill and the Budget Measures Bill. That does not reflect what he said. It does not reflect the record in black and white.

What he has done is come in here, sneak in here, and suggest that this was somehow always his position, rather than have the courage of owning up to the fact that he changed his mind. Own it, own the fact that you shifted your position. There is no dishonour in shifting your position—except, of course, if you have a consciousness of guilt, when in your heart of hearts you realise that you are not prepared to own up and accept responsibility for your decision, when you realise in your own mind that there might have been something else operating on your decision. What would that be?

**Mr Marshall:** You tell us then.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, that is for you to tell us. You are the one who is coming in here and not honestly and openly owning up and taking responsibility for your decisions. This is for you to answer this question. It is for the Leader of the Opposition to answer the question of why he is dissembling about coming into this place and not telling us the truth about why he shifted his position.

One can only speculate, but it has something to do with a meeting, or series of meetings, that occurred between the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Opposition, and the banks. That is one thing we know. What we have is a clear position, on the public record, of support, then we have the lobbying by the banking sector, and then we have a shift in a position. Then we have this mealy-mouthed dissembling about whether, in fact, he did shift the position. Just own it, just own the fact that the position has been shifted.

This is consistent. You say that this is a contest at the next election—my word it is. It is about character. It is about owning up and taking responsibility for your own decisions. It is about leadership and about standing up for South Australia. What will be the next call? Will it be from Sally Zou when she decides to collect on her donation, or will it be from some other large, powerful interest that arrives in town and muscles the Leader of the Opposition to kowtow—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I would like to draw members' attention to standing orders where we are supposed to give people on their feet the right to be heard in silence. I draw the Premier back to the nub of the debate.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This goes fundamentally to the issue. This is an issue—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We are listening very carefully.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This is an issue of character—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This goes to the question of character, this goes to the question at stake, and the reason—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Point of order on my left. Please be seated, Premier. The member for Unley has a point of order.

**Mr PISONI:** Standing order 128: irrelevance and repetition. Not only is the Premier being irrelevant to the bill, the bill is about a new tax, or an increase in tax, for foreign investors here in South Australia, and the Premier himself—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Having drawn my attention to 128, we are going to listen very carefully to the Premier and remind him not to be repetitious.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I will draw my remarks—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He has already said that once, so if he says it again that is repetition, isn't it?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Deputy Speaker, what we are talking about here, the reason we are debating this bill, is that the Leader of the Opposition shifted his position. He shifted his position after lobbying by a powerful interest.

I make this point: there are many powerful interests that come to bear on the political process. There is lobbying that comes to bear on the political process. The real question is whether you are prepared to stand up for South Australia or whether you bow down to the pressures that are brought to bear, whether it is Malcolm Turnbull on the telephone saying, 'Drop the 50 per cent renewable energy target,' and then miraculously every Liberal opposition leader in the nation whistles up the same policy on the same day. That is not some independent assessment of public policy by the Liberal Party of South Australia, that is being whistled up by a large powerful interest. Who else is going to arrive in town? Who else is going to arrive in town and put pressure on the Leader of the Opposition?

This debate is fundamentally about whether you are prepared to stand up for South Australia or whether you are prepared to bow down to the pressure applied by five corporate interests. Banks, making \$30 billion of profits and our asking to pay one-third of 1 per cent of those profits by way of taxation, that is what happened here, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition is so shy about coming in here and accepting responsibility for his actions.

**Mr Marshall:** Goodness gracious! You're a sore loser.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:10):** It is amazing, isn't it, what we have witnessed here from the Treasurer and the Premier today? The politics of envy. This whole South Australian bank tax was all about the politics of envy, and guess what? They got the politics wrong because the South Australian public is much smarter than that. They know that this is a tax on them and a tax on business and a tax on the private sector in South Australia, and they know that it is the private sector that generates jobs in South Australia.

This government actually believes that it is its responsibility to run the economy. Look at the job they are doing in South Australia. It is an extraordinary situation. If we talk about self-interest, you cannot get anything more self-interested than being a member of the Australian Labor Party, the South Australian Labor Party in particular. Look at what has evolved in the shoppies union—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PISONI:** —over the last 30 or 40 years. This is about character and the conflicts of interest that face these people opposite every day in this chamber when they put their union before the people of South Australia. It happens time and time again. Look at what happens at Coles, Woolworths, Foodland, Big W, KFC, Subway and McDonald's. Kids' penalty rates on Sundays are trashed in exchange for the union having access to 15 or 16-year-olds on their first day at work. Read the enterprise bargaining agreement. It is all there. They are forced to sit in front of a union member,

a union delegate, who will put this single stick in front of them and say, 'Look at what will happen to you if you do not join our union.'

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Point of order. Order! We have a point of order. Member for Unley, we have a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I just point out that the member made a point of order about irrelevance earlier, and he is now talking about industrial relations.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is a member on his feet.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** So—

*Mr Wingard interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Mitchell, you are on two warnings and you will leave us if you continue. That would be a tragedy.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Had the member not moved his point of order, I would not have cared but given he is a hypocrite, he should have the same point of order apply to him.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down. We have to ask you to withdraw the word 'hypocrite'.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I withdraw the term 'hypocrite', ma'am, but my point of order stands about irrelevance.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

*Mr Wingard interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Mitchell, you move your lips once more and I will have to do something about it.

*Mr Wingard interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Then you need to leave the room. We are going to have to remind members that the Chair has been very lenient in letting people say a great deal in this debate. It is usual in the house for members to be given a wideranging opportunity in this sort of debate. So if I have to draw one of you back, you will all have to come back. I think it is important that we just try to keep to the topic which is the bill before us. I know you are going to try to do that, member for Unley.

**Mr PISONI:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Of course, character is the topic that the Premier brought into this debate, and I will respond to the issue of character that he introduced into this debate. Of course, what happens on that induction night is that, after a half an hour of propaganda that has continued to be thrown at these—

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** Point of order: section 128 again. You have given him some leniency and he has jumped straight back into talking about industrial relations, which has nothing to do with the bill before us.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It was beginning to sound like a friendly society's secret meeting at that point, but I know he will draw himself back to the nub of the discussion in the time that is remaining and try to give us something reasonable towards the bill.

**Mr PISONI:** This is about the politics of envy. This government pulled that trigger and they failed. We need to look at the history of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party

and its foundations within the shoppies union in South Australia. Everything is political. Even a 15-year-old trolley collector's first day at Coles or Woolworths is a political event because of the shoppies union in South Australia, just as the bank tax was a political tax, a political event here in South Australia, so that this Treasurer could push the button to set up an election based on the politics of envy. Guess what? You lost, Treasurer. You lost.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Did I?

**Mr PISONI:** Yes, you did. You were pulled up as the phoney that you are.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is unparliamentary to interject and it is unparliamentary to respond. I have a point of order on my right.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I ask the member to withdraw the remark that I am a phoney.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are a phoney? He could not have possibly said that. He did say that? I am going to give you the opportunity to withdraw it.

**Mr PISONI:** I am not sure that it is unparliamentary.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sure he is the real Treasurer, if that is what you are talking about.

**Mr PISONI:** Is the word 'phoney' unparliamentary?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He has asked you to withdraw it—that is the point.

**Mr PISONI:** I am happy to withdraw. I know that he is very bruised this week after having to—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PISONI:** —suck eggs.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sit down! Apparently, 'phoney' is there with 'banshee'. In other words, it is okay, so there it is.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, there is no point to all of that. Let's get back to the bill. I am sure the people of South Australia are more interested in the bill.

**Mr PISONI:** I am just surmising as to how—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have a point of order; sit down. Member for Newland.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** The Treasurer asked the member for Unley to withdraw and apologise. You have ruled that 'phoney' is in fact unparliamentary.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, it is not. It is like 'banshee'.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** I thought 'banshee' was. Mick said 'banshee' was as well.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You want me to rule on the word 'phoney'? Hang on, this could be groundbreaking. The computer says no. Let's get back to the bill.

**Mr PISONI:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. This is the culture that has evolved with the South Australian Labor Party. They like to tax. They will achieve anything they can by taxing. They even tax their union members in the shoppies union an extra 10 per cent that they then pay Coles and Woolworths to deduct their union fees from their salaries. So the lowest paid—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Unley, sit down.

**Mr PISONI:** —workers—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sit down! We are prepared to give you as much leniency as we have to this point, but it is going to now be about the bill. The debate in the chamber is to be relevant

to the bill. The Chair has been lenient on both sides for two speakers, so it stops now. Member for Unley.

**Mr PISONI:** I am done.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You have finished? Great. Treasurer, if you speak, you close the debate.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (16:19):** Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You do not have to say anything except that you move it a second time, really.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you for the advice. Thank you to the house for the quick passage of the first stage. It is an important measure to try to undo some of the damage done by the blockage of the budget. My real gripe about the blockage of the budget bill is not so much that the measure has fallen down, it is that a principle that has been held in longstanding convention in this place that has served this state well has been trashed. That is why it saddens me that the budget measure has not passed. Despite what the shadow minister says, and what the Leader of the Opposition says, these conventions have served this parliament well. It served this state well. It served Tom Playford well, it served Don Dunstan well—

**Mr Duluk:** Sir Thomas Playford; get it right.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My apologies: Sir Thomas Playford—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport is called to order for the first time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I say to the younger members who are sitting on the backbench, looking from afar at the front benches, that they are being led down a path that they do not recognise by their leader. It would not have been a path that they recognised when they joined the Liberal Party. It would not have been a path of this sort of radical, extreme type of politicking that the member for Unley and the member for Dunstan are advocating—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Money bills have been, by and large, only amended or abandoned by governments. Governments make the decision about whether or not these bills should pass. The examples that the shadow treasurer—and former treasurer—the Hon. Rob Lucas introduced into debate for precedence were on the basis of the Legislative Council using its constitutional power to make suggestions to the House of Assembly, which is its right, but the House of Assembly can reject those suggestions.

The Legislative Council then has two options: it can enter into a deadlock conference to try to resolve the dispute between the houses, or the bill is set aside. The opposition, with other members of the crossbench in the Legislative Council, set the bill aside. That is the first time a money bill has been set aside in this state's history. It is the first time a budget measures bill has been set aside in the state's history. That is unprecedented. It has never occurred before, but I am pretty sure it will not be the last time now, and that is the sad part of this debate.

While members are crowing about this measure being blocked, it is not a victory for parliamentary democracy. It is not a victory for the Liberal Party. It is a victory for an external force that has unbelievable reach and influence in this parliament. There has been much talk of a federal royal commission into the banking sector, and I am sure that the royal commission will look into the Bankers' Association's influence into political decision-making around the country and indeed in South Australia. It will be interesting to see what is found out during that royal commission about the opposition's public statements leading up to their backflip and then the sudden backflip. The Premier is right: it is about character. The trade union royal commission was also conducted—

**Mr Pisoni:** Great stuff about Bill Shorten in there.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is reminded he is on two warnings and I would hate to lose his contribution for the rest of the day.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Again, whenever they trash the conventions of the parliament, to disguise trashing those conventions, it turns personal. That is all the member for Unley has: personal attacks. That is all he has; that is all he has in his repertoire. It is not policy. He has not got up and argued a point of policy. In the end, I suspect the Liberal Party will support this measure. I suspect they are going to vote for it, despite the calls opposite, by saying, 'Yes, it's just another tax measure.' Yes, it is another tax measure that members opposite are going to support.

The reality is we did not have to be in here today with an increased surcharge from 4 per cent to 7 per cent; the budget could have been passed. If the opposition were so desperate to fight the bank levy at the last election, what they should have done—which is what the constitution is designed to do—is you say, 'The government's budgets are passed, and if you elect the opposition they will repeal it.' The opposition could have gone to the election fighting an opposition to the major bank levy, and we could have gone to the election defending the major bank levy, but the opposition are such strategic geniuses they block it.

We know now that, even if we win, this measure cannot pass. We won the last election and they did not pass our tax measures. Whatever we do, they are not going to support it because they are in the pockets of other interests. That is why we have to increase this levy from 4 per cent to 7 per cent. It has absolutely nothing to do with the SDA. It has nothing to do with any of the personal, vile, bitter attacks the member for Unley has, because that is all he has. It was not an issue on policy—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Point of order on my left.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I ask you to apply your last ruling to the Treasurer. The comments he has been making for the last five minutes have nothing to do with stamp duty on foreign investors of residential property in South Australia.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The table apologises. We have been dealing with the next set of problems that we anticipate facing. We are going to listen very carefully to the Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I thank the parliament for the speedy passage of the second reading and I am sure, given the discussions that I have had with the Hon. John Darley, the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Mr Brokenshire and the Hon. Mr Parnell, that this will have a speedy passage in the upper house as well. I suspect that the opposition will support it, too, but they may not. They may again go back to their wrecking ways, opposing measures.

Indeed, if this is such a terrible provision, why was there was no criticism of Gladys Berejiklian or Mike Baird when they introduced it in New South Wales, a Liberal government? There was no criticism of the major bank levy of Scott Morrison and the Prime Minister when they introduced it, but we have found out subsequently that secretly the Leader of the Opposition said he opposed it but just did not say anything to anyone. He kept it quiet, which I think speaks volumes. I commend the bill to the house and its speedy passage to the other house.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (16:26):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ELECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (16:27):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local

Government (Elections) Act 1999 and to make a related amendment to the City of Adelaide Act 1998. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (16:28):** 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.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is that seconded?

**Mr PISONI:** No, it is not.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, you do need to read it apparently. Once any one member withdraws leave you need to read it and put it on the record, or you could try to insert half of it later.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (16:29):** Okay, I will try that. The local government (Elections) Amendment Bill 2017 seeks to reform legislative provisions to improve the operation of local government elections and a voter turnout and to make miscellaneous amendments to achieve a more consistent and contemporary legislative elections framework for the local government sector.

The bill is based on work undertaken jointly by the Office of Local Government, the Local Government Association of South Australia (LGA) and the Electoral Commission of South Australia (ECSA) to review the operations of the 2014 local government elections. A discussion paper was released for public consultation in September 2015, with further consultation undertaken in October 2016 to clarify council's position on two key issues.

The review process found limited support for fundamental changes to the local government election system. Voluntary postal voting for local government elections will therefore remain in place. However, this review provided an opportunity to remove limitations and inefficiencies in the current local government election processes contained within the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 and subordinate legislation, as well as the City of Adelaide Act 1998 and subordinate legislation.

I now turn to the key elements of the bill. The first of these is quite straightforward. This is the proposed requirement for candidates to disclose whether they live within the council or ward they are contesting to ensure that this pertinent piece of information is readily available to people considering their vote. The second will provide all candidates with access to an electronic version of the voters roll.

The combination of provisions within the Electoral Act 1985 and the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 means that candidates who are members of registered political parties have access to an electronic copy of the House of Assembly portion of the voters roll in local government elections, but candidates who are not members of a registered party can only obtain a printed copy of the voters roll. The bill will therefore allow all candidates access to an electronic copy of the voters roll, with penalties in place for misuse of the voters roll, similar to the penalty that applies to the misuse of the House of Assembly roll.

The final significant element of the bill will require groups and bodies corporate in the City of Adelaide exercising their property franchise to designate a natural person to vote on their behalf. This reform has resulted from a recent case in the Court of Disputed Returns being brought to my attention by the then acting electoral commissioner where the honourable Chief Justice held that self-identification, when used to exercise a vote, is not sufficient as it provides no objective test in respect of the voter's entitlement to exercise that vote.

Under current provisions, the Adelaide City Council Act requires the City of Adelaide to maintain the property franchise roll and provide ballot papers to all property franchise holders. This will not change. However, to exercise their vote, group and body corporate property franchisors in the city currently rely on self-identification; that is, a person who is able to vote on behalf of the body



corporate or group without having to produce evidence that they are entitled to exercise that vote. On the advice of the Electoral Commission, this bill will change these arrangements.

Following discussions between the joint working group and representatives from the City of Adelaide this bill proposes that, in order for a group or body corporate property franchisors to receive their ballot papers, the group or body corporate will have to nominate a designated natural person who meets the eligibility criteria. I am confident this bill will improve the operation of local government elections and achieve a more consistent and contemporary legislative elections framework for the local government sector. I commend the bill to members. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999*

4—Amendment of section 6—Supplementary elections

The clause makes amendment to allow for the day and time at which voting at the election will close on polling day to be determined by the returning officer.

5—Amendment of section 9—Council may hold polls

Subclause (1) amends section 9(3) to require the council to provide notice of polling day by notice published on the council's website. Subclause (2) makes a consequential amendment.

6—Amendment of section 15—The voters roll

The clause makes several amendments to section 15 to permit the voters roll to be supplied and kept up to date in accordance with the requirements set out in the clause.

7—Substitution of section 19A

This clause substitutes section 19A as follows:

19A—Provision and publication of candidate profile

The proposed section substantially re-enacts the provisions in current section 19A, but removes the requirement for an electoral statement to accompany each candidate profile.

8—Amendment of section 27—Publication of electoral material

This clause makes a technical amendment.

9—Amendment of section 29—Ballot papers

This clause makes changes to the time for the drawing of lots to be 4 pm in the case of a periodic election, or in any other case 12 noon, or as reasonably practicable after those times.

10—Amendment of section 39—Issue of postal voting papers

This clause makes an amendment consequential on other amendments in the measure that change the time at which voting papers must be returned.

11—Amendment of section 43—Issue of fresh postal voting papers

This clause makes an amendment consequential on other amendments in the measure that change the time at which voting papers must be returned.

12—Amendment of section 47—Arranging postal papers

This clause makes an amendment consequential on other amendments in the measure that change the time at which voting papers must be returned.

13—Amendment of section 48—Method of counting and provisional declarations

The clause sets out the method by which the returning officer must conduct the counting of votes in an election conducted to fill 1 vacancy.

14—Amendment of section 91A—Conduct of council during election period

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

Schedule 1—Related amendment to *City of Adelaide Act 1998*

1—Amendment of Schedule 1—Special provisions for elections and polls

The clause makes several amendments to bring the provisions in the Act into line with the amendments proposed in the measure to the *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

### **CIVIL LIABILITY (TRESPASS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October 2017.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:34):** I rise to speak on the Civil Liability (Trespass) Amendment Bill 2017. This bill was introduced by the Attorney-General on 18 October 2017 to amend the Civil Liability Act 1936.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are you the lead speaker?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am the lead and probably only speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You have said that to me before and that has not been the case.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have generally followed through. These do not always attract a manifestly large number of people interested, but I am sure that if I gave a speech on the reason we have the Civil Liability Act 1936 it would be so absorbing that people would rush to the chamber.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Did you? Well, I could get really quite passionate about this. The most important thing about civil liability, in my view, is that governments should be as accountable as anyone else and so should their agencies and anyone employed or acting under instruction from them. Why is that so important? Because governments, relative to individuals, particularly in this state, are in a position of Goliath versus David. I am very passionate about this issue, so when amendments are presented to amend this legislation, which at present, except in certain circumstances identified in specific acts, they bind the Crown, and that is very important.

Nevertheless, this bill specifically proposes that there be no legal action for trespass that could be made against an officer serving a notice on behalf of the Crown when entering private property (namely, land), excluding a residential building. Mostly, this relates to police officers, who are of course employed by the Crown. I think it is fair to say that it is for a perfectly lawful purpose, particularly in the exercise of their delivery of service of summons and directions to be served pursuant to court action.

An authorised officer has the right to trespass with lawful excuse granted in certain circumstances. The authorised officers include, for the purposes of this bill, police officers, protective security officers, a sheriff of the court, a Public Service employee, any other person engaged by the Crown and persons included in the regulations. To the best of my knowledge, there are no others at this point, but that of course can vary and is subject to the disallowance provisions for all regulations.

On 19 October, a government briefing was provided. I thank those who attended for that purpose. To date, I have asked for two things, and they have not yet been provided. As I explained to the Attorney today, I am happy to proceed on the basis that this bill is passed today in this house and on the understanding that I will get these two things and that we may or may not consider some amendment between now and the other place. The first is to identify any cases that are pending against such officers—police officers or others—and the particulars of each and a list of those who

were consulted; to date, as I understand it, it has only been SAPOL, which was the only party who requested what is incorporated in this bill.

Secondly, that SAicorp, which of course is the state's insurance company, makes provision for the payment of claims for which there is some liability of the Crown. Essentially, what happens is that agencies pay an amount to SAicorp, a bit like their own private insurance company, and taxpayers pay the bill if there is some breach compensable in that way. It is a little bit concerning to me that it should come at the request of an agency without full disclosure of specifically what is at stake without the passage of these amendments.

I can only really rely on submissions that I have received and the fact that I made my own inquiries in relation to the one case I am aware of, that is, from the pleadings in the case of Dean Cosenza v the State of South Australia. Mr Cosenza instituted proceedings in the Supreme Court, civil jurisdiction, for which he was awarded, in a default judgement, \$100,000 compensation for an electricity salesman entering his property when he had ignored a no trespass notice.

The Full Court has heard an application, or it may have been a single judge. Nevertheless, the matter went on appeal. I will change that to this extent. I had referred previously to a Supreme Court application. My understanding is that it was a Magistrates Court application and that there was an order for payment by default on appeal that has been set aside. I think the status of that case at present is that Justice Blue of the Supreme Court, having overturned the Magistrates Court decision, leaves an outstanding claim for damages, which is now defended by the company (I think it is Origin), and that will follow its usual course. The details and extent of any other outstanding cases I am yet to receive. The government is on notice that we need to have some understanding about that before we give a final blessing to this legislation in the other place.

Let me be clear about this. There is good reason why we do not make laws just to deal with one case, or even two or three cases. In fact, when we deal with a very specific and narrow focus of application to have effect on someone's life or their right to claim or be the beneficiary of some entitlement through a legal process, that is frequently described as a hybrid bill and therefore needs to go through a proper process, a committee of inquiry, to ensure that making laws just to deal with one or two people who need to be dealt with, or making laws to give a benefit to a single person or entity or company or the like, requires very special consideration because of the fundamental principle that the laws we make here should be relevant to and applicable to everyone. That is, people are equal before the law and nobody is above the law.

I am very interested to know if an enforcement agency, in this case the police, are wanting to come to the parliament to get some redress to deal with something which may be quite meritorious. On the other hand, it may be to cover a circumstance where, frankly, their behaviour may have been less than adequate. I do not know the answer to that. I am not passing any judgement on it, but I do want that information before we finalise our position on that.

To date, those who have submitted to us suggest that, for employees or process servers or police officers or persons who are undertaking these types of duties, people who are going about their lawful duty, whether it is to read an electricity meter or whether it is to serve a document, there may need to be some dealing of that to facilitate it occurring, even in the circumstance of where there is notice of someone not entering, provided they are undertaking a lawful purpose. Secondly, they may need to ensure that there is no harassment or interference with their carrying out their lawful duties.

We have these laws to properly protect people's rights to not have people trespass on their property, and we need to ensure that the lawful entry and undertaking of lawful duties is balanced against that. With those words I indicate that we will not oppose the passage of the bill and look forward to the information that we sought on 19 October 2017. I know the Attorney-General's office has been very busy. They have been busy drafting up all sorts of bills to rush in here for urgent attention, but I am just reminding them that they promised this a month ago and I expect it.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—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) (16:44):** On behalf of the Attorney-General, I thank the speaker in this debate, namely the Deputy Leader of the

Opposition, who rightly predicted that she would be the only speaker during the debate. She was correct on this occasion.

It is apt that I am here as well, as the Minister for Police, to endorse this. As the deputy leader noted, a large number of the cases in which this issue would arise would involve SAPOL officers issuing summonses on people. From the government's perspective, it certainly would be concerning if people had the ability essentially to hold up a sign to say, 'We don't want the police to come here,' and then a summons was unable to be issued on a person. That is clearly not a very good public policy outcome, and that is what this bill is seeking to address.

It is quite limited in the way it does that. It is deliberately limited to just that very specific situation. Trespass offences generally will not be impacted, albeit in this very limited circumstance. On behalf of the Attorney, I can provide to the deputy leader the commitment that I have just spoken to the Attorney's staff and department, and they have been furiously working away on the information for the deputy leader, as they always do, as they always seek to provide information the deputy leader asks for. They will have that information for her between the houses to ensure that we can have a speedy passage of this sensible piece of legislation, which I endorse to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**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) (16:46):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (STATE PLANNING COMMISSION)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS (POSTPONEMENT OF  
EXPIRY) BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (BULLYING) BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (VOLUNTEER CHARTERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (STATE PLANNING POLICY)  
(BIODIVERSITY) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**LINEAR PARKS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—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) (16:52):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Today I am pleased to introduce the Linear Parks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017 which amends the *Linear Parks Act 2006* to support the creation of healthy, liveable communities by providing additional powers to establish linear parks.

Linear Parks are multi-functional open space corridors which provide a wide range of social and environmental benefits including:

- promoting physical activity by providing improved recreational opportunities;
- connecting neighbourhoods and encouraging walking and cycling through the development of safe off-road path networks;
- provision of green infrastructure within the urban environment;
- creation of urban biodiversity corridors which provide an opportunity to connect with nature; and
- stormwater management to improve water quality and provide flood mitigation.

The 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide provides a vision for a network of linear parks across the region. Building on the success of the River Torrens Linear Park, consideration will be given to preserving and establishing additional linear parks along a variety of corridors including Gawler River, Little Para River, Dry Creek, Sturt River, Field River, Christie Creek, Onkaparinga River, Pedler Creek and Port Willunga Creek.

The purpose of this Bill is to extend the provisions of the legislation to:

- a) establish, maintain and preserve linear parks as world-class assets to be used and enjoyed as public parks for the benefit of present and future generations,
- b) promote the use and enjoyment of linear parks by members of the local community and others, and
- c) promote healthy active lifestyles by facilitating the use of linear parks for exercise and other outdoor activities.

This Bill will help facilitate the establishment of linear parks by granting the Minister the same powers that local councils enjoy with respect to local government roads. This includes the ability to construct pathways and undertake associated planting and landscaping. Works may also include the installation of lighting and public facilities to support the establishment of the linear park corridors.

This legislation could be explored as another tool for the creation of community land corridors that do not have a significant environmental value, but provide social benefit.

The creation of a Linear Park would be an effective way to create seamless management of multiple adjoined land parcels, particularly when those parcels are a mixture of Crown Land, Government Minister land or local government land. Trying to create a park on land which includes multiple tenure and dedication arrangements relies on multiple approval and management processes for the various parcels of land. The creation of a linear park would mean there was only one process for consultation, approval and management for the single linear park.

The existing *Linear Parks Act 2006* provides a legislated consultation process with local government where land intended to form part of a linear park is under the care, control and management of a council. The Bill extends this process to require consultation with the general public as well as local government.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

## Part 1—Preliminary

## 1—Short title

## 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal. There being no commencement clause included, the measure will commence on receiving the assent of the Governor.

Part 2—Amendment of *Linear Parks Act 2006*

## 3—Amendment of long title

It is proposed to generalise the long title and insert a clause that sets out in more detail the objects and purpose of the principal Act.

## 4—Insertion of section 2

## 2—Objects and purpose of Act

New section 2 provides that the objects and purpose of the principal Act are—

- (a) to establish, maintain and preserve linear parks as world-class assets to be used and enjoyed as public parks for the benefit of present and future generations; and
- (b) to promote the use and enjoyment of linear parks by members of the local community and others; and
- (c) to promote healthy active lifestyles by facilitating the use of linear parks by members of the local community and others for exercise and other outdoor activities.

## 5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This proposed amendment would insert a definition of *SA planning portal* in section 3.

## 6—Amendment of section 4—Linear parks

The proposed amendments to section 4 clarify the land that may be included in a linear park established under section 4 of the principal Act and that land may be so included even if it has been dedicated under another Act or law for a purpose and despite that purpose. The amendments provide that notice of the proposal must be given in particular fashion and that consideration must be given to any submissions made in response to such notice. The amendments also make it clear that a council is not required to comply with any other Act or law in making a submission to the Minister under section 4.

## 7—Amendment of section 6—Special provisions relating to roads

This clause clarifies that an area of land in a plan defining a linear park that is specified on the plan as a 'road area' will be taken to be a public road. The Minister may, as the Minister thinks fit for the purposes of the principal Act, exercise the powers that a council may exercise in relation to a public road in the area of a council in relation to an area specified as a road area on a plan defining a linear park.

Today I am pleased to introduce the Linear Parks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017 which amends the *Linear Parks Act 2006* to support the creation of healthy, liveable communities by providing additional powers to establish linear parks.

Linear Parks are multi-functional open space corridors which provide a wide range of social and environmental benefits including:

- promoting physical activity by providing improved recreational opportunities;
- connecting neighbourhoods and encouraging walking and cycling through the development of safe off-road path networks;
- provision of green infrastructure within the urban environment;
- creation of urban biodiversity corridors which provide an opportunity to connect with nature; and
- stormwater management to improve water quality and provide flood mitigation.

The 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide provides a vision for a network of linear parks across the region. Building on the success of the River Torrens Linear Park, consideration will be given to preserving and establishing additional linear parks along a variety of corridors including Gawler River, Little Para River, Dry Creek, Sturt River, Field River, Christie Creek, Onkaparinga River, Pedler Creek and Port Willunga Creek.

The purpose of this Bill is to extend the provisions of the legislation to:

- a) establish, maintain and preserve linear parks as world-class assets to be used and enjoyed as public parks for the benefit of present and future generations,

- b) promote the use and enjoyment of linear parks by members of the local community and others, and
- c) promote healthy active lifestyles by facilitating the use of linear parks for exercise and other outdoor activities.

This Bill will help facilitate the establishment of linear parks by granting the Minister the same powers that local councils enjoy with respect to local government roads. This includes the ability to construct pathways and undertake associated planting and landscaping. Works may also include the installation of lighting and public facilities to support the establishment of the linear park corridors.

This legislation could be explored as another tool for the creation of community land corridors that do not have a significant environmental value, but provide social benefit.

The creation of a Linear Park would be an effective way to create seamless management of multiple adjoining land parcels, particularly when those parcels are a mixture of Crown Land, Government Minister land or local government land. Trying to create a park on land which includes multiple tenure and dedication arrangements relies on multiple approval and management processes for the various parcels of land. The creation of a linear park would mean there was only one process for consultation, approval and management for the single linear park.

The existing *Linear Parks Act 2006* provides a legislated consultation process with local government where land intended to form part of a linear park is under the care, control and management of a council. The Bill extends this process to require consultation with the general public as well as local government.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (DRINK AND DRUG DRIVING) BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council disagreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly for the reason indicated in the following schedule:

Because the amendments are not in accordance with the views of a majority of members of the Legislative Council.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its amendments.

**Mr KNOLL:** I rise merely to say that I have no doubt that in tomorrow's paper there will be the government's fourth or fifth attempt to beat us up over this legislation. What I want to put on the record is that the government should open its mind and see a bit of common sense on this and realise that there are a number of amendments that we have put that the Legislative Council very wisely is insisting upon.

I want to put on the record the fact that we are open to working with the government to find a solution to this. There are important measures in this bill that need to be passed, especially in relation to the changes to the drug-testing regime for police on the street. I assume that we will disagree and the house will disagree and then we will end up in deadlock where we can work out a solution.

Motion carried.

*Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. C.J. Picton.*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (SENTENCING) BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (VEHICLE INSPECTIONS AND SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**PASSENGER TRANSPORT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 November 2017.)

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:58):** This bill amends the Passenger Transport Act 1994 and makes related amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. The bill flows from reforms and changes in the small passenger transport point-to-point industry and the entry of Uber and other ride-sharing providers into a more deregulated market in South Australia. It delivers on previous public commitments to introduce tougher penalties by the government for breaches and to placate concerns within the industry in areas where the initial accreditation and compliance structures put in place by the government to meet the new environment have clearly been poorly negotiated, cumbersome and lacking in resources for compliance enforcement and have left the public at potential risk and the industry in disarray.

The bill broadly expands penalties for anybody providing unlicensed or unaccredited passenger transport services and gives added powers to transport safety compliance officers to deal with new point-to-point models. Tougher penalties will apply to drivers, operators, company executives and directors who seek to circumvent the legal framework, with penalties increasing across the Passenger Transport Act.

As an example, the current penalty for operating a service without appropriate accreditation carries a maximum division 3 fine of \$30,000. The proposed penalty will be \$35,000 for the first offence and \$50,000 for subsequent offences. Along with increased penalties, demerit points and disqualifications will also be in place as a deterrent to those who may seek to avoid penalties for operating without required criminal, medical or safety checks by having a third party pay fines on their behalf. Repeat offenders will therefore, through demerit and disqualification, be prevented from driving.

Under the provisions of the bill, there is a corporate multiplier of five times if the offence is committed by a corporation. The bill also enables an automatic temporary suspension of accreditation of a driver who is charged with an offence punishable by imprisonment, with the Passenger Transport Standards Committee overseeing the fairness of any such decision.

As the alternative to prosecution for unintentional breaches, there will be enforceable voluntary undertakings allowing a more cooperative approach where it is felt remedial action of this kind by the offender is the best recourse. While undertakings are voluntary, they create a legal obligation, with sanctions applying for failure to fulfil. To address the changing and evolving nature of point-to-point business models, the bill inserts extraterritorial provisions to reinforce the Passenger Transport Act and its regulations applying to all providers, regardless of whether the parent company is based in an Australian jurisdiction or overseas.

With regard to compulsory third-party insurance, the government has reasserted their belief that point-to-point drivers are on the road more than private drivers and therefore their premiums should be higher. Of course, it should be noted that South Australia has amongst the highest third-party insurance for the taxi industry, in particular. As a comparison, a taxidriver operating in South Australia will pay third-party insurance of about \$6,000 a year compared to a taxidriver in Victoria, which will be around about \$1,200 or so a year. It is a significant difference.

I would suggest that the difference is more that the Victorian system is market driven and based on accidents and the cost those accidents have to the insurance scheme, whereas, over time, because of the monopoly nature of CTP insurance in South Australia and the fact of the heavily regulated taxi industry, CTP insurance is seen as being a cash cow for governments to increase the rate of insurance as a way of getting more revenue that eventually returns back to the government through dividends paid through the MAC.

It will be interesting to see what happens to third-party insurance premiums when the third-party insurance system is fully deregulated. At the moment, there has obviously been some deal done with the three private providers where they are still able to charge very high third-party



insurance, even though it is a version of a private sector process, but we are not seeing the full impacts of an open market there.

Unfortunately, taxi operators in South Australia paid a price for the premium that the government has achieved through the sell-off of the Motor Accident Commission because their third-party insurance premiums have been artificially increased over the years. They were locked in at that very high rate before the process was handed over to the private sector and they are stuck in that position for the first three years of the new scheme.

It will be very difficult for taxidrivers to compete while they are paying such a high premium compared with other states. The market is difficult and very cyclical. There are different parts of the day and different parts of the year where you can be sitting around for an hour between a \$30 or \$40 job, from which you must pay all your costs. I certainly do not envy taxidrivers in this current environment.

What they need is a more vibrant economy in South Australia where there is more discretionary spending on things like entertainment, where people might go out for the evening and decide to leave their car at home. I am sure they are benefiting at the moment from the chaos in the public transport system; however, we certainly would not like to see one system suffer in order for another system to improve. We would like to see growth in that area for the taxi industry and for public transport in South Australia.

The bill amends the Motor Vehicle Act 1959 to ensure that drivers with incorrect CTP insurance are required to pay the higher premiums, with fines and the ability for insurers to recover moneys from those contravening the act. While the industry has concerns regarding the cost and lack of flexibility of the current CTP model, as I said earlier, I agree with them. It needs reform to make it fairer. I would like to speak about something that came from one of South Australia's three taxi companies.

They were a bit surprised that they were not aware of the bill, and I am not sure what happened there. They raised concerns which the minister might be able to cover in his closing remarks, or we can go into committee to try to get some clarification. Their concerns relate to the transport booking service covered under new section 28B of the bill, which states:

- (2) In determining whether a person (the service provider) operates a transport booking service, it does not matter—
  - (a) whether or not the passenger transport service is provided by the driver as an agent or employee of the service provider;

I think the booking agencies have concerns, and this goes back to the collection of the \$1 fee that the government imposed on the taxi industry, hire-car industry and the ride-sharing industry. At the moment, as I understand it, the driver is responsible for collecting this fee.

This part of the bill changes that emphasis to it being collected by the booking agency, which of course is very easy for the app-based agencies. However, in certain circumstances, it is much more difficult for the traditional booking agencies of the three South Australian cab companies. What was raised with me was that there are more and more arrangements where a booking is made directly with a taxidriver by mobile phone, and there are collections from the side of the road or from taxi ranks, and the booking agency has no control over the booking itself or the hail of that cab. Although, if the meter is turned on, the fare would fix that problem.

In the industry, I have been told that often there will be the case where a negotiated cash payment between the driver and the passenger will be made. It is in that situation, of course, where penalties could apply to the booking agency when they had no idea that that transaction had even taken place. I will ask the minister if that is something that has had some consideration and if that interpretation that I have been made aware of is correct and whether it is something that might be able to be dealt with between the houses.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:10):** The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure's Passenger Transport (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017 is, I believe, the next step in following the widespread reforms to the taxi and chauffeur vehicle industry introduced into South Australia last year, and for these reasons, obviously, I support the bill.

The way point-to-point passenger transport services are provided has changed. New models of service delivery have entered the market and the old models have evolved in response. Consumers demand to have the freedom and right to choose the type of small passenger transport service that best responds to their needs. Whenever I visit our sons in Sydney or Melbourne, I am certainly acutely aware of their ability to access transport for us to go wherever we have to go. I am not quite at the cutting edge of technology that they are, but I can see that it is meeting the needs of those younger people.

The state government's reforms have delivered a level playing field that can adapt to the evolving needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century customer and, regrettably, I am stuck in the previous century. The introduction of the reforms have allowed new service providers with new technologies to enter the industry. These reforms have also made the industry more competitive and sustainable by cutting fees and red tape and assisting existing participants to adjust to new competitors. I am pleased to note that this bill will provide even further protections and safeguards for both the industry and passengers while ensuring the transport safety compliance officers have the additional powers they need to effectively work in the new business environment and with the new technologies which have transformed the industry.

The state government has worked extremely hard to find the right balance between the community's demand for more choice, better passenger vehicles and service and the need to improve working conditions for drivers without watering down the robustness and/or the effectiveness of the accreditation process. I think that is an extremely important point. The tougher penalties proposed by this bill will be welcomed by the taxi industry. I know that because I have had a few people from the taxi industry knock on my door, as I am sure you have, Deputy Speaker, and it will be welcomed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It would be a pointless exercise.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Knocking on your door? I thought you have always been very accessible. It will be welcomed by the taxi industry, as over the last year or so I have repeatedly heard the industry request a more fair playing field, and I believe this bill goes a long way to do this. Let me emphasise this point: the increases in penalties will not affect the large majority of industry participants, who are already doing the right thing, and that is mostly the case with all penalties. The taxi industry is quite used to the safety requirements for their vehicles and drivers, and I believe that the industry in the main is supportive of the initiatives that provide greater safety for South Australians and, quite rightly, they should be.

These penalties will, however, hurt those participants in the industry who deliberately set out to not comply with the law and in doing so put their passengers at risk. I do not feel sorry for those people who will be caught out by the increased penalties proposed in this bill. It is correct and proper that they are caught out. In most instances, first offences carry lesser penalties than the second or subsequent offences. Appropriate driver and vehicle accreditation is also about upholding safety on our roads for passengers getting into their vehicles and other road users. If vehicles involved in passenger transport are not inspected, they may be unroadworthy, potentially placing the driver, the passengers and other road users at risk. Of course, they have to be inspected.

Passenger transport vehicles also tend to be on the road more than family cars and therefore have a greater chance of being involved in an accident. No-one can seriously argue that it is not a matter of public safety when someone has a serious criminal record or a conviction related to a reportable child-related offence or a medical condition; clearly it is. Fines may not always deter people from driving when they should not, so I support the introduction of the loss of demerit points and, for repeat offenders, the loss of their licence for up to six months. I believe that this will be very effective in changing and improving the behaviour of industry participants. The introduction of demerit points is also a very important step towards protecting all road users. They target wilful, neglectful and reckless behaviour. They are about upholding safety on our roads while also improving the standard of passenger transport drivers.

As passenger transport drivers are frequently required to transport the most vulnerable members of our community, we place our trust in and rely on these drivers to get us and our loved ones around, so it is critically important that this bill is passed in this place—and I did not get any indication from the opposition that they were not supporting it—to ensure that our safety compliance

officers receive the additional powers they require and that the wide range of new penalties for providing an unlicensed or unaccredited passenger transport service is made into law as soon as possible.

In addition to these criminal sanctions, the bill ensures that unaccredited persons and/or companies cannot and will not make a profit at the expense of law-abiding industry participants. Having easy access at your fingertips to a variety of reliable and safe passenger transport options is vital, not only for the people who use these services but also for the long-term sustainability of the industry. It is also a road safety issue. As most in this chamber would know, I was a firefighter for nearly 20 years. I am very proud of that fact, too. During this time, I learnt that the use of passenger transport services such as taxis, chauffeurs and ride share provides an opportunity for the public to make a safe alternative choice in driving, in particular when a person is impaired or tired.

One of the good things about not being in the fire service is that I do not have to attend some of those horrific accidents that I did in the past, accidents that could have been avoided had those people taken the alternative travel arrangements that they can choose today. Using a passenger transport service to get home after a night out and a few drinks will always be the right decision, and having a variety of easily accessible options to do so safely is vital. It also reduces the number of private vehicles on the road. Reducing vehicles on our roads and maximising safe travel options benefits our whole community.

It is the role of the small passenger transport industry utilising taxis, chauffeur and ride-sharing services to provide safe, affordable, responsive and innovative options for travel to the South Australian community. It is the role of the government to provide the legislative framework for this to occur. This bill takes the Passenger Transport Act, which was written in the last century, and transforms it into legislation that enhances opportunities and meets the challenges of providing passenger transport services in the 21<sup>st</sup> century without compromising safety or the long-term sustainability of the industry. I commend the bill to the house.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge that we have some guests in the gallery today from Christ the King School at Warradale. We hope they are enjoying their time here in the parliament. They are the guests of the member for Morialta.

#### *Bills*

#### **PASSENGER TRANSPORT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (17:18):** I thank the member for Unley and the member for Colton for their contributions on the bill. I am glad to have the support of the house on this important bill. We have been through a very busy 18 months in the passenger transport industry. We have had the emergence in Australia and, of course, in South Australia, of new technologies like ride-sharing applications on smart phones, which have created a new type of competition in the passenger transport industry.

In South Australia, we have had a taxi industry in the configuration as we know it now. I believe its roots can be traced back to the 1950s, somewhat a little prior to my time. In fact, it is probably somewhat a little prior to the time of most of us in here. More recently, but still a good 20 or 30 years ago, we saw the emergence of the chauffeur vehicle industry or what we would now consider the blue-plate operators here in South Australia. So the emergence of a new type of competition I think could be euphemistically described as causing a few ripples in the pond. It has been a challenge for us to work out how to make sure that the growing number of South Australians who want to take advantage of these new types of services can do so, and can do so safely.

The existing regulatory models were quickly shown to be outdated and inapplicable to these types of services. Certainly, the most obvious example of these ride-sharing services is the international company called Uber, which announced its intentions to operate Australia-wide, particularly throughout the course of 2015, and emerged here in South Australia during the course of that year, and such was their business practice, at least at the time, in deliberate defiance of local laws and custom when it came to operating across Australian jurisdictions.

Despite my entreaties and the entreaties of other jurisdictional transport ministers to the national transport minister at the time—not the current federal transport minister, but the previous federal transport minister—urging a consistent approach across all jurisdictions so that all Australian states and territories were applying the same types of laws with the same types of principles to these ride-sharing companies, and in particular Uber, perhaps more of a reflection of his interests in the transport portfolio, that federal transport minister declined that opportunity and the states were left to go it alone.

What we saw over the course of the last months of 2015 and the early months of 2016 was a game of playing different jurisdictions off against one another with what the appropriate rules and regulations should be. It was a challenging time for the existing industry. We had some proponents of these new transport service providers, particularly the Greens and also the opposition, who were urging the government in this state to welcome these new operators in without regulation, without the same types of requirements that we have always imposed on the existing operators (the taxi and the chauffeur vehicle operators) without the driver checks and without the vehicle checks.

I have made it clear and consistent that the first principle that we should have when regulating these transport services is one of safety. Passengers have the right, when they are procuring one of these services, to demand that the driver who will be providing the service is safe and reputable and appropriately providing that service, as is the vehicle, and that was not the approach that was taken by those political parties I just mentioned. They did not believe that that level of regulation was required and that it would be an unfair inhibitor on these new entrants into the market.

I also said at the time that we had to think of who comprised the existing industry. There are thousands of families who are invested in either the taxi industry or the chauffeur vehicle industry in South Australia, thousands of people who have either purchased the right to operate taxis through taxi plates or who pay to the government an annual lease payment for the right to operate a blue plate. Then of course there are all the costs on top of that: the costs of purchasing and operating a vehicle to the appropriate standards. It is a significant investment.

Even while we had a period of time, particularly from the very late 1990s through the 2000s when the value of these taxi plates escalated very substantially as more and more people took taxi services, the people who owned those taxi plates quite often used the market value of those taxi plates as equity, either to run their own business, to purchase vehicles, or to make other financial contributions towards their taxi businesses or, indeed, to secure other types of assets—even real estate, even the family home, for example.

They were incredibly important assets, so you can imagine the concern that these taxi plate owners had not just at the emergence of these new competitors and these new service providers and what that meant for the viability of their own businesses but also for what it meant for their own liquidity and their family's financial position. That is why the approach from the government was a careful and considered one. It was not the approach of those opposite, which was to just welcome in Uber without regulation and without regard to the impact on those thousands of families who have been operating taxis and chauffeur vehicles in South Australia.

Our approach was to have a very thorough review about the sort of regulation that we should apply to these new operators, if indeed they were to be made legal here in South Australia at all. That is just what we did. We made sure that all the drivers had to have not only a national police clearance but a working with children check. I do not think any of us need to reflect on the community standards and expectations that we should be imposing on those people who provide these services now with regard to that working with children clearance.

We also wanted to make sure that the vehicles were appropriately inspected and judged to be roadworthy so that they could be operated on South Australian roads and, in a measure that the

member for Unley touched on, that they were appropriately insured as well. In this regard, the member for Unley is absolutely right: the taxi industry has been subject to very high compulsory third-party premiums for many years to reflect the fact that, perhaps unlike the vehicles that we would all operate personally, which might be on the road for up to an hour or a couple of hours a day, taxis often operate in excess of 18 hours a day, and they commensurately have a much higher risk of accidents and injury out on the roads.

The risk-based analysis, the actuarial analysis that is done to determine their premiums, was not something that was established under this government. In fact, it was established quite some time ago under a regime administered by the former treasurer, a member of the other place, the Hon. Rob Lucas. We have continued on that actuarial analysis-based premium setting regime here in government.

The member for Unley is right: will that change in the future? We would hope that in market competition, with at least three private companies providing insurance into the market, competition may indeed drive that down. However, I think the inference from the member for Unley's comments that this is some kind of revenue raising scheme for the benefit of the Consolidated Account needs to be firmly refuted. Members should be reminded that this is the same measure that the opposition Treasury spokesperson, the Hon. Rob Lucas, presided over.

I return to the impact on local industry. We differed from the opposition in its saying that Uber should be welcomed in without regulation. In contrast, we said that they should be regulated and that they should be subject to higher standards. We also recognised, as we should, the likely impact that Uber's presence, even operating legally within the new regulatory environment in South Australia, was likely to have on the South Australian industry.

We offered, and indeed continue to pay out, an industry assistance package to members of the existing South Australian passenger transport industry. We think that this is incredibly important. It is a measure largely consistent with the measures taken in other states, although at the time of its announcement South Australia's was by far the most generous industry assistance package.

You may recall, Deputy Speaker, that when the member for Unley and the Leader of the Opposition were asked if they thought any industry assistance or compensation was necessary for the existing industry, the response from the member for Unley was, no, they did not believe it was necessary. Their position for the passenger transport industry was, 'Let Uber and ride share in without any regulation, and don't assist the existing industry on the way through in the face of new competition.' I am very glad to say we have refuted that.

After a period of watching some of these ride-share operators in practice, Uber's promise of 5,000 new jobs, of a massive impact on the unemployment rate and of a new land of milk and honey that would be delivered here in South Australia by the mere fact of their presence has not quite materialised. In fact, I still think we are short of about 1,000 registered drivers under Uber, so we are perhaps running at only 20 per cent of the promise that was made, and not just by them, I should say, but also by the Leader of the Opposition. He promised 5,000 jobs from his policy of letting them in to South Australia.

However, I am pleased to say that certainly the operations of Uber and their approach to the South Australian government and the community has improved dramatically, particularly over the last 12 months, to the point where we have offered them accreditation and we have re-offered them accreditation at the expiration of their first accreditation period. We have got to the point now where we believe that the vast majority of their drivers are appropriately accredited and they are taking steps or have taken steps to make sure that their vehicles are compliant, have been inspected and are roadworthy, and that is a welcome improvement.

Unfortunately, we are seeing some participants in the industry who are not doing the right thing. This is not a comment targeted at a particular type of service or operator; unfortunately, this is a pox on all types of operators, a small number of whom are choosing to flout the law. They are either providing services as drivers while they are unaccredited, they are providing services in vehicles that are not roadworthy or they may even be transport booking services which have not been appropriately accredited or which may not be meeting the terms of their accreditation. These are very serious matters, not because we would like to see our regulatory environment that we have

established for these new services kept up with, although we believe it is always important to uphold the law, but because it presents a serious safety risk.

Unfortunately, across all forms of personal passenger transport—perhaps if I could describe it euphemistically—there is a very regrettable number of incidents that occur each year. It may be in a taxi, it may be chauffeured vehicle or it may be in a ride-share service vehicle that illegal activities take place. They may be assaults, thefts or some other criminal activity. It is both absolutely necessary and important to make sure that the drivers are accredited, that the vehicles are accredited and that the booking services are accredited and are meeting the terms of their accreditation.

This enables the government, perhaps most usually through South Australia Police, to make sure that we can track down those services and those people involved in the conduct of those services—not just the service provider and the driver but also the passenger, the recipient of those services—and follow through the circumstances of that incident, lay charges and punish those people as appropriate. It is a critically important safety measure.

Most of us here in this chamber have children. Some of us have children much older than mine, and some of them would even be procuring some of these services. It may be after a late night. It may even be, for those children—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Indeed. The member for Unley makes a very salient point that the unfortunate yet important duty of parents to provide taxi services to their children in the wee hours of the morning is sometimes called upon. Fortunately for us, like other parents, we do not need to be accredited to provide those services because that would be perhaps one straw that might break the camel's back in that type of service provision. Nonetheless, we want to make sure that those people, whether they are children or other people within our community, are kept safe and that is why these standards are very important and why I commend these penalties to the house.

I might attempt to respond to the member for Unley's query in my remarks here. If I do an insufficient job of addressing his concerns, I am more than happy to move into committee. The member for Unley raised the issue of the collection of the government's \$1 levy on the industry. You may recall that the purpose of the \$1 levy is to fund that industry assistance package and to reduce fees and charges for those people participating in the industry, as well as provide some improved and additional services to disabled passengers, particularly the lifting fee, and other benefits to the industry.

It has been a matter of consternation for the industry about how this \$1 levy is to be collected. I think the member for Unley touched on an important point there. There were various models, to be fair, that I think the member for Unley was heading towards in his comments about how that \$1 levy should be collected. We took the view that it would be simplest for the industry and simplest for government to have what we now call the transport booking service, previously known in the taxi industry as centralised booking services, collect that \$1 levy.

That would mean that we are imposing a burden on three bodies or organisations, rather than the hundreds of people who might be leasing a taxi plate, or rather than the more than 1,000 taxi plates that are owned, or indeed the more than 4,000 people who are taxidriviers. Unsurprisingly, in the first instance, there was some resistance from the transport booking service at being faced with this task, despite assurances from government that if it required an amendment to their processes or systems that we would be willing to assist them financially with the costs of altering their processes or systems to enable them to do this. It is a far better way of capturing this \$1 levy than requiring it of the drivers.

It would be incredibly burdensome, and additionally burdensome for a group of people who are amongst the lowest paid workers in our community, to expect them to collect and pay to the government this \$1 levy. Of course, it would be more convenient for the transport booking service and so that is why we have gone down that path. The member for Unley gave an example which, unfortunately, can be an accurate example of what might be described as a 'cashie', where a passenger jumps in a taxi and says, 'Can you run me home for 20 bucks? Don't worry about turning the meter on.'

That has always been illegal under our regulations, and so it should be. If we have one of those unpalatable incidents which I described earlier, if there is some sort of assault or some sort of robbery or any other such incident, if that meter is not turned on there is no record of that service which is provided, unless there happens to be some accidental capture of that service, for example, through some sort of app which might be running on a smart phone or some other system which may, coincidentally, be recording the locational coordinates of that service being provided.

Every transport booking service, particularly in the taxi industry, but also elsewhere, as soon as a meter is switched on or as soon as the appropriate device is activated to record that service, tracks that service, and that is important for those safety reasons. It is also really important, perhaps less so for a state government but important in the national context, that that sort of job, the undeclared cash job, is, in my understanding, also illegal from the Australian Taxation Office's point of view because it more than likely represents undeclared income for that taxidriver.

It also creates, back into the more relevant industry context and the state context, a lack of clarity in the relationships between the driver, the leaseholder, the operator of the vehicle, the plate owner and the transport booking service about what work has been done and how the benefits and the costs should be shared amongst the industry. That is the rationale behind the \$1 levy being collected by the transport booking service.

There has been a disparity of views amongst the transport booking services, the three taxi companies—I do not think there is any denying that—but it is a better outcome for the industry as a whole to have it centralised with the burden falling to three organisations, rather than falling to plate owners, plate operators or leaseholders, let alone the drivers.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11.

**Mr PISONI:** Minister, are you able to advise whether all three of the booking agencies were consulted in this process?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes.

**Mr PISONI:** Were they able to have a copy of the draft bill in order to be properly consulted?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that, while all three may not have seen the full draft bill, there was at least a session in person where they were briefed on the contents of the bill and the operation of this particular clause. I am advised that it was made very plain to them how this mechanism was to operate within the industry where they would be collecting the levy.

**Mr PISONI:** I accept what the minister was saying in his second reading speech in attempting to clarify this section of the bill, but can he clarify if there is a liability for the booking agency for fares collected in a 'cashie', that term he uses, if, either after a tax department investigation or some other form of investigation, it can be identified that a particular driver or cab operator had racked up thousands of dollars in cash trips? Who would be liable for paying the \$1 levy?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised that it would be unlikely for that liability to be imposed on the transport booking service for the \$1 levy for those particular types of trips for the following reasons. One is undeclared income by an individual who may happen to be a taxidriver. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to have an understanding of whether that undeclared income came from providing taxi services as a driver. If it could be determined on a reasonable or proven basis, it would then be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to understand how many trips gave rise to, for example, X hundred or X thousand dollars of undeclared income that the tax office was taking exception to for that individual.

It is further complicated in another light. There is a recognition by the department and by the industry that, unfortunately, from time to time some passengers do runners. There may be some trips that are not appropriately accounted for, perhaps if I can use the phrase, through the chain of reporting that the meter and log keeping back up through the transport booking service usually records.

The last comment I make is that we have also indicated, particularly in the early months of operation of this levy, that there is going to be a period of adjustment and coming up to speed for drivers becoming familiar with their requirements and the transport booking service becoming more competent in ensuring that they are capturing the dollar levy liability from the driver and the operator through the chain back up to them. Does that provide sufficient clarity?

**Mr PISONI:** I do agree with the minister that it would take an enormous resource to try to estimate the value of taxi rides that were delivered in this manner. However, things do happen. If it became more widespread, it may very well be that the department might put resources in to deal with an issue like that, for example. Is it the intention of the bill that the liability for those identified cash transactions would not fall with the booking agency? Is that the intention of the bill?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Generally speaking, if the services are paid for and recorded on the meter, then they are liable for that trip. If they are not recorded on the meter, then we have almost zero visibility—perhaps zero visibility—of that trip and hence cannot raise a liability for that trip.

One of the other reasons why we were attracted to the model of the transport booking service capturing the data and collecting the levy and paying it to government is that they have a pretty sophisticated and nuanced understanding of what is happening out on the road. As I mentioned before in my earlier comments, it is a requirement that at the commencement of a job the meter is switched on. That is recorded back at base, and they understand that.

My understanding, though, is also that the transport booking service can also see where the cabs are. If they are moving around and the meter is not on and that is happening throughout the course of the night, they will want to know what is going on because they are missing out not on the dollar levy but on fees and revenue from the conduct of that taxi. So they almost assume a quasi enforcement role within the industry themselves because they are trying to make sure that the cab driver and that taxi vehicle itself is doing the right thing by turning the meter on for each job. If that is not happening, they are not getting paid.

There is also the practice of the relationship between the driver and the operator of the taxi. Not always but that tends to be, for example, a person who leases a plate and purchases a vehicle and then enters into an arrangement with a driver to drive the taxi plate or to drive the car that that operator has provided. That is most commonly—not exclusively but most commonly—done on a revenue-share basis. They will be very closely scrutinising the amount of work that has been done in that taxi.

The more work that gets done the more the driver gets paid, but also the more revenue the operator shares in. It is the operator who has an additional relationship with the transport booking service, because they have to pay base fees; that is, they have to pay to get jobs sent to their car, for example. So both the transport booking service and the operator have, I guess, what I describe as a quasi enforcement role in making sure that the meter is turned on and that revenue gets recorded, because those two are at risk of being out of pocket if cash job after cash job after cash job gets done by a particular driver or a particular vehicle on an ongoing basis.

I think the short answer to your question is that we cannot accurately determine how many cash jobs are being done. It is a relatively safe assumption that it is in the very, very small minority of jobs that are done, because it is a great risk to the driver that they will be found out by the operator and/or the transport booking service if a car is racking up kilometres and being seen to be whizzing around the metropolitan area but no revenue seems to be coming in.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 20) passed.

Schedules (1 and 2) and title passed.



Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (17:51):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (SUITABILITY TO HOLD LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2017.)

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:52):** I rise on behalf of the opposition to support the bill, and I know that there are a couple of other members who would like to speak on this it, in particular the member for Hammond. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has a longstanding discretionary power to refuse the issue or renewal of a driver's licence or learner's permit or to suspend the same or put probationary precautions on these in order to minimise risk of accident, injury or repetition of offences by a driver. This section can apply regardless of the driver undergoing a period of disqualification relating to offences. Accordingly, these powers are used in exceptional circumstances to keep dangerous drivers off the road.

The bill aims to enhance the registrar's powers to take action against dangerous drivers, whereas in the past these powers could only be used in relation to individuals who were previously convicted on expiated offences. The criteria will be broadened to include past behaviour indicating to the registrar that action should be taken to minimise the risk of injury or offences occurring rather than being required to consider whether the action would prevent the risk eventuating.

The bill also clarifies that when the registrar determines to take action under the new provision, the overriding and pre-eminent consideration is protection of the public. The bill also makes it clear that the registrar should take into account any possible hardships eventuating from a decision in relation to a licence or learners permit and that the individuals affected continue to have the rights to internal or external review under the act.

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

At 17:55 the house adjourned until Tuesday 28 November 2017 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***CLARE OVAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT**

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (2 March 2017).

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):** I have been advised:

The Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council have applied to the Commonwealth Government for a Building Better Regions grant to support the Clare Oval Redevelopment Project.

The Infrastructure Projects stream of the commonwealth government's Building Better Regions Fund opened on 18 January 2017 and closed on 28 February 2017.

To be considered for a Building Better Regions Grant, for a project of this type the applicant must show that they have secured half of the total project costs.

I am advised that the total cost of the Clare Oval Redevelopment Project is \$10.47 million dollars.

I note that the Office for Recreation and Sports has met with the council on 20 December 2016 and advised that the level of funding sought falls outside their funding programs.

Accordingly, the Clare and Gilbert Valley council wrote to the Premier, the Minister for Sport and Recreation, and me as Minister for Regional Development on 14 February 2017 seeking a commitment to provide \$3 million towards this project. This was two weeks prior to the close of applications for the commonwealth's Building Better Regions program.

The Government recognises the importance of community facilities to South Australian regional centres. The proposal to redevelop the Clare Valley Sports and Recreation Precinct presents an exciting opportunity for the Clare and surrounding district community, focusing on additional and improved sports and recreation facilities.

Regrettably, given the limited time provided to undertake an appropriate assessment of the proposal, the government was unable to accommodate this funding request at this time.

However, acknowledging the proposal's anticipated benefits, I would encourage the council to pursue future opportunities to apply for funding under the Building Better Regions Fund.

The Office for Recreation and Sport has advised of a separate funding proposal from the council for the development of the Watervale Community and Sports Centre. I am advised this would fit within the Community Recreation Sport Facility Program requirements, which the ORS administers.

I note also that the government has recently provided the council with an in-principle funding commitment for the development of a new bridge in Auburn to replace the existing railway bridge, forming part of the Riesling Trail.

*Estimates Replies***PUBLIC SECTOR AUDIT**

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 document prescribes the internal procedures that must be followed when issuing summons in order to conduct an audit or make an examination under the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987* (the Act). A summons can be issued by the Auditor-General requiring:

- appearance of any persons or the production of any relevant accounts, records or other documents
- requiring a person who has access to information to provide that information in writing
- a person appearing before him or her to make an oath or affirmation and answer all questions put to them truthfully.

The Act expressly recognises that the Auditor-General is not subject to the direction of any person as to the manner in which:

- functions are carried out
- powers are exercised by the Auditor-General.

Independence is the keystone of every audit and is fundamental to the integrity of a public sector audit. Given the independence of the Auditor-General's role and function, it is generally not appropriate for the Auditor-General to release details of internal procedures and practices used when undertaking statutory audit work.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD**

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 Utilities Sub-Committee was formed following the September 2015 Economic Development Board meeting.

Since its formation, it has met a total of 21 times between its first meeting in October 2015, and its final meeting in February 2017. This total includes internal meetings, meetings with external stakeholders and organised events.

#### LOW CARBON ECONOMY UNIT

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 spending for the Low Carbon Economy Unit for 2016-17 was \$1,746,000. The estimated expenditure for this financial year is \$1,884,000; for the 2018-19 financial year is \$1,777,000; for the 2019-20 financial year is \$1,417,000 and for the 2020-21 financial year is \$1,502,000.

#### 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 communications plan for the Energy campaign and Premier's Communications Advisory Group documentation were prepared by the Government Communications, Engagement and International Relations division in my department.

The requested documents have been released under a Freedom of Information application to the Hon. Rob Lucas MP.

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

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:

|                                | 2017-18<br>(\$'000) | 2018-19<br>(\$'000) | 2019-20<br>(\$'000) | 2020-21<br>(\$'000) |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Expenses                       | 5,982               | 5,481               | 5,225               | 5,101               |
| Income:                        | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   |
| Net cost of providing services | 5,982               | 5,481               | 5,225               | 5,101               |

Please note the above figures do not include overhead costs. Corporate overheads are allocated as part of the annual budget papers process.

#### COUNTRY CABINET

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:

Our commitment was for three Country Cabinet meetings per year. We have met this commitment every year since 2014 and planning is under way for 2018.

#### 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) approved the Energy communications plan on 6 March 2017.

#### 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) approved the Energy Plan campaign submission on 6 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:

- That the media plan is reviewed to extend duration of television communications until the end of April 2017 and revisit weighting of the print media buy.
- Creative and media to be provided to the Government Communications Advice Group within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for approval prior to entering the public domain.

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

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 Economic Development Board's Energy sub-committee provided me with Cabinet in Confidence briefings.

#### **ENERGY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION TASKFORCE**

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts):** I have been advised that the Energy Plan Implementation Taskforce has been created under the leadership of Mr Sam Crafter. There are four FTE internal to government resources that are paid for by the Energy Plan and just under 16 FTE external resources planned for the project team.

#### **STATE COORDINATOR-GENERAL**

In reply to **Mr BELL (Mount Gambier)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts):** I have been advised that the appointment of the State Coordinator-General, Jim Hallion, followed extensive consultation with industry leaders in July 2014. The Property Council of Australia SA welcomed the announcement and noted that the run of applications to the State Coordinator-General indicated industry frustration with local government processes.

In the first six months of the State Coordinator-General, more than \$210 million in major developments were accelerated to the Development Assessment Commission approval stage.

The threshold value of works in Metropolitan Adelaide has increased from \$3 million to \$5 million while retaining the threshold of \$3 million outside Metropolitan Adelaide.

Proposals must satisfy the criteria prescribed in Schedule 10 of the Development Regulations 2008 but excludes development solely for residential purposes. Proposed developments which include purpose-built student accommodation, aged care or serviced accommodation, industrial, commercial or retail uses can be considered for call-in by the State Coordinator-General if the works exceed the threshold values.

#### **WOOMERA PROHIBITED AREA**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** I am advised the coexistence model detailed in the 2014 Woomera Prohibited Area (WPA) legislation is managed through the WPA Advisory Board, which includes senior executives from Department of Defence, Department of Industry, Air Force and from South Australian Government departments including the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) and Defence SA. Working level contact for operational issues is managed through direct liaison between Defence SA, DPC, Woomera Test Range and the WPA Coordination Office (WPACO—Department of Defence).

The WPA Advisory Board held their last meeting on 20 September 2016 at Defence SA. Since the meeting Defence SA staff have met with South Australian government representatives in South Australia and Canberra and are working to finalise a Memorandum of Understanding between the South Australian government and Department of Defence. A new WPA Advisory Board has been appointed and will meet before the end of 2017.

#### **VETERANS' AFFAIRS**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** There are approximately 2,300 veterans and spouses buried in the Derrick Gardens, with the remains of a further 3,000 (approximately) veterans and spouses interred in the RSL Walls. A further 850 veterans and spouses are interred in the Garden Edge section of the Derrick Gardens referred to as the Derrick Gardens of Remembrance.

On 16 November 2016, I signed a ten year agreement with the Centennial Park Cemetery Authority for the protection of veterans' graves and memorials in the Derrick Gardens and RSL Walls areas of Centennial Park cemetery.

The new agreement with Centennial Park was negotiated in substantially the same terms as the 2006 Agreement, which expired on 30 September 2016. The approximate annual cost of the agreement is \$100,000 per annum.

#### **VETERANS' AFFAIRS**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** The Office for Public Sector is leading a Change@SA 90 Day Project with a goal of facilitating better employment pathways for transitioning Australian Defence Force Personnel. Outcomes and recommendations from the 90 Day Project will provide tools and pathways for transitioning military personnel to be better placed to seek employment within the South Australian government, as well as providing the state government, as an employer, with information on the advantages of hiring ex Australian Defence Force personnel.

#### VETERANS' AFFAIRS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** The following table details the expenditure of grants budget for the Veterans' Affairs branch within the Department of Treasury and Finance for the 2016-17 financial year:

|    | Purpose  | Amount Requested |
|----|--|------------------|
| 1  | RSL Murray Bridge—Long Tan Service   | \$1,000.00       |
| 2  | North Road Cemetery—History Book   | \$1,157.18       |
| 3  | The Long Ride Home—The Long Ride Home fundraising bike ride                      | \$5,000.00       |
| 4  | Wasleys Community Group—Their Duty Done  | \$3,400.00       |
| 5  | Veterans SA—2017 Ex-Service Commemorative Calendar                               | \$5,500.00       |
| 6  | Veterans SA—Dardanelles Cenotaph Commemorative Service                           | \$2,000.00       |
| 7  | RAR—Long Tan Commemorative Service   | \$5,000.00       |
| 8  | 3 RAR—Battle of Maryang San Commemorative Service                                | \$515.00         |
| 9  | Veterans SA—VAC Reception  | \$484.40         |
| 10 | RAR Association—Hat Dich Commemorative Service                                   | \$565.00         |
| 11 | Veterans SA—The Last Post  | \$560.00         |
| 12 | SA Boer War Association—Anglo-Boer War Commemorative Service                     | \$1,000.00       |
| 13 | Trojan's Trek—Trojan's Trek governance requirements and staff education          | \$5,000.00       |
| 14 | Reconciliation SA—Aboriginal Veterans Commemorative Service                      | \$5,000.00       |
| 15 | AUS American Association—Battle of the Coral Sea Anniversary Dinner              | \$1,000.00       |
| 16 | Veterans SA—Veterans' Voice Autumn 2017  | \$2,000.00       |
| 17 | 3RAR—Kapyong Day Commemorative Service   | \$515.00         |
| 18 | 3RAR—Long Khanh & Operation Overlord Commemorative Service                       | \$515.00         |
| 19 | Service Voices—Service Voices' Radio Program                                     | \$5,000.00       |
| 20 | Register of Aboriginal Veterans of SA—Return to Country Ceremonies—Steve Dodd    | \$4,500.00       |
| 21 | Aboriginal Veterans of SA—Miller Mack Re-interment ceremony                      | \$2,500.00       |
| 22 | National Servicemen's Association of Australia (SA Branch)—public address system | \$2,350.00       |
| 23 | Vietnam Veterans Federation—repair of vandalism – Warradale premises             | \$1,000.00       |
| 24 | Loxton Mardi Gras—Military Streets of Loxton—audio tour                          | \$1,433.00       |
| 25 | 3RAR—50th Anniversary Reunion  | \$1,000.00       |
| 26 | Partners of Veterans—Partners of Veterans—May Board Meeting                      | \$1,980.00       |
| 27 | Balaklava Museum Inc – Commemorative Plaque -Boer War Veterans                   | \$1,000.00       |
| 28 | Veterans SA—Anzac Sporting Medals Program  | \$1,906.26       |

|    | Purpose  | Amount Requested |
|----|--|------------------|
| 29 | Morgan RSL Sub-Branch—ANZAC Day/Remembrance Day expenses   | \$630.00         |
| 30 | Veterans SA—Official History of WWI by C W Bean  | \$2,500.00       |
| 31 | Flinders University of South Australia—Wish Me Luck Exhibition catering—Chaffey Theatre, Renmark | \$262.00         |
| 32 | Flinders University of South Australia—South Australians in France project                       | \$3,000.00       |
| 33 | Kangaroo Island RSL Sub-Branch—Light Horse Men uniforms  | \$2,400.00       |
| 34 | Legacy Club of Adelaide—Legacy Boss Boot Camp Launch   | \$1,464.00       |
| 35 | RSL – SA—RSL Annual State Government Grant   | \$100,000.00     |
| 36 | Legacy Club of Adelaide— Annual State Government Grant   | \$100,000.00     |
|    | TOTAL  | \$273,136.84     |

The following table details the annual allocation of grants budget for the Veterans' Affairs branch within the Department of Treasury and Finance across the forward estimates:

|   | 2016-17<br>\$000 | 2017-18<br>\$000 | 2018-19<br>\$000 | 2019-20<br>\$000 | 2020-21<br>\$000 |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Grants and Subsidies Expenditure Budget | 283              | 283              | 283              | 283              | 283              |

Budget allocation for the annual allocation of grants for the 2017-18 financial year and forward estimates is \$283,000. The figure of \$273,136.84 for the 2016-17 financial year was the actual expenditure for that period.

#### VETERANS' AFFAIRS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** The following table details the budget for the Veterans' Affairs branch within the Department of Treasury and Finance across the forward estimates:

|                     | 2016-17<br>\$000 | 2017-18<br>\$000 | 2018-19<br>\$000 | 2019-20<br>\$000 | 2020-21<br>\$000 |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Expenditure         | 11 844           | 1 714            | 1 409            | 1 427            | 1 444            |
| Revenue             | 525              | 525              | 25               | 25               | 25               |
| Net Cost of Service | 11 319           | 1 189            | 1 384            | 1 402            | 1 419            |

The budget included in the table above excludes an allocation of corporate overhead and reflects the direct branch budget. Corporate overhead comprises departmental corporate services, incorporating the Office of the Chief Executive, Treasurer's Office, Human Resources, OHS&W, ICT and Finance.

#### BIZLINK

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):** I am advised that 178 people attended BizLink seminars in the regions run by the Office of the Small Business Commissioner during 2016-17 and provide the breakdown of each session as follows:

| Event Name      | Event Date     | Location              | Attendees |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| BizLink Seminar | 10 August 2016 | TAFE SA, Port Lincoln | 15        |

| Event Name      | Event Date       | Location                                | Attendees |
|-----------------|------------------|---|-----------|
| BizLink Seminar | 11 August 2016   | Regional Development Australia, Whyalla | 10        |
| BizLink Seminar | 12 August 2016   | John Pirie Motel, Port Pirie            | 10        |
| BizLink Seminar | 7 September 2016 | Council Chambers, Victor Harbor         | 26        |
| BizLink Seminar | 7 September 2016 | Chaffey Learning Centre, Murray Bridge  | 14        |
| BizLink Seminar | 25 November 2016 | Payneham Library                        | 16        |
| BizLink Seminar | 24 February 2017 | Port Adelaide Business Hub              | 20        |
| BizLink Expo    | 29 May 2017      | Auchendarroch House, Mount Barker       | 20        |
| BizLink Expo    | 13 June 2017     | Mount Gambier City Hall                 | 47        |
| TOTAL           |                  |   | 178       |

#### AUTOMOTIVE WORKERS IN TRANSITION

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, the Automotive Workers in Transition Program spent \$661,000.

#### STOLEN GENERATIONS REPARATIONS SCHEME

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:

As per the terms of the Independent Assessor's contract, the incumbent is required to provide services from 29 April 2016 to 30 June 2018.

The contract specifies a number of services required to be delivered over the term of the contract and does not specify hours of work.

The total remuneration for this contract is \$200,000.00.

The total remuneration paid until 30 June 2017 is \$120,000.00.

\$40,000.00 was disbursed in financial year 2015-16.

\$80,000.00 was disbursed in financial year 2016-17.

It is anticipated that a further \$80,000.00 will be paid in financial year 2017-18.

All figures are GST inclusive.

#### STOLEN GENERATIONS REPARATIONS SCHEME

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:

As of 22 August 2017, 11 ex gratia payments have been made, totalling \$55,000.00.

**STOLEN GENERATIONS REPARATIONS SCHEME**

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:

Five applicants have passed away since submitting their application for reparation.

**OCEAN PARK**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Yes, the 'Adventures in Australia' exhibit at Ocean Park Hong Kong depicts South Australia.

The 'Adventures in Australia' exhibit is an immersive, walk-through experience, designed to encourage tourism and educate OPHK guests about South Australia, our climate, culture, fauna and flora, as well as to share critical messaging about environmental sustainability and conservation.

Guests to the exhibit currently view a video about South Australia prior to proceeding through a film corridor depicting signs and tourism images of South Australia. Inside the exhibit, further images and signage provide information about Indigenous culture, the South Australian outback, National Parks, Kangaroo Island and the Adelaide Central Business District (including Adelaide Oval and the Festival Theatre precinct).

Messaging is translated into English. The exhibit also symbolises the importance of the long-standing, close ties between South Australia and Hong Kong and our shared commitment to sustainability and conservation.

**NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARDS**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

- The presiding members (board chair) of all eight regional NRM boards are paid \$258 per four-hour session plus \$64.50 per hour for out of session duties. This has not changed since 2008.
- All presiding members are paid the same rate.
- Members of all eight regional NRM boards are paid the same rate of \$206 per four-hour session plus \$64.50 per hour for out of session duties. This also has not changed since 2008.
- Presiding members from all eight boards are paid an annual retention allowance. General members are not paid a retention allowance.

**ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

During 2016-17, no members of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Board were paid travel allowances in order to attend board meetings, whether that be from interstate or in South Australia.

EPA Board members travelled intrastate to Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier during the financial year to undertake community and stakeholder consultations. The EPA covered the costs associated such as for flights and accommodation however no additional allowances were provided to members.

**WORKFORCE SUMMARY**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

As of 22 August 2017, the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources employs:

- Twenty-four (24) rangers who are women; and
- Thirteen (13) rangers who identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The current average age of a ranger is 45 years old.



**ASBESTOS DISPOSAL**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

There is no baseline asbestos disposal data to compare recent tonnages disposed.

**DEPARTMENTAL STAFF**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

There are 6.2 FTE staff employed in specific communications roles within SA Water.

There are 3.0 FTE staff employed in specific media roles within SA Water.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

SA Water does not manage a grant programme or fund for which the Minister is responsible.

a)

## Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                   | Balance of the Grant Program or Fund |            |            |            |            |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|   | 2016-17                              | 2017-18    | 2018-19    | 2019-20    | 2020-21    |
| Royal Zoological Society                        | See – (e)                            | 5,709,000  | 5,817,000  | 6,076,000  | 6,189,950  |
| Stormwater Management Authority                 | See – (e)                            | 5,248,000  | 5,379,000  | 5,513,000  | 5,651,000  |
| South Eastern Water Conservation Drainage Board | See – (e)                            | 2,350,325  | 2,409,083  | 2,469,310  | 2,531,043  |
| Adelaide City Council—Parklands                 | See – (e)                            | 1,613,350  | 1,653,000  | 1,694,325  | 1,736,000  |
| Water Levy transfer payments—NRM Boards         | See – (e)                            | 15,169,000 | 15,176,000 | 15,086,000 | 15,463,150 |
| State recurrent allocation grants—NRM Boards    | See – (e)                            | 2,479,000  | 2,571,000  | 2,664,000  | 2,731,000  |
| National Landcare Program                       | See – (e)                            | 13,719,000 | -          | -          | -          |
| Native Vegetation                               | See – (e)                            | 1,653,000  | 1,694,000  | 1,737,000  | 1,780,000  |
| Goyder Institute                                | See – (e)                            | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  | -          | -          |
| Murray-Darling Basin Authority                  | See – (e)                            | 20,055,000 | 20,697,000 | 20,868,000 | 22,160,000 |
| Coorong, Lower Lakes & Murray Mouth Program     | See – (e)                            | 3,643,000  | 2,597,000  | -          | -          |
| Riverine Recovery Program                       | See – (e)                            | -          | 1,549,000  | -          | -          |
| Marine Parks                                    | See – (e)                            | 690,000    | -          | -          | -          |
| Total   |                                      | 75,432,882 | 62,673,895 | 57,267,743 | 59,431,253 |

## Environment Protection Authority

| Name of Grant Program or Fund  | Balance of the Grant Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                | 2016-17                              | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
| Adelaide Catchment to Coast    | \$12,090                             |         |         |         |         |
| Maralinga Regulatory Oversight | \$15,299                             |         |         |         |         |
| National Pollutant Inventory   | \$8,720                              |         |         |         |         |
| Dry Creek Salt Field           | \$3,524                              |         |         |         |         |

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                    | Balance of the Grant Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|  | 2016-17                              | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
| National Packaging Covenant Industry Association | \$15,000                             |         |         |         |         |
| Petroleum Regulations                            | \$7,217                              |         |         |         |         |

## Green Industries SA

| Name of Fund        | Balance of the Grant Program or Fund |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                     | 2016-17<br>\$'000                    | 2017-18<br>\$'000 | 2018-19<br>\$'000 | 2019-20<br>\$'000 | 2020-21<br>\$'000 |
| Green Industry Fund | 108,273                              | 118,726           | 139,450           | 164,925           | 191,494           |

b)

## Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                   | Budgeted (or Actual) Expenditure from the Program or Fund |            |            |            |            |
|---|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|   | 2016-17   | 2017-18    | 2018-19    | 2019-20    | 2020-21    |
| Royal Zoological Society                        | See – (e)   | 5,709,000  | 5,817,000  | 6,076,000  | 6,189,950  |
| Stormwater Management Authority                 | See – (e)   | 5,248,000  | 5,379,000  | 5,513,000  | 5,651,000  |
| South Eastern Water Conservation Drainage Board | See – (e)   | 2,350,325  | 2,409,083  | 2,469,310  | 2,531,043  |
| Adelaide City Council—Parklands                 | See – (e)   | 1,613,350  | 1,653,000  | 1,694,325  | 1,736,000  |
| Water Levy transfer payments—NRM Boards         | See – (e)   | 15,169,000 | 15,176,000 | 15,086,000 | 15,463,150 |
| State recurrent allocation grants—NRM Boards    | See – (e)   | 2,479,000  | 2,571,000  | 2,664,000  | 2,731,000  |
| National Landcare Program                       | See – (e)   | 13,719,000 | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Native Vegetation                               | See – (e)   | 1,653,000  | 1,694,000  | 1,737,000  | 1,780,000  |
| Goyder Institute                                | See – (e)   | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  | 0          | 0          |
| Murray-Darling Basin Authority                  | See – (e)   | 20,055,000 | 20,697,000 | 20,868,000 | 22,160,000 |
| RSPCA   | See – (e)   | 1,104,207  | 1,131,812  | 1,160,107  | 1,189,110  |
| Coorong, Lower Lakes & Murray Mouth Program     | See – (e)   | 3,643,000  | 2,597,000  | 0          | 0          |
| Riverine Recovery Program                       | See – (e)   | 0          | 1,549,000  | 0          | 0          |
| Marine Parks                                    | See – (e)   | 690,000    | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Total   |   | 75,432,882 | 62,673,895 | 57,267,743 | 59,431,253 |

## Environment Protection Authority

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                    | Budgeted (or Actual) Expenditure from the Program or Fund |           |          |          |          |
|--|---|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
|  | 2016-17   | 2017-18   | 2018-19  | 2019-20  | 2020-21  |
| Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) Projects       | \$100,000   | \$100,000 |          |          |          |
| National Integration-SA Contribution             | \$18,096  | \$19,000  | \$20,000 | \$21,000 | \$21,000 |
| National Packaging Covenant Industry Association | \$0   |           |          |          |          |
| SA Conservation Council Contribution             | \$10,863  | \$11,000  |          |          |          |
| Adelaide Catchment to Coast                      | \$456,910   | \$552,000 |          |          |          |
| Maralinga Regulatory Oversight                   | \$26,701  | \$28,000  | \$29,000 | \$30,000 | \$31,000 |
| National Pollutant Inventory                     | \$173,951   | \$171,730 |          |          |          |
| Murray-Darling Basin Authority Risk Assessment   | \$119,020   | \$3,000   |          |          |          |
| Dry Creek Salt Field                             | \$14,476  | \$35,000  |          |          |          |

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                                  | Budgeted (or Actual) Expenditure from the Program or Fund |           |           |           |           |
|--|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|  | 2016-17   | 2017-18   | 2018-19   | 2019-20   | 2020-21   |
| Establishment of Innovation Cluster                            | \$0   | \$43,000  | \$44,000  | \$45,000  | \$46,000  |
| Water Quality Monitoring & Aquatic Ecosystem Reporting Program | \$29,026  | \$30,000  | \$30,000  |           |           |
| Petroleum Regulations  | \$119,729   | \$131,000 | \$134,000 | \$138,000 | \$142,000 |

## Green Industries SA

| Name of Grant Program                        | Budgeted (or Actual) Expenditure from the Program or Fund |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|  | 2016-17<br>\$'000   | 2017-18<br>\$'000 | 2018-19<br>\$'000 | 2019-20<br>\$'000 | 2020-21<br>\$'000 |
| Industry Infrastructure                      | 1,149   | 2,052             | 3,321             | 3,229             | 3,736             |
| Local Government Infrastructure              | 480   | 1,364             | 3,350             | 3,600             | 3,103             |
| Trade Waste Implementation                   | 70  | 3,083             | 840               | 0                 | 0                 |
| Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 92  | 500               | 372               | 0                 | 0                 |
| Trade Waste Advice & Support                 | 51  | 148               | 128               | 0                 | 0                 |
| Metropolitan Infrastructure                  | 20  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |
| Regional Implementation                      | 35  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |
| Innovation                                   | 90  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |
| Business Sustainability                      | 52  | 182               | 280               | 350               | 400               |
| Climate Change Initiatives                   | 718   | 7,042             | 4,867             | 1,042             | 1,068             |
| Household Hazardous Waste Infrastructure     | 0   | 54                | 540               | 0                 | 0                 |
| Waste education                              | 0   | 200               | 700               | 700               | 700               |

c)

## Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                   | Budgeted (or Actual) Payments from the Program or Fund |            |            |            |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|   | 2016-17  | 2017-18    | 2018-19    | 2019-20    | 2020-21    |
| Royal Zoological Society                        | See – (e)  | 5,709,000  | 5,817,000  | 6,076,000  | 6,189,950  |
| Stormwater Management Authority                 | See – (e)  | 5,248,000  | 5,379,000  | 5,513,000  | 5,651,000  |
| South Eastern Water Conservation Drainage Board | See – (e)  | 2,350,325  | 2,409,083  | 2,469,310  | 2,531,043  |
| Adelaide City Council—Parklands                 | See – (e)  | 1,613,350  | 1,653,000  | 1,694,325  | 1,736,000  |
| Water Levy transfer payments—NRM Boards         | See – (e)  | 15,169,000 | 15,176,000 | 15,086,000 | 15,463,150 |
| State recurrent allocation grants—NRM Boards    | See – (e)  | 2,479,000  | 2,571,000  | 2,664,000  | 2,731,000  |
| National Landcare Program                       | See – (e)  | 13,719,000 | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Native Vegetation                               | See – (e)  | 1,653,000  | 1,694,000  | 1,737,000  | 1,780,000  |
| Goyder Institute                                | See – (e)  | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  | 0          | 0          |
| Murray-Darling Basin Authority                  | See – (e)  | 20,055,000 | 20,697,000 | 20,868,000 | 22,160,000 |
| RSPCA   | See – (e)  | 1,104,207  | 1,131,812  | 1,160,107  | 1,189,110  |
| Coorong, Lower Lakes & Murray Mouth Program     | See – (e)  | 3,643,000  | 2,597,000  | 0          | 0          |
| Riverine Recovery Program                       | See – (e)  | 0          | 1,549,000  | 0          | 0          |
| Marine Parks                                    | See – (e)  | 690,000    | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Total   |  | 75,432,882 | 62,673,895 | 57,267,743 | 59,431,253 |

## Environment Protection Authority

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                                  | Budgeted (or Actual) Payments into the Program or Fund |           |           |           |           |
|--|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|  | 2016-17  | 2017-18   | 2018-19   | 2019-20   | 2020-21   |
| Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) Projects                     | \$100,000  | \$100,000 |           |           |           |
| National Integration-SA Contribution                           | \$20,000   | \$19,000  | \$20,000  | \$21,000  | \$21,000  |
| National Packaging Covenant Industry Association               | \$15,000   |           |           |           |           |
| SA Conservation Council Contribution                           | \$10,000   | \$11,000  |           |           |           |
| Adelaide Catchment to Coast                                    | \$432,000  | \$552,000 |           |           |           |
| Maralinga Regulatory Oversight                                 | \$27,000   | \$28,000  | \$29,000  | \$30,000  | \$31,000  |
| National Pollutant Inventory                                   | \$172,671  | \$171,730 |           |           |           |
| Murray-Darling Basin Authority Risk Assessment                 | \$118,000  | \$3,131   |           |           |           |
| Dry Creek Salt Field   | \$18,000   | \$35,060  |           |           |           |
| Establishment of Innovation Cluster                            | \$0  | \$43,000  | \$44,000  | \$45,000  | \$46,000  |
| Water Quality Monitoring & Aquatic Ecosystem Reporting Program | \$30,000   | \$30,000  | \$30,000  |           |           |
| Petroleum Regulations  | \$127,000  | \$131,000 | \$134,000 | \$138,000 | \$142,000 |

## Green Industries SA

| Name of Fund        | Budgeted (or Actual) Payments into the Fund |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                     | 2016-17<br>\$'000                           | 2017-18<br>\$'000 | 2018-19<br>\$'000 | 2019-20<br>\$'000 | 2020-21<br>\$'000 |
| Green Industry Fund | 27,600                                      | 31,714            | 36,020            | 36,706            | 37,624            |

d)

## Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources

| Name of Grant Program or Fund        | Carryovers into or from the Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                      | 2016-17                                     | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
| Marine Parks Regional Support Grants | -   | 171,000 | -       | -       | -       |

## Environment Protection Authority

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                  | Carryovers into or from the Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|--|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|  | 2016-17                                     | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
| Adelaide Catchment to Coast                    | \$37,000                                    |         |         |         |         |
| National Pollutant Inventory                   | \$10,000                                    |         |         |         |         |
| Maralinga Regulatory Oversight                 | \$15,000                                    |         |         |         |         |
| Murray-Darling Basin Authority Risk Assessment | \$1,000                                     |         |         |         |         |

## Green Industries SA

| Name of Grant Program or Fund                | Carryovers into or from the Program or Fund |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|  | 2016-17<br>\$'000                           | 2017-18<br>\$'000 | 2018-19<br>\$'000 | 2019-20<br>\$'000 | 2020-21<br>\$'000 |
| Trade Waste Implementation                   | 1,066                                       | 2,017             | 840               | 0                 | 0                 |
| Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 880   | 500               | 372               | 0                 | 0                 |

| Name of Grant Program or Fund | Carryovers into or from the Program or Fund |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                               | 2016-17<br>\$'000                           | 2017-18<br>\$'000 | 2018-19<br>\$'000 | 2019-20<br>\$'000 | 2020-21<br>\$'000 |
| Trade Waste Advice & Support  | 89  | 34                | 128               |                   |                   |
| Climate Change Initiatives    | 0   | 2,000             | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |
| Regional Implementation       | 90  | 55                | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |
| Metropolitan Infrastructure   | 20  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |
| Innovation                    | 45  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |

e)

Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources

Controlled Grants

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund  | Value of Commitment | Beneficiary  |
|---------|--|---------------------|--|
| 2016-17 | Annual contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority (\$19.444m), SA Barrage Fishways grant (\$325k) and other contributions (\$96k).   | \$19,864,745        | MURRAY DARLING BASIN AUTHORITY                             |
| 2016-17 | Annual funding payment.  | \$2,000,000         | GOYDER INSTITUTE   |
| 2016-17 | Grant funding for acquisition and management of Nilpena Station.   | \$1,730,000         | AUSTRALIAN WILDLIFE CONSERVANCY                            |
| 2016-17 | Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative.  | \$1,264,500         | BHP BILLITON OLYMPIC DAM                                   |
| 2016-17 | Grant for the administration of the Animal Welfare Act.  | \$1,077,275         | RSPCA SOUTH AUST INC                                       |
| 2016-17 | Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative.  | \$901,182           | BETTS PARTNERSHIP (LARWOOD INVESTMENTS PTY LTD)            |
| 2016-17 | Revegetation and Community Engagement grants under the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth Program and the Riverine Recovery Program.  | \$405,459           | NGARRINDJERI REGIONAL AUTHORITY INC.                       |
| 2016-17 | Milestone payments under grant agreement with the Minister and the International Centre for Excellence in Water Resources Management.  | \$400,000           | WATERED AUST PTY LTD                                       |
| 2016-17 | Artificial reef project (\$300k), Giant Australian Cuttlefish annual monitoring program (\$22k), Conditional monitoring of aquatic and littoral vegetation within Lakes Alexandrina & Albert (\$18k) and GPS tags on Fur Seals in the Coorong (\$10k). | \$350,000           | PRIMARY INDUSTRIES & REGIONS SA                            |
| 2016-17 | Projects funded under the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth Program for restoration, environmental management and volunteer support.   | \$344,413           | GOOLWA TO WELLINGTON LOCAL ACTION PLANNING ASSOCIATION INC |
| 2016-17 | Wirraminna South Vivian land system conservation stewardship agreement.  | \$312,370           | INGLEWOOD PROPRIETORS PTY LTD                              |
| 2016-17 | HMS Womersley Chair in Systematic Botany (\$182k), Principal economist environmental science (\$76k) and NRM Research & Innovation Network Honours Scholarship (\$10k).  | \$268,289           | UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE                                     |
| 2016-17 | Mt Burr swamp restoration project (\$205k) and Fishing for the Future clinics (\$29k).   | \$233,950           | NATURE GLENELG TRUST                                       |
| 2016-17 | Contributions to the Lake Eyre Basin (\$188k) & Great Artesian Basin (\$30k).  | \$217,500           | DEPT OF AGRICULTURE & WATER RESOURCES (CWLTH)              |
| 2016-17 | First and second year partnership fees for founding partners.  | \$200,000           | CLIMATE-KIC AUSTRALIA LTD                                  |

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund  | Value of Commitment | Beneficiary  |
|---------|--|---------------------|--|
| 2016-17 | State Community grant (\$120k), Nature conservation principles in NRM (\$52k) and River Renewal Roadshow (\$20k).                    | \$192,704           | CONSERVATION COUNCIL OF SA INC                       |
| 2016-17 | Milang Foreshore Habitat Restoration project.  | \$185,250           | ALEXANDRINA COUNCIL                                  |
| 2016-17 | Establishment of Climate Change Services South Australia Ltd.  | \$174,000           | CLIMATE CHANGE SERVICES SOUTH                        |
| 2016-17 | 2016-17 funding for the Maralinga Lands Unnamed Conservation Park Board.   | \$160,000           | MARALINGA LANDS UNNAMED CONSERVATION PARK            |
| 2016-17 | Ongoing support for the operation of Nature Play SA (\$120k) and grant for 'Come & try fishing' day (\$7k).                          | \$127,042           | NATURE PLAY SA                                       |
| 2016-17 | Top soiling and turfing (\$62k) and Murray Cod stock enhancement project (\$50k).  | \$111,985           | DISTRICT COUNCIL OF RENMARK PARINGA                  |
| 2016-17 | Billa Kalina coward land system conservation stewardship grant.  | \$87,622            | BILLA KALINA PASTORAL CO                             |
| 2016-17 | Grant for management subsidy.  | \$70,000            | NATURE FOUNDATION SA INC                             |
| 2016-17 | Creating Biophilic Cities through Citizen Science project (\$50k) and NRM Research & Innovation Network Honours Scholarship (\$10k). | \$60,000            | UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA                        |
| 2016-17 | Grant funding for NRM Project & Liaison Officer.   | \$55,000            | PRIMARY PRODUCERS SA                                 |
| 2016-17 | Grants for Volunteer Support Programs Unit.  | \$50,750            | FRIENDS OF PARKS INC                                 |
| 2016-17 | Host fee for Gravity Enduro National Championships 2016-2018.  | \$50,000            | MOUNTAIN BIKE AUSTRALIA INC                          |
| 2016-17 | Recreational fishing grants.   | \$45,650            | RECFISH SA   |
| 2016-17 | Sponsorship funding for joint conservation projects.   | \$44,000            | ARID RECOVERY LTD                                    |
| 2016-17 | Emu Bay operating grant (\$20k) and recreational fishing grants (\$20k).   | \$39,634            | KANGAROO ISLAND COUNCIL                              |
| 2016-17 | Design of jetty to water access stairs (Pt Noarlunga) \$25k and recreational fishing grant (\$10k).                                  | \$35,000            | CITY OF ONKAPARINGA                                  |
| 2016-17 | Improve the condition of 360 hectares of native pastures through managed grazing.  | \$34,400            | MOSOONA FAMILY TRUST                                 |
| 2016-17 | Port Gawler floating pontoon.  | \$34,000            | TWO WELLS REGIONAL ACTION TEAM                       |
| 2016-17 | South East aboriginal project officer and South East Flows Recovery Project decision support.  | \$32,972            | BURRANDIES ABORIGINAL CORP.                          |
| 2016-17 | Recreational fishing grant—Weeroona Island, Pt Germein fish cleaning stations (\$25k) and boat washing station (\$7k).               | \$32,512            | MT REMARKABLE DISTRICT                               |
| 2016-17 | Whyalla Point Lowly recreational fishing enhancement project.  | \$29,100            | CORP OF THE CITY OF WHYALLA                          |
| 2016-17 | Fencing grants.  | \$25,085            | WASHPOOL PROPRIETORS PTY LTD                         |
| 2016-17 | National Hydrological Modelling Partnerships.  | \$25,000            | EWATER LTD   |
| 2016-17 | Marion Bay fish cleaning facility.   | \$22,400            | MARION BAY PROGRESS ASSOC INC                        |
| 2016-17 | Recreational boating facilities grant for Cowell fish cleaning station.  | \$21,000            | DISTRICT COUNCIL OF FRANKLIN HARBOUR                 |
| 2016-17 | Funding and management of Crown Land properties.   | \$20,497            | NATIONAL TRUST OF SA                                 |
| 2016-17 | Grant for conservation ecologist's position.   | \$20,000            | NATURE CONSERVATION SOCIETY OF SA                    |
| 2016-17 | Fencing grant.   | \$18,224            | THE TRUSTEE FOR THE PINESLOPE PASTORAL FARMING TRUST |

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund   | Value of Commitment | Beneficiary                              |
|---------|---|---------------------|--|
| 2016-17 | Community grant.  | \$15,375            | ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENDERS OFFICE           |
| 2016-17 | Digital Challenge—People, Parks and Well Being, innovation in ageing.                                 | \$15,000            | DEPT OF PREMIER & CABINET                |
| 2016-17 | Major events sponsorship for Oz Harvest SA Great Food Rescue Race 2017.                               | \$15,000            | OZ HARVEST LIMITED                       |
| 2016-17 | Building and erecting jetty shelter.  | \$14,990            | SOUTH AUST AMATEUR FISHERMEN'S ASSOC INC |
| 2016-17 | Ceduna jetty shelter.   | \$14,000            | DISTRICT COUNCIL OF CEDUNA               |
| 2016-17 | Data for the Genuine Progress Indicator (\$10k) and inaugural meeting of the Wakefield Futures Group. | \$14,000            | WAKEFIELD FUTURES GROUP INC              |
| 2016-17 | Ardrossan jetty shelter.  | \$14,000            | YORKE PENINSULA COUNCIL                  |
| 2016-17 | Large interpretive sign/shelter at the Robe obelisk.  | \$13,636            | DISTRICT COUNCIL OF ROBE                 |
| 2016-17 | Port Victoria boat ramp pontoon extension.  | \$13,300            | PORT VINCENT PROGRESS ASSOC              |
| 2016-17 | Recreational fishing grant.   | \$13,000            | DISTRICT COUNCIL OF ELLISTON             |
| 2016-17 | Fishing camps and activity days.  | \$11,725            | EDMUND RICE CAMPS (SA) INC               |
| 2016-17 | Cat eradication (Eyre Peninsula).   | \$11,110            | GLENTOA PTY LTD                          |
| 2016-17 | War veterans' fishing group grant.  | \$11,080            | TPI ASSOCIATION (SA) INC                 |
| 2016-17 | NRM Research & Innovation Network Honours Scholarships Program  | \$11,000            | FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SA                |
| 2016-17 | Burra to Kapunda landscape program.   | \$10,500            | ULANDI PARK POLL DORSETS                 |
| 2016-17 | Recreational fishing grant for Port Broughton fish cleaning station.                                  | \$10,000            | BARUNGA WEST DISTRICT COUNCIL            |
| 2016-17 | 3rd Water Innovation Summit (New Delhi, India—4th to 5th September 2016)                              | \$10,000            | DEPT OF STATE DEVELOPMENT                |
| 2016-17 | Grant for fencing and associated groundwork, weed management.   | \$10,000            | KERNCHEN & CO                            |
| 2016-17 | Building Upgrade Finance—Value proposition for councils' project.                                     | \$10,000            | LOCAL GOVT ASSOC OF SA                   |
| 2016-17 | Construction of a coastal walking trail in the township of Southend.                                  | \$10,000            | SOUTHEND PROGRESS ASSOC INC              |
| 2016-17 | Large number of small grants  | \$333,731           | GRANTS OF LESS THAN \$10,000             |
|         | Total   | \$31,954,956        |  |

## Administered grants:

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund              | Value of Commitment | Beneficiary                                     |
|---------|--|---------------------|---|
| 2016-17 | Water levy transfer payments               | \$8,101,741         | SA MURRAY-DARLING BASIN NRM BOARD               |
| 2016-17 | Support grants                             | \$5,604,161         | ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SA INC.             |
| 2016-17 | Annual grant paid to support the authority | \$5,120,000         | STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY                 |
| 2016-17 | Water levy transfer payments               | \$3,783,104         | SOUTH EAST NRM BOARD                            |
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants           | \$3,658,384         | SA MURRAY-DARLING BASIN NRM BOARD               |
| 2016-17 | Allocation of funding to the Board         | \$2,293,000         | SOUTH EASTERN WATER CONSERVATION DRAINAGE BOARD |
| 2016-17 | Water levy transfer payments               | \$1,919,680         | ADELAIDE & MT LOFTY RANGES NRM BOARD            |
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants           | \$1,903,398         | SOUTH EAST NRM BOARD                            |
| 2016-17 | Water levy transfer payments               | \$1,711,859         | SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD                         |

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund                           | Value of Commitment | Beneficiary                          |
|---------|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants                        | \$1,704,746         | ADELAIDE & MT LOFTY RANGES NRM BOARD |
| 2016-17 | Payment for park land activities                        | \$1,505,000         | ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL                |
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants                        | \$1,474,320         | EYRE PENINSULA NRM BOARD             |
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants                        | \$1,401,040         | ALINYTJARA WILURARA NRM BOARD        |
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants                        | \$1,326,960         | SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD              |
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants                        | \$1,253,680         | NORTHERN & YORKE NRM BOARD           |
| 2016-17 | Native Vegetation Fund support grant                    | \$1,108,000         | NATIVE VEGETATION FUND               |
| 2016-17 | State recurrent allocation grant                        | \$1,058,240         | ALINYTJARA WILURARA NRM BOARD        |
| 2016-17 | State recurrent allocation grant                        | \$1,058,240         | KANGAROO ISLAND NRM BOARD            |
| 2016-17 | National Landcare Program grants                        | \$986,680           | KANGAROO ISLAND NRM BOARD            |
| 2016-17 | Water levy penalty payments                             | \$597,148           | ADELAIDE & MT LOFTY RANGES NRM BOARD |
| 2016-17 | Funding to support the Board.                           | \$515,000           | COAST PROTECTION BOARD               |
| 2016-17 | Water levy transfer payments                            | \$376,933           | EYRE PENINSULA NRM BOARD             |
| 2016-17 | State recurrent allocation grant                        | \$362,520           | SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD              |
| 2016-17 | Water levy transfer payments                            | \$157,945           | NORTHERN & YORKE NRM BOARD           |
| 2016-17 | Land levy transfer payments                             | \$154,848           | SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD              |
| 2016-17 | Water levy penalty payments                             | \$129,896           | SA MURRAY-DARLING BASIN NRM BOARD    |
| 2016-17 | Land levy transfer payments                             | \$52,321            | EYRE PENINSULA NRM BOARD             |
| 2016-17 | Water levy penalty payments                             | \$25,727            | NORTHERN & YORKE NRM BOARD           |
| 2016-17 | Optimised grooming traps for targeted feral cat control | \$20,000            | ECOLOGICAL HORIZONS PTY LTD          |
| 2016-17 | Large number of small grants                            | \$128,001           | GRANTS LESS THAN \$10,000            |
|         | Total   | \$49,492,572        |                                      |

## Environment Protection Authority

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund              | Value of Commitment | Beneficiary                               |
|---------|--|---------------------|---|
| 2017-18 | Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) Projects | \$100,000           | Cooperative Research Centre (CRC)         |
| 2017-18 | National Integration-SA Contribution       | \$19,000            | National Environment Protection Council   |
| 2017-18 | SA Conservation Council Contribution       | \$11,000            | SA Conservation Council                   |
| 2017-18 | Adelaide Catchment to Coast                | \$27,500            | City of Salisbury                         |
| 2017-18 | Adelaide Catchment to Coast                | \$50,000            | City of Adelaide                          |
| 2017-18 | Adelaide Catchment to Coast                | \$25,850            | LCS Landscapes                            |
| 2017-18 | Adelaide Catchment to Coast                | \$56,000            | Star of the Sea – Marine Discovery Centre |

## Green Industries SA

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund | Value of Commitment \$'000 | Beneficiary                    |
|---------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2016-17 | Innovation                    | 45                         | CDL Solutions SA Pty Ltd       |
| 2016-17 | Innovation                    | 45                         | SA Group Enterprises Inc       |
| 2016-17 | Metropolitan Infrastructure   | 20                         | Integrated Waste Services      |
| 2016-17 | Regional Implementation       | 35                         | Penola Recyclables             |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure      | 145                        | Peat Soils & Garden Supplies   |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure      | 107.5                      | Ceduna Can & Bottle Pty Ltd    |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure      | 62.3                       | Finding Workable Solutions Inc |



| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund                | Value of Commitment \$'000 | Beneficiary                         |
|---------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 99.7                       | Clare Valley Waste                  |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 180                        | Eco Waste Solutions Pty Ltd         |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 120                        | Foodbank of SA Inc                  |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 200                        | U Pull It Auto Dismantlers          |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 85                         | BSH Waste Solutions                 |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 150                        | VISY                                |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 22.6                       | Copper Coast District Council       |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 23                         | Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority   |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 180                        | Northern Waste Management Authority |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 40                         | East Waste                          |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 22                         | City of Murray Bridge Rural         |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 12                         | District Council of Ceduna          |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 90                         | City of Mount Gambier               |
| 2016-17 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 90                         | City of Charles Sturt               |
| 2016-17 | Business Sustainability                      | 1.2                        | Mondelez International              |
| 2016-17 | Business Sustainability                      | 1.5                        | Holla-Fresh Pty Ltd                 |
| 2016-17 | Business Sustainability                      | 4.5                        | University of Adelaide              |
| 2016-17 | Business Sustainability                      | 1.3                        | Van Schaik's Bio Gro Pty Ltd        |
| 2016-17 | Business Sustainability                      | 23.3                       | Dairy SA                            |
| 2016-17 | Business Sustainability                      | 17.5                       | Motor Trader Association of SA      |
| 2016-17 | Business Sustainability                      | 2.5                        | Kingston Vineyards Pty Ltd          |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Implementation                   | 70                         | Barossa Fine Foods Pty Ltd          |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 10                         | Master Butchers Co-operative        |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 9.7                        | Vili's                              |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 8.4                        | Barossa Fine Foods Pty Ltd          |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 4.3                        | Australian Bight Seafood Pty Ltd    |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 4.2                        | Orora                               |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 7.4                        | Spring Gully Foods Pty Ltd          |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 9.7                        | Teys Australia Naracoorte Pty Ltd   |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 4.8                        | Beerenberg Pty Ltd                  |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 9                          | Robern Menz Pty Ltd                 |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 4                          | Henschke Cellars Pty Ltd            |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 4                          | Coopers Brewery Limited             |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 6.8                        | Macro Meats                         |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 4.4                        | La Casa Del Formaggio               |
| 2016-17 | Trade Waste Resource Productivity Assessment | 5                          | South Australian Brewing            |
| 2016-17 | Women in Waste Leadership Award              | 5                          | City of Charles Sturt               |
| 2017-18 | Trade Waste Implementation                   | 63                         | Barossa Fine Foods Pty Ltd          |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 95                         | U Pull It                           |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 55                         | Peats Soil                          |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 115                        | Eco Waste Solutions                 |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 45                         | Foodbank SA                         |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 85                         | VISY Recycling                      |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                     | 38                         | Ceduna Recycling                    |

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund                      | Value of Commitment \$'000 | Beneficiary                           |
|---------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 37                         | Finding Workable Solutions            |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 115                        | NAWMA                                 |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 100                        | Clare Valley Waste                    |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 7                          | Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority     |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 50                         | BSH Waste Solutions                   |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 15                         | East Waste                            |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 55                         | City of Charles Sturt                 |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 9                          | DC Copper Coast                       |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 7                          | DC Ceduna                             |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 55                         | City of Mount Gambier                 |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 32                         | Rural City of Murray Bridge           |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 140                        | Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority     |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 29                         | Mid Murray Council                    |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 42                         | DC Elliston                           |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 10                         | DC Streaky Bay                        |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 19                         | DC Lower Eyre Peninsula               |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 360                        | SKM Industries Pty Ltd                |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 164                        | Jeffries Group                        |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 270                        | Peats Group Ltd                       |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 87                         | Polybags Pty Ltd                      |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 90                         | SA Group Enterprises                  |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 47                         | Reclaim PV Recycling Pty Ltd          |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 135                        | VISY Recycling                        |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 90                         | Agricycling                           |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 90                         | Trident Plastics                      |
| 2017-18 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 90                         | Adelaide Hills Recycling              |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 113                        | Port Adelaide Enfield Council         |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 39                         | City of Burnside                      |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 129                        | Holdfast Bay City Council             |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 27                         | City of Prospect                      |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 40                         | City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 25                         | Alexandrina Council                   |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 2                          | Kangaroo Island Council               |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 9                          | City of Mount Gambier                 |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 9                          | City of Marion                        |
| 2017-18 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 45                         | City of Tea Tree Gully                |
| 2018-19 | Trade Waste Implementation                         | 7                          | Barossa Fine Foods Pty Ltd            |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 82                         | Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority     |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 17                         | Mid Murray Council                    |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 25                         | DC Elliston                           |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 6                          | DC Streaky Bay                        |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 11                         | DC Lower Eyre Peninsula               |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 210                        | SKM Industries Pty Ltd                |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 95                         | Jeffries Group                        |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 158                        | Peats Group Ltd                       |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 51                         | Polybags Pty Ltd                      |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 53                         | SA Group Enterprises                  |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 28                         | Reclaim PV Recycling Pty Ltd          |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 79                         | VISY Recycling                        |

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund                      | Value of Commitment \$'000 | Beneficiary                           |
|---------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 53                         | Agricycling                           |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 53                         | Trident Plastics                      |
| 2018-19 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 53                         | Adelaide Hills Recycling              |
| 2018-19 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 113                        | Port Adelaide Enfield Council         |
| 2018-19 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 45                         | City of Burnside                      |
| 2018-19 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 39                         | Holdfast Bay City Council             |
| 2018-19 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 27                         | City of Prospect                      |
| 2018-19 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 41                         | City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters |
| 2018-19 | Local Government Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) | 8                          | Alexandrina Council                   |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 12                         | Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority     |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 2                          | Mid Murray Council                    |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 3                          | DC Elliston                           |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 1                          | DC Streaky Bay                        |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 2                          | DC Lower Eyre Peninsula               |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 30                         | SKM Industries Pty Ltd                |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 14                         | Jeffries Group                        |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 22                         | Peats Group Ltd                       |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 7                          | Polybags Pty Ltd                      |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 7                          | SA Group Enterprises                  |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 4                          | Reclaim PV Recycling Pty Ltd          |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 11                         | VISY Recycling                        |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 7                          | Agricycling                           |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 7                          | Trident Plastics                      |
| 2019-20 | Recycling Infrastructure                           | 7                          | Adelaide Hills Recycling              |

#### REGULATED ASSET BASE

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

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

- The statutory asset (written down) value as at 30 June 2016 was \$9,442m for water assets, and \$4,336m for sewer assets; and
- The regulatory asset base as at 30 June 2016 was \$12,076m, and the regulatory asset base as at 30 June 2020 is expected to be \$13,195m.

#### ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors within Regions South Australia.

a) 2015-16:

| Dept/Agency | Position Title | Classification | Allowance Type | Allowance Amount | End Date |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------|
|             |                |                | NIL            | NIL              |          |

b) 2016-17:

| Dept/Agency | Position Title | Classification | Allowance Type | Allowance Amount | End Date |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------|
|             |                |                | NIL            | NIL              |          |

**BUDGET EXPENDITURE**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**  
I have been advised:

\$110,000 of the \$590,000 2015-16 supplies and services expense relates to:

- \$38,000 employment agency contractors and service contractors
- \$25,000 records management costs
- \$16,000 communications and sponsorship
- \$13,000 Crown Solicitor Office's expenses
- \$7,000 services provided by PIRSA
- \$6,000 travel and motor vehicle expenses, and
- \$5,000 other office supplies and minor office management costs.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**  
Please note the following assumptions in answering this question:

- a) 'Balance of the grant program or fund' reflects the unallocated amount of the program or fund for each financial year.
- b) Actual grant expenditure in 2016-17 and budgeted grant expenditure in the out years for each grant program or fund.
- c) Actual revenue in 2016-17 and budgeted revenue in the out years into each grant program or fund.
- d) Reflects approved carryovers into the program or fund from previous financial years. 'Proposed end of year carryover – 2016-17' are still to be approved and reflect 2016-17 end of year carryovers submitted.
- e) Actual grant recipients in 2016-17 and budgeted commitments in the out years.

|    |  | 2016-17<br>Actual<br>\$ | 2017-18<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2018-19<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2019-20<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2020-21<br>Budget<br>\$ |
|----|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|    | Grant Program —Regional Development Fund   |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| c) | Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund ie revenue  | 1,025,000               | 625,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| b) | Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund  | 18,403,642              | 15,000,000              | 15,000,000              | 15,000,000              | 15,000,000              |
|    | Mid-Year Budget Review and other adjustments   | -                       | 2,401,000               | 3,595,000               | 888,000                 | 544,000                 |
| d) | Carryovers into or from the program or fund  | -                       | 352,000                 | 1,332,000               | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Proposed end of year carryover—2016-17   | -                       | 1,659,000               | 2,195,000               | 2,195,000               | 2,195,000               |
|    | Total funding for the year (assuming proposed carryover is approved)   | 18,403,642              | 19,412,000              | 22,122,000              | 18,083,000              | 17,739,000              |
| e) | Details, including value and beneficiary, of actual grants for 2016-17 and budgeted commitments in out years |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | ROUND 1—Regional Development Fund—started 2014-15  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | Major Projects Program   |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | Bowmans Intermodal Pty Ltd   | -                       | -                       | 514,000                 | -                       | -                       |
|    | Como Glasshouse  | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Days Eggs  | 137,250                 | 132,250                 | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |

|   | 2016-17<br>Actual<br>\$ | 2017-18<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2018-19<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2019-20<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2020-21<br>Budget<br>\$ |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Lenswood Cold Store Cooperative Society Limited                             | 200,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Pernod Ricard Winemakers  | 159,291                 | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Sundrop Farms   | 3,500,000               | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Thomas Foods International  | 255,000                 | 250,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Small Grants Program  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Australian Pure Fruits  | -                       | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Australian Saltworks  | 63,994                  | 131,006                 | -                       | 5,000                   | -                       |
| Ceravolo Orchards   | 20,000                  | 20,000                  | 20,000                  | 5,000                   | -                       |
| Joyson Orchards   | 50,000                  | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Robarra   | 35,000                  | 165,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| SA Mushrooms  | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Wilson Pastoral   | -                       | -                       | 15,000                  | 5,000                   | -                       |
| Regional Food Initiatives Program   |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Adelaide Hills Farmers' Market  | 9,100                   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Fleurieu Peninsula Food Inc   | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Kangaroo Island Food and Wine Association                                   | 11,645                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Limestone Coast Food (Wattle Range Council)                                 | 40,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Regional Development Australia Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island | 4,485                   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Regional Development Australia Barossa                                      | 15,296                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Regional Development Australia Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula                   | 40,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North                          | 40,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Community Infrastructure Program  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Northern Areas Council  | -                       | 328,869                 | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |
| Whyalla City Council  | 247,476                 | 67,524                  | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |
| ROUND 2—Regional Development Fund—started 2015-16                           |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Major Projects Program  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| CMV Farms Pty Ltd   | 200,000                 | 380,000                 | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       |
| DMK Engineering   | 179,313                 | 356,064                 | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |
| TE Storage and Logistics (vendor—Messamurray Property Trust)                | -                       | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Midfield Group  | 950,000                 | 1,050,000               | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Beerenberg Farm   | -                       | 700,000                 | 150,000                 | -                       | 50,000                  |
| Greenwheat Freekeh  | -                       | 360,000                 | 340,000                 | 200,000                 | -                       |
| Torbreck Vintners   | 100,000                 | 100,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Hunter Poultry  | 22,500                  | 27,500                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Rowesa Pty Ltd  | 200,000                 | 190,000                 | 10,000                  | -                       | -                       |
| Treasury Wine Estates   | 200,000                 | -                       | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       |
| JT Johnson and Sons   | 150,000                 | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Whitty Engineering  | 160,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Ashwood Estate  | 75,000                  | 446,319                 | 50,000                  | -                       | 60,000                  |
| d'Arenberg  | 1,000,000               | 750,000                 | 250,000                 | -                       | -                       |
| B.-d. Farm Paris Creek  | 450,000                 | 100,000                 | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       |
| Country Cabinet Program ('Fund My Idea')                                    |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Community Accommodation and Respite Agency                                  | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |

|   | 2016-17<br>Actual<br>\$ | 2017-18<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2018-19<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2019-20<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2020-21<br>Budget<br>\$ |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gener8 Theatre                                      | 30,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Kind Hearted Kitchen                                | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Light Regional Council                              | -                       | 30,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Quorn Community Recreation Centre                   | 30,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Upper North Regional Sports Stadium                 | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Community Infrastructure Program                    |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Barossa Village                                     | 75,000                  | 600,000                 | 60,000                  | -                       | 89,000                  |
| Other Ministerial Commitments                       |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Port of Thevenard project—Ceduna Council            | -                       | 725,000                 | 775,000                 | -                       | -                       |
| ROUND 3—Regional Development Fund—started 2016-17   |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Major Projects Program                              |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Australian Grain Export Pty Ltd                     | 250,000                 | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Beston Pure Dairies                                 | 365,000                 | 1,880,000               | 255,000                 | -                       | -                       |
| Chat Hill   | 175,000                 | 185,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Gambier Earth Movers                                | -                       | 388,820                 | -                       | 50,000                  | -                       |
| Inghams Enterprises—Murray Bridge Feed Mill         | 690,000                 | -                       | 1,010,000               | -                       | -                       |
| Inghams Enterprises—Yumali Breeder Farms            | 1,000,000               | 1,000,000               | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| McLaren Vale Cheesemakers Pty Ltd (Woodside Cheese) | -                       | 190,000                 | 30,000                  | 80,000                  | -                       |
| Mitolo Wines  | -                       | 505,000                 | -                       | 52,418                  | -                       |
| Pikes Wines   | 4,000                   | 263,000                 | 26,000                  | 27,000                  | -                       |
| P & L Rogers  | -                       | 190,000                 | 30,000                  | -                       | -                       |
| Premium Adelaide Hills Beverage Experience          | -                       | 900,000                 | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       |
| Prime Valley Pastoral                               | -                       | 650,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Primo Smallgoods                                    | 1,228,292               | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Solar Eggs Farms                                    | -                       | 320,000                 | 80,000                  | -                       | -                       |
| Country Cabinet Program ('Fund My Idea')            |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Karoonda Area School                                | -                       | 30,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Lameroo Regional Community School                   | -                       | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| RSPCA   | -                       | 35,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Arid Recovery                                       | -                       | 15,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Community Infrastructure Program                    |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Vine Inn Barossa Community Hotel                    | 180,000                 | 19,182                  | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |
| Regional Council of Goyder                          | -                       | 200,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Mary MacKillop Care SA                              | -                       | 100,000                 | 390,000                 | 410,000                 | -                       |
| RDF Upper Spencer Gulf Program                      |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Roxby Council                                       | 180,000                 | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Cu-River Mining Australia Pty Ltd                   | 71,000                  | 276,306                 | 25,000                  | 25,000                  | -                       |
| Northern Reservoir Utilisation Project              | -                       | 800,000                 | 2,380,000               | -                       | -                       |
| Other Ministerial Commitments                       |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Whyalla Interest Free Loans scheme—contribution     | 3,808,000               | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| Regional Black Spot funding                         | 882,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |

|    |  | 2016-17<br>Actual<br>\$ | 2017-18<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2018-19<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2019-20<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2020-21<br>Budget<br>\$ |
|----|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|    | Local Government Association of SA – Regional Youth Traineeship Program                                      | 800,000                 | 800,000                 | 400,000                 | -                       | -                       |
|    | Regional Arts and Culture Program  | -                       | 350,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Sundrop Pty Ltd  | -                       | 500,000                 | 2,000,000               | -                       | -                       |
|    | Big River Pork   | -                       | 450,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | District Council of Elliston—communications infrastructure   | -                       | 100,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Costa Group Monarto Mushroom Farm  | -                       | 900,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total  | 18,403,642              | 18,161,840              | 9,005,000               | 859,418                 | 199,000                 |
| a) | Amount still to be allocated   | -                       | 1,250,160               | 13,117,000              | 17,223,582              | 17,540,000              |
|    | Grant Program —Regional Development Australia  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| c) | Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund ie revenue  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| b) | Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund  | 3,600,000               | 3,145,000               | 3,183,000               | 3,221,000               | 3,262,000               |
|    | Mid-Year Budget Review and other adjustments   | -                       | -                       | 150,000                 | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Carryovers into or from the program or fund  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Proposed end of year carryover—2016-17   | -                       | -                       | 182,000                 | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total funding for the year (assuming proposed carryover is approved)   | 3,600,000               | 3,145,000               | 3,515,000               | 3,221,000               | 3,262,000               |
| e) | Details, including value and beneficiary, of actual grants for 2016-17 and budgeted commitments in out years |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North   | 570,000                 | 475,000                 | 23,750                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Regional Development Australia Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula  | 564,000                 | 470,000                 | 23,500                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Regional Development Australia Murraylands and Riverland   | 540,000                 | 450,000                 | 22,500                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Regional Development Australia Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island                                  | 510,000                 | 425,000                 | 21,250                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Regional Development Australia Far North   | 480,000                 | 400,000                 | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Regional Development Australia Limestone Coast   | 480,000                 | 400,000                 | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Regional Development Australia Barossa   | 456,000                 | 380,000                 | 19,000                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total  | 3,600,000               | 3,000,000               | 150,000                 | -                       | -                       |
| a) | Amount still to be allocated   | -                       | 145,000                 | 3,365,000               | 3,221,000               | 3,262,000               |
|    | Grant Program —Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| c) | Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund ie revenue  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| b) | Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund  | 1,478,829               | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Mid-Year Budget Review and other adjustments   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Carryovers into or from the program or fund  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Proposed end of year carryover—2016-17   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |

|    |  | 2016-17<br>Actual<br>\$ | 2017-18<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2018-19<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2019-20<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2020-21<br>Budget<br>\$ |
|----|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|    | Total funding for the year (assuming proposed carryover is approved)   | 1,478,829               | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| e) | Details, including value and beneficiary, of actual grants for 2016-17 and budgeted commitments in out years |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | Bickford's Australia Holdings  | 1,478,829               | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total  | 1,478,829               | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| a) | Amount still to be allocated   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Grant Program —Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback Futures Program  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| c) | Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund ie revenue  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| b) | Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund  | 618,910                 | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Mid-Year Budget Review and other adjustments   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Carryovers into or from the program or fund  | -                       | 633,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Proposed end of year carryover—2016-17   | -                       | 381,252                 | 299,748                 | 175,000                 | 25,000                  |
|    | Total funding for the year (assuming proposed carryover is approved)   | 618,910                 | 1,014,252               | 299,748                 | 175,000                 | 25,000                  |
| e) | Details, including value and beneficiary, of actual grants for 2016-17 and budgeted commitments in out years |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | Leigh Creek Magnesite Pty Ltd  | -                       | -                       | 150,000                 | 50,000                  | -                       |
|    | Orroroo Kangaroo   | 25,000                  | 40,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Outback Communities Authority  | 123,175                 | 75,900                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Wilpena Pound Resort   | -                       | 195,000                 | -                       | 5,000                   | -                       |
|    | Access Training Centre   | -                       | 180,000                 | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Johnson Home Improvements  | 92,500                  | -                       | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |
|    | Nigel Young Physiotherapy  | -                       | 80,000                  | 20,000                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Farina Restoration Group   | -                       | 60,000                  | 3,000                   | -                       | -                       |
|    | Golden North Ice Cream   | 170,000                 | -                       | -                       | 30,000                  | -                       |
|    | Pichi Richi Railway Preservation Society Inc.  | 44,000                  | 101,000                 | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |
|    | Whyalla City Council   | 24,235                  | 60,765                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Port Pirie Regional Council  | -                       | 51,587                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Bendleby Ranges (Luckell Pty Ltd)  | 50,000                  | 20,000                  | 15,600                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | District Council of Peterborough   | 90,000                  | 60,000                  | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       |
|    | Combined Independent Agents Association  | -                       | 90,000                  | -                       | -                       | 25,000                  |
|    | Total  | 618,910                 | 1,014,252               | 268,600                 | 85,000                  | 25,000                  |
| a) | Amount still to be allocated   | -                       | -                       | 31,148                  | 90,000                  | -                       |
|    | Grant Program —Job Accelerator Fund  |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| c) | Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund ie revenue  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| b) | Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund  | 800,000                 | 373,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Mid-Year Budget Review and other adjustments   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Carryovers into or from the program or fund  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |



|    |  | 2016-17<br>Actual<br>\$ | 2017-18<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2018-19<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2019-20<br>Budget<br>\$ | 2020-21<br>Budget<br>\$ |
|----|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| d) | Proposed end of year carryover—2016-17   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total funding for the year (assuming proposed carryover is approved)   | 800,000                 | 373,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| e) | Details, including value and beneficiary, of actual grants for 2016-17 and budgeted commitments in out years |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | Local Government Association of SA – Regional Youth Traineeship Program                                      | 800,000                 | 373,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total  | 800,000                 | 373,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| a) | Amount still to be allocated   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Grant Program —Economic Sustainability Program   |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| c) | Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund ie revenue  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| b) | Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund  | 1,090,000               | 2,000,000               | 2,000,000               | 2,000,000               | 2,000,000               |
|    | Mid-Year Budget Review and other adjustments   | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Carryovers into or from the program or fund  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
| d) | Proposed end of year carryover—2016-17   | -                       | 1,075,000               | 195,000                 | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total funding for the year (assuming proposed carryover is approved)   | 1,090,000               | 3,075,000               | 2,195,000               | 2,000,000               | 2,000,000               |
| e) | Details, including value and beneficiary, of actual grants for 2016-17 and budgeted commitments in out years |                         |                         |                         |                         |                         |
|    | Almond Board of Australia  | 1,000,000               | 1,000,000               | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Mannum District Hospital Health Advisory Council   | 50,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Coorong District Council   | 40,000                  | 10,000                  | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Pitchford Produce  | -                       | 35,000                  | 5,000                   | -                       | -                       |
|    | Berri War Memorial Community Centre  | -                       | 310,000                 | 190,000                 | -                       | -                       |
|    | Monarto Zoo  | -                       | 360,000                 | -                       | -                       | -                       |
|    | Total  | 1,090,000               | 1,715,000               | 195,000                 | -                       | -                       |
| a) | Amount still to be allocated   | -                       | 1,360,000               | 2,000,000               | 2,000,000               | 2,000,000               |

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**

Note: the response below covers the whole of the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, including portfolios of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Forests and Regional Development.

a) Primary Industries and Regions

| Year    | No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities | Employment Expense |
|---------|---|--------------------|
| 2016-17 | 15.4  | \$1.583 million    |

## b) Primary Industry and Regions

| Year    | No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities | Estimated Employment Expense |
|---------|---|------------------------------|
| 2017-18 | 15.4  | \$1.620 million              |
| 2018-19 | 14.4  | \$1.518 million              |
| 2019-20 | 14.4  | \$1.541 million              |
| 2020-21 | 14.4  | \$1.564 million              |

## 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 |
|  |

## ii. Primary Industries and Regions SA

|   |
|---|
| Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18 |
| \$299,000   |

**REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND**

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**  
I have been advised:

As at 30 June 2017, of the 88 projects offered grants from the Regional Development Fund the total value that have not proceeded is \$7.7 million. This includes \$2 million for seven projects that did not proceed after they were initially announced. These projects were proposed by:

- Gadaleta Steel Fabrication
- Kelly Engineering
- Dowling Potatoes
- Holla Fresh
- Gather Great Ocean Group
- Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council
- McLaren Vale Distillery

Examples of why some projects did not proceed include a change in the direction of the project, an inability of the recipient to meet its co-investment contribution, or a sudden industry downturn that affects the demand for a company's product or service.

When grants don't proceed, the funding allocated to the project returns to the Regional Development Fund to be allocated to other projects, so there is no net loss to the distribution from the Fund.

Grant payments are made on a reimbursement basis when agreed milestones are met. Accordingly, no money was paid on any of the projects where the project did not proceed.