

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 7 June 2018

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call Mr Clerk, I welcome to parliament today students of Klemzig Primary School, who are guests of the member for Torrens. I hope you enjoy your visit to Parliament House.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT ROAD DRAINAGE PROJECT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:01): I move:

That the first report of the committee for the 54th parliament, entitled Port Road Drainage Project—Stage 2, be noted.

The Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works are a continuation of the works identified in the City of Charles Sturt Port Road Rejuvenation Stormwater Management Plan (SMP). The Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works comprise the installation of approximately 2.6 kilometres of underground twin cell trunk drainage between Old Port Road, Cheltenham and Park Street South in Woodville. The relocation of other utilities and services as required to accommodate the trunk drain alignment is also work contemplated by the stage 2 works, and naturally there are associated streetscaping and other works within the works program for this project. The Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works are an integral part of the Port Road Rejuvenation SMP.

As part of that SMP, there are a number of key aims for the works, the first being flood management. This is to provide existing properties at the floor level with flood protection at or above the 100-year average recurrence interval (ARI) and ensure that new development does not degrade the level of flood protection for existing properties within the precinct. The second aim is management of stormwater quality. The objective is to improve the quality of stormwater discharges to West Lakes and, in particular, in recognition of the high recreational value of West Lakes, provide a reduction in gross pollutants, nutrients and sediments entering West Lakes.

Third, the objective is to manage stormwater re-use to encourage opportunities for the on-site retention of stormwater and/or the beneficial use of stormwater for wider purposes in and around the precinct. Fourth, there is a focus on environmental protection and enhancement as maximising opportunities for urban biodiversity and amenity. The estimated capital cost of the works is \$19.7 million.

The works were initially scheduled to be completed in December 2018, although an updated project schedule has been received and now brings the expected completion date forward to August 2018. The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 and been assured by stormwater management officers and the City of Charles Sturt officers that acquittals have been received from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Crown Solicitor that the works and procedures are lawful.

The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects, as set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Having regard to the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:05): I thank the member for Kavel for reporting to the parliament on this important project and doing so in such a detailed manner. It is an important project for the western suburbs. Some members may be familiar that these sections of Port Road, particularly between Woodville and Port Adelaide, have been regularly subject to flooding of various severity over the last 30 to 40 years, and I am sure people who have been around longer than I have would say it goes back even further.

It is a great credit to the City of Charles Sturt that as a council they have bitten off such a large infrastructure project. Of course, they are not doing it on their own but with the assistance of the Stormwater Management Authority, which I think was a terrific initiative of the former Labor government in its very early days. It has assisted councils across South Australia try to address flood mitigation works, particularly in the metropolitan area where there has been a greater risk of flooding.

This project is only one of a number of key projects that are of great concern to local government. Members opposite are probably more familiar with the Brownhill Creek flooding issue and how challenging that has been to deal with, from its tributaries all the way out to the sea. The Stormwater Management Authority has been of great assistance to councils with that project and also with this project in particular.

Before the boundary redraw, which preceded the last state election, there was another very significant flood mitigation project undertaken by the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and the Stormwater Management Authority, this time around Birkenhead and Peterhead. It had to be fast-tracked after the significant flood event of February 2014—in fact, I think it was Valentine's Day 2014—when hundreds of homes were inundated with floodwaters in those two suburbs. That was an \$8.8 million investment.

It is good to see councils in the western suburbs that are prepared to invest in these critical projects. For a council, a \$20 million project—in fact, it was originally anticipated to be a \$24 million project by the City of Charles Sturt, and I think the member for Kavel now reported that it was a \$19.7 million project—or that \$8.8 million project at Birkenhead and Peterhead is a big investment by local government. Of course, that may be grist to the mill if legislation is ever passed about the much-heralded rate capping reform of the government, but I digress.

I did want to speak particularly about this project's impacts on the road network and the surrounding homes and businesses. I was engaged in very serious discussions with the member for Flinders during some of the member for Kavel's contributions about an event that will be occurring at 1 o'clock today, so I was distracted and did not hear whether he made reference to the fact that the aim of these works is to prevent an inundation event, a one in 100 year flood event inundating up to 3,800 homes and causing an approximately 600-millimetre deep inundation in the proximity of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which would of course preclude emergency access to that hospital. So it is an important project from that perspective.

It is a project that spans a couple of key intersections along the Port Road and Old Port Road corridor. In particular, I am thinking of the nexus of Port Road and Old Port Roads, heading further towards the city, getting to the West Lakes Boulevard, Cheltenham Parade and Port Road intersection—one of the busiest intersections in the metropolitan road network. Over 70,000 vehicles approach this intersection on those three roads each day. I am talking particularly about the West Lakes Boulevard approach, which is a great frustration for the more than 22,000 vehicles that use what is currently configured as a single lane until it approaches that intersection.

These stormwater works have cleared the wide median in the middle of Port Road. The City of Charles Sturt had been in discussions with the government and the various agencies that the member for Kavel made reference to, seeking the appropriate approval for these works. Given the City of Charles Sturt had been in communication with the government about these works, coordinating them with things like traffic management but particularly the upgrades to various rail infrastructure as part of the Torrens Junction and Torrens to Torrens works—two initiatives of the former Labor government—the Department of Transport took it upon itself to think about whether there might be an opportunity to address the capacity of this intersection and make some improvements to this intersection.

Bear in mind the works that the City of Charles Sturt's contractors—T & J Constructions, I believe, a proud South Australian company—have already undertaken. They had effectively cleared the site of vegetation and also undertaken works for car parking arrangements, which were used by some of the businesses around there like CMI Cheltenham, the Toyota dealership, of which I am sure some members are increasingly becoming familiar as they undertake their new roles in this place.

Getting this intersection upgraded has been a great concern to me while the City of Charles Sturt has made the provision for works to more easily occur at this location. So I am very pleased that in the most recent Mid-Year Budget Review the former Labor government committed \$6 million for the upgrade of the West Lakes Boulevard, Port Road, Cheltenham Parade intersection. That \$6 million would enable a widening of the approach of West Lakes Boulevard to the intersection, with two lanes of traffic to approach and more lanes within the intersection both for right-hand turns from West Lakes Boulevard but also through traffic to Cheltenham Parade.

That would significantly ease the congestion that a lot of people experience from suburbs like West Lakes, Woodville West and Seaton and the surrounding communities when they try to make their way into the city, particularly each weekday morning. Traffic congestion does get severe. It can take up to five or six changes of lights for a vehicle trying to turn right onto Port Road to head toward the city to get through that intersection. The \$6 million for this project was not an election commitment. It was locked into the state budget, the funding is provided and the appropriation from the Department of Treasury and Finance was made to DPTI. It is absolutely critical that this project gets underway.

I recently met with some of the executive team from the City of Charles Sturt to ask them about how a range of projects in the council area was going. Of course, I have spoken in this place—indeed, I think on our first day—about traffic management issues within the City of Charles Sturt, in particular in Grange and Seaton. I have asked them about how some of these projects were going. We had a long discussion about the progress of this particular stormwater upgrade project and also the coordination between it and the promised intersection upgrade of West Lakes Boulevard, Port Road and Cheltenham Parade.

I am very disappointed to hear that, while these stormwater works are being undertaken, there has unfortunately been radio silence from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure about this intersection upgrade. Given that works had not started on the ground for this intersection upgrade, but they had been funded so that they could be planned to be delivered in time with this stormwater upgrade, I am very concerned that the \$6 million committed by the former Labor government may be taken off the table by the new Treasurer, or maybe even by the new transport minister, and that this intersection upgrade will not be delivered.

It would be a great shame if the 70,000 people who use this intersection each weekday and the nearly 25,000 people who use it from the West Lakes Boulevard approach continue to be held up in traffic, despite there being money available and the department being ready, willing and able to deliver this project. I hope that the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer recommit to the \$6 million provided by the former Labor government.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:16): I would also like to speak about the report into the Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works. I sit on the Public Works Committee as well. These stage 2 works are a continuation of the works identified in the City of Charles Sturt Port Road Rejuvenation Stormwater Management Plan. The Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works comprise the installation of approximately 2.6 kilometres of underground twin-cell trunk drain moving between Old Port Road, along past Cheltenham, and finishing at Park Street South in Woodville. There will also be some service relocation as required to accommodate this trunk drain alignment, either gas or electricity, and also associated streetscaping.

These Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works are an integral part of the Port Road Rejuvenation Stormwater Management Plan. The stormwater management plan has key aims for the works and I will list them. Flood management is to provide the existing properties with flood protection at or above the 100-year average recurrence level for one in 100 year events. It should be worth pointing out that it is not a definite to happen once every 100 years. It is more that the probability

is that there is a one in 100 chance of that happening. This flood management will also ensure that new development does not degrade floor level protection to existing properties, so there is something quite sensible there for new development.

Another aim is to improve stormwater quality because it improves the quality of the stormwater discharges that flow along Old Port Road and out to West Lakes, which, in particular, recognises the very high recreation value of West Lakes. Often you see people out there doing triathlons and you will see them even swimming in West Lakes. I myself have swum in West Lakes, as a young athlete. You also have rowers in there as well and, while they are probably unlikely to fall in, it is always good to have good water quality should they fall in.

Stormwater quality will provide a reduction in gross pollutants, nutrients and sediments that enter West Lakes. This will also encourage some key aims for stormwater re-use by encouraging opportunities for the on-site retention of stormwater and the beneficial use of it so it does not just get flushed out eventually to sea. A final aim is environmental protection and enhancement, which will maximise opportunities for urban biodiversity and also amenity. You can see also that the stage 1 works have certainly given a higher amenity value to that section of Old Port Road.

The Stormwater Management Authority has referred the Port Road Drainage Project to the Public Works Committee, which is pursuant to the requirements of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. The report that has been so moved by the member for Kavel, the Chairperson, examined the history of the proposal and also the efficacy of the application of South Australian taxpayer funds to the Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works.

The report structure itself is guided by and largely limited to the terms of the Parliamentary Committees Act. It describes in summary the evidence that was presented to the committee, both written and oral, and then concludes with a brief summary incorporating the findings and the recommendations, which has been discussed also by the Chair. On Thursday 17 May, witnesses provided oral evidence to the Public Works Committee in regard to the stage 2 works of this project.

The witnesses present included David Trebilcock, the General Manager of the Stormwater Management Authority, as part of the Department for Environment and Water. The Stormwater Management Authority is the statutory authority established under schedule 1 of the Local Government Act. This authority provides grants and subsidies, mainly to local government, to undertake stormwater management planning and stormwater infrastructure works.

The Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 works are the subject of a successful grant application to the Stormwater Management Authority, which then means that the authority will be funding 50 per cent of the cost of this project, with the other 50 per cent provided by the City of Charles Sturt. It is worth congratulating them because it is a significant sum of money to put in for a project, but I think the benefits of this project will be received well by the ratepayers of Charles Sturt.

Also present was Matthew Kildea, who is the project manager from the City of Charles Sturt, as they are also funding a significant amount of these works. Mr Kildea was specifically brought in to the City of Charles Sturt to manage this project, supervise the construction and manage budgets—all the usual project management roles. These two gentlemen gave the committee an overview of the project and the current progress to assist with our deliberations.

It is worth pointing out, and I have mentioned previously, that it is a multistage project. Stage 1 of this project was Waterproofing the West, which some in the house will be familiar with. It is the wetlands that go down Old Port Road, for those of you who know the area. Stage 2 is the upstream drainage works of that project, to actually get the water into the wetlands but also mitigate flooding within the stage 2 boundary along Port Road. Currently, Port Road floods in a one in three months event, which is reasonably common. This drainage project will increase the standard to a one in five years event. There will still be some flooding in the area, but certainly a lot less frequently than has been experienced previously.

The biggest benefit of this project, from a regional perspective, will be access to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. At the moment, in a one in 100 years event the entrance to the hospital will be inundated to a depth of up to 900 millilitres, which would make it impossible to access the hospital. This project, once completed, will enable that entrance to remain open during major storm events. It just so happens that The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is in the worst location it could be in this

catchment area. The City of Charles Sturt also presented some photos of various flooding events that affected local businesses. One photo showed a restaurant that got up to about a metre depth of water at their front door, so they have to close every time there is a major rain event.

As I mentioned earlier, this is the stage 2 component of the overall project, which essentially runs from Old Port Road down to Park Street South, which is the city side of Woodville Road. We were informed the project had an initial cost estimate of \$24 million but, through some design optimisation and some positive tender results, that has been brought down to an approximate amount of \$19.7 million. As I said earlier, the Stormwater Management Authority will provide half of that.

As part of our deliberations, a costing comment was sought from the Department of Treasury and Finance and they noted that the stage 2 works will not have an impact on the general government net operating result, net lending position or general government sector debt.

The committee was also shown pictures of the construction taking place. I can inform the house that it basically takes up the whole median down Port Road and twin pipes are installed in the middle. At the same time, as I mentioned earlier, gas and overhead and underground power need to be worked with; in fact, the 275-kilovolt main feeder into the city goes through there. This resulted in a substantial amount of complexity for what really was two pipes to go down that zone.

At the same time, the City of Charles Sturt and the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board collaboratively worked together and identified opportunities to apply water-sensitive urban design into the reconstruction of the Port Road median strip once the pipes have been put in place. They have identified that the median strip can be reconstructed to drain to vegetated swales, which will reduce the frequency and volume of flows into the underground pipe drainage system. That delays peak water flows into the underground pipe drainage system and helps improve the stormwater quality.

In closing, I will say that the project is ahead of schedule. It is scheduled to be completed in August 2018 and, while there is landscaping that will follow after these works—and it may appear that it is still going—that is a separate council project. In terms of outcome, there are 250 properties within this stage 2 that currently flood that will not flood after these works, and it will also result in significant improvements along Port Road, as a road. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends that this proposed public work proceed.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (11:26): As a member of the Public Works Committee, I too wish to speak to the house regarding the report. I commend the member for Kavel and the member for Morphett for their work and their contributions this morning. Prior to talking about the project itself, I want to point out to the house the preamble in the report itself, which talks about the functions of the Public Works Committee and in particular the legislative basis for the work we do at the behest of and at the direction of the house.

Section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act is the basis upon which we carry out our work. Essentially, it charges the Public Works Committee on behalf of the parliament and therefore on behalf of the people of South Australia to ensure that public funds are properly directed and that appropriate oversight is given to proposed public works. I will not step through every subsection of section 12C of the committees act, but I note that in particular it does charge the Public Works Committee with responsibility for looking at the efficiency and the progress of construction work and the reasons for any expenditure beyond the estimated costs of the construction. That is a very important role of the committee.

I note also that the committee can undertake other functions at the behest of either the act or a resolution of both houses. Section 16A of the act automatically refers works of a value in excess of \$4 million to the committee. As has been pointed out, the subject work of this particular report is estimated at some \$19.7 million, and therefore the project is automatically referred to us, as members of the Public Works Committee, for our consideration.

I will close my consideration off insofar as the function of the committee is concerned with a recap of the point that I am delighted and honoured to be charged with the responsibility for ensuring that South Australian taxpayers' money is properly and appropriately expended and that there is

oversight at all stages of the works so that there is no waste and, to the extent that there are overruns with cost, that the reasons for those overruns are investigated and reported to the house and therefore to the people of South Australia.

The Port Road Drainage Project stage 2 is a continuation of a broader project of some \$60 million worth of work, undertaken primarily to address significant storm-related and/or flooding issues in the area of Port Road. The stage 2 works, the subject of this report, apply to approximately 2.6 kilometres of underground twin-cell trunk drains between Old Port Road, Cheltenham, and Park Street South in Woodville. As the member for Morphett has elucidated, there are enormous complexities involved in the works, given the pre-existing services, not the least of which is the power cable from the state's major power source into the city, which, subject to the use of renewable energies and what have you, provides power for the city and the state.

Before I move on, I point the house to section 1.2 of the report, which not only refers to the section of the act that deals with the reference of these works to the Public Works Committee but also points out that section 16(1)(c) of the Parliamentary Committees Act enables the Public Works Committee to reopen investigations into any project for the purpose of further examination and monitoring. So it is a serious task we undertake on behalf of the long-suffering South Australian taxpayer, and, as I said, it is something I am delighted to be charged with. Having partial responsibility for it is something I look forward to, working on behalf of the South Australian taxpayer into the future.

As has been previously indicated, the project is designed to essentially address flooding in the Port Road catchment. The catchment itself comprises some 657 hectares of land from the City of Charles Sturt, with a small amount in the City of Port Adelaide Enfield. The practical issue is that at present the drainage system in place has a likelihood of having its capacity exceeded in any given year by a factor of more than 99 per cent. I note with some interest that the report refers to an 'exceedance' that will typically occur four to six times a year, which, I am delighted to inform the house, actually means that it floods quite a lot. So exceedance, at least in this context, means it does flood and it floods on a regular basis.

As part of the evidence given to it by the two witnesses referred to by the member for Morphett, the committee was provided with some quite graphic photographs of some of the flooding suffered by businesses and home owners in the area. To the extent that this mitigates the loss and trauma associated with that, it is a marvellous thing. The aim of these works is not just about floods and flood management, but typically that is a major consideration. As has been pointed out by speakers before me, it also addresses issues of stormwater quality, stormwater re-use and environment protection and enhancement, with the maximisation of opportunities for biodiversity and amenity.

The works have involved a considerable amount of dislocation in the Port Road area. In section 3.2 of the report I note detailed references to the quite extensive consultation undertaken by the project managers. Again, the committee was given evidence about consideration made and advice provided to local residents and businesses regarding the partial lane closures on Port Road, in particular the impacts on parking and therefore the impacts on local businesses.

I also note, for the benefit of the house, the considerable investigation that has taken place insofar as matters of state and Aboriginal heritage are concerned. The report indicates there are no Aboriginal heritage issues, and to the extent that there are heritage issues they are not deemed to be impacted at all. I note wryly a recommendation from the Department for Environment and Water—which was not taken up by the program managers—recommending the provision of electric vehicle charging points as part of this work. I also note the provision of car parking spaces and associated electric charging points will not be part of the report's remit.

As discussed, the primary value of the proposed project is to offset the impacts of a one in 100 year flood. The benefit to cost ratio, which is a primary consideration of the committee, is about 2:1 for the project in its entirety with anticipated savings of around \$120 million, on a conservative basis, for the investment of \$60 million. The project procurement is being managed by the City of Charles Sturt and is being conducted in an open and transparent manner with multiple tenders and prices selected. I commend the report and the proposed public work to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:36): I rise to speak to the first report of the Public Works Committee in the 54th parliament regarding stage 2 of the Port Road Drainage Project and commend the committee, with members from both sides of the house making sure we get the right outcome as far as drainage works on Port Road are concerned. This is a continuation of the works identified in the City of Charles Sturt Port Road Rejuvenation—Stormwater Management Plan.

The stage 2 works comprise the installation of approximately 2.6 kilometres of underground twin-cell trunk drain between Old Port Road, Cheltenham, and Park Street, South Woodville, as well as service relocation. I note that it has been mentioned there is a major powerline relocation that has to be done as part of these works, as these services need to be relocated to accommodate the trunk drain alignment. Obviously, there is the associated streetscaping along with this.

The stage 2 works are an integral part of the Port Road Rejuvenation—Stormwater Management Plan. As part of that stormwater management plan, the key aims of the work are flood management, providing existing properties' floor levels with flood protection at or above the 100-year average recurrence interval, and ensuring that new development does not degrade the level of flood protection to existing properties.

Stormwater quality is obviously something that needs to be looked at, improving the quality of stormwater discharges to West Lakes in particular, and, in recognition of the high recreational value of West Lakes, providing a reduction in pollutants, nutrients and sediments entering West Lakes. In the past, we have had blue-green algae outbreaks in West Lakes, and there are probably not many in this place who can remember when the area was essentially swampland. It is now quite a picturesque suburb. However, according to the report, this stormwater management will only improve the quality of the water in West Lakes.

There is also the opportunity for stormwater re-use, so it is about encouraging opportunities for the on-site retention of stormwater and the beneficial use of stormwater, and that is always a good thing. When we have a year like this where it has been quite dry coming into winter—certainly at home at the farm at Coomandook we have not had a lot of rain. We have had almost enough, but it is probably never enough in a year like this that has been a very tight year, in an agricultural sense, in a range of areas.

That reflects right through to the city, to our catchments and to the ability to have enough water to utilise not just for critical human needs in regard to drinking water but, obviously, water that we need for other things. As I said, we need it out in the country for our farmers, but in the city the water that is needed for parks and gardens and other uses, quite rightly, could be re-used stormwater, just to save the drain on the Murray.

I was heavily involved in discussions during the time of drought. We were not getting those flows down the River Murray through 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009, and some big decisions were made around the size of the Desalination Plant. It was built at 100 gegalitres per annum, which obviously was twice the size of what we proposed at around 50 gegalitres per annum. It is costing us all a fortune to keep it running, because the plant has to run at somewhere around 8 per cent or 10 per cent capacity to keep the membranes wet so that if we do need—and let's hope this does not happen—to wind that plant up to 50 per cent capacity or even full capacity, which I doubt but who knows, we need to know that the membranes and the whole state of that plant will function appropriately.

The appropriate use and re-use of stormwater is vital. The extended drought was a turning point in our state's history, which was not relieved until September 2010 when the Darling water first flowed down the river for the initial recovery and then we had the water from the Southern Basin come through the Murrumbidgee and the other rivers that feed in to the Murray and, once again, it came back to being the 'mighty Murray'. However, let's not forget that if it does not rain then we do not fill the dams that are needed for Adelaide's water supply, the next option is pumping out of the Murray, and the next option after that is the Desalination Plant.

I understand it is always a balancing act for the operators of the water system, SA Water, about how much is pumped and how much will we get to fill those dams. I sincerely hope that we get a good winter but, because of the way this season has come along, it does concern me greatly. We

need to make sure that any works like these that go into place maximise the capacity of the stormwater that we can re-use. It is absolutely vital that that happens.

As part of this report, there is the appropriate environment protection and enhancement, which is maximising the opportunities for urban biodiversity and amenity. The capital cost is close to \$20 million, at \$19.7 million. As has been stated, 50 per cent of this money is coming out of the City of Charles Sturt council, and that is a huge commitment. There are flooding issues along this road, so the work does need to be done.

Along with this work is the associated site clearing, demolition, disposal, bulk earthworks, backfilling and reinstatement of some land and associated service relocation, as I discussed earlier, to accommodate that large trunk drain alignment. Also needed is the supply and installation of all associated pits and internal connections, tree protection and removal where required, completion of new paved car parking bays and landscaping, comprising trees, shrubs, irrigated grassed areas and associated streetscaping.

I commend the members of the Public Works Committee for their work in regard to this proposal. It looks like the completion of the project may be in August instead of the previously forecast completion in December, so that is something to be celebrated. Any works that can be done in a timely manner, even pre time instead of on time, are a bonus for everyone involved. I hope these works continue speedily and we get the best outcome for managing stormwater along these roads, including the appropriate vital re-use of stormwater, as I indicated before in my contribution. I commend the works.

Motion carried.

Motions

UNIVERSAL AMBULANCE COVER SCHEME

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Bedford:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report on the feasibility and effectiveness of a universal ambulance cover scheme for South Australia; and in particular—

- (a) the potential benefits of a universal ambulance cover scheme;
- (b) the extent to which there are gaps in current coverage arrangements and the social costs thereof;
- (c) the administrative and financial costs and risks associated with current arrangements;
- (d) models for a universal ambulance cover scheme (including models for universal ambulance cover in other jurisdictions);
- (e) the likely costs of a universal ambulance cover scheme and potential funding models, including alignment with other social insurance schemes;
- (f) the legislative and governance arrangements that would be optimal for a universal ambulance cover scheme; and
- (g) how a universal ambulance cover scheme could be best implemented.

(Continued from 31 May 2018.)

Mr PICTON (Karna) (11:47): It is my pleasure to speak on the motion from the member for Florey to start up a select committee—I think it would be the first select committee of this parliament—to look into the issue of ambulance fees and whether there should be a change in South Australia's approach to ambulance fees. Obviously, she is advocating for a universal coverage for ambulances.

I indicate that the opposition is happy to support a select committee. We believe that it is a good time to look at the issue of ambulance fees across South Australia. There have been a number of very significant changes in the delivery of ambulance services over the past 20 years since the transition from St John volunteer services in the city to fully paid SA Ambulance staff. We have seen the increasing professional delivery of services through paramedics. Paramedics have increased skills in terms of the delivery of services, providing very high-quality services to the point that the level of service received for a healthcare affliction in an ambulance now, compared with 20 or 30 years ago, is dramatically different.

Paramedics can perform a whole range of different functions. They are soon to be a registered profession. We want to continue to see those skills develop and our society benefit from those excellent, hardworking paramedics across our system. At the same time, we have seen increasing demand for those services as well. Year after year, the resources being put into SA Ambulance Service have increased quite dramatically.

Because of that extra demand, of course, we see extra usage in terms of either the demand for people to get ambulance cover or, if they do not have cover, the need to pay fees. We think that is something worthy of examination by this parliament. We think it is worth looking at what the approaches are across other states and internationally to see whether we do have the best practice approach to ambulance fees in South Australia and whether there are ways that we could improve it in the future. We think that is a very appropriate issue for this parliament to look at through a select committee. I hope that it is something that the government will see is worthy of examination. We hope to work with the government to look at this issue, and we think this is exactly what our parliament should be doing.

We have heard the Premier a number of times talking about how he wants this to be a hardworking parliament. Here is the first chance for the government to show that it is keen for this parliament to be hardworking and taking on the big issues through investigations such as these into important issues that the community is concerned about. We hope that they will look upon this motion from the member for Florey and support it so that we can look at this issue, gather the evidence and report back to the parliament and the public on the best approach to this issue.

Sadly, I think we are about to see that the government is going to adjourn this motion off again. Hopefully, we will see next week, or the week after, when we are meeting in this place, the government supporting this select committee, because this is a test of whether they do want to see a hardworking parliament. I congratulate the member for Florey on bringing this motion to the house. I acknowledge that she has a genuine and longstanding interest in this area, and we hope that this can be an area where we can work together in a bipartisan way to investigate the best outcome for South Australia.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It is highly disorderly to reflect on the vote of a house, I remind members. Let's not get off to a bad start.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (RULES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:53): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996, the National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) Act 2011 and the National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today's electricity market is quite different from the one that operated when Australia's National Electricity Market was established in 1998. The government recognises the need for a National Electricity Market that can adapt and respond to challenges in the face of evolving technologies and the need to meet our climate change objectives whilst ensuring the affordability, security and reliability of the system.

At an extraordinary meeting of COAG energy ministers on 7 October 2016, ministers agreed to an independent review of the National Electricity Market to take stock of the national electricity

system, its security and reliability, and to provide advice on a coordinated national reform blueprint. Dr Alan Finkel AO, Australian Chief Scientist, was appointed to lead the review.

In delivering his final report in July last year, Dr Finkel emphasised the importance of strong governance and ensuring there is a coordinated approach from energy market bodies to the rapidly changing National Electricity Market. A key recommendation of the review was the establishment of the Energy Security Board, comprising the AEMC, AEMO and AER, with an independent chair and deputy chair.

The board is responsible for the implementation of the national reform blueprint, as articulated in the final report, as well as providing whole-of-system oversight of the security and reliability of the NEM. It will be integral to improving long-term planning with clear strategic direction provided by the COAG Energy Council, referred to in the energy laws as the Ministerial Council on Energy (MCE).

Importantly, the board is able to draw on the expertise and experience of each of the market bodies, as well as those of the chair and deputy chair, providing for a strategic, collaborative and coordinated approach to issues as they arise. In recognition of the need for the board to commence its role as soon as practicable, it was established as a non-statutory authority. Importantly, its role will be reviewed after three years.

At the COAG Energy Council meeting in Brisbane on 14 July 2017, ministers agreed that there was a need to provide a mechanism to allow for the timely implementation of the board's recommendations. The Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws) (Rules) Bill 2018 establishes a mechanism by which a recommendation of the Energy Security Board to make a rule, once it has the unanimous support of the MCE, can be made by the South Australian minister under the National Electricity Law, National Gas Law, or National Energy Retail Law, as appropriate.

In order for the minister to make such a rule, the bill prescribes several statutory requirements, which any proposed rule must meet. Firstly, the proposed rule must be in connection with energy security and reliability, or long-term planning of the NEM, or, in the case of the rules under the National Gas Law, may also be in relation to investment in, and operation and use of, natural gas services.

Secondly, the board must be satisfied that the proposed rule meets the relevant legislative objective. This ensures that the same rule-making test, which the AEMC applies in its making of rules, is applied to a rule made by the minister through this process. Finally, the proposed rule must have been the subject of consultation, in accordance with any MCE requirements. The process for undertaking consultation will be outlined in the ministerial rule-making consultation guide issued to the Energy Security Board by the MCE and made public, which forms part of the Energy Security Board's operating protocols.

Once recommended by the Energy Security Board, a proposed rule must receive the unanimous support of ministers, then the MCE can recommend that the same proposed rule be made by the South Australian minister. Once made by the minister, the rule becomes indistinguishable from all other rules over which the AEMC has jurisdiction. For the avoidance of doubt, this is expressly allowed for by the bill. The rule-making power can be used by the minister or on multiple occasions but only for as long as the Energy Security Board is in existence. Should the decision be made at the three-year review to abolish the board, the minister's power to make rules, as provided for by this bill, would also cease to exist.

The bill also makes two further amendments across each of the energy laws, unrelated to the Energy Security Board. For timeliness, they have not been included here. The first of these is in response to a recommendation of the Finkel review, that the recommendations of the Review of Governance Arrangements for Australian Energy Markets—known as the Vertigan review—to expedite the current rule-making processes be implemented by the end of this year.

As part of the Vertigan review, the Australian Energy Market Commission acknowledged it would be more likely to utilise the expedited rule change process were the publication time line to be increased from six to eight weeks. This bill makes that change where rule change requests are considered to be non-controversial. A minor amendment to the definition of National Gas Rules under the National Gas Law is also contained in this bill to correct a minor drafting issue.

The COAG Energy Council remains committed to ensuring the focus remains the security and reliability of the national energy system and that this is inherent in every decision we make. A national security board has been established to ensure a collaborative and coordinated approach to governance by drawing on the expertise of each of the market bodies under the leadership of the independent chair and deputy chair enabling the board to provide whole-of-system strategic advice, including where appropriate the recommendation to implement that advice through a rule change.

By providing the South Australian minister with the rule-making power under each of the energy laws, this ensures that should a rule change be recommended by the Energy Security Board and approved by the MCE, it will be made in a timely manner but only if it has met the statutory requirement contained in this bill. We look forward to reviewing the Energy Security Board in three years' time and, to quote the words of Dr Finkel, 'We will know that we have been successful if, in three years from now, electricity is no longer a topic of discussion in the general community.' I commend this bill to members. I table the explanation of clauses.

Mr WEATHERILL (Cheltenham) (12:01): I rise to speak briefly on this matter. The opposition, after a period of adjournment, will consider its position in relation to this bill. But I want to make some observations about the National Electricity Market and the circumstances that have brought us to this moment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham, I understand that all you can do at this point is adjourn the debate. It is not possible to make a second reading speech, given that it has just been introduced. That is the advice I am getting.

Mr WEATHERILL: I think I am in order.

Members interjecting:

Mr WEATHERILL: But I am in order to speak.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

Mr WEATHERILL: Yes, we can do that at some stage. I am in order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: My advice is that it needs to be adjourned at this point in the debate.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT FEDERAL DIVERSITY JURISDICTION) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:03): On behalf of the Attorney-General, obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Magistrates Court Act 1991 and the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statutes Amendment (SACAT Federal Diversity Jurisdiction) Bill 2018 will address the recent High Court decision in *Burns v Corbett* which has the consequence of preventing the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal from exercising its jurisdiction in residential tenancy matters and also potentially other matters within its jurisdiction where the matter involves the exercise of judicial powers and involves residents of different states.

The bill will ensure that if SACAT is unable to exercise its jurisdiction because of *Burns v Corbett*, the Magistrates Court will be able to exercise the jurisdiction to resolve the dispute with the same powers and fees as SACAT. *Burns v Corbett* involved a New South Wales dispute arising from equal opportunity legislation before the New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT).

The High Court held that NCAT did not have jurisdiction to deal with the dispute because it involved the exercise of judicial powers as distinct from administrative powers in a dispute between residents of different states. The court held that, under the Australian Constitution and the commonwealth Judiciary Act 1903, only a court referred to in chapter 3 of the Constitution could deal with such a dispute, that is, a dispute involving federal diversity jurisdiction.

In a judgement handed down by the president of SACAT, the Hon. Justice Hughes, in the matter of *Raschke v Firinauskas*, it was held that disputes under the Residential Tenancies Act 1995 are matters involving the exercise of judicial powers and therefore fall within the types of matters that may only be heard by a court in circumstances where one of the parties is resident interstate.

The immediate problem arising from these judgements is that there is no other body with jurisdiction to deal with tenancy disputes under the Residential Tenancies Act 1995, which contains provisions to deal expediently with tenancy disputes, including, for example, to make vacant possession orders and use the SACAT bailiff to enforce them.

While the government is presently considering appealing the SACAT judgement, the outcome of any appeal is unlikely to be known for some months. In the meantime, SACAT advises that the *Burns v Corbett* decision could affect up to 700 or 800 matters per year, with landlords in affected cases unable to collect rent or evict tenants under the Residential Tenancies Act.

To urgently address this gap, the government has prepared this bill which will amend the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 and the Magistrates Court Act 1991 to ensure that the Magistrates Court is able to exercise jurisdiction in any matter in which SACAT may be unable to because the matter involves an exercise of federal diversity jurisdiction.

These amendments would operate so that the Magistrates Court is able to exercise all the powers and functions of SACAT in dealing with such matters, with SACAT transferring the matter to the Magistrates Court with no separate application or fee to the court required. The amendments will be implemented to streamline to the greatest extent possible the handling of affected matters so that the impact on parties is minimised. I commend the bill to members and I table a copy of the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Boyer.

FAIR TRADING (TICKET SCALPING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 May 2018).

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (12:08): I rise today to support the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018. I note that the introduction of the bill adds to the Marshall Liberal government's consumer measures, having recently introduced the Fair Trading (Gift Cards) Amendment Bill, for the purpose of extending gift card expiry dates to a minimum of three years. It is, of course, another election commitment that was made to be delivered and introduced to this house within the first 100 days, and that is exactly what we have done. It is another demonstration of this government's firm commitment to putting consumers first and increasing protections in relation to legitimate access to tickets to major events, to sports events and to concerts.

The Fair Trading Act 1987 is administered by the Consumer and Business Services branch, and they do a fantastic job, and this bill and legislation being introduced I believe will go a long way to addressing some of the concerns that everyday South Australians have with regard to ticket scalping in this state. The bill is being introduced to address limitations currently exposed by the Major Events Act 2013, introduced by the previous government, which failed to appropriately deal with the issue of ticket scalping in our state.

Very few events were ever declared major events under the previous legislation, and not a single person was prosecuted under that act. In every sense this was a hollow piece of legislation that failed to provide any protection to legitimate consumers and customers, everyday South Australians who wanted to pay a fair price to watch their favourite team play or to see their favourite band—and we have had some fantastic acts visit South Australia over the past 10 years or so.

By way of concerts, we have had Ed Sheeran, Midnight Oil, Adele, Guns N' Roses, AC/DC I believe a couple of times in the past 10 years—a concert that the member for Hammond, I am sure, was well and truly on his feet—The Rolling Stones, Foo Fighters, Pearl Jam, Fleetwood Mac, and the list goes on. These are just some of the amazing concerts we have had in South Australia over the past 10 years or so.

We here in South Australia are blessed in many ways: we do not just have great concerts, we also have great sporting events each and every year. I note that we have had some pretty large events over the last 10 years or so: the A-League grand final, when the Reds did us all very proud in winning the first premiership in that particular sporting event; Crows and Power games, of course, are frequently held in South Australia; the AFL final series (obviously it was a very strong year last year by the Crows, and we have had quite a few strong years by both teams over the previous 10 years or so); the Ashes; one-day events; and, the T20 events, including our fantastic Adelaide Strikers.

We must make very clear what this legislation is actually seeking to do. We must also be very clear about what this legislation is not seeking to cover. We are talking about events of an appropriate level here. We are not talking about your local school drama performance or the local community group Scouts or Girl Guides, for instance, putting on an event, not even Peter Coombe playing his greatest hits from our childhood at, say, the Gov, although, I am sure for some in this house, particularly of my age, this would be considered a major event.

The bill also does not intend to prevent resale between friends or family members or genuine resale. It happens from time to time that events come up where someone is unable to attend a particular event, whether through sickness, circumstances or unavailability. I know that many in this chamber often have late notice for commitments and events, and likely have been in a situation where resale may well have been necessary.

Perhaps even one's taste in music or allegiance to a particular sporting team may change between the purchase of a ticket and the particular event. However, I am certain that loyalty to a team is something that no-one in this house would ever have any issues with. The government recognises there is a need for a secondary resale market. However, we also note that a secondary market has both positive and negative impacts for consumers.

While it does allow resale for legitimate purposes, it does also expose the consumer to certain risks, including unauthorised resale, scalping or fake or illegitimate tickets. As we bring forward this legislation and present the arguments for need for reform in this area, it is clear that in the future a consolidated national approach is needed, and I do note that the amendments being introduced here are based on the New South Wales amendments and legislation introduced previously. However, it is very clear that the time to act to be a step ahead on this issue, and to prevent where we can activities that are against consumer protection here in South Australia is now.

In terms of the practical application of this bill, ultimately the crux of the bill is to modernise this piece of legislation. When this legislation was originally drafted, there was no online marketplace for ticket resale and scalping which has now become so popular on sites like eBay, Gumtree and Trading Post—websites that were not originally set up to be used for this purpose. The idea of a bot buying tickets was somewhat fanciful just a couple of years ago.

The definition of a bot is worth explaining for certainty around this new technology. Bots effectively are software used to purchase a large number of tickets in a short period of time, therefore limiting the availability of tickets to the everyday consumer. These tickets are then later resold at a much higher price and often for profit. As a result, the availability of tickets to members and the general public is incredibly diminished, particularly when trying to buy them at the original face value. In order to attend these events, everyday South Australians are often forced to purchase tickets at a significantly higher amount via a secondary market. These bots are often described as cowboy software and often contradict the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets in the first place.

Ticket resale and ticket scalping are fundamentally two very different concepts. 'Scalping' is a term given to the unauthorised reselling of tickets to an event at a price higher than the ticket's original face value for the purpose of making a profit. In the past, we have seen tickets here in South Australia sell for 10 per cent, 50 per cent, 100 per cent, 200 per cent higher than face value, even

reports of tickets being sold to the recent Adele concert here in Adelaide at above 700 per cent of face value.

It is important to note that ticket resale is often legitimate in nature, for reasons discussed previously, and in other markets ticket resale has been authorised and legitimised through legislation. In terms of the operation of this bill, effectively it will prohibit the advertising or associated hosting of an advertisement for the resale of tickets or the actual resale to an event in South Australia to which the provisions apply. As I noted, the exclusions to that are for an amount that exceeds 110 per cent of the original supply cost of the ticket.

This policy aligns with other jurisdictions interstate, particularly the New South Wales jurisdiction. There will be a requirement that any resale advertisement must include certain information, including the original supply cost of the ticket, and details of the location from which the ticket holder is authorised to view the event including, for example, any bay number, row number or seat number that coincides with that particular ticket—a standard that is often used on resale sites both legitimate and illegitimate overseas.

Importantly, to deal directly with the bots on the internet, this bill will prohibit the use of software that enables or assists a person to circumvent the security measures of a website in order to purchase tickets for an event in contravention of the terms and conditions. Finally, the bill will enable the minister to require an event organiser to publicly disclose certain information about a particular event including the total number of tickets available for sale to the general public.

These reforms not only increase transparency within the primary market but they also enhance consumer protections with respect to the resale of tickets via the secondary market. Consumers will be better able to access tickets and will have greater information available to them to make an informed decision when purchasing those tickets. I would like to make some further comments in regard to the previous government's bill.

The former government liked to think that ticket scalping was not an issue for the everyday South Australian and that for some reason, having to pay prices well above the face value of tickets was something that did not affect the everyday life of South Australians. The former minister for tourism in this place often stated that the hype of ticket scalping did not actually live up to the reality and that, just because tickets were offered online at higher prices, that did not necessarily mean they needed to be bought.

These words really do diminish the rights of South Australians to purchase a ticket at its true price and prevent scamming. However, more importantly, this prevents everyday South Australians from attending amazing experiences, concerts and sporting events—events that underpin our enjoyment and amenity here in South Australia. Where possible, it is contingent on us in this place to ensure that all South Australians can access these events for everyone's benefit.

The impact of ticket scalping and the absence of legislation to deal with the issue do not just impact consumers or promoters but also impact the artists or sportspeople themselves. I note that many artists want their fans, their true fans, to have access to see them perform. They have said outright that they do not want bots consuming tickets but want their true fans and all their fans to have equal access to those tickets.

I did not think at the beginning of today that I would be quoting Taylor Swift in this parliament, but here I find myself. She has publicly stated that her goal is to get tickets into the hands of her fans and not scalpers or bots. That is a fairly strong statement from an artist, to make a public comment that they do truly care not just about selling the tickets to their concerts but who has access to those tickets.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: She is a role model for us all.

Mr COWDREY: The member for Schubert makes a pertinent remark that Ms Swift is a role model for everybody in this house and, I am sure, more broadly as well. As an athlete, I also note that ticket scalping goes against any of the legacy principles and outcomes that most major events seek to achieve. If you look at an Olympic Games or a Paralympic Games—and I am sure the same can be said for the AFL and other large sporting organisations—the impact that these games hold

goes far beyond those who are able to access the tickets to attend the events. In many cases, these events are well subscribed to very early on.

One of the true impacts of an Olympic Games or Paralympic Games is having the likes of schoolchildren and the everyday person be able to come, to attend and to see the amazing feats and experiences that each of our athletes has performing in front of a crowd that truly understands and is excited by seeing those athletes perform. These legacies, I believe, are tarnished in some way if we continue to leave these provisions in place, where bots can scoop these tickets up, sell them at a much higher price and, to a real extent, ensure that there is not a fair availability to all people.

This is also true if we reflect on the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games from just a few weeks ago. Again, as a major event and one that I am sure most people in this house—I notice that we have a group of young schoolchildren now entering the chamber. I am sure they watched the Commonwealth Games just recently and were excited by what they saw with our athletes. Perhaps, in the future, a Commonwealth Games could be coming here to South Australia.

To have the availability of tickets be clear, that they will be sold at face value and access will be given to all South Australians, is a principle that we need to make sure is present. It is very clear that the time to take action and the time to lead the way in terms of reform in this area is now. We know it is going to take a national approach to ensure that there is a consolidated and clear view of ticket scalping and that all the issues involved are covered. However, from a state perspective we can ensure that the bots have less of an opportunity through this legislation. That is why it was introduced in New South Wales, and that is why we want to introduce it here in South Australia.

From a national perspective, obviously the NRL State of Origin was on last night. Interestingly, instead of the event taking place in either Queensland or New South Wales it actually took place in Melbourne. The result of the game is certainly not consistent with previous years. I think New South Wales won for the first time in quite some time, although I do not have any real allegiance to either side of that debate.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Which debate?

Mr COWDREY: State of Origin. The ability of all members to access those tickets is incredibly important. Major events certainly are something that each and every South Australian wants to see.

In terms of where the future of ticket scalping is going and the future of ticket resale, overseas there have obviously been examples of authorised ticket resale sites. There are arguments for and against the authorisation of such sites. It is something I am sure will be covered by national legislation, which I do not believe will be too far away as this issue is continuing to affect more and more Australians each and every day. However, there is further reform that we do need to consider.

I believe that looking at examples of what has been done internationally certainly goes some way to addressing that. First and foremost, we have to address what we can address now, which, as has been said, is to eliminate the issues as best as we can to do with bots scooping up these tickets and reducing access to such events for everyday South Australians.

In conclusion, this bill reflects the Liberal government's commitment to easing the burdens on consumers and protecting them where protections are necessary, and this is certainly a place where protections are necessary. It delivers on an election promise. I am certainly proud to support the bill. I am sure there will be much more support for the bill from other members.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:27): I am pleased to rise today to support the bill, which is part of a series of amendments to the Fair Trading Act designed to increase consumer rights and protections and which fulfils another Marshall government pre-election commitment—another Marshall government pre-election commitment. It is startling the frequency with which we are ticking these off. This particular one will strengthen the protections for consumers against ticket scalpers.

As someone who loves his footy and sport in general, I have regularly bought tickets to events that I really wanted to attend, obviously, otherwise I would not have bothered buying a ticket to that event. Showdowns, particularly, are exciting for me. I enjoy coming down to Adelaide to watch Port play Adelaide regularly. In the past, I have hastily got online to purchase tickets for myself, family

and friends. It is really disappointing when you find that you have been too slow and that they have been sold out already.

It is even more frustrating and basically unfair to see the tickets to events that you had hoped to spend your hard-earned money on, so that you can enjoy watching a game you really wanted to see or take your girlfriend to a concert she really wanted to see—which is more common than not to see one that she wants to see rather than one I want to see but, if you are trying to get some brownie points, it is not a bad practice to get in to go to those particular concerts—available for private sale online or on social media at hugely inflated prices that place them out of reach for the average punter. This bill aims to right this wrong and offer increased protection for consumers so that more of us can enjoy going to events developed, designed and marketed for the general public to enjoy.

Ticket prices have been carefully set to ensure that the event can meet its costs, yes, but also to ensure accessibility and affordability for as many people as feasibly possible. In this way, the bill offers protection for the event organiser and official promoter, who is often unfairly slurred by the precedent of overpriced ticketing from ticket scalpers. The practice unfairly reflects on event organisers, who are left appearing like they have let their patrons down, have not offered protection for them from scalpers, have not offered enough reasonably priced tickets or do not care about their attendees or whether they can afford to attend at the event or not.

The unjust result can be that event organisers can appear to be discriminating against sections of the community, only catering for the elite and preventing many from joining in because tickets are priced out of their budget. This is unfair to the people and organisations that work hard to organise and market the quality events that this state has become renowned for. It is simply not just or fair when prices are out of reach of the people the event is intended to attract, and this bill will go a long way to restoring the faith of South Australians who have been impacted by the activity of ticket scalpers who have been able to increase their activities in recent years with the rise of social media and Facebook's reach into every household in our state.

As outlined in the Marshall Liberal government's '2036' policy papers pre-election, we need to stop dishonest scalpers to ensure sports and entertainment fans are not fleeced by massive price mark-ups. The purpose of this important bill and the amendment to the fair trading laws is to protect the public from exploitation. It is recognised that there are already current laws that protect consumers from being forced to pay massive prices to ticket scalpers, but the current law only applies to formally declared major events, which are relatively rare, and that even then there have been no serious attempts to enforce that law.

The fact that there have been so few scalpers prosecuted under existing laws—in fact, I understand there to be none—means that scalpers are just laughing all the way to their bank accounts, and this issue has done nothing to restore public confidence in this state's governance. The example of the first 2017 Showdown between the Crows and the Power has been discussed, with scalpers easily acquiring tickets and marking them up by 300 per cent, making them out of reach and disappointing hundreds of families.

Such instances have created much emotion around this issue and have thankfully served to highlight the need for action. In fact, there was a huge backlash against ticket scalping at the 2001 AFL Grand Final, which sparked considerable debate on the issue and forced responses in parliaments across our land, but I will speak more on that later.

The bill before us will repeal section 9 of the Major Events Act and amend the Fair Trading Act, so that the laws apply to any event in South Australia that is subject to resale restrictions. This bill will also prohibit the advertising or hosting of any event where tickets are selling for over 110 per cent of the ticket price, in addition to capping the total resale price to 110 per cent of the total acquisition price. The maximum penalty, in the case of a body corporate, is proposed to be \$100,000, and in the case of a natural individual, \$20,000—sufficient deterrents, I believe.

Existing law does not address technological advances since its original passage, including the advent of ticket bots that purchase tickets online far faster than a person can and in bulk, wiping out thousands of opportunities in a second, which is criminal. This bill outlaws the use of ticket bots and provides affected parties, such as ticketing agencies, venue operators, artists and sports codes, with the right to commence proceedings against people using bots and selling tickets above the cap.

Increasingly, computer programs or bots are being used to enable scalpers to buy up tickets in a remarkably quick time. The use of bots allows security measures on ticketing websites to be cheated so that larger numbers of tickets can be purchased. This not only blocks fans but enables the scalpers to take a free ride on the back of organisers who run the risk of staging events.

The bill makes changes to the Major Events Act to enable promoters to declare more events a major event in order for them to be protected by the new laws and from ticket scalpers. It is unacceptable that the existing process to have an event declared a major one is expensive and time consuming, which has deterred so many from going down that path.

This new Marshall Liberal government is committed to running an efficient and stable government, with particular emphasis on increased transparency and openness, to combat a rising public tide of mistrust and disaffection from the political process, and more protection for consumers. With today's ability for anyone to easily set up online campaigns and reach thousands quickly and easily based on lies or otherwise, dubbed around the world as fake news, more and more corrupt behaviour is occurring and affecting increasing numbers of people.

You only need to keep up with the list of scams circulating at any time to know that there are very serious professional sinister communicators from around the world infiltrating our lives here in South Australia, so it is little wonder that people have become disengaged and confused by who to trust where. If you cannot trust the son of a deposed Nigerian prince to give you money, then who can you trust, member for Newland?

Ticket scalpers are scammers in this same way and must be stopped. Other states, too, have introduced measures to prevent scalping to send a clear message to these opportunists that they are not welcome. This bill is largely modelled on legislation that has passed in New South Wales very recently. In fact, it is only since 1 June 2018 that New South Wales has had its new ticket reselling laws, which, similarly to this proposed bill, make it against the law to resell tickets above the original value plus 10 per cent.

The New South Wales laws also include a protection for consumers, preventing tickets that have been resold at or below face value, plus 10 per cent, being cancelled by event organisers. Under New South Wales law, it is now recognised that buying a ticket from a scalper, whether in person, online or over the phone, carries two main risks: the ticket may not be genuine, or may not be provided at all; and a ticket bought from a scalper may be cancelled by the event organiser if the ticket was resold for more than 10 per cent above the original cost.

The new New South Wales laws to target ticket scalping apply to all tickets to New South Wales events that are first sold or supplied by the authorised seller from 1 June 2018 and have a resale restriction. A resale restriction is a term or condition of a ticket that limits the circumstances in which the ticket may be resold or prohibits resale of the ticket. This bill will work in a similar way. The difference is the New South Wales penalty for selling tickets over the 10 per cent cap carries a maximum \$11,000 penalty for individuals, compared to our proposed \$20,000, and \$22,000 for businesses, compared to our \$100,000 for body corporates.

Looking at Queensland's work in this area, they, too, legislated only recently and their new laws apply only to events at nine designated major Queensland venues. In Queensland, like this bill before us, it is illegal to resell or buy a ticket at a price greater than 10 per cent above the original ticket price, but the law applies only to events held in specific venues. There are nine stadiums and venues listed where ticket-scalping rules apply.

The Victorian government also recently passed similar laws with its Major Events Legislation Amendment (Ticket Scalping and Other Matters) Act 2018, which amended the Major Sporting Events Act 2009 in relation to ticket scalping. In undertaking research on this topic, it was interesting to read about the efforts in 2010-11 to explore the merits of a national reform legislative response to this issue. The idea was considered to have merit by the Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council, given that there were holes in the existing legal framework across all state jurisdictions, and the council proposed an issues paper on the topic at the invitation of then minister for the competition policy and consumer affairs, the Hon. Dr Craig Emerson MP.

The Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council invited interested stakeholders to make submissions on the topic and submissions were received from varying sources, including individuals, sporting organisations, online auction websites, and ticketing agencies. They included a number of high-profile sporting organisations, among them Tennis Australia and Cricket Australia, who voiced their opposition to the practice of ticket scalping and called for the introduction of a uniform national regulatory scheme against the practice.

However, the bid failed, unfortunately, with a final report concluding that national regulation was unnecessary, largely because the existing legislative framework was considered adequate. That said, at the time it was believed by many that a golden opportunity to address outstanding problems with existing antiscalping legislation, mainly the difficulties of enforcing the state-based anti-scalping laws and the confusion for event organisers who operate across multiple jurisdictions, had been squandered.

By opponents of the decision, it was broadly considered that whilst uniform national antiscalping laws may not have stopped the practice altogether, it would have been a useful deterrent for event organisers to have. Quoting from a submission to the Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council back in 2010, Tennis Australia stated that it was against the unauthorised onselling of tickets for profit and adopted this stance because it believed it had an obligation, as a not-for-profit organisation, to ensure that events of national and international significance it organised, in particular the Australian Open tennis tournament, were as accessible to as many people as possible.

It was highlighted at the time by Tennis Australia that it sets ticket prices to ensure accessibility and that ticket-scalping practices undermine this effort. Cricket Australia's submission to the Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council inquiry raised a similar argument—surprisingly—adding that 'scalping is a direct breach of contract that should not be aided or assisted in any circumstances' and that 'scalping involves profiteering by individuals who take advantage of our policy of setting affordable ticket prices and our strategy of providing opportunities for Australian families to attend the cricket'. And what a wonderful event the Adelaide Test is. It is a beautiful time to attend out the back there in sunny Adelaide in the middle of December.

The Coalition of Major Professional and Participation Sports submission to the Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council gave additional rationales against ticket scalping—namely, that it exposes consumers to counterfeited tickets, undermines the integrity of authorised sales and preys on genuine fans of a sport.

Our Parliament Research Library, here in this place, provided interesting material from interesting sources, and I must quote from a paper published some years ago, admittedly, in 2006, written by Lynden Griggs, senior lecturer in law at the University of Tasmania, which was entitled—and probably still is entitled—'Ticket scalping: its legal and economic effects on the illusion of perfect innocence'. It is an interesting title, and it is so named because it attempts to highlight the vital role sport plays in our society, the value it has in our daily lives and the need for all codes and forms to be accessible for all.

The paper provided details of the intent of the Sports Event Ticketing (Fair Access) Act 2002, developed in Victoria in response to the huge public backlash there, which I mentioned before, against the scalping of tickets to the 2001 AFL Grand Final. This legislation sought to control the secondary market in the selling of tickets as well as controlling the activity in the physical vicinity of venues. The article from Lynden Griggs explores the principles behind consumer protection and antiscalping legislation and practical solutions offered as a way of reaching a compromise between the economics of allowing a scarce resource to be allocated to the person prepared to pay the most as against the inherent backlash of the traditional fan to perceived extortionate prices charged in the secondary market.

I particularly like the paper's introduction, which I believe gets to the heart of the intent of this bill in the house today and what sparked the writing of legislation in Victoria in 2002 after the AFL Grand Final ticket-scalping experience. The introduction offers this:

The role of sport in the Australian psyche has rarely been under-estimated. The tribal attachment to a football code and team, the insatiable appetite for information in respect of the players and the burgeoning coverage of domestic and international sport in the all-pervading media clearly demonstrate that, for many Australians, this country would cease to resemble a civilised society if all sport ceased tomorrow.

Hear, hear, I say! It goes on:

However, this is not a recent phenomenon—recall the ancient civilisations and the sporting stadia that they produced—

such as the Colosseum—

...bearing a striking resemblance to the modern architecture of the MCG, Wembley, the New Orleans Superdome and Candlestick Park—

in San Francisco. It further goes on:

Given sport's exalted status, organisers and sporting codes have an obligation to ensure that, if sport is to retain this position, it must be run efficiently and fairly—otherwise the disillusionment of the fan base (the consumers supporting the infrastructure) will be self-evident and quickly dissipate any long-held goodwill. The illusion of perfect innocence will be forever lost.

Hence the tie-in to the paper's unusual title. I will continue to quote from that paper:

For this reason, ticket scalping (the practice of buying tickets for major sporting events at a low price and selling high) must balance the consumer-driven demand for tickets to be available in the secondary market against the palpably angry response to the long-suffering fan who is unable to attend the finale of a season due to the excess demand in the marketplace and the pricing of tickets beyond her or his reach. Despite ticket scalping arguably representing the quintessential essence of a capitalist free market economy, it is generally regarded as abhorrent and as something to be controlled.

Another colourful quote contained in the paper, which I feel I must share:

'Many people believe scalpers are the cockroaches of the entertainment industry. They were there at the beginning and they'll be there at the end, hawking front-row seats to the Apocalypse.'

This issue of ticket scalping significantly upsets many across our society, and rightly so. As vowed prior to the election by Premier Marshall, 'We will protect the public from ticket scalpers so they can enjoy major events like footy matches and concerts without being exploited.'

This bill will prohibit the advertising or hosting of any event where its tickets are selling for over 110 per cent of the ticket price and, in addition, cap the total resale value price to 110 per cent of the total acquisition price. It will also require that any resale advertisement includes specific details, such as the original cost and seating arrangement. It will outlaw software such as ticket bots that contravene the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets.

Importantly, it will increase the number of compliance officers for the enforcement of minor breaches. In doing some research for this topic, I noted that that was a criticism of the scheme implemented in Canada. They implemented a policy to control the amount of ticket bots but did not have the necessary enforcement officers and found there was little result at the end of the day. Increasing the number of compliance officers should prevent that happening again.

In conclusion, this is another part of the Marshall Liberal government's pre-election commitments that we are delivering. I fully support the bill and its intent and hope that its passage is swift through this house.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:47): I am pleased to rise today to support the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018. 'Ticket scalping' is the term given to the unauthorised reselling of tickets for an event at a price that is higher than the ticket's original value, where the sole intention by the individual or the body that is reselling these tickets is to make a profit. Ticket scalping denies fair access to tickets by members of the public who love sporting events and live entertainment. The South Australian public deserves more effective protection from this practice.

Certainly, my first experience with ticket scalping was as an observer seeing it happen in the United States. You would see people outside American sportsgrounds—for example, gridiron basketball—selling off tickets in hand and people buying them at overinflated prices. These were desperate people who really wanted to support their sport. At that time, sport, especially in Australia, was still suburban based. We did not have the national competitions that we have now; it was very much fan based and clubs were owned by members.

As a young fellow, I had many sporting heroes and I could not imagine the day when I would not be able to see my sporting heroes play on the field. I just thought that this was one of those

American aspects that would stay over in America, but unfortunately it has been a bit insidious and made its way here into Australia. So I am very pleased that the Marshall Liberal government is taking a stand on this. We have recognised that all people should be able to go to these events, whether they be sporting events or live entertainment, and enjoy the performances.

The South Australian public needs much more effective protection, and the Marshall Liberal government will implement measures to protect people wanting to attend these major sporting events or live events from being exploited by exorbitant pricing. We will be taking strong measures to protect the public from scalpers. The bill includes a number of measures to increase consumer protection in relation to ticket scalping in South Australia. As previously pointed out by other speakers here, it was an election commitment, a commitment that was part of this government's plan for the first 100 days in office. Once again, the Marshall government is delivering what was promised.

These amendments put consumers first and build on other amendments that have been made to the Fair Trading Act to allow extended gift card expiry dates—again, measures to try to help consumers that will ultimately also help with their cost of living. The bill before us seeks to increase consumer rights and protections to fans attending sporting and entertainment events. As with many other aspects of sales that we have seen in the last 20 years, or certainly this century, the introduction of online ticket sales has brought with it disruption.

Performers and event organisers can now utilise online ticket sales, and it is to their benefit because they can supply tickets to their events online as well as by traditional methods such as phone sales and mail order. For the purpose of this bill, an event organiser is defined as the person who first authorises the first supply of tickets, and this could be the performer themselves. It could be a promoter, an operator or even the event venue. There are multiple people and bodies that can be classified as the first supplier of tickets.

Online sales allow tickets for events to be released at set times and for consumers to purchase tickets easily instead of by previous methods, including lining up in person—and we have seen the classic pictures of people in line for two days before a sale to try to get access to tickets—or trying to phone up at that time, rushing to put in their phone call the second the tickets are released only to experience that dreaded engaged signal. Online sales allow people to purchase at the same time to try to get access to these events, and what we have seen is a growth in people being able to attend the events.

Unfortunately, the mechanism itself also allows tickets scalpers to make use of the ease of purchase, enabling them to quickly sweep up tickets to onsell at a profit, and in so doing price gouge customers and consumers. Ticketing companies themselves have recognised that this is an issue and tried to counter the ability to purchase tickets online by imposing a maximum number of tickets that can be purchased in any one transaction. Quite often you will see there is a maximum of four tickets or 10 tickets, and the intent of this is so that people cannot stockpile tickets and have the event sell out from these first event providers.

As with other aspects of digital disruption, rather than an actual person performing this there is a growing trend for a number of organisations to use new software that utilises ticket bot systems that can be directed to bypass the security measures of ticketing websites. You can imagine that a person would be there selecting the four or the 10 tickets, but you now have multiple ticket bots effectively impersonating people but at the same time purchasing on behalf of a single person or organisation. Tickets can quite rapidly be purchased by these bots. They are bypassing these security measures of the ticketing websites and, as I said, in so doing purchasing large numbers of tickets for these big events. This all takes place in the same time that an actual person could make a single purchase online.

It is all well and good for these tickets to be stockpiled by a ticket scalper who then has to have a mechanism to sell them. Again, this is where the digital world has allowed for an ease of resale. Previously, you would see advertisements in the local newspaper as a way of advertising this, but now there are online resale platforms to resell these same tickets, quite often at inflated prices—eBay and Gumtree, to name a few.

As an example, at the Ed Sheeran concert at Adelaide Oval this year concert tickets were being resold on one such online retail platform, viagogo, for as much as \$3,500 each. This happened

moments after they sold out on the original event organiser's ticketing program, and they were then offered for sale straightaway. So you can see the frustration that might occur for consumers who genuinely want to attend the event to be obfuscated by these mechanisms.

The former minister for tourism stated that there was a lot of hype around ticket scalping, that it does not actually live up to the reality and that just because these tickets were offered online at high prices does not mean that people have to buy them. However, in Adelaide we are quite often bypassed by big international events in favour of Melbourne or Sydney, which requires the price of an air ticket, a hotel and all the ancillary expenses, such as meals and taxi fares, so sometimes on a commercial decision people decide, 'I'll pay the inflated price because then I can go and see it in my home town with my friends,' as opposed to going to all the effort of travel—and even just the time factor itself—so people are being taken advantage of.

I could relay the appetite of young fans, such as my daughter, who went to this Ed Sheeran concert. She was able to buy a ticket at a proper price without having to go to a resale site. However, this was done some 10 months before the concert itself, so you can see that there is pent-up demand to go there. The day of the event itself gives a snapshot of how much fans really want to go and see their idols, so to speak, and, as I said, buy the ticket 10 months in advance to the mosh pit to get as close as possible to this global megastar.

I probably would not want to do that myself, but in my younger days I have been in a mosh pit, so I understand the appetite for it. Just to get to this mosh pit is general admission, so there is nothing reserved. For those who have not been to one of these sweaty occasions, you can do a bit of—

An honourable member: Not for a while!

Mr PATTERSON: —not for a while—crowd-surfing as well once you get into the mosh pit. Just to get into these areas, they lined up outside Adelaide Oval two hours before the gates opened. The gates used not to open until the concert was on; in fact, now the gates open five to six hours before the actual event and then there was a 500-metre race against others to get to this mosh pit from the gates.

My daughter, being probably a bit younger than some of the others, although she is quite agile, ended up being nine rows back at this event. I should point out that this was in the open sun, it was 30° and they were packed in as others then filtered into this area. It was basically standing room only and waiting for five hours before the concert started. Finally, when it did start, the sun had gone down so there was a bit of temperature relief.

In the end, she got to see the performance of Ed Sheeran. No doubt it was a fantastic performance, and by all accounts she will do it again. That shows some of the effort that people will go to in order to attend major events, and it gives a bit of a picture why these major events are so popular. At this stage, now that I have described the popular nature of an Ed Sheeran concert, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call for petitions, I welcome to parliament some distinguished guests, namely, Senator Mitch Fifield, federal Minister of Communications and the Arts, who is a guest of the Minister for Industry, as well as the previous member for Reynell, Gay Thompson, a guest of the member for Frome. I also welcome students from East Marden Primary School, years 4 and 5, who are guests of the Speaker.

*Petitions***HINDMARSH BOULEVARD RESERVE**

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light): Presented a petition signed by 584 residents of the Town of Gawler and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the Minister for Local Government to refuse to approve the revocation of community land, classification of Lot 180 Hindmarsh Boulevard, Evanston Gardens, as requested by the Town of Gawler council.

*Ministerial Statement***SKILLING AUSTRALIANS FUND**

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am very pleased to announce that the government has entered into an agreement with the commonwealth to increase funding for apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia. I have signed an agreement with the Prime Minister to access the Skilling Australians Fund, securing \$87 million over the next four years. This fund will be complemented by \$100 million of state funding. While I had the privilege of signing the agreement—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I congratulated the Minister for Industry and Skills on negotiating this deal on behalf of the government. His work will deliver benefits to South Australians who are looking to upskill and undertake vocational education for years to come.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has leave.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Skilling Australians Fund prioritises apprenticeships and traineeships, including occupations in high demand, occupations with reliance on skilled migration pathways, industries and sectors of future growth, trade apprenticeships and apprenticeships and traineeships in regional and rural areas. As a government, we are placing greater priority on training closely aligned to jobs, including apprenticeships and traineeships, and strengthening the link between industry and vocational education and training.

The government is committed to ensuring that our skills investment is aligned to jobs in demand. This is reflected in our recent release of the Subsidised Training List for 2018-19. The Department for Industry and Skills has consulted a wide range of industry associations and employers on how the fund should be implemented to increase apprenticeship and traineeship commencements.

Engagement with industry and employers to design projects that meet their needs and grow the number of apprentices is a critical element to our approach in achieving the target. This agreement is another example of how having a mature, working relationship with the commonwealth can benefit the state, and I look forward to seeing it rolled out to unlock opportunities for South Australians.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Minister for Industry and Skills, I call to order the following members: the member for West Torrens and the member for Ramsay.

TRAINING AND SKILLS COMMISSION

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am very pleased to announce that the Marshall Liberal government has met our commitment to revitalise the Training and Skills Commission. This is a key component

of our strong plan to boost training participation through apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government has achieved our goal to revitalise the Training and Skills Commission within the first 100 days of forming government.

The state government has received the voluntary resignations of all 10 ordinary members of the Training and Skills Commission to support the revitalisation. At my request, the chair has agreed to remain and steer the commission into the future. I thank the members for the extensive work undertaken in their roles on the commission to support training outcomes for our state. I particularly commend their early work to form Industry Priority Skills.

The state government is committed to delivering an industry-led training sector. We want training to align with real job outcomes here for South Australians. The Subsidised Training List, released on 24 May, was the first step. The renewed Subsidised Training List created an additional 4,000 funding places throughout the entire system in our state, that is, government and non-government. We continue to implement major reforms and make significant investments to boost training participation through a strengthened training system in South Australia.

The Marshall Liberal government has committed \$100 million to secure matched funding from the commonwealth to support a range of initiatives that will create an additional 20,815 apprenticeships and traineeships over the next four years. A renewed Training and Skills Commission will be a key driver in meeting this target. Engagement with industry and employers to meet their needs to grow the number of apprentices is a crucial element of our approach. Our focus includes occupations in high demand, occupations with a reliance on skilled migration pathways, industries and sectors of future growth, trade apprenticeships, and apprenticeships and traineeships in regional and rural areas.

To increase training participation in South Australia, we will implement flexible apprenticeship pathways, establish a new technical college, design and implement Australia's first entrepreneurial curriculum for all schools and establish four entrepreneurial high schools, two in regional South Australia and two in metropolitan Adelaide. This is a first in Australia.

A revitalised Training and Skills Commission will drive positive reforms in pursuing the Marshall Liberal government's strong plan for change. Furthermore, the Marshall Liberal government is committed to re-establishing industry skills councils to ensure that industry has a stronger voice in TAFE, VET in schools, the Training and Skills Commission and directly to the highest levels of government decision-making.

We will reduce the duplication of effort, in consultation with industry and stakeholders, and give industry a clear voice in the development of government policy and investment decisions. To ensure that we get this right, we will listen to industry and work with them to shape the model. Depending on the feedback from industry, the government may seek to implement the new councils without legislative change.

I am pleased to announce that I will be shortly inviting industry stakeholders to engage government on the formation of the industry skills councils. Submissions will be welcome on the role, industry coverage and composition of the councils and on the role of the revitalised Training and Skills Commission. I will chair a series of industry round tables to explore options. To conclude the industry engagement, I will host a meeting of industry champions to agree on a model, which I plan to announce and begin implementing in August.

Question Time

FOSTER CARERS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister provide the house with the current number of foster carers in South Australia?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:08): I do have that number here. In fact, it was recorded in my speech on volunteers that I gave earlier to the house. On 17 May 2018, there were 1,255 approved foster carers, 578 approved kinship carers and 132 who were specific child-only carers.

FOSTER CARERS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:08): Supplementary: what target has the minister set for increasing the number of foster carers?

Members interjecting:

Ms STINSON: I can ask a new question, if you would like.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will allow it on this occasion. Please continue.

Ms STINSON: What target has the minister set for increasing the number of foster carers in South Australia?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:09): I thank the member for the question. What I will say is that, despite the several millions of dollars that were announced under the former Labor government to increase the numbers of foster carers, the numbers actually went down under their watch. They announced \$9 million, \$4 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —different amounts, yet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —they failed on every level. So what I am doing is meeting with all the stakeholders, getting a picture of the actual mess that I have been left with, and, I will, over time, determine what the targets are. The target is certainly—

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! The minister will be seated for a point of order.

Ms COOK: Point of order: that contains debate.

The SPEAKER: So the point of order is for debate. I don't believe it does. The minister is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport is called to order. The point of order is for debate. I think the minister is allowed some preamble to get to her answer. I will listen carefully, but I believe she is answering the question. If there are any bogus points of order, I will be calling members to order and warning them. Minister—the target.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Unlike the former government that made announcements and failed on them, where is the \$15 million new building that you were building for the Salisbury office and the Gawler office and then it wasn't including Gawler? Unlike the former government that made grand announcements that it never fulfilled, I am researching and meeting with as many stakeholders as possible. I will have a measured approach to my portfolio, and I will be increasing the number of foster carers and, in due time, I will release my estimates.

SKILLS TRAINING

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on how the government is investing in skills training and how this will help prepare residents in my electorate for future job opportunities?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: the Premier just gave a detailed ministerial statement, as did the Minister for Industry and Skills.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! The member will be heard in silence. What is the point of order?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The question is seeking a response that the house has just been given.

The SPEAKER: That is a bogus point of order, and the member knows it. I call him to order and I warn him. I will listen carefully to the Premier and ensure that the answer is not exactly the same as what I just heard. The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. It is a great pleasure to answer this question from the member for Colton. I am sure he is going to be very interested in the answer, unlike those opposite, who want to stop the Premier from giving a statement on how we are going to increase skills in South Australia. One of the things that we on this of the house talked about in the lead-up to the election was having more people with skills—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in South Australia, and one of our initiatives, of course, was to establish a technical specialist secondary school in the north-western suburbs of South Australia. This was a very, very important commitment that we made to the people of South Australia, and the reason why we made it was very simple. When we actually looked at the results when the previous government was in power we saw a massive fall, a freefall, in terms of the number of apprentices and trainees here in South Australia.

Sir, I am sure you are very interested to know this, but in 2013 we had 30,693 people who were undertaking apprenticeships or traineeships in South Australia—2013, not that long ago. What have we got at the moment after 16 years of failed Labor government in terms of developing skills? The answer is 14,725, less than half the number of people undertaking apprenticeships and traineeships that existed in South Australia over five years ago.

Well, the reality is that that is completely unacceptable, and that's why the new government is focused every single day on trying to make sure that we have the requisite skills to deliver not only on the massive naval shipbuilding program that we have here in South Australia or coming to South Australia but also for the entire industry here in our state.

So earlier today I announced that yesterday I had signed an agreement with the Prime Minister—a national partnership agreement—to access \$87 million worth of federal government funds via the Skilling Australians Fund, but we have done much more than that: we are pushing ahead with establishing a specialist technical college in the north-western suburbs of South Australia.

But more than that, we are not satisfied just with that level of performance: we are going to be streamlining the registration process for employers to hire apprentices. We want to see more kids who are finishing school considering a trade here in South Australia. We know that there are lots and lots of jobs in this area. In fact, a school student who is finishing school at the moment should have the reasonable expectation of a further 30 years in a trade here in South Australia if we provide that opportunity, and that's precisely what we are doing.

We are also providing more flexible apprenticeship pathways for commencing full-time work in year 12 while the student still continues to achieve their SACE qualification. As the minister has spoken in this parliament on many occasions, we will be re-establishing the industry skills councils and revitalising the Training and Skills Commission.

We do all of this because we have an ambition to grow the size of our economy. We want to grow the size of the economy because we want our next generation to stay here in South Australia.

To do that, we've got to grow our economy and we've got to grow jobs. A key component of that is making sure that our students, when they finish school, look at the technical opportunities that exist within the wonderful opportunities that are presented by not only the naval shipbuilding program in South Australia but advanced manufacturing, agriculture, mining, and so many other technical areas in our state.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How does the minister plan to encourage more South Australians to take on a child in care?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:16): I thank the member for this very important question, and I further note that the numbers went backwards: more people left the foster care system under Labor than joined—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —despite the millions of dollars that were announced. What I have been doing—and I also did a lot of work in this area in opposition—particularly in the regional areas, is I have met with lots of foster carers and kinship carers, and I held two forums in Parliament House in opposition.

What I was hearing consistently was that under the former Labor government there was a complete lack of respect for foster and kinship carers. They were treated as babysitters. They weren't given adequate information. They weren't given Medicare numbers. They weren't given their blue books to know of their vaccinations or their health. They weren't even told of the circumstances where children had come into care. Many of them were re-traumatizing children by leaving them in a room at night by themselves with no light on, not knowing that they had been abused. There were many things that were going wrong under the former Labor government for foster carers, which was causing them to leave.

Another area of concern was the inability to find out what care concerns were regarding and to then put their case forward to dispute. For example, one lady told me of two foster children she had who were fighting at the top of the stairs. She grabbed one of the boys by the wrist to stop him from falling down the stairs and then had a care concern recorded against her as if she was some criminal. She was never given the opportunity to give her side of the story of what had happened.

What I will be doing is treating our foster carers and kinship carers with the respect that they deserve. They are doing a very, very important job on behalf of all of us, the state. The children of the state are all of our responsibility. As their legal guardian, I particularly take that with great responsibility, and I am very thankful to all of the foster carers and kinship carers. In fact, Anglicare has an information night coming up on 13 June, I believe it is, at 6pm, and I have been encouraging people I meet who are interested to please go along and find out how they can be part of the solution with a Liberal Marshall government.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY OPEN DAYS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. When does the minister expect to hold her first open days at residential care facilities?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:18): I would have to take advice, but I would expect that an open day at a residential care facility would be completely inappropriate. I note that the former minister took me on one site visit to Tregenza House, and then I had no further visits as a shadow minister. As the minister, I am visiting as many residential care facilities as possible to see how the children under my care are living so that we don't have another Oakden under a Liberal government.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY OPEN DAYS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:19): Has the minister ever asked her department to consider open days at residential care facilities?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:19): No, I think it would be completely inappropriate.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Will the minister please update the house on the government's progress in implementing its energy solution?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:19): I thank the member for Flinders for his question, and I note that for the last several years his electorate of Flinders has been particularly hard hit with regard to electricity, and lack of electricity actually, particularly on the Far West Coast. I know that he and all of our government are working very hard to address that issue and many other issues left to us by the former government.

With regard to the specific question—an update on the progress—let me just explain why the progress of our energy plan is so necessary. Over the last several years, South Australians have been punished, absolutely punished, by the energy policies of the former Labor government. They have been punished with high prices. They have been punished with blackouts. They were punished with an unprecedented statewide blackout back on 28 September 2016, which brought attention on our state for all the wrong reasons. We have a wonderful, extraordinary, amazing state in so many ways, but when it comes to our track record in electricity over the last several years under Labor, people don't look at us positively, unfortunately.

But we are going to correct that. The Premier's Marshall Liberal government is going to correct that issue. We put forward before the last election our energy policy, and I have to say that it's been very pleasing, now in government, with access to much more information, access to resources, access to a whole range of organisations, including a government department, to hear that the intent of our policy and the way that we want to go about it is being incredibly well received. In fact, it gets positive feedback everywhere I go.

Now we are at the phase of actually getting into the nitty-gritty of implementation. So let me just say, number one, we will deliver on our commitments in the Premier's 100-day plan. All of the things to do with energy in South Australia that were in the Premier's 100-day plan are being implemented. We are working through the detail about how we will roll out our \$100 million household storage scheme. We are working through the details of how we will roll out our \$50 million grid-scale storage scheme. We are working through the details of our \$30 million trials into demand aggregation, demand response and demand management.

We are taking advice from universities, from departments, from people in all areas—the Australian Energy Market Commission, the Australian Energy Market Operator. Everybody is contributing to this solution. Let me tell you where we are getting extraordinary support, and that is from the newly formed department of energy and mining. The Premier made it very clear that a Marshall Liberal government would not have the mess, would not have the chaos of the previous Labor government. We would not have department heads reporting to three, four, five or six different ministers so that nobody really knew what was going on. We have a structure: one minister, one CEO, one department.

Let me tell you about this department. This department, the department of energy and mining, under the new Premier, is working incredibly hard to develop and implement our energy solution, and they are loving it. Let me just tell you: the same people who had been in the department—let me be very clear: there's been no slash and burn, no picking out individuals, no retribution. These are the same, high-quality, capable, good people, and do you know what? They've got a spring in their step. They are loving working in a Marshall Liberal government. They're doing a great job, and we are going to deliver.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Have open days at residential care facilities ever been discussed between the minister and her department?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:23): I thank the member for the question. I won't be responding to hearsay.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister asked her department to organise events whereby members of the public would be able to inspect and select a child in care to take home?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Child Protection, who will be heard in silence. Is the member for West Torrens interjecting? Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:24): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I won't be responding to private conversations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! That is not an excuse to interject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will stop interjecting. The member for Davenport.

NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:24): My question is to the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

Mr MURRAY: —Minister for Environment and Water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

Mr MURRAY: Will the minister inform the house on the government's commitment to protect and enhance our environment by increasing rangers in our national parks?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:25): I thank the member for Davenport for his very worthy question. I know he has a particular interest in our natural environment and in the preservation and stewardship of the open spaces that my department has responsibility for. He is particularly excited, no doubt, by the creation of Glenthorne national park on the western boundary of his electorate. He would be keen to be assured that there will be enough on-the-ground resources and staff to be able to implement that policy and care for our national parks across the state.

In the lead-up to the last election, the Liberal Party announced that we would increase the number of park rangers by 20 to 25 per cent. That's 20 park rangers. That doesn't sound like that many, and it's not. It will just be the beginning of our recovery for park rangers, but an extra 20 does come close to 25 per cent. Unfortunately, we currently have only 93 park rangers in the state. When the Liberal Party last left government in 2002, we had almost 300 park rangers and now we are down to only 93.

Park rangers are an iconic part of the management of our natural landscape. They provide support to volunteer groups and friends groups. Many of us would have friends groups operating within our electorate, who can work alongside park rangers, whose capacity can be expanded and who can work with local community groups, look for funding opportunities and stretch the dollar that bit further in the preservation of our natural environment.

We also know that park rangers can provide an iconic role within nature-based tourism, which this government and the previous government were intent to grow for our state. Park rangers play

an important role in that. We see expanding their numbers and developing their knowledge and understanding as being an absolutely critical part of our strategy around nature-based tourism.

We are also very keen to develop the role of park rangers more broadly. We are keen to develop a particular class of park ranger to look after our coastal environments, in particular. We have 5,067 kilometres of precious coastline in South Australia, often fragile coastline, the front line in the battle against changing climate and the need to adapt to climate change, so we need to have park rangers who have specific knowledge and understanding around coast.

We are very keen to grow the number of Indigenous park rangers. Their connection with country is so important. We have seen some successful federally funded Indigenous park ranger programs developed in recent years, particularly one around the Coorong National Park with the Ngarrindjeri people. It has been really heartening to see the success of that. On this side of the house, we are all about looking at the growth of that front-line service provision.

Yesterday, it was great to hear the member for King talk about Para Wirra Conversation Park in her contribution to the deputy leader's motion on World Environment Day. With our increase in park rangers, we will be looking to get someone into Para Wirra Conservation Park. The member for King was one of many speakers who spoke yesterday on the deputy leader's motion. In fact, you needed a park ranger to get the tumbleweed off the other side of the house during their lack of contribution. This side of the house will always stand up for practical environmental outcomes and that includes having resources on the ground, in our parks, enhancing and revitalising them and partnering with the community in order to do that.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister been advised by her department about the appropriateness of members of the public being able to inspect and select a child to take home?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:29): I don't recall having a specific discussion on that topic, but we certainly know that under 16 years of Labor there was huge failure in child protection, as well documented in the Layton review, the two Mullighan inquiries, the Debelle inquiry and the recent Nyland royal commission. What I will be doing is putting the best interests of children at the heart of every decision I make.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister received advice on the impact such a policy could have on vulnerable children in care?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: standing order 97. It is a hypothetical question.

The SPEAKER: The point of order was for a hypothetical, 'Has the minister received advice.' I will allow it on this occasion. Minister, have you received advice?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:30): Can I hear the question again?

The SPEAKER: Can we get the question repeated, please.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe will be heard in silence, as will the minister.

Ms STINSON: Has the minister received advice on the impact such a policy could have on vulnerable children in care?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order: it is hypothetical because it has 'could' in it; is that right?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be heard in silence. The point of order is that it is hypothetical; is that right?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, now that we have all been able to hear the question word for word, it does include a hypothetical—

The SPEAKER: Because of the word, 'could'.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —because it says 'of such a potential policy'.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Badcoe like to rephrase the question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

Ms STINSON: I am happy to rephrase, Mr Speaker. Has the minister received advice on the impact such a policy would have on vulnerable children in care?

The SPEAKER: It is still hypothetical, member for Badcoe. I'm sorry, it is still hypothetical. I will give you time to rephrase the question without a hypothetical, without 'could' or 'would'. I call the next member, the member for Narrunga.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUSTRALIA

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the house on the state government's commitment to provide long-term funding to the state's regionally based RDAs?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:32): I thank the member for Narrunga; it is great to see that he is a champion for regional South Australia. The opposition can make fun of the regions all they want—they have for the last 16 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Yes, it has been an absolute disgrace. What I can say is that there is a new dawn in regional South Australia. We are here to support the regions. We are here to help the regions grow and, through this government's commitment to the RDAs over the next four years, we will be putting \$3 million into the seven regional RDAs here in South Australia to help them diversify, to help them grow and to help them underpin our export numbers.

More importantly, it's about giving the security that the RDAs need to develop our regions. It's about giving them that security, a long-term funding stream that would allow them to employ the right people, to acknowledge the right projects, to make sure that the 28 per cent of South Australia's population in the regions, generating over 50 per cent of our merchandise exports, is recognised so that we can make those exports grow, so that we can make that 28 per cent of the state's population more relevant when it comes to diversifying our economy and recognising the hard work and dedication our regional sector puts into the state's economy.

As I said, the state government will provide \$3 million per annum to the seven regionally based RDAs, from 2018-19 to 2021-22. Meeting with the RDAs in my regional travels around South Australia, they have acknowledged our commitment to their cause; they are absolutely delighted. I support the Minister for Energy and Mining in that there is a new step in developing industry in South Australia. There is a new step within the RDAs because they know that the Marshall Liberal government is there to support them and they are there to support regional South Australia.

In the past, the RDA boards in South Australia have had considerable success in developing and delivering collaborative projects, and this is why the regions are as successful as they are. This is why we are, on this side of the house, supporting regional South Australia, supporting those RDA

boards, so that we can work in partnership with state, federal and local governments. We are going to make the RDAs more relevant and we are going to make sure that they give the support to regional South Australia.

From the Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island to the Far North, from the Limestone Coast to the Murraylands and Riverland, and to the Yorke and Mid North, from the Barossa to Whyalla, and to Eyre Peninsula, Regional Development Australia is working closely with industry to make sure that they grow, they develop and they can help South Australia's economy diversify and help it grow. These boards have provided important services and they will continue to provide important services by giving our regions the security and underpinning the economic drive that they are continuing to need to develop and move with the times.

We know that industry, particularly in the primary production and in our service sector in the industry, is a huge contributor not only to our economy, putting food on tables, but to making sure that when people turn on the tap there is a water supply, making sure when they open their fridge there is good South Australian produce there. But it is really important to understand that not only will the RDAs get our backing—the \$150 million Regional Growth Fund over 10 years, the \$750 million Royalties for Regions fund over 10 years and the \$10 million blackspot funding that will be implemented because hashtag #regionsmatter.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. The member for Badcoe.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister received any advice on the impact of such a policy?

Members interjecting:

Ms STINSON: Well, I have been talking about the policy for some time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STINSON: —but I am happy to detail it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right for one second. Would you like to rephrase the question with—

Ms STINSON: I am happy to elaborate on the question.

The SPEAKER: Would you like to rephrase the question?

Ms STINSON: Sure.

An honourable member: You haven't ruled on it and you're asking her to rephrase it; why should she?

The SPEAKER: Because there was no policy given. In order to elicit an answer, member for Badcoe—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am trying to help.

Ms STINSON: I'm pretty sure she is familiar with what I was talking about.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am trying to help.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will allow the member for Badcoe to rephrase her question in silence. The member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister received any advice on the impact of a policy in which members of the public are able to inspect and select a child and take them home?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: this is the same hypothetical question the member asked last time that you ruled as being hypothetical.

The SPEAKER: I do believe that the question has been changed slightly; I will allow it. Minister, would you like to answer the question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:37): That is not our policy and I won't be discussing private discussions I have with my department or anyone about ideas; that needs to be in a safe environment.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How many times has the minister visited a residential care facility?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:38): Well, I would have to count in my head. I know I have been to Port Pirie, to the Gawler office. I've got scheduled visits next week. I visited Tregenza House for the second time, in shadow and then as the minister. I would say I have probably visited around 20 residential care facilities so far and plan to visit many, many more.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:38): My supplementary question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Did the minister meet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

Ms STINSON: —with any children on those occasions?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:38): Absolutely.

INDUSTRY 4.0

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Will the minister inform the house what the new state Liberal government is doing to help maximise the industry benefits of Industry 4.0, otherwise known as the fourth Industrial Revolution?

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Minister for Transport, I also warn him. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:39): Did I just get warned?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It's alright, I probably deserved it.

The SPEAKER: You did, minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I thank the member for Morphet for the question and note the work that he has done before coming to this place in helping to advance IT systems and helping to develop more technologically savvy and technology forward-looking businesses. Industry 4.0, or the fourth Industrial Revolution, as he put it, is a concept that the Marshall Liberal government has been grappling with and seeking to help advance for some time now.

I was lucky enough in 2015 to travel to Berlin as part of a federal government delegation under the auspices of the Australia Germany Advisory Group to discuss with the Germans, especially a lot of their defence capability as well as their IT capability, around what they call 'Industrie vier punkt null'. The Germans really are world leaders when it comes to developing the fourth Industrial Revolution. It's why it was really exciting having them come over here on our soil in Perth last year to discuss how we could implement some of these ideas and technologies here.

What was really exciting was that last week, on 29 May, I had the great fortune to open the Frontier 4.0 conference here in Adelaide down at the Wine Centre. I was able to open the conference on behalf of the Marshall Liberal government and the Premier. What really excited me about this conference is, when you look at the partners and the sponsors that were involved, they were all private companies.

This was a conference that was put together by private industry, led by a man named Peter Barnard from SAPN as well as the guys from Enerven. They wanted to, of themselves and their own volition, get together and discuss how we can bring our economy and our technology, our infrastructure systems, into the 21st century and really get the benefits that Industry 4.0 says that it can deliver.

What I am really excited about is this is a philosophy, this is an approach, that the Marshall Liberal government is taking not only to these kinds of conferences but to the way in which we interact with business in South Australia. The best example we've got is the innovation hub that we are in the process of setting up down at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. In conjunction with the university and their Institute for Machine Learning, we are bringing together businesses that can grapple with the benefits that Industry 4.0 can bring to the South Australian economy, helping to bring the private sector into developing these ideas rather than always just relying on government to be the answer.

In my portfolio areas, some of the most exciting developments in this sphere are going to come through the formation of our South Australian Public Transport Authority. We need in this place to grapple with the idea of how we are going to deliver public transport services into the 21st century, how we are going to deliver infrastructure projects into the 21st century and how we are going to be able to take advantage of these amazing benefits, which can potentially help to reduce the cost of hard infrastructure provision in our state. The idea is we can use our existing road network, our existing public transport network and deliver more for South Australians without spending billions and billions on hard infrastructure.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: So already within planning there are 3D modelling tools that are being developed. I have spoken previously about the work that is being done within traffic management to improve there, and I look forward to working with many of the businesses that were there at that conference on the day. Can I say that the energy in the room was really quite exciting. In fact, what excited me most is that I was really the only government involvement of the day. Everything else was the private sector getting on with the new government.

My message to them, very clearly on behalf of the Premier and this new government, is that we are here to say yes. We are here to find ways to enable them to go about and do what they need

to do. We are essentially saying we are open for business, we are open to new ideas, we are open to taking risks in the knowledge that this will help to bring jobs and growth and greater prosperity for all South Australians.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister provide the house with dates and locations of her visits to residential care facilities?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:43): I will take advice from my department as to whether that is appropriate to be given out.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. Why were DPC public sector employees Bia Delaney, Margot McInnes, Amy Butler, Liam Golding, Paul Larder, Jessica Stapleton and Matthew Cox transferred out of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet following the election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): That would be a matter that would have been decided by either the chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet or the acting chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier play any role in any public sector employee who held a substantive role in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet being transferred out of the agency following the election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): As per the previous answer, all of those decisions are made by the chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet or, in the current situation, the acting chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier tell cabinet office executives that all cabinet office staff who had previously been employed in the former premier's office or a former minister's office would be transferred out of cabinet office and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): Absolutely not.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE PLAINS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the house on our new state government's support for collaboration with food producers in the Northern Adelaide Plains?

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: —who will be heard in silence.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:45): I thank the member for King for her question. It is just amazing that—

The SPEAKER: It is.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —on this side of the house we have an interest in our regional centres. We have an interest in primary production, but we also have a really keen interest in collaboration, particularly in horticulture and agriculture. I would like to thank the member for King for her question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: She is a very keen advocate for the Horticulture Coalition, as she is a very strong advocate for her people in King, the horticulturalists, as part of the Northern Adelaide Plains group. Yes, I was out there on Friday night and spoke to them. It was a night of discussing how that sector is going to grow and how the Northern Adelaide Plains is going to benefit with a concept of looking at ways they can further collaborate with their neighbours or with industry and how they can cluster. There were a number of key speakers down there, notably the Barossa RDA and, of course, the Limestone Coast Red Meat Cluster, who were there to give us examples of just how collaboration and clustering can work, particularly in agriculture and horticulture.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: You're irrelevant.

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

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What I can say is that Friday night was attended by an enthusiastic group of people—horticulturalists, agriculturalists, the service sector. It was heartening to walk the tables and understand what their issues are and how they could better integrate the horticulture sector, the service sector and also the agronomy. I think it has been very well noted that the \$300 million of local economy that comes out of the Northern Adelaide Plains sector is a critical contributor to the state's economy.

But there is more work to be done so that we can grow the economy there. One of the opportunities is that they can look at some of the export markets. On this side of the house, we are here to provide that catalyst so that they can actually have the expertise, the professionalism, put around and nurtured within those businesses to understand the trials and tribulations and the hard work that is undertaken and needed to become an exporter out of South Australia.

The Northern Adelaide Plains is a great working example of particularly horticulture, vegetable production and fruit production, but there are also emerging niche products coming out of the Northern Adelaide Plains. It is becoming very evident that those niche products, under a lot of family succession farms and businesses, are starting to grow now. The next generation is stepping up. They understand that they can't use old-school methods. They have to look at ways that they can be more competitive and they can produce the products that the markets are demanding.

Gone are the days of producing a product, putting it into a truck, into a box and into a market. It is also very important to understand that clustering is something that doesn't happen overnight. It has been acknowledged that clustering in the Northern Adelaide Plains will be their way to move forward. I am sure that the member for King is very aware that she has to give those horticulturalists the support they need, and she will do that, as this side of the house will do for the entire regional sector, the horticulture sector—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —the agriculture sector and particularly the vignerons, because we know that over \$600 million in South Australia's economy comes away from the vignerons. It is also important to note that clustering and collaboration will make the Northern Adelaide Plains a better horticultural sector.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:49): My question is to the Premier.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I'm glad you're enjoying them. Has the Premier, or any member of his staff, requested public servants within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to compile a list of staff who worked within the former premier's office?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just say that again slowly.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier, or any member of his staff, requested public servants within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to compile a list of staff who worked within the former premier's office?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49): I certainly haven't and I am not aware of any staff doing so, but I am happy to make inquiries.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier, or any member of his staff, ever sought to influence or interfere with the employment arrangements of non chief executive public sector employees?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can you just read out the second part?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Sure. My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier, or any member of his staff, ever sought to influence or interfere with the employment arrangements of non-chief executive public sector employees?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): No, absolutely not.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier, or any member of his staff, ever been cautioned about influencing or interfering with the employment arrangements of non chief executive public sector employees?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): I think the only thing that I can recall is that the former deputy chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet came down and spoke with my chief of staff seeking some clarification regarding comments that I had made to the cabinet office, which were clarified fully and made very clear to the deputy chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet at the time.

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You have had three in a row, sir. I will come back to you. Member for Flinders.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on his recent visits to regional South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:51): I thank the member for Flinders for that question. I am very conscious that my portfolio and the responsibilities that I have within that portfolio have a very significant amount of their components based in regional South Australia.

We have been very clear on this side of the house that we will be a government for all South Australia, but we will have a particular focus on assisting the regions to maximise their potential, whether that be their economic productive potential or the potential of their natural environment. We know that those two things often go hand in hand. It has been my desire, since becoming the Minister for Environment and Water and in my previous role as the shadow minister, to get into regional South Australia as often as possible to connect with those communities, to understand their needs and to use what I find out from those visits to shape the policies that I am responsible for in this role as Minister for Environment and Water.

Since becoming minister, I have made every effort to get out into the regions as often as possible. I had the pleasure, within the first few days of becoming the minister, to head down to the Coorong. That is an area that the member for Hammond, the member for MacKillop in particular and

the member for Finnis have talked with me so often about the importance of that fragile environment at the end of the River Murray, and so much attention needs to be given to that area.

I updated the house earlier in the week on the Coorong science summit that I have coordinated and brought together, and I will be keen to update the house on that in the future. The Coorong was one of the first places that I visited. It was great to be able to meet the many stakeholders, from fishers to shack owners to people involved in the tourism industry around the Coorong and environmentalists as well, to talk about their priorities for that area. Shortly afterwards, I had the great privilege of being able to fly over the Coorong with federal minister David Littleproud to get a real understanding of those immense bodies of water and the geography that links them together.

My first substantial visit to the regions, in terms of an overnight stay, was up to the Riverland. I made a commitment to the Minister for Agriculture and Regional Development that I would go up to the Riverland and meet the many people in his electorate who rely on a healthy working river for their livelihoods, to spend time meeting with stakeholders, business people, environmentalists, and meet with SA Water staff, Department for Environment and Water staff and NRM officers to understand more about the working environment of the mighty River Murray and the huge complexities that surround that part of our state—a real food bowl of our state and an area of our state that does a huge amount of economic lifting. However, we will only be able to do so with a healthy, natural environment. My visit to the Riverland was incredibly important, and I look forward to returning there again as a guest of the member for Chaffey.

I also had the opportunity a few weeks ago to head up into the Clare Valley and Burra. I went to Burra to open a national heritage tourism conference hosted by the National Trust. Heritage and heritage tourism is a critical part of regional South Australia's economy. It is important across the whole state, but often regional communities have particular assets which can be highlighted and be part of a heritage-tourism strategy, something our government is keen to work on. Regions mean so much to this government, and certainly as a minister in this government I am very keen to continue to support our regions.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. This is the 20th question for the opposition. The member for West Torrens.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:55): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. What comments did the Premier or his staff make regarding the cabinet office staff that caused the deputy chief executive officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to caution the Premier?

The SPEAKER: Premier, would you like to have a go at that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I think I can absolutely say unequivocally there was no caution provided by staff members to the Premier or the Premier's office. The reality is that, on coming to government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we made it very clear that we would be a very different government from the previous government, and one of the things in particular that we spoke about in the early days of coming to government and assuming this incredible privilege and responsibility on behalf of the people of South Australia was a different methodology of operating. We wanted to move to a full cabinet orientation, and this meant that we would be relying very strongly on the work of the cabinet office.

I met with the chief executive, Ruth Ambler, of the cabinet office, and I expressed to her a change in orientation from the previous government. In fact, the cabinet meets twice per week. We meet on Mondays and we meet again on Thursdays. So, this morning we met following Executive Council, where all members of the cabinet who are present in Adelaide and available attend

Executive Council with His Excellency the Governor of South Australia, the Hon. Hieu Van Le, and then after he departs we resume the second cabinet meeting for the week.

We believe that the cabinet working together produces much better results than other methodologies. Now, I am not going to criticise other methodologies, but it seemed to me that under the previous government we seemed to have lots of decisions being made on the fly, lots of papers being deposited on the cabinet table without a lot of consultation with other government departments. We hear a lot of, I suppose, compliments from within departments that they are being fully consulted, which leads me to believe that they probably weren't being that consulted previously under the previous arrangement.

I met with Ruth Ambler. I met with the senior people within the cabinet office to tell them about the arrangements that we were putting in place. There was no caution that was provided. I think it was more excitement about the opportunity to work with the new government, which was going to treat our senior bureaucrats, and in particular our cabinet office, with absolute respect.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:58): My question is to the Premier. How long after the Premier or his staff clarified his comments to the deputy chief executive of DPC was it that the deputy chief executive was terminated?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:58): Just say that again, sorry.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Premier. How long after the Premier or his staff clarified his remarks to the deputy chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was the deputy chief executive terminated?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't have that information with me, but those two issues are completely unrelated, and if those opposite suggest that those two things are related then they just don't understand how the Public Service Act operates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will be heard in silence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: He is answering the question. The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is difficult to believe that those opposite in government for 16 years—and, in fact, the member for West Torrens who has been in this parliament for considerably longer than that—don't understand how the Public Service Act operates. The Premier appoints chief executives. That is my responsibility, and I take that responsibility very seriously, sir, as you would be aware. All other appointments are the responsibility of the chief executives themselves.

I hope that the member for West Torrens isn't suggesting that there was some sort of interference by the Premier regarding the appointment of the deputy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —chief executive because if he—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it's an outrageous accusation. Maybe the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will not interject—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I'm just making—

The SPEAKER: —and the Premier will not respond to interjections. If I hear anything unparliamentary, I will ask members to withdraw. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We take our responsibility very seriously. We are fully aware of our roles and our responsibilities as the Premier and as cabinet ministers, and we make sure that we conform to the requirements under the Public Service Act, which is an excellent act. We've got excellent public servants here in South Australia. I have enjoyed working with them all, and I will continue to enjoy working with them all.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier rule out having ever instructed, asked or inferred to Ruth Ambler on the removal of any public servants from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet who held substantive roles within that agency?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): As I have said, I will be quite clear on this because—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —until I became the Premier—

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and certainly at any time up to and including that meeting, I had never met anybody in the cabinet office. In fact, the only person I had ever met who was in the cabinet office was the former member for Bright and now the Minister for Environment and Water in South Australia.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

Mr BROCK (Frome) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Minister, about four weeks ago I asked you a question regarding the Regional Growth Fund which you went to the election with. Since that time, have you had any opportunity to establish the criteria for businesses in regional South Australia?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:01): I thank the member for his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Yes, with respect, my office is working feverishly in developing the terms of reference for that Regional Growth Fund. I want to make it very clear that I am going to make sure that that Regional Growth Fund is there to target all of regional South Australia. What I am also going to make very clear is that the terms of reference will be very inclusive. It is going to be about developing regions. It's about regional development. I can say categorically that it won't be there for individual businesses, and as such it won't be there for individuals. So, if you are looking for any more than that, you will have to wait until those terms of reference come out, and that will be somewhere before 1 July.

Mr BROCK: Supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder has the call.

ABORIGINAL POWER CUP

Ms HABIB (Elder) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Mr Bignell: The true voice of the regions has been silenced.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is on two warnings. The member for Elder has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder.

Ms HABIB: My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister update the house on the launch of the Aboriginal Power Cup at Ethelton and what the Port Adelaide Football Club is doing to support Indigenous youth in our regions?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:03): I thank the member for her question and note her great interest in sporting groups and communities in her electorate and right across the state.

Yesterday, I was fortunate enough to be at the opening of the Aboriginal Power Cup. This is a great initiative that focuses on engaging young people in Aboriginal culture and identity, education, promoting healthy lifestyle choices, and developing teamwork, leadership and life skills. Now in its 11th year, this event comprises a competitive football carnival as its centrepiece, involving 450 students from 70 schools across South Australia.

Participants in the carnival must have met strict guidelines regarding a minimum 80 per cent school attendance and targets regarding both academic and behavioural components of the program. The top teams in the carnival will play off on Friday night at Adelaide Oval as the curtain-raiser to the Port Adelaide's AFL clash against Richmond. Participants will again feature in a special cultural performance as part of the welcome to country in the lead-up to the first bounce.

The Port Adelaide Football Club has positioned itself as a leader in programs that really deliver for the lives of Aboriginal youth. These programs are having a great material impact in Closing the Gap initiatives in South Australia. I must commend the Port Adelaide Football Club for their wonderful work. Santos was a great sponsor of this as well.

One of the things that's really good about this program is that the students from all the different areas actually design their own jumper. They have a competition, they design their jumpers and the jumpers look absolutely fantastic. There was one from Immanuel school. I know from up in Murray Bridge, from a school from the region of the member for Hammond, the jumper they designed was absolutely outstanding.

I spoke to a few of the young people about who did the jumper designs and how it all came about, and the glow on their faces when they talked about the process, their involvement, their engagement with this, was absolutely outstanding. I mentioned Santos being involved as well, a good South Australian company that has supported and got right behind this program, and they have been involved for 10 of the 11 years, and they are absolutely outstanding. Representing them was Che Cockatoo-Collins.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Those on the other side might mock these sorts of programs, but I can say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —they are great for our community. Che Cockatoo-Collins was there, spoke to the young people, and the awe in which he was held was outstanding. They were just fixed on what he had to say. He talked about the opportunities a company like Santos will provide for young people that want to work potentially in the mines and in the regions, but he also spoke about the opportunities that they give to the local communities by providing jobs for doctors and shop owners and dentists and mechanics and all those sorts of things that grow in a community that grows with industries like Santos around. Uncle Fred gave the Welcome to Country. He was fantastic.

On top of all that, Port Adelaide, the football club itself, supplied their Indigenous players to be great mentors. I have to single out one in particular, because when we got there they were screaming for C. Wingard. I was so pumped. I thought, 'They want me here. This is fantastic,' and I was standing at the front and people were saying, 'It's C. Wingard, it's C. Wingard!' I thought, 'I've never had so much love in my life. This is absolutely wonderful.'

Lo and behold, standing right behind me was Chad Wingard, so it was a little bit disappointing and deflated my ego, but Chad was one of the Indigenous players that was there, again mentoring these young people. Paddy Ryder was there, Steven Motlop was there, and Pauly Vandenberg, who works for the Port Adelaide Football Club, was there, doing a great job as well, as was Marlon Motlop and a few of the other guys. They just go about their job.

An honourable member: Dom Barry.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, Dom Barry was there as well. They go about their job; they're very unassuming, but they do a great job. Again, when they just get around with the young people, engage with the young people, talk to them and show them the way and show them what their future can be, they really lock on. I just want to commend the Port Adelaide Football Club and all the players for the great work they did and the great work they do in our community. The Aboriginal Power Cup is a wonderful, wonderful program.

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

Mr BROCK (Frome) (15:07): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think I must have to scream for a supplementary. However, my question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Minister, I take on board that you haven't got any criteria at this stage for the Regional Growth Fund, and I'm looking forward to that for my own electorate.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, I will hear the entirety of the question before I deliberate if the question is in order, since the member did commence before the final buzzer.

Mr BROCK: During your conversations with the many regional development associations across regional South Australia, which I agree about—they are the backbone of it—have you had discussions regarding the Regional Growth Fund and where it is currently at the moment?

The SPEAKER: Minister, would you like to answer that question?

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: I couldn't hear.

The SPEAKER: Could you please repeat a version of the question.

Mr BROCK: I will bring it back. Minister, during your conversations with the many regional development associations across regional South Australia, have you had any discussion about where the Regional Growth Fund is and when it will be available to people in the regions?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:08): I thank the member for his very important question. Yes, when I met with the RDAs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BROCK: Excuse me, Mr Speaker, I cannot hear the answer.

The SPEAKER: Yes, neither can I. Thank you, member for Frome. Members on my left will be quiet, as will the members on the right.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: The members on your left don't care about regional South Australia, sir. They don't care about regional—

The SPEAKER: Could the minister please answer the question; return to the substance. Thank you.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: To the member, yes, my long discussions with the RDAs did encompass how the Regional Growth Fund would be designed and developed.

As I have with many industries, commodity sectors and businesses around South Australia, I am being inclusive as to how that money will be allocated and how those terms of reference will be

put to the criteria of people being able to apply for that money. It is important that regional South Australia is given an ear. For 16 years they have been ignored. There were no votes over there for that part of the world—regional South Australia.

What I will say is that for the 16 years they have been ignored, for the next 16 years they will not be ignored, I can assure you. Member for Frome, thank you for your question. You will hear what the Regional Growth Fund is about in due course.

Grievance Debate

HINDMARSH BOULEVARD RESERVE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:10): I rise to speak about the proposed revocation of the community land status on an important reserve in Evanston Gardens, at the heart of my electorate. Today, I tabled before the house a 584-strong signed petition calling the house's attention to the Town of Gawler's intention to revoke the community land status on a reserve located at 180 Hindmarsh Boulevard.

The petition reads that the council is seeking to sell the reserve for housing development, which will remove important open space from the immediate vicinity that is utilised by local fauna and adds to the amenity of the suburb. The Town of Gawler has explained that the reserve is currently underutilised as open space and is not used for any structured or formalised recreation purposes. The council acknowledges that the reserve does provide a visual amenity to the neighbouring properties and includes an unformed path and a number of small trees.

However, in its written proposal, the Town of Gawler documents that it is planning to reinvest the funds raised from the sale of the reserve into other capital investments, including a neighbourhood reserve, also located on Hindmarsh Boulevard. I should stress that only a portion of the funds will go to the upgrade and that other funds will go to other capital projects, including the upgrade and renovation of the civic centre.

The house would be aware that under the Local Government Act 1999 the Minister for Local Government must approve any decision made by local council to revoke the community classification of a park or reserve before it can be sold on the open market. In this light, the petition also requests that the house urge the Minister for Local Government to refuse to approve the revocation request. I have been informed that the Town of Gawler is currently in the process of reviewing all submissions received in response to their intention to revoke the community land status of the reserve and will produce a report to be presented to the ordinary council meeting on 24 July 2018.

It needs to be emphasised, however, that in discussions with me concerned local residents have expressed their lack of confidence that the Town of Gawler will listen to their pleas. In fact, I can inform the house that over the past two years a number of decisions and actions taken by the Town of Gawler have created an atmosphere of mistrust and lack of confidence that council's consultation processes are a genuine attempt to gauge community views.

Residents simply do not believe that the Town of Gawler is listening to them. This is why I commend to the house the actions of the concerned Evanston Gardens residents. They have left no stone unturned in their efforts, and I hope that the Minister for Local Government will listen to their arguments, even if the Town of Gawler does not. This type of concern is not unique to the Town of Gawler and is an issue that local government needs to address.

Indeed, all levels of government need to consider whether their consultation processes are sufficiently robust and also ask themselves whether their residents would consider them fair and reasonable, irrespective of the outcome. Consultation and engagement processes vary from council to council, and this is an area I believe needs to be reformed. Meaningful consultation and engagement can only be truly effective when they take place on a foundation of transparency, disclosure and accountability.

Residents do not trust processes where decisions are made in secret. Residents may not always agree, but they are more likely to understand and accept a council decision when they understand the full context. The petitioners have indicated that they are prepared to work with council to develop and maintain the reserve, possibly developing a community garden to benefit the multigenerational community. Council has a unique opportunity to engage with this community and

develop a positive ongoing working relationship or they can create another group of residents who feel betrayed by their local council and fuel further mistrust.

The ball is truly in the Town of Gawler's court. In my opinion, this is one of many areas where public policy is ripe for reform, both legislatively and in practice.

YELLAKKA YELLAKARRI STUDENT LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:14): Naa marni. I acknowledge this parliament meets on the traditional lands of the Kaurna people. From 15 to 18 May, around 70 students from 13 schools came together from across Greater Adelaide for the Yellakka Yellarkarri student leadership program run by Catholic Education South Australia. This program, for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, is hosted at Tauondi Aboriginal College in Port Adelaide. This was the seventh YY, with students gathering and celebrating their Indigenous culture and sharing stories and experiences, since 2011.

Instead of the usual week, this year was an intense four days filled with extreme highs and lows. During their time together, the students listened to amazing and spirited speeches by elders, attended legal workshops, participated in traditional Aboriginal cookouts, sang songs, learned basic Kaurna language and also gathered for a welcoming and a closing ceremony.

I was privileged to be part of the closing ceremony at the invitation of our friend Auntie Katrina Power, who is with us today along with Melissa Clarke from the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. It was there that I had the joy of meeting Sara Pacella, who has been my shadow this week in parliament and who is also here today with her mother, Elizabeth. Sara has inspired me and the words in this grievance today.

The students came together to draft a statement, workshopped by the ALRM and inspired by the Uluru Statement from the Heart and its aftermath. The statement gathered students' thoughts and was to represent them as Aboriginal children. It reads:

We, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leaders of tomorrow have come together, on Kaurna land. We want to be recognised. We want to be heard, and we say:

We are saddened and outraged by the legacy that has been left by invasion. Our culture, our language, our land and families have been stolen and destroyed by colonisation. We are astounded to learn that after the truth of 'terra nullius', the Australian government has done nothing to redress the 200+ years of lies and deceit on which this 'Australian country' has been built. Until a treaty is entered with our Aboriginal Nations, non-Aboriginal Australia are visitors and invaders on this land, and living on our country unlawfully. We know this now. Yet despite the wars, the massacres, the segregation, the protection and the assimilation of our people, we have survived, our culture has survived and we are proud to be Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. We will determine our future.

We know what keeps us strong. It is our culture, our identity, our belonging, our family, our community, and our country. We seek to be taught our culture, to practice our culture and in the future grow healthy, happy and safe children immersed in culture. We have come from a long line of warriors; 65,000 years of knowledge and spirituality. We are the oldest living culture in the world. We need to, and we are, in unity maintaining and strengthening our living culture for future generations. Other societies have much to learn and sharing our culture is our gift.

The strength that is bestowed upon us by our ancestors will see us succeed and become educators, midwives, professional athletes, business owners, lawyers, doctors, engineers, photographers, role models, actors and politicians.

We ask that non-Aboriginal Australia respect us. Respect our land. Respect our culture, learn the truth and tell the truth. We ask for nothing more than what is right and fair. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders together with non-Aboriginal Australia can then truly come together to strengthen our pride as a nation, and walk together in unity. As future leaders we will create a better life for our families and communities and nothing will stop us. This is who we are, and more.

Powerful words, powerful history shaping powerful futures. YY helped the students to reflect on how important it is to feel safe and to open up and share their struggles, and the students learned that by sharing their struggles with each other they gain more confidence to share this with other non-Indigenous people. This in turn helps to clarify their identity in this nation.

There was some contention amongst the students and the schools about the wording of the statement that was drafted; not everyone agreed with it. It is a bit like in this community on nearly every issue you can imagine, and I know it is how I felt the first time I saw an invasion role play at my son's school in 1988. However, there were definitely some common themes.

There was recognition of the belief that Australia was not terra nullius, or uninhabited, when the English settlers arrived. There were First Nation peoples. The stolen generation recollects the legacy of trauma, widespread abuse, displacement, removal of children and loss that continue to affect Indigenous communities, families and individuals today. Much culture and many languages have been lost; losing language when history and culture is handed down orally is devastating. This important part of Australia's history is not really being taught enough in Australian schools.

YY was an amazing program that challenged and captivated the students involved. It has opened up the possibility for a lot of debate and the opportunity to reflect on what it means to be Aboriginal. This can only be a good thing.

Today, we heard that the Victorian parliament is introducing a bill to progress negotiations on a treaty. South Australia has similar aspirations, and commissioner Roger Thomas, who began his work under then minister Kyam Maher, is preparing a report for Premier Marshall, who we are grateful has stayed to hear this grievance today. Let us hope that the treaty and recognition will be part of our history very soon.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I also welcome to parliament today senior Kaurana woman Katrina Power.

Grievance Debate

CURTIS ROAD

Mr GEE (Taylor) (15:19): Again, I wish to speak about Curtis Road. I recently spoke about all the issues affecting the part of Curtis Road between Main North Road and the Northern Expressway. Today, I am going to speak about a dangerous intersection on Curtis Road where it intersects Heaslip Road on the western side of the Northern Expressway. To give some perspective on this intersection, Curtis Road runs from Main North Road in the east to Angle Vale Road in the west, and Heaslip Road runs from Angle Vale in the north to Waterloo Corner Road in the south.

All traffic travelling east or west on Curtis Road is required to stop at the intersection with Heaslip Road, where stop signs and lines are clearly marked. Those vehicles travelling on Heaslip Road have an unrestricted right of way through the intersection. Vehicle approach from all directions to this intersection is up to 80 km/h, and it is situated in a semirural setting. That said, I can inform members that the Angle Vale community adjacent to this intersection has been identified as the fastest growing in South Australia.

This intersection is the main route for vehicles, including heavy vehicles, travelling from Angle Vale, Lewiston, Two Wells, Virginia and beyond to the metropolitan area. I use this road to drive to Two Wells, Angle Vale and Virginia, and I am always cautious as I approach this intersection. There is an agreed solution to this intersection, which is the installation of a roundabout and a reduction in the speed limit from all directions.

I have been advised that a deed has been signed by the landowners, the City of Playford and the state government that includes a roundabout at this intersection at some time in the future. However, residents are reporting at least one near miss at this intersection each day and a high number of crashes. There was a fatality at this intersection last year where a 22-year-old man from Virginia lost his life. It is always tragic when we lose a member of our community but even more so when it can be prevented. We need to act before another family loses a loved one.

I have been campaigning on this issue since I became the local Labor candidate, alongside the Angle Vale residents association, to achieve an upgrade to make this intersection safer for all road users. I want to acknowledge the grassroots campaign that has been led by the association, particularly Clint Marsh. Clint raised the profile of this issue with his Facebook page and as a state election issue, and he continues to ensure that all candidates and the Playford council do not forget about this issue.

Clint is the captain of the local Dalkeith CFS brigade. He has attended many road accidents and knows how dangerous this intersection is. Also, as a local resident with a young family, he wants to see action now before another avoidable tragedy occurs. The truth with this issue is that some

drivers are refusing or failing to stop at the stop signs. I have written to the previous and current transport ministers regarding this issue and know that, following my contact with the previous minister, DPTI conducted a survey and study at this intersection.

It was pleasing to see that both the Liberal and SA-Best candidates supported urgent action at this roundabout during the recent state election campaign. The Liberal candidate for Taylor, Sarika Sharma, started a petition for action at the intersection, stating:

The Curtis road and Heaslip road intersection has been a continuous traffic danger hazard for commuters...where countless accidents and multiple deaths have occurred due to its high speed zone and sharp turning corners.

She further advised the *Bunyip* newspaper that, while she was standing at the intersection, an accident could occur every single second. The City of Playford have advised that they will not initiate a reduction in the speed limit on the part of Curtis Road under their care and control, which is disappointing. However, I believe the community campaign is achieving some success. The Playford mayor told the *Bunyip* newspaper:

It is important that the Curtis and Heaslip and Womma and Stebonheath intersections are upgraded and, further, that council hopes proposed roundabout developments can be brought forward.

I want to speak about the Womma and Stebonheath intersection at another time, as this is another dangerous intersection. This upgrade also has widespread support from the local community. The Angle Vale residents association, local communities, myself, the City of Playford and Ms Sharma are all supporting the urgent upgrade of this intersection. I am calling on the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure to meet with the members of the Angle Vale residents association.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:24): I rise to inform the house of circumstances that led to the Public Works Committee being unable to adopt the terms of reference for an inquiry today. Seven days ago, the draft terms of reference for an inquiry into the Gawler Line Modernisation Project were tabled. I read those draft terms to the house:

That the Public Works Committee conduct an inquiry into the Gawler Line Modernisation Project (the Project) with particular reference to—

1. The circumstances surrounding the \$46.6m write down in expenditure on the Project identified by the Auditor-General in the Auditor General's Annual Report 2013-14.
2. The circumstances giving rise to the \$28.6m in expenditure incurred for the Project in respect of a section of the Project between Salisbury and Gawler identified by the Auditor-General in the Auditor-General's Annual Report 2013-14 as unlikely to provide any future economic benefit.
3. The efficiency and progress of construction of the Project, including—
 - a. Design;
 - b. Scope;
 - c. Project supervision;
 - d. Tendering; and
 - e. Mobilisation.
4. Any other relevant matter relating to or arising from the Project or the Auditor-General's Report.

The Presiding Member's notes accompanied the draft terms of reference, and they referred to the Auditor-General's Annual Report 2013-14, Volume 4, page 1287. At 8.56pm last night, the member for Light provided me with an email. I will read that email, and my response to that email, to the house:

Dear Mr Chairman

Just a short note to advise that both I and the Member for West Torrens will be an apology for the PWC to be held tomorrow morning as there are no substantive matters to transact.

The only matter likely to be before the committee is a proposal by the chair for an inquiry, which in our opinion, is an abuse of the committee system as the information sought is available from the Government.

Given the majority of the PWC members are members of the Governing party they can obtain the information sought direct from their Minister.

Members of the Liberal Party need to stop acting as if they were in opposition.

I hope there will be some real work before the committee at its next meeting.

I read my response:

Dear Mr Piccolo and Mr Koutsantonis

I refer to Mr Piccolo's e-mail of 6 June 2018.

There is no proper basis to assert that the proposed inquiry into the Gawler Line Modernisation Project (Proposed Inquiry) is an abuse of process.

The functions of the Public Works Committee are set out in s12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1992 (SA) (the Act) and the terms of reference for the Proposed Inquiry closely complement those functions.

It is clear that the nature and scope of informal inquiries as may be made by a Minister or the Executive are quite different to the nature, scope, powers and character of a parliamentary inquiry conducted by a parliamentary committee under the Act. Amongst other matters, the substantial powers and immunities available to the committee are not available to a Minister. Importantly, witnesses appearing before the committee are afforded certain powerful protections.

The Proposed Inquiry would examine serious matters raised by the Auditor-General in relation to certain public works.

All members of the committee have an interest in ensuring that the proper business of the committee is not frustrated.

It is disappointing that having more than sufficient notice of the Proposed Inquiry and of its terms it took [the member for Light] until after the house rose last night to raise the matters giving rise to this correspondence with the Presiding Member.

That closes my email. There is, as I mentioned in my correspondence, no proper basis to suggest an abuse of process. In fact, what has occurred is that the Labor Party is wilfully obstructing the proper business of the committee. They are preventing the committee from examining the circumstances that led to a gross waste of public money. South Australians expect this parliament to do its work and the committees of parliament to do their work.

The question is this: why are two former Labor ministers standing in the way of this inquiry? What does the former Labor government have to hide? On this side of the house, we believe in transparency and accountability. The Labor Party believes in cover-ups. They are prepared to do whatever it takes to stop us from getting to the bottom of how \$46 million of public money was wasted by their incompetent administration.

Time expired.

TOGETHER IN THE SOUTH

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:29): Today, I rise to speak about an excellent initiative that I have had the privilege of being involved in since its inception, an initiative that is now strongly underway in and around my electorate: Together in the South. Together in the South is a community-led initiative that brings together community members, community organisations, philanthropy, business, schools, council and government agencies to support vulnerable children who are zero to eight years old living in our southern community.

It is relentlessly focused on aligning every effort to ensure that every child is safe, healthy, active, ready to learn and engaging positively. This collective effort is assessed by agreed, shared measurement processes that track our progress towards our shared results. Operating across nine suburbs within the City of Onkaparinga, it has been aligning effort to support children for around three years. The group is currently rolling out a significant campaign, systematically getting more zero to four year olds into playgroups by making sure that information about available playgroups is everywhere and by supporting community members to connect other community members to playgroups and support them to attend.

Playgroups are a great way for young children to try new activities, make friends and develop a sense of community. They are also a great way for parents to connect with others and get the

support and advice they may need to feel confident and positive about their parenting journey. This push to increase attendance rates at children's playgroups in our southern community by Together in the South is a great idea, and it will provide practical outcomes for parents and young children living in the south.

Playgroups play such an invaluable role for parents and their children's development. New parents receive particular benefit from being engaged with playgroups, as they offer them support and advice at what can be a challenging time in their lives. As part of the campaign, Together in the South has collated the details of the local playgroups into an easy-to-access booklet and is reaching out to parents of young children through multiple community networks and through social media.

The impetus for this project came via data commissioned by Playgroup SA that shows that more can be done to ensure that young children and parents get involved in playgroups. By encouraging more social and educational opportunities for young children, particularly those who are less engaged with community activity, we ensure that they have the tools they need to hit the ground running at kindergarten and primary school. Jess, a young mother of two from Christie Downs, recently shared her experience of playgroups. She said:

I came to a playgroup through my community support worker. I didn't know about playgroups before then.

I was trying to finish Year 12 and I had a young baby. As soon as I started taking my baby daughter to playgroup I saw how good it was for my baby and me.

You can have a conversation...your child is stimulated and learning.

They see so many new things...they learn so much and it takes a huge stress off parents who can get together in a neutral space.

Together in the South is built using the collective impact model and is part of Together SA's network of community-led, collective impact initiatives now happening across our state. Together in the South is also an Opportunity Child site. Opportunity Child provides backbone support and coordination to 10 similar initiatives across our country, using collective impact to dramatically improve the lives of the 65,000 Australian children who start school each year with big challenges in learning and in life.

Collective impact is a framework for achieving large-scale social change and for solving complex social issues. It is a structured approach that brings community members and organisations together to innovate and to focus on a common objective, with the aim of achieving lasting results. Together in the South are using this model to achieve long-lasting results for children in our southern community. Together, over the past few years, we have identified the 2,000 most vulnerable zero to eight year olds, and it is them and their families that we seek to engage, support and empower through this work.

It is initiatives like the playgroup program that encouraged the former government to support Together SA and its community partners. Together SA receive funding and in-kind support from an array of community and philanthropic organisations, but they need ongoing government support so they can continue to provide community initiatives like the playgroup program. I implore this state government to continue to support Together SA so they can get on with what they do best: bringing local community members together to develop and grow long-term practical solutions to complex social issues.

GROUNDWATER DRAINAGE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:34): I would like to draw the house's attention today to the seven-year long neglect of a groundwater drainage issue stemming from a residential and retail complex developed at that time in Henley Beach. As many people know, I am a passionate advocate for the beautiful section of metropolitan coastline that I am fortunate enough to represent, but with the good comes the bad, and there are several issues that currently face this section of Adelaide's coast.

I was lucky enough throughout the campaign to have frequent visits from my colleague the member for Black, the then shadow environment minister, to discuss several coastal issues affecting my electorate, issues like sand replenishment, coastal restoration and the longstanding drainage issue. These issues were regularly brought to my attention whilst out on the campaign trail and are a key priority of mine to resolve, so I am thankful for the attention that the now Minister for

Environment gave to these matters prior to the election and for his continuing to work with me on delivering a resolution for them moving forward.

One of the more longstanding issues that many in my community cannot seem to understand is why it has taken so long to resolve the groundwater drainage problem at Henley Beach. For seven long years, local residents have had to put up with stained water constantly draining onto the beach from the groundwater aquifer, which was discovered upon construction of the residential and retail development at Henley Square.

I am also honestly quite surprised by the length of time it has taken for this matter to be resolved. Shortly after the election, I wrote to the Minister for Environment requesting an update on this matter and was provided with an in-depth briefing subsequently on what work had occurred over the lengthy seven-year period. I took this opportunity to stress the importance of having this issue resolved for our community. The groundwater drainage problem appeared to have come to light in 2011, when it was intercepted during excavation works carried out by the developer.

Since then, the Department for Environment has been working in collaboration with the City of Charles Sturt and the developer to achieve voluntary compliance in resolving this matter. Currently, the intercepted groundwater is being directed to holding tanks in the basement car park of the development and then subsequently disposed of onto the beach at Henley Square. This current arrangement is posing a risk to the resource itself, as there is a small chance of increased groundwater salinity, as well as possible soil subsidence.

In light of the risks brought to my attention and the astronomical waste of water that has proven to be clean and safe, I again advocate my strong desire for this to be resolved as quickly as possible. I do not believe that there is a reasonable explanation for taking seven years to address this matter. It certainly cannot be blamed on a lack of public pressure.

I would like to acknowledge, well before my advocacy on this matter, the tireless work of my community, in particular the Western Adelaide Coastal Residents' Association (WACRA), that has kept this issue in the public eye and has constantly held the department, council and developer to account, but now, in my role as a local member, it is my turn to deliver for my community. In the coming days and weeks, I will be liaising with the minister, the department and other stakeholders to ensure that we find a long-term and permanent fix to this long-running problem.

I believe we should be working towards delivering a resolution before next summer, when thousands upon thousands of locals, visitors and tourists will again flock to the beautiful tourist destination that is Henley Beach.

Resolutions

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE ANNIVERSARY

The Legislative Council concurs with the resolution of the House of Assembly contained in message No. 16 for the appointment of a joint committee on matters relating to the 125th Anniversary of women's suffrage and will be represented on the committee by four members, of whom three shall form the quorum necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee. The members of the joint committee to represent the Legislative Council will be the Hon. C. Bonaros, the Hon. T.A. Franks, the Hon. J.M.A. Lensink and the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:39): I move:

That the members of the House of Assembly on the joint committee be Ms Bedford, Ms Luethen, Ms Habib and Ms Hildyard.

Motion carried.

*Bills***SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish the South Australian Productivity Commission, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The South Australian Productivity Commission Bill 2018 initiates a key economic reform, and its introduction fulfils another major commitment in my government's 100-day plan.

The commission will play a vital role in generating jobs, investment and economic growth in South Australia. The functioning of this commission will instil a high level of public confidence that the advice and recommendations that it provides are based on rigorous analysis and political impartiality. That is why this bill establishes the commission as an independent statutory body, which will be fully and publicly accountable for the advice it provides and the actions that it recommends.

The commission will deliver a very important function for South Australia by making recommendations to government to remove existing regulatory barriers and to directly support productivity growth, unlocking new economic opportunities and creating new jobs in our state. Productivity improvement is a key source of long-term economic growth, business competitiveness and real per capita income growth. It is an important determinant of living standards and wellbeing for all South Australians.

For too long South Australia's productivity growth has failed to keep pace with the rest of the developed world. Labor productivity has lagged as other jurisdictions have seen massive increases in private capital investment, as well as more effective investment in skills, education and training. Equally, our state has missed opportunities to grow multifactor productivity, something that, if continued, will drag on the growth of our prosperity and an increasingly digitally enabled services-based world.

We are committed to bringing a new approach to government, to government regulation and to service provision. The commission will be tasked with identifying unnecessary regulation for removal and advising the government on ways to modernise and simplify regulation which has become outdated or which imposes unnecessary costs on South Australian businesses and families, allowing businesses to grow and create jobs and families to raise their living standards.

It is the role of government to maximise the efficient use of taxpayer funds in the delivery of services and infrastructure. The commission will identify opportunities to improve the accessibility, efficiency and quality of services delivered or funded by government, to facilitate structural change whilst minimising the hardships that may occur as a result of this change, and to promote regional development and development occurring in an ecologically sustainable way.

These objectives will ensure the commission works to improve the lot of all South Australians collectively, rather than the particular economic sectors or individual groups. Importantly, the commission will not serve as a committee of audit. This is not about reducing the quality of outcomes achieved by government spending but, rather, improving both quality and efficiency for every dollar spent. This bill requires the commission to act transparently.

A Notice of Inquiry setting out the terms of reference and opportunities for the public to provide submissions will be made publicly available every time a matter is referred to the commission for inquiry. The commission's report on each inquiry that it makes will be published on the commission's website, including its recommendations for government action.

Commissioners will be eminently qualified by virtue of their knowledge and experience in industry, commerce, economics, law or public administration, bringing together the best available

advice and expertise of our private and public sectors. We have many highly capable people engaged in developing public policy in this state: in the public sector and in the parliament.

However, it is important that we challenge our thinking as we go to ensure that our assumptions and analyses are thoroughly tested and that we look for innovative approaches and solutions to problems that affect South Australians. This independent body of experts will make a valuable contribution in testing and extending the depth of thinking by government, improving the quality of outcomes delivered for South Australians.

I am pleased to be able to introduce this bill in the government's first 100 days, as I committed to do before the election, and I look forward to support in both places for this important and necessary initiative. I commend the bill to members in this house, I table a copy of the explanation of clauses and encourage members to give this important legislation serious and favourable consideration.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Hildyard.

FAIR TRADING (TICKET SCALPING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:47): I note that in the lunch break the member for Schubert advised that he has also had some experience with crowd-surfing.

I might add that the performance peak sporting bodies and event organisers do all they can to ensure that the prices of tickets are affordable because they want genuine fans to be able to enjoy their events and only pay the price advertised. Instead, quite often they watch in dismay as resellers grab these tickets, jack up the price and pretend they are about to sell out.

This process completely destroys the trust with the public because many times these organisations are not-for-profit, especially the sporting ones, so it is beholden on us to try to find a solution. Oftentimes we see the situation where games are notionally sold out, only to see a good number of empty seats that have been purchased by these scalpers.

From a player's and entertainer's perspective, they love nothing more than playing to a packed stadium. They understand full well that the long-term success of their act or their sport relies upon engaged audiences, especially the younger generation—and especially in sport, because they are the future of that sport. Peak bodies realise this and try to ensure that seats are made available at affordable prices for families.

Many times you will see kids going there just to get the autograph of their sporting hero after the game, so we need to foster this. Stopping scalping will only encourage it. I have had the opportunity to play in front of packed stadiums of 90,000 people. It is a buzz for the players as well. Athletes want to perform in front of people who truly appreciate their skills. There is nothing better than having both teams of a contest being supported and hearing the barracking going on, rather than just a sterile environment where people are not there. This really is about trying to ensure that people are able to attend these major events.

The Major Events Act 2013 could have given protection to consumers, as section 9 of that act prohibits the sale or offering for sale of tickets in a controlled area for a major event and, in any other case, prohibits the sale or offering for sale of tickets to a major event at a price that exceeds the original price by more than 10 per cent. However, this protection for consumers relies on an event being declared a major event by the government. For events that are not so declared, no protection is given to the public from ticket scalpers.

It was even revealed in 2017 that not one person had been prosecuted for selling tickets at inflated prices under the Major Events Act 2013. Unfortunately, the Major Events Act 2013 also does not address the technological advances since its original passage, including the aforementioned ticket bots that purchase tickets online faster than a person can. Legislative changes are therefore required to address these limitations and, at the same time, increase overall consumer protection with respect to ticket scalping here in South Australia.

Under the Major Events Act, the government needs to declare an event as a major event, as I mentioned, so we will repeal section 9 of the Major Events Act and, rather, amend the Fair Trading Act so that the laws apply to any event in South Australia that is subject to resale restrictions. We will prohibit the advertising or hosting of advertising of any event where tickets are selling for over 110 per cent of the tickets' original price in addition to capping the total resale price to 110 per cent of the total acquisition price. We will require that any resale advertisement includes specific details, such as the original cost and seating arrangements.

The bill will seek to outlaw software, such as ticket bots, which contravenes the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets. The bill will also seek to increase the number of compliance officers for enforcement of minor breaches. Expiable offences will also be introduced to enable quick and effective enforcement of minor breaches without having to pursue costly court action. This will also act as an effective deterrent for others. There will also be a provision for a small public education campaign about the changes to these ticket-scalping laws.

This bill therefore broadens the scope of the legislation so that ticket-scalping provisions apply to any sporting or entertainment event in South Australia that is subject to a resale restriction. Event organisers, via their resale restriction, are effectively putting restrictions in place for their event because they know that it will be a popular event and that therefore ticket scalping could consequently eventuate. Quite often part of the resale conditions is that tickets can be cancelled.

The amendment to the Fair Trading Act relating to resale restrictions as a trigger removes the requirement for a government to declare an event a major event. As an example, this would draw in the previously mentioned Ed Sheeran concert and other concerts such as Adele's, AFL finals and similar crowd-pulling entertainment events. I should add that it will not affect smaller events, those events that are very worthwhile but may not have the latent consumer demand that would lead to an undersupply of tickets. Unfortunately, sometimes my forums are in this situation.

There will be a requirement that any resale advertisement must include certain information, including the original supply cost of the ticket and details of the location from which the ticketholder is authorised to view the event, including, for example, the bay number, row number or seat number of the ticket. This is particularly important, as some online resale sites utilise marketing and advertising methods to give their site pre-eminent listing in search engines such as Google, so that when consumers conduct an online search to purchase tickets for particular events, they get taken to these sites rather than the original, authentic event organiser site.

These online resale sites, once visited, then appear to the consumers as legitimate ticket sellers. However, on the resale sites tickets are often highlighted as 'only a few remaining' to provide that sense of urgency to buy at these inflated prices, when in fact the primary ticket selling site still has ample tickets available. So allowing consumers to understand what the original supply cost of the ticket is means they can understand what the differential is between the price they are buying and the price at which the event organiser provided the ticket.

The government recognises that legitimate circumstances exist where a person may want to resell their tickets and therefore there is a need for a secondary market. However, that secondary market should not be at the expense of consumer rights, because we do not want to stop families or people, who are genuine in their need to sell because another event has come up, being able to do so. While the existence of a secondary market has both a positive and a negative impact for consumers, it does provide consumers with access to tickets.

Importantly, to deal directly with bots on the internet, the bill will prohibit the use of software that enables or assists a person to circumvent the security measures. I note in closing that this reform is modelled on similar reforms that have commenced in New South Wales, and having our legislation aligned with this will hopefully give other jurisdictions throughout Australia something to aspire to in trying to overcome this issue nationwide. I commend the bill.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:55): I rise to support the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill. The bill fulfils another Marshall government election commitment and will strengthen protections for consumers against ticket scalpers. It is important because the bill forms part of a series of amendments to the Fair Trading Act designed to increase consumer rights and protections. The current act has not addressed technological advances since its original passage, including the

advent of ticket bots that purchase tickets online far faster than a person ever could. The bill will protect us, as the terms of the current act are not well defined and enforcement is currently poor.

Buying tickets is usually expensive and can be tricky and these days is often a significant financial investment for most families that I know. A personal example of this occurred last year when I purchased tickets to the cricket—Australia versus England—for my husband for his birthday. He was born in England but has lived here for 28 years, so I thought this would be a good competition for him to watch. Knowing that he loves cricket, but that he needed to give his workplace early notice of the time off during the week, I purchased the tickets a few months before.

Purchasing these tickets was problematic for me for a few reasons. First, I had very little knowledge of which type of cricket games are the most entertaining and so which one to choose; secondly, I was unsure where the good seats in the stadium were; and, thirdly, his workplace often requires a long lead time for leave applications and therefore I did not know whether he would be able to get the time off.

As it turns out, I chose tickets for the last day of a test match. I found out it is called a test match from the member for Newland. In my mind, I thought this could be an exciting point of the game. I subsequently found out, upon telling my husband about this, it was very risky because the game could even be over on that day. This was a worry, given the tickets I bought were a big financial outlay for our family at the time. Furthermore, this gift was made even more worrisome when my husband's employer said that they could not commit to granting leave.

Because so much was up in the air, I emailed the seller to ask if I could have a credit and instead purchase tickets to a sporting event on a weekend. They said the tickets could not be changed and that this was covered somewhere in the terms and conditions, which I did not really have time to read because I was campaigning. This is my most recent example of purchasing event tickets. It was a big outlay for our family. We do not do this very often because we like to go to events together and that usually adds up to a lot of money.

Disappointingly, but not surprisingly, I have heard from other members that the former government did not see this ticket cost as an issue. From my conversations in my community I imagine that purchasing tickets for events is a significant outlay for most families these days. In my electorate, the cost of living has been raised as a major issue for a number of years now, which is one of the key reasons I chose to put my hand up and represent my electorate on the platform of lower costs, better services and more jobs for South Australians. Every day I am so proud to be part of this new government as we announce delivery after delivery of our commitments and the ongoing focus on real change for South Australia.

In other examples, I have heard of people purchasing tickets for AFL matches from people they thought were legitimate people who could not attend the match, only to find out that the tickets did not work for them at the gate. Imagine how disappointed a family would be. Similar incidents have occurred where people have purchased tickets to AFL games only to find that the person who sold them the resell tickets hiked up the price by 50 per cent or more from the original price they paid for the ticket. I am told incidents like this have occurred regularly for AFL finals matches and AFL grand finals, and this is very concerning and, I am sure, very disappointing for everyone involved.

I have heard of other incidents with the cricket where people have resold tickets that are supposed to be only in that person's or that member's name, and then incidents have occurred at the gates for the people who have purchased the resold tickets. Imagine buying a present for someone for their birthday and then it ends up this way on the day. It would be incredibly disappointing. I urge people who are purchasing resold tickets to sporting events to do their research, be cautious and do not purchase resold tickets from people they do not know to avoid being taken for a ride.

The outlay on tickets to events is a big deal for most everyday South Australians. More and more a ticket to a large concert or an established act is a luxury purchase for most people I know. I have not personally attended a music concert for a very long while now for this reason. My son loves Taylor Swift, and when I was researching the cost of her tickets recently I saw that it was reported that Taylor Swift's recent world tour had seats that started from \$60 and went upwards of \$1,300 each near the stage. Imagine taking a family to that. *The Star* reported:

At Swift's upcoming Toronto shows in August, the closest seats are in small supply on the secondary market. Less than 10 tickets were available in the standing area near the stage and each was listed for an asking price of \$1,200 to \$4,200 on the reseller SeatGeek.

Imagine explaining to your child that you had to be miles away from the front because you could not afford that sort of expense.

Therefore, I support the measures to protect South Australians from unscrupulous ticket scalpers. Let's face it, dodgy ticket resellers or scalpers need to be stopped. People who hike up the price like crazy are just taking advantage of people. Buying a ticket from a scalper, whether in person, online or over the phone, carries risks. The ticket may not be genuine or may not be provided at all. Of particular interest in this new bill is clause 37F(2):

A ticket resale advertisement must not specify an amount for the sale of the ticket that exceeds 110% of the original supply cost of the ticket.

Further, clause 37F(3) provides:

A ticket resale advertisement must specify the following particulars:

- (a) the original supply cost of the ticket;
- (b) details of the location from which the ticket holder is authorised to view the event (including, for example, any bay number, row number and seat number for the ticket).

Clause 37G—Restriction on ticket resale profit provides:

A person must not sell a ticket to any other person for an amount that exceeds 110% of the original supply cost of the ticket.

Maximum penalty:

- (a) in the case of a body corporate—\$100 000;
- (b) in the case of a natural person—\$20 000.

Expiation fee: \$550.

This is not small change in any way and is a deterrent to unscrupulous behaviour. I am pleased to support this bill to protect South Australians and make more tickets accessible to more South Australians.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (16:03): I rise today to speak on the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018, which addresses an important issue that I believe many have or will likely deal with at some point in their life. As I am sure many honourable members know, this is an issue that one could argue is as old as time, in that there are always people who seek to gain from the desperation and unfortunate circumstances of others. This is simply a more specific example of this age-old practice of profiting from others who do not have the luxury of choice—a bit dramatic, I know, but in the case of unfair profiteering I believe that such drama is quite apt.

At its core, this bill will form part of a series of amendments to the Fair Trading Act, which are all intended to promote and grow South Australian consumers' rights and to ensure that these rights are subsequently protected. It is unfortunate that such amendments must be made, as one would assume that this issue would have been addressed in previous years. However, it is the case that the current act does not address the new technical avenues that people now use to achieve their wicked results.

The introduction of ticket bots is a prime example of this point, as they are used to purchase multiple tickets in a much shorter span of time than any person possibly could. This results in ticket sales closing mere minutes, if not less, after opening the public purchase. How can we sit back and watch this kind of exploitation of the system that is supposed to make obtaining these tickets a fair process?

I am sure everyone can understand or recall the feeling at some point in their lives of having something they so desperately wanted disappear before their eyes. To then have that feeling followed by the helplessness of knowing you will have to pay considerably more—in a staggering number of cases over 110 per cent more—than you initially planned for the chance to attend the

concert, sporting event, festival and so on that you have been thinking and dreaming about is quite honestly crushing for those in this position.

It is not fair to the honest individuals who just want to purchase a ticket. The present vague and undefined terms of the act need to be addressed and subsequently enforced to avoid consumers suffering a much larger purchase price than they should have to pay just so someone can sit back and profit from their poor luck. This is why this government is pushing for all events taking place in South Australia to be subject to resale restrictions that cap the total resale price at 110 per cent of the total acquisition price. Likewise, including such details as original sale price and seating arrangements in advertising will be essential as part of this bill so as to provide awareness of the options available to the public purchasing these tickets.

The implementation of a small public education campaign about these changes to scalping laws will also help to achieve a broader awareness and understanding of the rights that consumers have when dealing with ticket scalpers and their sales. Outlawing the aforementioned software like ticket bots is also essential to this process of achieving better protections for these consumers, as they currently flout the terms and conditions of the websites used to sell these tickets.

Most websites will in fact actively place warnings against the use of such software on the very pages used to purchase tickets online. Likewise, they impose that only a set number of tickets may be obtained per purchase. This, however, does not hinder the progress of ticket bots, hence the need for such measures in this bill. It is my hope that outlawing this software will not only decrease the number of tickets being circulated by ticket scalpers at elevated prices but also increase the rate of consumers actually purchasing their tickets through these websites at the original asking price and not having to hand over an unnecessarily large amount of money to scalpers who might be using this software.

An interesting point I would like to add is that consumers are already attempting to circumvent ticket scalpers and the possibility of missing out by buying tickets up to 12 months in advance for slightly elevated prices and seats that may not be very well positioned. It seems an absolute farce that these consumers feel that they must, as a rule, pay more than usual for tickets that do not offer them the best seats so that they may avoid paying even more for tickets closer to the event or risk missing out entirely.

It is also important to note that there will be recognition for legitimate circumstances whereby an individual may need to resell their tickets. For example, someone might fall ill, find themselves needing to attend another engagement or possibly even find themselves outside the state at the time of the event, creating a need for a secondary market. After all, what is the point of implementing laws to better the experience and chances of consumers attending a desired event if unexpectedly available seats are not then accessible to people as they arise?

It seems senseless that South Australia must strive to implement legislation that has already been introduced to, and functioned positively in, other Australian states. It is very hard in my opinion to argue with the terms of this bill when they have been largely modelled on legislation passed in New South Wales earlier this year. Why would we oppose amendments that allow people to avoid exploitation while simultaneously addressing the new technological advancements that make such reprehensible acts possible?

Considering how frequently these tickets are purchased as gifts for family and friends in the hope of bringing these individuals' wishes to life, it seems irresponsible to allow the current act to continue in this vein. For the younger consumers who are likely in possession of vastly less money than most, it would be devastating to face the prospect of forking out extra cash that they may not actually have, or alternatively missing out altogether.

South Australia has begun to host more and more large-scale events like concerts, as the member for Colton mentioned earlier, for Adele, Ed Sheeran, Queen, and major sporting events like semifinals and preliminary final AFL games that were sold-out events. With such events as these providing equally large fan bases of people wanting to attend, the implementation of this bill is vitally important to the continued protection of consumers with an interest in attendance at events that attract business for our tourism industry and the general consumer industry of South Australia as a whole.

It is my hope that honourable members can see why this bill is of such importance to the people of South Australia and that they can do the right thing and put this bill through, as it would be an unnecessary evil for the current legislation to continue and for the consumers of South Australia to suffer any further exploitation by ticket scalpers. That is why I commend the bill to the house.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:11): I also rise to make a contribution on the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018. Once again, it is good to be in the house speaking on an issue where the government is delivering on its election promises. In the lead-up to the election, one of the items of policy that we said we would introduce in our first 100 days was of course this bill. It goes on the back of some of the other bills we have been talking about this week in relation to consumer protection, which is very important.

As I said, this is an election commitment to strengthen protections for consumers against ticket scalpers. I am sure almost everyone in this chamber has been subject at some time to a ticket scalper either unknowingly or absolutely voluntarily. In my case, when I wanted to go to the Ashes in 2005 in the United Kingdom, I was very fortunate to get tickets through a ballot for the Edgbaston test match, which was the test match where Ricky Ponting won the toss on a very dreary, wet day and elected to bowl.

In the warm-up for that match, Glenn McGrath rolled his ankle, so Australia went into the second test of the series without him. I think Michael Vaughan made a brilliant century on that opening day at Edgbaston. That was also the test match that we know Australia lost by three runs on the last day. There was that scene where Freddie Flintoff was shaking the hand of Brett Lee. It was one of those great sporting moments, but I digress. After Edgbaston, we went to Manchester. I was doing my 2005 post-uni trip. I did not have any tickets for the Manchester test match, and I was very keen to—

Ms Luethen interjecting:

Mr DULUK: Exactly. The member for King obviously loves her cricket like I do. We rolled up to Manchester without any tickets, and that was probably the first time I had an experience with ticket scalpers. As someone who loves cricket, I obliged and have no doubt that I paid more than 110 per cent of the face value of the tickets. Being my luck, day one was almost a washout, as it inevitably is in Manchester, so that was a lot to pay, but we went back for days two and three and probably had the same bloke scalping tickets outside the gates at Old Trafford.

It was a most enjoyable test match. Day four was washed out again, and the game ended up being a draw. Australia, of course, then went on to lose the final test at The Oval, and we lost the Ashes in that series in 2005. Almost every member of the English team received the Order of the British Empire (OBE) for their efforts in regaining the Ashes for England. That was my first experience of price scalping. I thought, 'This is very unjust.' If only the grounds in the United Kingdom had greater capacity—

Mr Mullighan: You would have got us home in that test.

Mr DULUK: I also could have made a duck.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You could have had an OBE, member for Waite.

Mr DULUK: I could have had an OBE, sir. Of course, when price scalping gets out of control, it is punters, fans and families who inevitably miss out to corporate greed. I think that any government that can do its best to protect the consumer for the greater good of the enjoyment of the many in terms of sporting events is very exciting. Some of my friends faced the issue of ticket scalping at the 2017 AFL Grand Final. I think many of my friends who paid exorbitant prices wish there was a refund policy on ticket scalping.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: Wrong result.

Mr DULUK: It was the wrong result. They are some of the issues that mums and dads in the street, the general public, face when there is price gouging of this type. The new Marshall Liberal government is looking to fix up an area where the previous government failed, in particular the former responsible minister for this legislation, the member for Mawson. He effectively created a bit of a toothless tiger in what was then the Major Events Act 2013. With our bill, we hope that events such

as the Big Bash, with the fantastically popular Strikers, and the Showdown can be protected under this legislation.

The current law only applies to the rare occasion when a major event has been formally declared and, even then, there has been no serious attempt to enforce that law, as I said previously. So this measure is pretty important. The prevalence of ticket scalping denies fair access to tickets for members of the public who love sporting events and live entertainment. The South Australian public, in my view, deserve more effective protection in this practice.

That is why this bill seeks to modernise ticket-scalping legislation to reflect the present day reality of how people purchase tickets, such as, obviously, online. Going back to the Crows making the grand final last year, there was a division between some members of the public who are not tech-savvy who had to line up at Ticketek, BASS or Ticketmaster, competing for tickets at the same time as they could be purchased by the online mechanism.

I think the last thing we ever want to do, especially in terms of sporting events, is see lifelong dedicated members who go week in, week out—whether it be Crows, Port, Central District Football Club or whatever their sport is—be denied the opportunity to watch the teams they love on the most important days in the sporting calendars. Whether it is the Ashes, cricket, football, concerts or whatever the occasion, we want the South Australian public to be able to enjoy it live just like they do on any other week of the year.

This bill forms part of a series of amendments to the Fair Trading Act designed to increase consumer rights and protections. As I said, the current act does not address technological advances since the original passage back in 2014, including what is now the advent of ticket bots that purchase tickets online far faster than a person ever could. As many members have said in their contributions, people spent hours waiting to buy tickets to the Adele and Ed Sheeran concerts. They logged into their accounts the minute the tickets were due to go on sale, only to find that the ticket allocation was exhausted. It is not fair to the consumer that bots are able to take tickets this quickly.

I do not believe in the big arm of government. I do not believe in overregulation, but I do believe in a fair playing field for all. Once again, it is about a regulated product. Attendance at sporting events, the sale of liquor, cigarettes and gaming products are all regulated events and products that society deems that government has an obligation to regulate. It is important, as I have been saying and will continue to say and always will champion in this house, for families and mum-and-dad punters in the street to be able to enjoy concerts, sport or whatever they like. It would be great if we had this problem when we were buying opera tickets or tickets to the symphony orchestra as well, but they do not seem to have this issue as much as other events.

All too often fans log onto a ticketing website only to find that, as soon as tickets go on sale, those words 'allocation exhausted' are displayed. These disappointed fans are then shocked when they find out that there are plenty of tickets available on resale sites but for a grossly inflated price. Some of those inflated prices are in line with the Zimbabwe rates of inflation. It is certainly worrying to a lot of people that you can normally get a ticket to the AFL Grand Final for a couple of hundred bucks and all of a sudden it is on there for a couple of thousand dollars and you think you are in Harare. Adele tickets, for example, recently were selling at 700 times their value. I am not sure what the true worth of Adele tickets are. One would argue that it is whatever the market pays and so it is.

Mr Pederick: She can sing.

Mr DULUK: She certainly can sing, member for Hammond, but with the Adele concerts that were recently in Australia and South Australia, within minutes of the tickets going on sale, resale sites were selling tickets for \$5,000 when the highest retail price then was \$308 for a premium ticket. After the tickets went on sale, viagogo had 140,000 searches for Adele tickets.

Because the Ed Sheeran concert in Adelaide earlier in the year was not declared a major event, tickets were being sold at double the retail price. B reserve originally was priced at \$104.50 and was being resold on viagogo for \$266. C reserve was originally priced at \$73.95 and was being resold on Gumtree for \$190. A reserve, originally priced at \$165.90, was being sold on Gumtree for \$250.

Another major issue, apart from the increased price, is that the tickets sold on viagogo are not always legitimate. For the WA Ed Sheeran concerts, 173 of the 194 tickets found to be fake were sold by viagogo. Of course, there is an obligation, no doubt, of buyer beware. As a buyer, if you are going on these sites, a fair degree of public caution is always required, but I suppose it is for us as legislators to ensure that we make sure that individuals are responsible for their own actions.

If they are prepared to go on these type of sites to purchase these tickets, there is a bit of buyer beware and there is no point complaining too much after you go down that path, but at the same time, as I have said, we have an obligation to ensure that mums and dads in the street from suburbia, from my electorate in Blackwood or coming down from Berri to Adelaide to go to Ed Sheeran, have just the same right, or the same opportunity, as anybody else to go to a concert.

For the first 2017 Showdown between the Crows and the Power, scalpers had swooped on the tickets and were looking to profit by up to 300 per cent on the face value of these tickets. I assume that was a Crows game and I assume that we won. In August 2017, the former government bowed to pressure and reclassified Adelaide and Port Adelaide football finals as major events, but this, I remember, was quite hotly debated and only came after our shadow at the time, the member for Chaffey, urged this to happen. He was out there protecting the interests of sports fans in Adelaide.

At the time, the then sports minister, and now member for Mawson, downplayed the problem of scalping, suggesting it was not as serious as was being reported. There are a few quotes in relation to that. I suppose what we need to address, in terms of the current act that we are looking to amend, is the definition of scalping and current enforcement, which is poor. Of course, it is always difficult to enforce things, especially within the federation and where ticketholders might be purchasing tickets from an interstate jurisdiction.

What are we doing? Under the Major Events Act, the government needs to declare an event as a major event for ticket-scalping provisions to operate. We will repeal section 9 of the Major Events Act and amend the Fair Trading Act so that the laws apply to any event in South Australia that is subject to resale restrictions. What else are we doing? We are going to prohibit the advertising or hosting of any event where tickets are selling for over 110 per cent of the ticket price, in addition to capping the total resale price to 110 per cent of the total acquisition price, requiring that any resale advertisement includes specific details, such as the original cost and seating arrangement. I think that is something that is really important about the 'buyer beware' aspect.

If we can ensure, in terms of tickets that are being sold to South Australians—that is, from people who are reselling tickets—that the buyers know what the original face value of that ticket was and what they are receiving, because the last thing you want to do is to rock up to the last Saturday in September at the MCG and realise that you have paid \$1,000 or \$100 for a non-viewing standing spot in the southern stand at the MCG. If your team loses, maybe you are not too fussed by half time, but when you originally get there and you say, 'Gee, I forked out a lot of dough for this non-seating, non-viewing spot at the MCG,' it certainly is a bit of a price to pay. So ensuring that consumers have all the facts in front of them is very important.

What else are we doing under these changes? We will outlaw software, such as ticket bots, which contravenes the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets, and we will be increasing the number of compliance officers for enforcement of minor breaches. Offences will also be introduced to enable quick and effective enforcement of minor breaches without having to pursue costly court action. This will also act as an effective deterrent to others.

In terms of some of the penalties, for body corporates the maximum penalty under proposed section 37H of the act is \$100,000, and for a natural person \$20,000, and there is provision for on-the-spot expiation fees of \$550. For failure to comply with the ticketing resale advertising provisions under proposed section 37I(1) it is the same thing: for a body corporate, a \$100,000 penalty, and a penalty of \$20,000 for an individual, but of course there is an on-the-spot expiation fee of \$550 to ensure that a quick deterrent can be put to those who are seeking to contravene this important legislation.

The government recognises that legitimate circumstances do exist in which a person may want to resell their tickets and that therefore there should be a secondary market. For example, you might actually buy grand final tickets and then realise that your team did not make the grand final,

such as the Port Adelaide Football Club. You might be a big Port supporter but then you realise they did not make the finals, so you want to resell your grand final tickets. That is completely fair enough. It is completely understandable that someone would want to do that.

You might be a Collingwood supporter and they win one or two games in a row and you think, 'Oh, they're going to win the finals. I'm going to book prelim tickets,' and then you realise that they don't make the prelim at all. They don't make the finals again. In fact, I think the only supporters who are protected by this legislation are probably Carlton supporters because they will not be back in the finals at this rate.

I think it is important that, in a case of changed circumstances such as sickness and family reasons, people who have purchased tickets in good faith to attend an event have an opportunity to resell those tickets should they not be able to make it, because that interaction is within the normal intercourse of purchasing and selling, which is obviously completely fine and to be encouraged, and that is what commerce is about.

In terms of consumer rights, there has been strong consultation with the Tourism Commission of South Australia in drafting this bill, and I understand that it is quite supportive of these changes. I believe this bill is largely modelled on legislation that passed the New South Wales parliament earlier this year. So, from a South Australian jurisdictional point of view, there is an opportunity to create uniformity within the federation.

In the time that I have left, I would like to say that this bill is part of a suite of measures around consumer protection, which we have been debating this week. It is important that it also backs onto this parliament and South Australia as a jurisdiction, changing and creating legislation that reflects the changing use by consumers, especially in regard to the interface with new technologies. We saw that last week with the passing of Carly's Law through the parliament. We beefed up the criminal intent penalties for individuals who purport to be not who they are via the use of the internet. From the consumer protection point of view, we are looking to do the same.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (16:30): I rise to speak on the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill, and I do so with great interest. This is something that I have long pursued here in South Australia, particularly in my previous role as shadow minister for sport and recreation. It showed me that the system was flawed and that scalpers could go behind a law that was flawed.

This bill is just an example of my wish, my want and this party's pledge, an election commitment to benefit the passionate people of South Australia. The member for Waite talked eloquently about his experiences at the cricket and the football. As we have all said on this side of the house, it is an experience for the majority of people to attend sports events or concerts. Any event that is a highly sought-after ticket is a highly prized event to attend.

This has become quite a topical issue in recent years, and I have been concerned for the people being exploited. Scalpers were getting away with scalping at exorbitant prices. There was also fraudulent activity; that is, there were fake tickets, and people would get to events inevitably to find paying customers in those seats. Those tickets had either been duplicated, or customers would find when they got there that there was no such thing as row X, Y or Z or seat 400.

The messages and communication I have received from enthusiastic sports fans who had been duped or scalped have come from far and wide. We have heard many examples about the exorbitant increase in prices. In some cases, people cannot get to sporting events for legitimate reasons so they want to onsell tickets, and by law they can onsell only at 110 per cent. But what really raises eyebrows is that, while scalpers were creating havoc and flouting the system, the previous minister said that it was not happening, that it was not going on and that there was no evidence that it was happening. I fronted the minister, the media and my colleagues and showed them examples of the digital capacity for people to buy a large number of tickets online and then onsell them.

Buying a large number of tickets takes away the rights of genuine sports fans who are long-serving supporters or passionate advocates for different sporting codes. It is also about going to concerts, particularly some of the music concerts—and there are too many to name—but most of

those people who were approached by scalpers and who buy those scalped tickets are desperate to see their favourite son or daughter in a sporting team or on stage singing their favourite tune.

This bill will strengthen protections for consumers. It is about consumer protection and it is long overdue. The buck has been passed for a long time, particularly with respect to who is responsible, whether it was actually happening, whether there has been enough policing around it happening and making sure that the websites responsible take them down and not ignoring the complaints and the plight of people who have experienced the scourge of scalping. Of course, dealing with digitised ticket purchasing, online systems and the ticket bots buying copious numbers of tickets is a fact of life these days. I know that some of them are buying a quota every day, and in some cases that quota is hundreds of tickets.

Under the Major Events Act, the government needs to declare that an event is a major event for the ticket scalper provisions to be operative. Too often promoters and government decided they would not declare events major events because there are more criteria and a bit more effort has to go into an event that has been declared major—that is, security has to be beefed up and traffic conditions have to be altered. There is also an expense involved, so promoters and government tend not to do that. However, on this side we have heard about and we have seen what scalping is doing to our passionate sporting event goers and concertgoers, so we are going to act. I think it is a good outcome.

Importantly, the bill will prohibit the advertising or the hosting of advertising of any event where tickets are selling for over 110 per cent of the original ticket price in addition to capping the total resale price at 110 per cent of the total acquisition price. It also requires that any resale advertisement includes specific details, such as the original cost and seating arrangements. It will also outlaw software such as ticket bots, which I have mentioned and which contravene the terms and conditions of websites that sell these tickets.

The previous government failed to enforce the ticket-scalping laws under the Major Events Act. Declaring an event a major event does come with a cost. However, I think it was ignorance and, in some cases, arrogance when some were claiming that it was not happening when it was happening as plain as is the nose on a person's face. Also, there will be an increase in the number of compliance officers for the enforcement of minor breaches, and expiable offences will be introduced to enable quick and effective enforcement of minor breaches without having to pursue costly court action. There is nothing like a cash deterrent because cash hurts the hip pocket. A fine will certainly deter some. I guess once the law has been amended and made compliant and effective, we will see much less ticket scalping going on.

Ticket scalping is a scourge on the enthusiast. We have to be fair. Do I say that this bill will rid us of ticket scalping 100 per cent? Probably not, but we have raised our hand and said that we are going to protect consumers, because we are listening to those consumers. We are listening to the people who have been impacted for such a long, long time. I know that the member for Waite has related some of his experiences in terms of the test cricket and the footy. I remember as a young fellow, which is not that long ago, really—

Mr Teague: Pretty much right now.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —yes, as a teenager, not that long ago—going to a concert and being approached by scalpers. It really did amaze me. I did not buy it, but the person standing behind me did and bought it at great cost.

It is important that we do not penalise people who genuinely want to resell their tickets. As I said, there are genuine excuses for people who cannot attend or, for one reason or another, have seen fit not to go to the event they have purchased the ticket for, so they will onsell, but there are criteria. We know that Australia's major sporting bodies do not oppose the onselling of tickets at face value where there is valid reason. There are many bona fide purchasers who intend to use the tickets but, as I said, have a genuine reason not to attend.

Previously, the only protections from ticket scalping came, as I said, through the Major Events Act 2013. However, we have consistently seen those events sold out and we have seen the

scalpers do what they do, exploiting people who are enthusiastic attendees. More importantly, it is those people who are desperate to attend events who are, sadly, somewhat vulnerable.

One of the events that I recall in my role with the shadow sport portfolio was a Big Bash semifinal between the Adelaide Strikers and the Sydney Thunder. When the Twenty20 came to Adelaide Oval it was a huge event. It is a great event. It is short, sharp, shiny and great for families. I think the event was sold out in less than two hours. Sadly, those tickets were selling for five and more times the original ticket value.

Families wanting to go along to enjoy a good family event were the people who missed out. It was affordable entertainment. For those who have been to a Big Bash event, there is plenty of flame and smoke and fireworks, but there is also plenty of big bash and plenty of hard-hitting cricket. It is really intense sport for 100 minutes. These days, people are time poor and they want to go along to an event, have a great experience, get in and get out.

It was not just the sporting events that were impacted. Many of our much publicised music events have also been ransacked by scalpers. I am an Adele fan, I am not afraid to admit. She has a magnificent voice and the stage show was second to none—it was an outstanding concert. People were standing outside that concert selling tickets for five and ten times the cost of the ticket and, sadly, people were paying it. People were very keen to go into that concert and be a part of it. If they did get a ticket, rightly or wrongly, it was money well invested.

The bill will finally provide greater protection against these types of examples. As I have said, in my previous role as shadow for sport, the people I spoke to were the reason I continue to pursue the scalpers and continue to strongly advocate on behalf of consumers. I am very proud to be part of a government that is going to act to make sure that they tighten up the legislation so that they protect our enthusiastic sport fanatics and our fanatical concertgoers because these are the people who are being done over. If they have not gone into the ticket box in time or they have not gone online in time and the concerts and matches are sold out, they are then susceptible to scalpers doing their thing, increasing ticket prices by a significant amount of money.

I think these organisations will welcome the bill and the message sent to ticket scalpers that in South Australia they can no longer exploit enthusiastic and passionate fans without persecution. Without further ado, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:44): I rise today to speak on 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 is yet another commitment that the Marshall Liberal government committed to introducing within its first 100 days of government, and I am very proud to be part of a team that has been delivering on its commitments in the first 100 days.

We were very clear, going to the election, on what we are going to deliver for South Australia and we have been ticking boxes daily to uphold those commitments. I know the people of South Australia very much appreciate a government that has indicated what it is going to do and then deliver on those commitments, and that is the government we want to be. I also commend the Attorney, who has moved quickly to introduce this legislation, and hope that it will receive support from both sides of parliament.

This legislation is long overdue. The former government truly dropped the ball on this issue. It failed to hear the complaints of thousands of South Australians who are well and truly tired of being ripped off by ticket-scalping bots, who are sick of spending hundreds of dollars on inflated ticket prices and who are sick of being turned away from events because they were sold fake tickets online. That is where this has come from.

This has been a problem for South Australian families, in particular, who want to go to events—concerts, sporting events, whatever it might be—but the ticket bots have come through and swept up all the tickets. They are then sold back online at exorbitant prices, and families invariably miss out because they cannot pay those prices. The Marshall Liberal team tried to tackle this issue from opposition in the previous parliament, and I was proud to introduce a very similar bill during the last session of parliament. I know that the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place is a keen supporter

of protecting consumers and finally putting an end to ticket scalping, and I hope those views are supported in this chamber.

Ticket scalping these days does not occur in front of a stadium, or even around the corner in a shady venue. There are fewer and fewer overcoats and less and less cash changing hands on site. The serious offenders are the online ticket-scalping bots that I mentioned a few moments ago; they buy up hundreds of tickets and try to sell them at inflated prices. For those who are unaware, that is probably the real change in the landscape now.

Technology does some wonderful things in our society. Everyone these days has a smart phone or an iPhone or something like that, and when you do get your tickets you can often just have them on your phone and scan them as you walk through. The technology is absolutely outstanding, but there are signs that people are using the technology to take advantage of others. These ticket bots are one such example of technology not being used for good. These organisations have very intricate computer programs. I am not a computer boffin, that is for sure, but I am told by the computing experts that these programs are set in place and when tickets come online, on sale, they just swoop in and buy copious amounts.

If you or I were to go online, Mr Deputy Speaker, be it on our phone or on the internet, when we get through we can generally purchase only a limited amount, three or four or whatever it might be. If you are going with a group of eight, you have to try to ring through twice or get online twice to try to get tickets together, and it is very hard to do. However these bots bypass that technology, bypass that road map if you like, and swoop through and collect a lot of tickets. They suck up all the tickets and then they go and resell them back online. Some might say it is an ingenious business model, but it is not a fair business model, and that is the problem we have here.

We think South Australians should have a fair opportunity to purchase these tickets as well. It is these bots, these systems, that we want to crack down on, when people get these tickets and go and sell them online at exorbitant prices. This bill will make it an offence to advertise a sporting or entertainment ticket for resale at a price that is more than 110 per cent of the original supply cost of the ticket; that is, the cost of the ticket plus 10 per cent. One of the members on the other side, the member for Florey, raised this with me and said, 'Why are you allowing the extra 10 percent?' which is a very good and valid question.

We know there are fees and charges that go on a ticket when you purchase it, so we do not want to stop anyone who has legitimately purchased a ticket for an event but then cannot go to that event from being able to reclaim their costs. Within that 10 per cent margin, they can reclaim the cost of the fees and charges that go with purchasing a ticket. That is the reason for the extra 10 per cent, which I think everyone that I have spoken to feels is very fair and reasonable.

If you do purchase a ticket but you cannot go to an event because you are sick or have something else on, such as someone's birthday or whatever it might be, you can still sell your ticket online but at 110 per cent of the original price, with that 10 per cent extra to cover your fees and charges.

The bill also provides for substantial maximum penalties for breaches of the antiscalping laws, including a \$20,000 fine for an individual and a \$100,000 fine for a body corporate. These penalties will apply to both the advertisement of tickets for resale and the actual resale of tickets above original acquisition costs. That means that if you advertise the tickets online at an exorbitant price, you can be fined. If you are an individual doing it and you are trying to sell off a couple of tickets at an exorbitant price, you can be fined up to \$20,000. If it is one of these ticket bot companies that is actually doing it and then putting it online, that company can be fined \$100,000. I think that is a significant impost and, we hope, a strong deterrent to stop people doing this because, again, it is a scourge.

I heard that the Minister for Primary Industries, who spoke before me, is a big Adele fan. When Adele comes to town, we want South Australians to be able to go to those concerts. We want South Australian families to be able to purchase the tickets at the price that is advertised and go along to those concerts. When Adele comes to town, or any other concert or event for that matter, they set their ticket prices. Obviously, they make a profit. They are wonderfully talented artists who deserve to make profits out of their skills and talents, so they set their ticket price. It is not for someone

else to come along, because they have a good technical system where they can swoop in and purchase a heap of tickets, and profiteer off that.

That is not fair, that is not right, and it is not fair on the consumer in South Australia. That is why we are bringing this law into place, and we know South Australians will very much appreciate us cracking down on this. When these concerts come to town, all South Australians should have the opportunity to go and get the tickets at the price that the artist, in this case, demands for the ticket and not the overinflated price they are forced to pay if they have to go online and some other entity has been able to swoop in, collect tickets and then profiteer off extra demand.

The Minister for Primary Industries also spoke about sporting events, and we know this happens in sporting events. As he pointed out, we do not want this happening for people who are going to the Big Bash, which is a great example. Tickets are \$20 or \$30 and are designed for families to be able to go to this event and enjoy it together. But, when the surge of popularity comes—if the Strikers make a final or something like that—all of a sudden people who have been going all season can no longer afford to buy tickets.

The demand rises and these operators electronically go through and purchase a whole wad of tickets and then go and sell them at an exorbitant profit online, and families miss out, and that is what is disappointing. We do not want to see that happen. Another important 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 gives a perspective of how many tickets will be out there in the market.

Again, I mentioned that when you go online and purchase tickets for a concert or a sporting event, generally you can only buy a limited number, if it were you or me, Mr Deputy Speaker. You could potentially just get enough for your family or a couple of mates, whoever is going to the event.

However, when these bots sweep through and collect all the tickets, no-one knows how many the regular public got and how many were picked up by the bots. Through the event organiser declaring how many tickets are available, the public will then know and it will be all aboveboard. Fans should know how many tickets are available to an event, which is the reason that the minister has put in these powers to enable public disclosure on ticket numbers.

This really is a great bill. As we said, we went to the election with a number of election commitments and a lot of them were hinged around cost-of-living issues, and this is just one. It is a small one, but one that is a piece in the puzzle. This bill will enable South Australians not to be gouged by ticket scalpers. Ultimately, it means that money stays in people's pockets. The Minister for Primary Industries spoke about going to a Strikers game, where tickets were advertised online. Tickets that cost \$20 or \$30 were advertised for \$200 or more. Think about that: that is 10 games that someone could go to if they can pay \$20 for the ticket as opposed to \$200 for one ticket.

That really puts money back into the pockets of South Australians and gives them more cash. They can decide to go to more games or they can decide to spend the money elsewhere. But, if they are being forced to pay \$200, they miss out economically. The point raised is that they can take their family. If it is \$20 a ticket, they can take your whole family, have a wonderful family night out and watch the game for under the \$200 they would otherwise have to pay for the ticket.

At the moment, people are profiteering out of events, concerts and sporting events. I think the member for Lee even mentioned that it could happen at a *Frozen* concert, which would be terrible—concerts that are put on for families, for parents and grandparents to take their kids—and to be priced out of the market because someone is profiteering in this manner really is not acceptable. As I have been involved in pushing this barrow for a long time, I am very proud that this is one of our 100-day commitments that we have before the parliament, and I hope that we get support from both sides of the house and that the bill is progressed through so that we can do everything in our power to stop the gouging and the scourge of ticket scalpers in South Australia.

As I mentioned, the government recognises that legitimate circumstances exist where people may want to resell their tickets, and therefore they need a secondary market, so we are not stopping that if people want to sell them online and that sort of thing. Technology is advancing, people can do that and that is fine, but we want to make sure that they are not selling them at that excessive price,

profiteering from selling someone else's tickets or making money out from the people putting on the show.

Consumer and Business Services consulted the Tourism Commission in the drafting of this bill, which is fantastic because we wanted to make sure the Tourism Commission had a say in the way we went with this. The bill was modelled largely on legislation passed in New South Wales earlier this year, so it was great to be able to dovetail in with what they have done in New South Wales, and by all accounts they are having success there with the bill. We hope that it does send a strong message to the people out there who are doing this type of thing.

Interestingly, and I have made the point already, I note that when artists put on a concert there are a lot of things to take into account: the staging, the travel, the whole lot, and then the fee for service for their wonderful talents. They do put a price on a ticket with all that taken into account, and they put it out there and the market will decide whether or not people want to go to those concerts.

I refer to Ed Sheeran, who had a concert, I think last year (I did not get to go, but I know that my kids did), and for his concert he put an anti ticket-scalping mechanism in place, so we have an artist who is really singing from our hymn sheet—and he is a good singer, too, and he is singing very well. He sees the same problem I have been identifying here this afternoon, and clearly it happens all round the world. So, given that we have charge of our local jurisdiction, it is really important that we enact this legislation to stop the scourge of ticket scalping.

Ed Sheeran identified the problem, said that he did not want people doing this and put a few mechanisms in place. Unfortunately, I think that some tickets were reported as still being sold at higher prices, but his point is that he is putting on the concert, that he is performing for the people of the local area—in this case, he was performing for South Australians in our great state—and he wanted to make sure that his fans, and a lot of them were kids who would have saved their pocket money, worked part-time jobs or done extra work around the house or whatever it might have been, were able to afford to buy their tickets. Families and parents as well might have bought tickets for the whole family.

When the ticket-scalping machine gets going, the price skyrockets, and that just hurts families and turns families off concerts. I know that there are people out there who, when tickets go on sale, if they are all swept up really quickly, do not even think about going to the concert. They think, 'It is just too hard, I can't get online, I won't be able to get tickets,' and they almost give up before they start. Now people will have the opportunity because the gouging will not be able to happen. Also, when tickets get resold, we want to make sure that they are not fake or counterfeit tickets, and we want to make sure that the resold tickets can be used for the event they are sold for.

Having that 110 per cent leeway means that people selling tickets will be far more inclined to be genuine and legitimate ticket resellers because they are not doing it to turn a massive profit out of their tickets. We think 10 per cent is fair and reasonable and will cover any fees and charges from the purchase of the ticket. Really what we are doing is killing a black market in ticket sales so that people will genuinely know that tickets for sale online are from people legitimately selling tickets for that event.

My kids go to a lot of the festivals around town. They will book a ticket for a festival here or potentially interstate, and then something will come up and they will not be able to go. They will get a better offer from another friend or a boyfriend or a girlfriend will invite them somewhere else, so they will sell their festival ticket. Again, they can go and resell that, but at that 10 per cent margin so that they can still get their money back. Kids can spend money; if anyone has kids, they know they can spend it and spend it fast. So if they can get their money back for the ticket they have purchased, then that is a benefit.

Again, I commend this bill to the house. It is one we put forward in the last term of parliament and it was disappointing that we could not get more traction to get it through. I think South Australian families will really appreciate this. It will help with the cost of living, the burden that all South Australian families have been feeling. We know we have had the highest electricity prices in the nation, thanks to those on the other side, who left us with that burden as well, and the general cost of day-to-day living keeps pushing through the roof for families.

This is something that we think will make it easier for families to get access to tickets for concerts and sporting events. We want to keep families here in South Australia and we want to keep people here in our great state. We know young people are leaving at a rate of knots and we want to stop that, to circumvent that and start bringing them back. If you want to have a family, there is no better place in the world to have a family than right here in South Australia. Part of that is a quality of life and quality things around you, like a house and a car and a job, and wanting your family to be able to go to events like this. Having a bill like this in place is beneficial to families on a very big scale.

I commend this bill to the house because removing the scourge of ticket scalpers is something that we have talked about for a long time in this place, and to have the action here now is a very big bonus for all South Australians. I again thank the Attorney for moving this bill and I look forward to its swift passage through this house and through the upper house as well. I know that South Australians will be appreciative when we can implement this bill.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (17:03): I, too, rise to talk to the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill effectively repeals section 9 of the Major Events Act 2013 and makes amendments to the Fair Trading Act. The primary reason for the amendments to the Fair Trading Act is that it is administered by the Consumer and Business Services organisation or subset, more accurately, of the Attorney-General's Department. They have considerable experience in administering consumer-based transactions and, as a result, the decision has been made to enhance the act under which they operate and to use that as a vehicle through which reform will be taken.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

Mr MURRAY: I note for the benefit of the house that there will be no tickets on sale for the minister's shot at the basket there!

The Major Events Act was brought into effect in 2014 and had some alleged protections in place to ensure that no ticket scalping was taking place. The practical problem was that events had to be deemed or declared as major before any such protection could be brought to bear for consumers. Not surprisingly, the complete lack of capacity by the then government to do that, whether it was deliberate or not, meant that as recently as 2017 not a single person had been prosecuted for scalping tickets. Clearly, that was not working.

As I said, the intention is to instead move scalping protection out of the Major Events Act and into the fair trading regime. Ticket scalping, of course, is the purchase and resale, usually at exorbitant rates, of tickets to an event of one sort or another. We have heard all sorts of contributions today about events that members have attended and paid exorbitant prices for, so I will not belabour the point insofar as what constitutes scalping. It is interesting that ticket scalping is now facilitated through some of the major websites, particularly eBay, Gumtree, etc., and that it utilises quite sophisticated software to enable it to occur.

I also noted with considerable interest a fact given in the introductory speeches, and it has been referred to again this afternoon, that some Adele tickets were on sale for 700 times their true value, some \$5,000, I think the figure was. I, too, feel the need to confess that I am something of an Adele fan; of course, she runs subject to the primacy of Cold Chisel, etc. Having said that, I could not see myself paying 700 times the face value for a ticket to go see her, nonetheless, people do.

The other important point is that there is a need for a secondary market for tickets. There will be circumstances under which people purchased tickets that have an irrevocable nature who have, by virtue of sickness, ill health or some other completely valid reason, a need to endeavour to recover their investment. In those circumstances, it is entirely appropriate that they have the ability to recover their investment.

In making these changes to the Fair Trading Act, we are not seeking to prevent people from recouping their investment, but we are putting in place a variety of measures to address some of the existing problems, as we see it, with the Major Events Act. In doing so, we provide consumers with far more enhanced capabilities vis-a-vis protection of their rights and visibility of the marketplace with regard to the tickets that are the subject of the sale.

Looking at the current issues with the Major Events Act, as detailed it relies on the minister declaring an event to be a major event. The sheer breadth of the number of events we have heard

referred to today, which can be readily found on any website, means that there is an almost unlimited scope for ticket scalping. As a result, preventing it via the declaration of an event to be a major event simply fails the pub test, quite frankly. There has also been an inability to effectively enforce the current provisions.

The current provisions do not address the question of software or ticket bots. It has been a source of minor joy for me today to listen to a variety of speakers cover off the question of software bots, how they go about working and the best way to cover those. I will leave the technological discussion to others, but it is interesting to see that, essentially, the way the proposed changes will address the issue is not on the basis of any form of software but is simply by making it illegal for someone to seek to circumvent the terms and conditions on a website that is selling tickets.

In the case of a company it is a maximum penalty of \$100,000 and in the case of an individual it is \$20,000. It is putting in some real teeth to prevent the use of the software and to track people back at the source. The way in which the Fair Trading Act will be amended is to implement a series of resale restrictions. In so doing, it will prohibit the hosting of an advertisement for resale of tickets at anything exceeding 110 per cent of the original cost of the ticket. This is a setting that aligns with other jurisdictions interstate.

In addition, the resale advertisement has to contain items, such as the original supply cost, row numbers, bay numbers, etc., that the ticketholder needs in order to access or view the event. As discussed, software bots will be effectively banned or criminalised, or at least rendered illegal, with a maximum fine of \$100,000 for corporations and \$20,000 for individuals. Interestingly, the majority of the legislation makes use of expiation fees. In this case, there is an expiation fee of some \$550.

The reforms not only increase the transparency available to consumers within the primary market for tickets but they also extend that transparency and protection for the resale of tickets into the secondary market on the websites and in the newspapers, as we have discussed. The intention is that, as a result, consumers will be better informed. They will have information, for example, on the number of seats available and therefore the likely demand for the ticket they are purchasing, as well as some protection vis-a-vis price.

The use of Consumer and Business Services, which currently administers the Fair Trading Act, brings with it several practical, real-world advantages, which means that this legislative change, this regime, will actually work. They currently have the systems, processes and structures, etc., in place in order to prosecute and, where necessary, advise and/or warn organisations in their current role of protecting the consumer. It therefore makes sense to have them undertake a supervisory and enforcement role in this regard.

The act makes reference to authorised officers. They are already defined under the Fair Trading Act. With the passage of this bill, those authorised officers will undertake compliance within the act itself and will also undertake whatever necessary enforcement activities are required. Additionally, they will provide advice to consumers who have questions or complaints with regard to ticket scalping. As I said earlier, a very deliberate part of the structure of the changes to the act is to enable quick and effective enforcement via the use of expiable offences. Each of the offences carries an expiation amount to enable quick and effective implementation of the enforcement of the act.

On this basis—the fact that this is an effective change that brings about real practical application of changes that will actually protect consumers, provide them with transparency and provide them with the capacity to have someone working on their side full time utilising pre-existing offices and structures and people who have those skill sets already in place—the end result is that we can expect to see for the first time in South Australia effective protection of consumers by virtue of outlawing the practice of ticket scalping. On that basis, I commend the bill to the house.

Ms HABIB (Elder) (17:15): As Bob Marley famously said in one of his songs—and I have a bad singing voice, so I will not sing it—'Get up, stand up, stand up for your rights. Get up, stand up, don't give up the fight.' That is exactly what the new Marshall Liberal government is doing, but we are not only standing up for our rights, we are standing up for the rights of all South Australians.

Imagine if we were so fortunate as to have had Bob Marley, back in his day, come to Adelaide to perform, as we have had big acts like Adele and Ed Sheeran in recent times, or imagine if we had

the AFL Grand Final here in Adelaide and one of our beloved teams, the Crows or the Power, whichever one you might like, was playing. Many of us would, without a doubt, be desperate to see the show or the game.

Unfortunately, there would be a large proportion of genuine fans who, for a number of reasons, would not be able to purchase tickets as quickly as some internet pages or other consumers and might find themselves in a position where they have been offered to purchase tickets well in excess of the original ticket price. In some cases, concert or sporting tickets have been purchased and resold for twice or triple the original ticket price by ticket scalpers or outlawed ticket bots that contravene the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets.

Recognising this injustice, the Marshall Liberal team promised prior to the election that we would introduce legislation to protect people wanting to genuinely attend major events, like the Showdown, the Big Bash and music concerts, from paying massive prices to ticket scalpers. We promised to do so within our first 100 days of government, so it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak in favour of this bill, the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018, yet another one of our election commitments being delivered when and as we promised.

This bill is absolutely crucial to increase consumer protections in relation to ticket scalping in South Australia because the current law requires an event to be declared a major event before it becomes an offence for a person to sell tickets at a price higher than 10 per cent of the face value of the ticket without the permission of the organiser. But promoters are loath to go through the expensive, cumbersome and time-consuming ordeal of getting a major event declaration, and we are not aware of a single scalper being prosecuted, despite the prevalence of this denial of fair access to tickets for members of the public who love sporting events and live entertainment.

All too often, fans log onto a ticketing website only to find that, after they press the refresh button several times after the release of tickets, the dreaded words 'allocation exhausted' are displayed. These disappointed fans—and I know I have been one of them several times—are then shocked when they find out that there are plenty of tickets available on resale sites, but for hugely inflated prices. For example, for last year's first Showdown between the Crows and the Power, scalpers had swooped on tickets and were looking to profit by up to 300 per cent on the face value of the ticket. This indeed does make a mockery of anyone's claim that scalping is not an issue.

How do scalpers obtain tickets when devoted sports and entertainment fans cannot? Increasingly, computer programs, or bots as they are called, are being used that enable scalpers to buy tickets in remarkably quick time. The use of bots allows security measures on ticketing websites to be cheated so that large numbers of tickets can be purchased. This not only blocks fans but enables scalpers to take a free ride on the backs of organisers who run the risk of staging events.

Other states have introduced measures to prevent scalping to send a clear message to these opportunists that they are not welcome. Now we, too, in South Australia are saying it is not acceptable to rip-off everyday mums and dads and people of all ages who are genuine fans and want to attend a sports game or a live concert. It is important to note, however, that the government recognises that legitimate circumstances exist in which a person may want to resell their tickets and that therefore there is a need for a secondary market. We know that there are times when people buy a ticket and, for whatever reason, something else comes up and they need to sell the ticket on. That secondary market should not be at the expense of consumer rights.

Specifically, this bill will prohibit the advertising or hosting the advertising of any event where tickets are selling for over 110 per cent of the ticket price and cap the total resale price at 110 per cent of the total acquisition price. It will require that any resale advertisement includes specific details, such as the original costs and seating arrangements. It will also outlaw software, such as ticket bots, which contravenes the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets. This bill will also increase the number of compliance officers for enforcement of minor breaches.

These reforms will not only increase transparency within the primary market but also enhance consumer protection with respect to the resale of tickets via the secondary market. Consumers will be better able to access the availability of tickets and will have greater information available to them to make an informed decision when purchasing tickets. Nobody wants to be caught

out when they think they are purchasing a ticket only to find out that the ticket does not actually exist. Quite simply, this bill will put consumers first and I commend it to the house.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (17:22): I am very pleased to rise here today in support of this bill to amend the Fair Trading Act. Yet again, I am very pleased to be speaking on another example of how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on those commitments that we took to the people of South Australia. I can certainly understand the novelty of this after 16 years of a Labor government where that was not the case. It was much more common to see a lot of smoke blown, distraction from various disasters and the creation of an impression of action without action actually occurring.

This is also another example of a bill that goes to protecting the interests of South Australian consumers. Ticket scalping continues to be a problem that concerns many within our own community. The current act does not address some of the technological advances in recent times since the original passage, including the advent of ticket bots that purchase tickets online much faster than people could ever do it themselves. Ticket bots are a problem overseas as well. Some data has been collected for these in the United States and the United Kingdom. In fact, Ticketmaster has said that in recent years up to 90 per cent of its traffic to its US site was bots, which reportedly recently also made five billion attempts to buy tickets on Ticketmaster at a rate of 10,000 a minute, which is really quite incredible.

The terms in the current act are not well defined, and enforcement is currently very poor. Under the Major Events Act, the government needs to declare an event as a major event for the ticket-scalping provisions to be operative. Since the act, we have not really seen any successful prosecution of people who have actually engaged in this kind of activity, despite several events where we have seen very massive increases in the price of tickets being resold. Unfortunately, the previous government did not take this issue seriously at all. In fact, they pretended that it was not an issue at all. They said that it was all hype, that no-one was really worried about this and that people only had themselves to blame, which is all very disappointing, I think.

This is just another example of the previous government failing to listen to the concerns of everyday South Australians, like so many other cases on matters such as high unemployment, really expensive power prices or Transforming Health cuts, which was a painful example of a government failing to listen to the people of South Australia in my electorate of Newland and in the electorates of King and Elder. The government also failed to take responsibility for child protection and Oakden.

They are examples of where the previous government failed to listen. By stark contrast, on this side we do listen to the concerns of South Australians. At the last election, we took a comprehensive reform agenda to the people. They elected us to government, and now we are delivering on what we promised. Our strong policy against ticket scalping is just another example of how we are listening and how we are acting.

In relation to ticket scalping, we will repeal section 9 of the Major Events Act and amend the Fair Trading Act so that that the laws apply to any event in South Australia that is subject to resale restrictions. Of course, that will not affect the small-scale events that the member for Colton mentioned earlier, such as small school plays, the local Blue Light disco or the local cheerleading showcase where little Johnny may have purchased his ticket for \$2 and wants to onsell it to his grandma for \$10. We will not be dealing with that. We are dealing with much larger events that are of—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Newland, if could I interrupt for a moment, please. Members, I know it is Thursday afternoon, but the member for Newland deserves to be heard in silence.

Dr HARVEY: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. We will prohibit the advertising or hosting of any event where tickets are selling for over 110 per cent, in addition to capping the total resale price to 110 per cent of the total acquisition price. The bill will require that any resale advertisement includes specific detail, such as the original cost and seating arrangements. It will also outlaw software, such as ticket bots, which contravene the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets.

Increasing the number of compliance officers for enforcement of minor breaches is also another important part of our plan. Offences will be introduced to enable quick and effective enforcement of minor breaches without having to pursue costly court action and will also act as an effective deterrent for others. We are also looking at a public education campaign about the changes to ticket scalping. It is worth noting that the government recognises that legitimate circumstances do exist where a person may want to resell their tickets and therefore there is a need for a secondary market. However, the secondary market should not be at the expense of consumer rights.

This bill is largely modelled on legislation passed in New South Wales earlier this year. In a perfect world, in order to catch all the events that would impact on South Australians, this would require uniform national laws, and this is one of the reasons for our bill being put forward—to align with those laws currently in effect in New South Wales.

Our first responsibility in this area is to protect consumers. At the moment, so many people in our community are struggling to afford to make ends meet, whether it be because of the cost of utilities or taxes, such as the emergency services levy, council rates and so many other things, which of course we are dealing with separately. When people want to treat themselves and enjoy some leisure time, it is simply not fair that tickets for events—whether that be an Adele or Ed Sheeran concert or any other event—be bought up quickly and then put up for resale at an exorbitant price out of the reach of so many South Australians. On this side of the house, we take seriously the protection of consumer rights.

When concerts come to South Australia, we want South Australians not to be ripped off. We have had some great events in recent times, including, as I mentioned, Adele, Ed Sheeran and AC/DC. Once upon a time, I may have attended some of these events, although in more recent years, with having young children, that has become much more difficult. Instead, I have spent much more time at the Wiggles or *Disney on Ice*, which are fantastic events as well. The Wiggles have been a very impressive group since 1991, and they are still going very strong despite a change in personnel. I am not aware of ticket scalping occurring for *Disney on Ice* or The Wiggles so far but, of course, we are a proactive government, not a reactive government, so we are going to be getting on with the job and getting on top of these issues as soon as we can.

There have been a number of reports of ticket scalping on AFL games, particularly finals. This was happening around last year's grand final, which of course affected many South Australians because the Adelaide Crows were in the grand final. This is an event which is held in Victoria, so these current laws would not have affected that, but there were also finals that were held in Adelaide, and this is something that we are dealing with.

In the present season, though, perhaps on recent form maybe these changes will not affect the current final series because our local teams may not quite get there. It is not looking good. The Crows have had a couple of shockers in recent weeks and they are no longer in the eight, and even Port Adelaide are only just hanging on by their fingertips. I think this Friday the Power are playing the Tigers, which is probably a tough game. It is here in Adelaide, so that will probably go in their favour a bit, but the Tigers are going pretty well at the moment.

On Sunday, we have the Dockers versus the Crows in Perth. It is not exactly the match of the round with ninth versus 13th, but it is always very hard to win in Perth. You never know: there might be a really big turnaround in the success of our local teams and, as I said, because we are a proactive government, we will ensure that the rules are in place so that South Australian fans who wish to attend, at this stage hypothetical finals at the end of the year, will be able to.

In closing, scalping is a scourge perpetrated by professional predators that results in ordinary punters paying exorbitant prices to attend sporting and entertainment events. On this side, we are committed to delivering on our plans to deliver better value for consumers and, for this reason, I am very happy to commend the bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:32): I did not want to miss speaking on this important legislation regarding the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018. My understanding is that at this stage, unless someone wants to speak in the next couple of weeks, I am the last speaker on the bill.

An honourable member: Shame!

Mr PEDERICK: It is outrageous, I know. This bill fulfils another Marshall Liberal government election commitment to strengthen protections for consumers against ticket scalpers. We are doing this because this bill forms part of a series of amendments to the Fair Trading Act designed to increase consumer rights and protections. The current act does not address technological advances since its original passage, including the advent of ticket bots that purchase tickets online far faster than a person could. The terms in the current act are not well defined and enforcement is currently poor.

I want to relay some information regarding ticket bots. The information is about the man who invented ticket bots and he explains why you cannot get that gig ticket. The article states:

By the time shotgun-wielding FBI agents raided his office, Ken Lawson, a former insurance salesman, had become America's greatest ticket scalper.

From 2001 to 2010, according to the FBI indictment, his company, Wiseguy, had bought and resold 2.5 million tickets and made more than \$25 million in profit. The kid from Arizona was living a wild life of drink, drugs and parties in Los Angeles.

He was charged with hacking and defrauding ticket sellers like Ticketmaster. The secret of his success was in the servers the FBI confiscated: computer programs, also known as ticket bots, that automate the process of buying tickets online. The bots grab all the best tickets before human buyers, and then flip them for resale on other sites.

This hyper-charged form of ticket scalping has little in common with the pre-internet era—
which I think was a much gentler era, to be frank, and it should be celebrated by those who can remember the pre-internet era, though I digress—
when men in coats sold paper tickets outside of stadiums.

'We were really good and that was probably our downfall,' Ken said. 'We just took it too far.'

I have edited here slightly. He said they made all the other guys trying to do it very angry. It continues:

'I made it too fast and too young and it got to my head.'

'We had a lot of fun, I'll say that.'

Seven years on from that FBI raid, governments and tickets sellers are still struggling to halt Ken's bot invention. The world's largest ticket seller, Ticketmaster, stopped 6 billion bot attempts last year, at a rate of more than 11,000 per minute.

What these sites rely on is that there is no government oversight. They use countries that are known as tax havens when they run these bots. The US enacted a national law outlawing bots in December 2016. There have been no prosecutions to date when this information was written. It continues:

High-profile scalping continues.

'Last I heard, the smart ones are moving to places like Gibraltar and Isle of Man and stuff like that—if they're outside of a nation state's jurisdiction, and then they're able to buy then how is a government going to go after somebody?,' [Ken]...said.

Ticketmaster [said]...that bot traffic often comes from 'Eastern Europe'.

Websites like Shows on Sale or Ticket Crusader tell members when tickets are going on sale. They claim they help 'beat the bots', but they can equally be used by scalpers with bots.

One of the top-ranked websites selling bots is registered in Panama—the tiny Caribbean country known for a canal, good beaches, and tax evasion. The website sells a range of bots for \$300-\$900.

A salesperson from the website said the software works in Australia and users can mask their identities with proxy IP addresses.

'The software doesn't expose your identity or anything,' the seller wrote in an email.

'We have been around for more than a decade and have been actively supporting our product more than ever.'

'No one except God can shut us.'

The seller said the software bypasses the CAPTCHA system, which generates tests that humans can pass but bots cannot (like picking out words behind squiggly lines), by using 'third party bypassing companies that type the CAPTCHAS for you'.

That is, there's a chance there's a human somewhere, possibly in India, typing numbers and letters into a CAPTCHA box so that a bot, which has been sold in Panama, and possibly launched from Eastern Europe, can buy tickets in Australia.

How were these bots invented? The article continues:

The first bots used by Ken's company were simple programs, like auto-fill, that saved his staff from filling out the same form over and over again. But he quickly saw their potential and began creating better bots. 'We started out with four computers, and as time went by, we got bigger and bigger, we got more programmers, more computers.' A single bot could open hundreds of windows and run through the process of buying a ticket simultaneously on each window. Ken would assign a 'power' to each show—a bot with 300 power meant the equivalent of 300 people buying tickets. 'Over time they were able to hit and buy 20,000 tickets in a couple of minutes,' he said.

Ken's company also shaved milliseconds off ticket buying by exploiting the lag—or latency—of data signals crossing the country. 'What we did is we spread 30 servers geographically around the country and every time sure as [heck] only one of them would get all the seats, Ken said. For example, when tickets for the 2006 Rose Bowl—the Superbowl of US college football—went on sale, Wiseguy bought 882 out of 1,000.

The FBI indictment lists other examples: In 2007, Wiseguy bought more than 11,700 Bruce Springsteen tickets, worth about \$1.3 million, as well as 1,924 tickets to the New York Yankee playoffs, and 11,984 tickets to Miley Cyrus concerts. Ken claims Wiseguy 'dominated 90 per cent' of ticket sales in America. They sold tickets to other scalpers, or 'brokers', who sold directly to fans.

After the FBI raided his office, Ken and his colleagues faced 42 charges of hacking and defrauding ticket sellers. His lawyers argued his bots went through the same ticket-buying process as a human, only much faster. He had not hacked the site. Ultimately, he accepted a plea deal and stayed out of jail. 'There was never a ticket crime they could get us on, including the bots,' he said.

So he is obviously very proud of what he managed to do, ripping off not just the system but consumers to get equitable access to sports events and concerts. The article continues:

Ticketmaster is owned by Live Nation, the world's largest events company. Live Nation also owns Australian venues and festivals and manages artists...In a written statement, a Ticketmaster spokesperson said: 'Ticketmaster has always championed transparency and consumer protection within Australia, across both the primary and secondary markets. We welcome new legislation and we will continue to work with industry to ensure that tickets get directly into the hands of fans.

'In the ticketing industry, bots are often used in an attempt to unfairly purchase tickets that should always be available for fans. Ticketmaster works to combat bots every day to make ticket availability and the overall ticket buying process better. Bots violate Ticketmaster's terms of use, and are, in many cases, illegal.'

Since that article came out about the FBI chase, New South Wales has enforced its own legislation in regard to scalpers, and this is very much similar legislation. Under the Major Events Act, what happens now is that the government needs to declare an event as a major event for the ticket scalping provisions to be operative.

We will repeal section 9 of the Major Events Act and amend the Fair Trading Act so that the laws apply to any event in South Australia that is subject to resale restrictions, prohibiting the advertising or its hosting of any event where tickets are selling for over 110 per cent of the ticket price, in addition to capping the total resale price to 110 per cent of the total price and requiring that any resale advertisement includes specific details such as the original cost and seating arrangements.

We will outlaw software such as ticket bots, and I just gave a fair description of one operator which contravenes the terms and conditions of websites that sell tickets, and increase the number of compliance officers for enforcement of minor breaches. Expiable offences will also be introduced to enable quick and effective enforcement of minor breaches without having to pursue costly court action. This will also act as an effective deterrent for others. There will also be a public education campaign about the changes being made to ticket-scalping laws.

This government recognises that legitimate circumstances do exist in which a person may want to resell their tickets and that therefore there is a need for a secondary market. Things happen: people get ill, people can be called away for whatever reason and tickets may have been purchased days, weeks or months earlier. However, that secondary market should not be at the expense of consumers' rights.

In regard to the drafting of the bill, Consumer and Business Services consulted with the Tourism Commission. As I indicated, the bill is largely modelled on legislation that passed in New

South Wales earlier this year. We certainly heard a lot of stories about different events that members have attended.

Mr Koutsantonis: What concerts do you like?

Mr PEDERICK: I was just about to get to that, member for West Torrens. You just about read my mind.

Mr Koutsantonis: You are an ABBA man, no doubt.

Mr PEDERICK: No, it has been mentioned in this place that I am an avid Kiss fan. I have been a Kiss follower for decades. Music like *Love Gun*, *Beth* and a whole range of songs. I tell you what, some of their best music was done in their concert in Melbourne with the Melbourne Symphony Orchestra. If members ever get the opportunity they should listen to Kiss with the Melbourne Symphony Orchestra playing alongside. It is a delight.

Mr Koutsantonis: Peter Criss, know Peter Criss? What are your views? Do you want to tell us?

Mr PEDERICK: You can have your opportunity in a moment, member for West Torrens. As we have got on to concerts, I will expand. I think it was 1980 when I attended a Kiss concert here in Adelaide; it was at Memorial Drive. I took my two younger brothers, who were quite young and still at school, but I had been out of school for a couple of years.

Mr Koutsantonis: Did you have your make-up on?

Mr PEDERICK: No, I didn't have the make-up on. That was quite a concert. From what I can remember, they could not do all the act with the fire because there was too much wind, so that was a slight disappointment, but I have been to another Kiss concert here in Adelaide since then. I also saw Dire Straits at Football Park. I think they had to operate under noise restrictions, which is a little—

Mr Koutsantonis: Mick Jagger, Thebby, Oval?

Mr PEDERICK: No, I didn't do Mick. Certainly, I have had the absolute pleasure and enjoyment to attend two AC/DC concerts at Adelaide Oval—they are one band. Sadly, we are not going to hear the fullness of AC/DC certainly in its original form ever again. My family has a bit of a link to AC/DC: Bon Scott came from the same town in Scotland my grandmother's family came from—Kirriemuir in Scotland, which is the name of my family farm at Coomandook, just for a little bit of digression. They certainly make good music, but I think their second to last concert was better than the last one.

Everyone has different tastes. I was not originally going to go to the Adele concert, but I managed to get hold of a couple of tickets at the last minute. I must say that it was a one-woman show, all night, and it was absolutely fantastic. As you can see, that is a bit of a shift from AC/DC and Kiss. Obviously, these concerts are held in Adelaide, but a lot of regional people come to these concerts, and it is fantastic that we have the opportunity, no matter where they are held.

As I said, we have had plenty of functions at Memorial Drive, at the old Football Park and now at Adelaide Oval. They are going to do some protection of that beautiful lawned area they have on Adelaide Oval, that grass that is grown in my electorate at Langhorne Creek, the surface area there. That is why we are moving this legislation—so that people have equity of access and do not have to fight against bots, where it is basically impossible to get a ticket.

Take something as simple as Sounds by the River, which is a fantastic event coordinated by Deb Alexander at Mannum. They have 5,000 tickets and I kept thinking, 'I need to buy a ticket for Sounds by the River'. I went online and I was diverted to a bogus site. Thankfully, I went to one of my staff who is a bit more internet friendly than I am and said, 'This looks a bit rich.' She had a quick look around and found the tickets on the appropriate site and we got them for the appropriate price. Even things like that can catch you out because these sites are dressed up to get around people and fool them.

I would love to talk more about concerts, but I am running out of time. I commend the bill, and I hope that we see its speedy progression when we come back in a couple of weeks' time.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

At 17:52 the house adjourned until Tuesday 19 June 2018 at 11:00.