

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 4 July 2018

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

**The SPEAKER:** 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*

#### **SESSIONAL ORDERS**

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (10:31):** I rise to ask you, Mr Speaker, to investigate a potential breach of the sessional orders. As you are aware, the house has changed the sessional orders to meet the government's commitment that questions on notice must be answered within 30 days. On 16 May, I asked questions to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing on SA Health's consultancies and grants. It has now been 49 days without an answer to these two questions. As this is a breach of the new sessional orders, I ask whether you can please investigate this matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Kurna. If you could provide any relevant documents to that effect, I will investigate and come back to the house.

**Mr Mullighan:** Arrest that minister, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** We will investigate all options, member for Lee. The Serjeant-at-Arms may indeed be kept busy.

### *Bills*

#### **PETROLEUM AND GEOTHERMAL ENERGY (BAN ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (10:32):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000. Read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (10:33):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce this bill; however, before I begin I would like to signal my displeasure at the limited time a private member has to introduce legislation in this chamber. For reference, when the government introduces legislation, both the lead speaker and opposition lead speaker are allocated unlimited time for second readings, yet when I do so as an independent I am limited to 15 minutes, as are other private members. It is outrageous and a serious slight on our democratic processes, especially when we consider that an hour is allocated to private members' bills yet I am restricted to 15 minutes.

Due to limited time, I have condensed a detailed second reading into the main parts, but there is much more to discuss. I offer whatever briefing any MP requires because this is a limited contribution on an important piece of legislation for my community and I cannot get into the detail that I would have liked due to time constraints.

I am going to skip over how we got here and focus on two critically important aspects, the first being the Natural Resources Committee inquiry into fracking in the South-East and the second is the notion that there is no evidence that fracking can do any harm. The Natural Resources Committee inquired into potential risks and impacts in the use of hydraulic fracture stimulation (fracking) to produce gas in the South-East of South Australia, and after two years of deliberation the committee handed down its findings. It is very important to point out that this committee was chaired by a Labor member and dominated by the Labor government of the day, who were very vocal and

supportive of fracking and the fracking industry. I will now read from an executive summary of that final report and, again, this is condensed:

... what the committee has repeatedly come back to is the community at the centre of this inquiry and thus to the question of social licence, namely: does the social licence to operate exist that would allow the development of an unconventional gas industry in the SE of South Australia?

Social licence was invoked in many submissions to the inquiry and by a number of witnesses appearing before the committee...

After considering all the evidence available to it, particularly the definition of social licence provided by the Member for Mount Gambier, the committee has reached the position that social licence does not yet exist for the development of an unconventional gas industry in the South East. This has been made starkly apparent by widespread opposition from the local community. This is not vehement or violent opposition; it is peaceful and determined opposition, and it is occurring in spite of there having previously been a conventional gas industry in the South East which has undoubtedly provided significant benefits including employment to the local community.

The vast majority of the submissions and representations the committee received were anti fracking in the South East. Essentially the only submissions in favour of unconventional gas development were from companies and lobbyists engaged by or heavily involved with the oil and gas industry.

None of the pro fracking representations, written or verbal, came from representatives of the South East. The committee made an effort to understand from the perspective of local people and businesses what the economic benefits may be, but despite repeated invitations and approaches to bodies we felt might represent this aspect of the debate, there were no witnesses forthcoming. The committee was actually somewhat surprised that no regional residents or businesses approached us, even in confidence, to express support for the development of an unconventional gas industry in the region...

At the beginning of this inquiry, the NRC saw its responsibility as recommending whether to frack or not to frack but by the end, although members have their views on the subject, the committee felt that ultimate responsibility rests not with the committee but with industry, government and community, to decide in concert. This inquiry has provided a forum for the issue to be discussed and the NRC has encouraged all stakeholders to have their say.

It was signed by the Hon. Steph Key MP, Presiding Member, on 29 November 2016. The Natural Resources Committee went on with a number of recommendations, and the first recommendation on the list was as follows:

Without social licence, unconventional gas exploration/development should not proceed in the South East of South Australia. The committee found that social licence to explore/develop unconventional gas does not yet exist in the South East of South Australia.

Even though this committee was dominated by the Labor Party, it was the Liberal Party that publicly proposed a 10-year moratorium on fracking in the South-East. I know this because I was involved in many party room discussions, which I will not go into here. On the same day, 29 November 2016, the *Financial Review* stated:

Mr Marshall said if the Liberal government won the next state election on March 2018, it would put in place a 10-year moratorium on fracking in the south-east of the state in a region with rich farming land and a large agricultural and cattle grazing sector. It also hosts dozens of award-winning wineries in the Coonawarra region.

'It makes no sense to put this highly productive region and South Australia's enviable clean and green reputation at risk by opening up some of our best farming land to fracking,' Mr Marshall said.

On 15 June 2018, just a couple of weeks ago, the Limestone Coast Local Government Association, which includes the seven council areas included in this legislation, moved a motion to 'support the member for Mount Gambier, Troy Bell, in his calls to amend The Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000'. This was unanimously supported. Our councils are supporting this 10-year ban and our community is supporting this 10-year ban, and the legislation is very restrictive to the South-East.

Today, I am going to address the other main comment you hear from politicians—in fact, I heard it on the way in here from a friend of mine—that there is no evidence. If you say something over and over again people start believing it; in fact, some start believing it themselves. I would have spent the majority of my time on this aspect because this is one of the critical elements. Apart from social licence, which I think the inquiry and community leaders have covered, this is the crux of the issue.

I will state right from the start that I am no expert in this field. I hold no qualifications and, apart from firsthand experiences whilst on two fracking tours of America, I am no expert and do not profess to be. So I went looking for peer-reviewed articles that are both positive and negative on

shale and tight gas. For those who do not know what 'peer reviewed' means, I offer the following explanation. Essentially, the term 'peer review' is an academic term for quality control.

Each article published in a peer-reviewed journal is closely examined by a panel of reviewers who are experts in the article's topic—that is, the author's professional peers, hence the term 'peer review'. Reviewers look for proper use of research methods, the significance of the paper's contribution to the existing literature and the integration of previous authors' work on the topic and any discussion, including citations. Papers published in these journals are expert approved and the most authoritative sources of information for research papers.

I will now go through some papers from different sources that have been collated by physicians, scientists and engineers (PSE) who have collected and analysed hundreds and hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific literature. What I found interesting is that research continues to lag behind the rapid scaling of unconventional forms of oil and gas development.

There has been a surge of peer-reviewed scientific papers published in recent years. In fact, of all the available literature on the impacts of shale gas development, nearly 80 per cent has been published since January 2013 and over 50 per cent in just the past year and half; this was up until 2015. What this tells us is that the scientific community is only now beginning to better understand the environmental and public health implications of the unconventional gas industry.

There are hundreds and hundreds of these peer-reviewed articles. In 2009, there were six; in 2010, there were six; in 2011, there were 34 peer-reviewed articles; in 2012, there were 72; in 2013, there were 142; in 2014, there were 192; and six months to 2015, which is where this collation ends, there were 103. You can see that the scale of the number of articles peer reviewed is exponential.

The PSE analysed different subcategories, and I will go through those subcategories. The peer-reviewed publications on the human health dimensions of shale gas development—original research—indicate two broad parameters. One was an indication of potential public health risks or actual adverse health outcomes, for which there were 21 peer-reviewed articles, and the other was where there was no indication of significant public health risk or adverse health outcomes, for which there were four. This group was looking at both the positives and negatives of the shale and tight gas industry.

There was an indication of potential public health risks or actual adverse health outcomes in 58 studies. There was no indication of significant public health risks or actual adverse health outcomes in four studies. In peer-reviewed publications on shale gas development and water quality contamination, there was an indication of potential, positive association, or actual incidence of water contamination in 33 articles, and there was an indication of minimal potential, negative association, or rare incidence of water contamination in 15 articles.

In peer-reviewed publications on shale and tight gas development and air pollutant emissions/air quality degradation, in original research there was indication of elevated air pollutant emissions and/or atmospheric concentrations in 30 peer-reviewed articles. There was no indication of significantly elevated or air pollutant emissions and/or atmospheric concentrations in four peer-reviewed articles. To summarise their points:

For each topic we found that the majority of original research indicated substantial risks from shale and/or tight gas development on the outcome of interest. Scientific consensus is not yet achievable given comparison limitations due to differences in geology, geography, regulation, engineering, and other attributes, as well as methodological differences between studies. However, these results indicate that shale and tight gas development has known public health hazards and risks. Regulators, policy makers, and others who are charged with determining how, where, when and if the development of shale gas should be deployed in their jurisdictional boundaries should take these findings into account.

This is exactly what I am doing. Quite simply, we need the 10-year ban on fracking in the South-East because the work has not been done yet in the South-East. There are many differences between the South-East and the Cooper Basin: the geology, the fault lines, the population density, the use of settling ponds, aquifers, and on and on it goes. The 10 years give everybody the time needed to make informed opinions based on facts specific to the South-East.

In summing up, I note that the leader of the Labor Party has publicly stated that he is going to spend a considerable amount of time in opposition undertaking a listening tour. As I foreshadowed in my address in reply, I welcome the new leader of the Labor Party to the South-East. What he is going to find is that the community in the South-East is opposed to fracking. The real question is: what is his party going to do about it? Is he going to support this bill, or is he going to continue to turn his back on the people of the South-East and pretend to listen, having already decided, and oppose this eminently sensible bill?

If the Leader of the Opposition is genuine about listening, then here is his first test. To my previous colleagues, this debate is no longer about fracking or not fracking in the South-East. The community has already decided that. This debate is now about trust. If you say one thing before an election, you need to honour it after the election. There is not one person in the South-East who believes a ministerial direction is a 10-year ban on fracking. I will move that this debate be adjourned.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (IMMUNISATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (10:49):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the South Australian Public Health Act 2011. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (10:49):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill I am introducing today, otherwise known as the no jab no play bill, is a very important bill for increasing the level of vaccination rates amongst children in South Australia. It will require children in this state to attain the appropriate immunisation levels in order to attend child care, kindergarten and other early childhood education. This bill was introduced by the former Labor government in the Legislative Council last year following extensive consultation with the community. Unfortunately, the bill stalled in that house before the last election and then parliament was prorogued.

We are introducing the bill in this parliament because we believe it is of critical importance that we achieve higher levels of vaccination in the South Australian population, most notably for the benefit of vulnerable children. I hope all members can see the importance of this bill in helping to protect our most vulnerable from the spread of preventable disease. In particular, there are some children who, for medical reasons, are unable to be vaccinated. It is important that all other children are vaccinated to ensure that those vulnerable kids, who for medical reasons cannot be vaccinated, are as best protected as possible.

The bill proposes tough new laws to improve immunisation rates amongst children, meaning that children must be appropriately immunised in order to attend early childhood care services. The mandatory immunisations would align with those immunisations listed on the National Immunisation Program childhood schedule. They include hepatitis B, whooping cough, polio, measles, mumps, rubella, and those strains of meningococcal that are currently on the schedule.

The no jab no play bill aims to improve South Australia's overall immunisation coverage while concurrently reducing pockets of underimmunisation. Early childhood care services are those that provide care for young children under the age of six years for fee or reward, such as child care, also called centre-based care; long day care and early learning centres; family day care; preschool and kindergarten; rural care programs; mobile childcare services; and occasional care. The no jab no play bill proposes that in order to attend early childhood services, a child must be age-appropriately immunised, on an immunisation catch-up program, or meet the exemption requirements.

Parents and guardians would be required to provide early childhood services with evidence that their child meets the immunisation requirements. The bill also proposes that a child with a

vaccine-preventable disease, or who is at risk of getting a vaccine-preventable disease, may be excluded from the early childhood service when an outbreak of that disease is occurring at the service. For consistency, exemption requirements will align with the commonwealth government's no jab no play legislation.

The bill attaches a maximum penalty of \$30,000 to any person who provides an early childhood service and enrolls a child without the appropriate exemption or immunisation history required. It is also anticipated that the no jab no play bill will improve the recording of vaccines in the South Australian population, which in turn will protect our community by increasing the level of immunity as such a large percentage of the population would be immunised against a specific disease, resulting in it becoming harder for vaccine-treatable diseases to spread.

This is legislation that is currently in place in three other states, notably New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. So, in the largest states in Australia, this legislation is in place protecting children there. We believe it should be in place here in South Australia to protect our kids. It is consistent with the steps the commonwealth government is taking on no jab no play. We call upon the government to seize the initiative, be bipartisan about this and support this legislation going through both houses of parliament.

I have to say, though, there is one vaccine that would not currently be covered by the bill that we hope in the future would be covered, and that is a vaccine to protect kids from meningococcal B. The vaccine for meningococcal B has been turned down a number of times at the national level by the PBAC—the federal government's authority that considers immunisation listings—largely, I think, because the evidence is that it is very specific to South Australia and does not have a broad national scope across the country.

We are seeing a very disturbing number of meningococcal B cases in South Australia. Already this year, there have been 12 meningococcal B cases in this state and that number is only going to rise as we get to the end of winter and through to the end of the year.

We took to the last election a policy to bring in an immunisation program for meningococcal B. When we lost the election, we gave our details, our costing documents, to the government and released them publicly so that we could hopefully see this up and running as soon as possible. Unfortunately, there have since been delays in that. The government has since set up an expert panel to assess that. They have delivered a report to the minister, which he has refused to release. We understand that that report does recommend an immunisation program for South Australian children of zero to five years and a catch-up program for teenagers.

Now that the minister has the report from his expert working group that he hand-picked, we think it is incumbent upon him to immediately take action to bring that immunisation program in for meningococcal B in South Australia right now. There is not a moment to lose. We think that the vaccine should be ordered immediately so that we can get this up and running as soon as possible in South Australia, and we would call upon him to do that. When that is in place, I hope that one day that could be part of this legislation as well. I commend this legislation to the house. It will play an important role in increasing our immunisation rates in South Australia and keeping children safe.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **ROYAL COMMISSIONS (EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 June 2018.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:56):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....	23
Noes .....	19
Majority .....	4

## AYES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cregan, D.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Knoll, S.K.  
Murray, S.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Teague, J.B.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.  
Duluk, S.  
Habib, C.  
Luethen, P.  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Sanderson, R.  
Treloar, P.A.  
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.  
Ellis, F.J.  
Harvey, R.M. (teller)  
McBride, N.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Speirs, D.J.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

## NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brown, M.E. (teller)  
Gee, J.P.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Rau, J.R.

Boyer, B.I.  
Close, S.E.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Piccolo, A.  
Stinson, J.M.

## PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.

Weatherill, J.W.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (THROWING OBJECTS AT VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:02):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 23  
Noes ..... 19  
Majority ..... 4

## AYES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cregan, D.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Knoll, S.K.  
Murray, S.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Teague, J.B.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.  
Duluk, S.  
Habib, C.  
Luethen, P.  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Sanderson, R.  
Treloar, P.A.  
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.  
Ellis, F.J.  
Harvey, R.M. (teller)  
McBride, N.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Speirs, D.J.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

## NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Mullighan, S.C.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brown, M.E. (teller)  
Gee, J.P.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Odenwalder, L.K.

Boyer, B.I.  
Close, S.E.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Piccolo, A.

## NOES

Picton, C.J.  
Wortley, D.

Rau, J.R.

Stinson, J.M.

## PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.

Weatherill, J.W.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 June 2018.)

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:09):** I rise to speak on the Road Traffic (Drug Testing) Amendment Bill. I have listened carefully to the contribution made by the member for Elizabeth, who brings this legislation to the house. As the member and the Attorney-General have made clear, the subject matter of the bill was considered by the last parliament. The last parliament adopted the Statutes Amendment (Drink and Drug Driving) Bill 2017 after discarding an amendment similar to the one now proposed by the member.

The amendment did not form part of the former government's business, having been proposed, I understand, by a member of the other place. The amendment would have the effect of permitting police to search vehicles after a driver returns a positive drug test and without first forming a reasonable suspicion that a search would reveal the commission of another offence.

What amounts to a reasonable suspicion was considered by Justice Jacobs in *Manley v Tucs*, a 1985 decision reported in the South Australian State Reports at 1. For the benefit of the house, I extract certain remarks made by Justice Jacobs, where he said:

Not only does 'suspicion' carry less conviction than 'belief', but to say that suspicion is 'reasonable' does not necessarily imply that it is well-founded, or that the grounds for the suspicion must be factually correct.

His Honour Justice Duggan reflected in *R v Rogers*:

Suspicion may be grounded upon matters which the police officer has observed and circumstances which have been reported. That is not to say that every matter reported as a fact may be legitimately taken into account in forming a suspicion. The requirement of reasonableness may require the police officer to assess the reliability of the informer or the hearsay information which has been communicated [to that officer].

Reform of the Road Traffic Act needs to be considered in a global way. There are matters that the Attorney has outlined to the house which must also be considered in that context. I will not detain us now by repeating those matters.

I add to the Attorney's remarks by saying that some of the matters that ought, in my view, be considered in a global review include forensic procedures for when police undertake a roadside drug test; on-the-spot arrangements, related to my first point, to reduce red tape and increase efficiency when dealing with drink and drug drivers; or any other practical and consequential amendments that may be required in view of a global review of the act, and some of the matters I have outlined to the house. Thank you for your indulgence, Mr Speaker.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**Mr BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

*Motions***GRANGE SURF LIFE SAVING CLUB**

**Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:13):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates the Grange Surf Life Saving Club on winning the recent 2018 Junior State Championships in March;
- (b) congratulates the club on winning nine of the past 10 junior surf lifesaving championships; and
- (c) acknowledges all the hard work of board members, volunteers and parents to enable the junior squad the opportunity to achieve this outstanding success.

It is terrific to be able to speak to this motion, given that it is about one of the two surf lifesaving clubs that the community I represent in this place is blessed to have servicing it: the Grange Surf Life Saving Club, of course, and also the Semaphore Surf Life Saving Club. Both clubs are going from strength to strength, particularly in recent times as, in Grange's case, it is enjoying some newly refurbished and constructed facilities that were jointly funded by the former state Labor government and the City of Charles Sturt, as well as the club itself.

Only a little farther down the coast, of course, the Semaphore Surf Life Saving Club is in the final third or so stage of the construction of its new surf lifesaving club facilities, which will attract families, volunteers and particularly children to get involved with that club.

I am very pleased to say that the substantial increase in funding for surf lifesaving club redevelopments over the last four years has seen the acceleration of club redevelopments across South Australia by some 11 years. The Semaphore Surf Life Saving Club was not due to be redeveloped for many years, and seeing that under construction at the moment as well as seeing the Grange Surf Life Saving Club enjoying its new premises is terrific for the community.

The first South Australian surf lifesaving club was not Grange, but it was not too far away. It was Henley, proudly represented by the member for Colton, I am sure, which was founded back in 1925. That was followed by Seacliff, Glenelg, Port Elliot, Moana, Port Noarlunga and again, into the 1950s, Brighton and Semaphore, which I have mentioned, and Christies Beach. The Grange Surf Life Saving Club was established towards the end of 1955 after a double drowning tragedy which occurred off the end of the Grange Jetty in 1954.

That is a segue to talk about the wonderful Grange Jetty, which is now some three or so years beyond its redevelopment. It is a magnificent facility, and it is one of many metropolitan jetties that has been redeveloped in keeping with its original construction and intent. It is somewhat different from what is envisaged for the member for Morphett's jetty, some sort of South Australian *Boardwalk Empire*-type facility, some sort of Atlantic City down there, selling salt water taffy, with Nucky Thompson patrolling the facilities on behalf of the good burghers of Morphett. We will wait to see if that eventuates.

Since its inception in 1955, the Grange Surf Life Saving Club has been an integral part of the community in Grange and its surrounds, patrolling the length of the beach from October to April from Reedie Street, Henley Beach up to the northern side of Point Malcolm Reserve, getting close to the Semaphore Surf Life Saving Club. They collectively keep many thousands of South Australians safe over the warmer months at, of course, the best beaches in metropolitan Adelaide.

While many of us go to the beach to relax and unwind, especially at Henley or Grange or Semaphore, if you live in the western suburbs, the volunteers from the Grange Surf Life Saving Club are giving up their time to ensure we can continue to enjoy the beach with the peace of mind that, if anything goes amiss, people will be attended to by our wonderful surf lifesavers. It is great news for the people of the western suburbs that Grange Surf Life Saving Club has such a strong and talented presence of junior surf lifesavers at the club.

It is extraordinary that the Grange Surf Life Saving Club has won a staggering nine out of the past 10 junior surf lifesaving state championships. It is a remarkable achievement that the club is, rightly, immensely proud of. This year, in March, the Grange Surf Life Saving Club convincingly won the 2018 junior surf lifesaving state championships, scoring a huge 391 points and finishing above



the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club as well as the Port Noarlunga Surf Life Saving Club. I make special mention of the strong showing by the other club I mentioned previously, the Semaphore Surf Life Saving Club, in that competition.

I should also congratulate the Grange Surf Life Saving Club on their dominant performance in the 2018 state championships, having been crowned champions with a massive total point score of 1,586, 219 points clear of the combined totals of the second and third place getters, a remarkable achievement. I have been informed by some of the other members of the community that I represent, particularly those with a closer affinity to the Semaphore Surf Life Saving Club, that the Grange Surf Life Saving Club is sometimes considered to be the Collingwood of surf lifesaving clubs, which is a disgraceful slur on them.

The only thing I can assume is that they are referring to the incredible and remarkable sustained period of success that football teams wearing the black and white and a Magpies logo experience, particularly in the more South Australian context. The real Magpies, I might point out, are not the confected wash overs from the VFL who blight our screens and populate the MCG on a regular basis. It is that sustained success that the Grange Surf Life Saving Club continues to achieve year after year that gives it a reputation as an incredibly strong club and a dominant force when it comes to championships, junior or open.

Of course, success at either level cannot be achieved, let alone sustained, without the extraordinary effort of all those people who manage the club, who superintend the club, whether it is the board committee members, the volunteers or the parents. The parents quite often approach the club in an effort to get their kids involved in an activity at the beach and, after seeing how much fun, enjoyment and personal development their kids experience from being part of a surf lifesaving club, they invariably become part of the club themselves and contribute not just in helping the club stay open and managing operations but quite often get involved in the patrolling task of surf lifesaving themselves.

I would like to acknowledge the extraordinary ongoing work of the President of the Grange Surf Life Saving Club, Mr Robert Thompson, who I am sure is known to many other members in this place who are familiar with their surf lifesaving clubs. He and his wife, Heather, have had a long affinity with Surf Life Saving South Australia, including serving on Surf Life Saving South Australia's executive, as well as the other club members who contribute their time to the committee as well as to keeping the club open.

The Grange Surf Life Saving Club has also some of the most highly regarded volunteers in the country with Caroline Kearney taking out the 2017 Volunteer of the Year Award at the 2017 Surf Life Saving Australia Awards for her dedication to member recruitment and retention, coaching, junior development and succession planning. Without volunteers like Caroline, many community based clubs, surf lifesaving or otherwise, would not be able to deliver what they do to their local communities and they would be much poorer for it.

This Saturday just gone I was very privileged to be invited to attend the 2018 Grange Surf Life Saving Club's presentation night at the Lakes Hotel, and I must say it was a terrific night. It was very pleasantly surprising to see the incredible number of juniors who came along to that night, very vocal juniors who love their club and love being a part of it. It was obvious to see the friendships and close personal connections that are formed not just amongst the seniors but also the juniors. I think the community of Grange, as I am sure is the case at Semaphore and Henley and the other coastal areas of our state, are very well served and can take great comfort in the strong junior levels of participation in those clubs. It bodes very well for their future.

I would like to make a few further comments about some of the specific awards which were given on that night. I think it is a terrific thing, like other surf lifesaving clubs do, to recognise milestones of volunteer hours or patrol hours amongst its members on the beach: Brian Hessian, 1,750 patrol hours, which is an extraordinary amount; David Forrest, 1,500 patrol hours; Bronwyn and Brian Smith, 750 patrol hours.

Also, 500 patrol hours were reached by Graham Gepp, who works at this place in Parliament House. That is a terrific effort to reach such a significant contribution of time spent keeping people

safe on our beaches. I know Graham has long been a leader of the IRB crew and also provides a lot of his own time maintaining the IRB and related facilities.

I also recognise Kelsey Reed, the open female club champion; Josh Hornibrook, the open male club champion; Elsa Dent, the masters female club champion; Brett Roe, the masters male club champion; Demi Bates, the under-14 female club champion; Adam D'Aloia, the under-14 male club champion; Charlotte Dolan, the under-15 female club champion; Sam Ralph, the under-15 male club champion; Kayla Roe, the under-17 female club champion; Anthony Scopacasa, the under-17 male club champion, who was very popular on the night; Siobhan MacLaren, the under-19 female club champion; and Joseph Semmens, the under-19 male club champion.

They are all extraordinary achievements for those individuals. Collectively, on top of the awards provided to the club on a regular basis for achievement at the junior level, it just goes to show the strength of this surf lifesaving club. I should also point out that the Grange Surf Life Saving Club runs the tiny tot and nipper programs for children from the age of five to under the age of 13 and also the youth program for teenagers aged 14 and 15. These programs are vitally important to getting young children involved in surf lifesaving and, in particular, involved in such an important community club.

They provide children with excellent beach awareness as well as invaluable skills such as advanced swimming techniques, first aid, CPR and water rescue as they progress in age and skill level. These skills may be used to save a life, let alone one of their friends' lives, in the future when out swimming at the beach in summer. Again, it goes to show how important these junior surf lifesaving programs are. I would once again like to thank all the volunteers and families who give up their time to help the younger generation come to appreciate the beach and come to appreciate it safely, let alone contribute so substantially to the surf lifesaving club.

This year is an exciting year for surf lifesaving in South Australia. I can see the member for Morphett looking at me very keenly because he knows that between 16 November and 2 December the surf Lifesaving World Championships will be held at Glenelg with some associated activities at the SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre. There will be a very heavily attended series of events over that couple of weeks. I am not quite sure how we are going to go drumming up surf conditions for those competitions. Perhaps the member for Morphett and I will be down there with a boogie board each, trying to cause some ripples—

**The SPEAKER:** Creating waves.

**Mr MULLIGHAN:** —in the metropolitan millpond that we all enjoy. We will see how we go. The world championships are the largest lifesaving event in the world and, with the addition of the World Youth Championships to the program, it is expected that this will be the largest lifesaving event ever held, with over 6,000 athletes and over 1,000 officials and volunteers expected to descend on Adelaide.

I hope that the Lifesaving World Championships inspire people to become part of lifesaving activities in South Australia and also emphasise the important service they provide to our community here in South Australia and around the world. I wish everyone participating in the Lifesaving World Championships, particularly the Grange Surf Life Saving Club and the Semaphore Surf Life Saving Club, all the best. Along with the other clubs in South Australia, I hope they make South Australia and particularly the western suburbs proud. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:28):** I also rise to support the motion on the junior surf lifesaving state championships. In March this year, over 3,000 surf lifesaving athletes competed at the 2018 championships, which offered over 500 events for participants aged between 7 and 87 years. The athletes represented over 20 surf lifesaving clubs from across the state. The major state events were the Senior State Championships at South Port Surf Life Saving Club, the Masters State Championships at Christies Beach and, of course, the Junior State Championships held at the beautiful Glenelg beach in my very own electorate of Morphett.

This year's Junior State Championships were held over three days, from Friday 9 March through to Sunday 11 March. The state championships are the culmination of hours of preparation by the many young athletes who compete. There were well over 1,000 nippers, including two of my own children, who were representing the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club.

The surf season itself started in the previous October when the water temperature still had not warmed up from winter. Invariably, in the first and second sessions there are strong and cold south-westerlies that certainly test the young children's desire. Some of the top age junior surf lifesavers had been training over the colder winter months, either hitting the water on weekends or swimming in pools during the week.

Surf lifesaving is an amazing activity for growing a child's confidence, knowledge and skills in a beach environment. Children can become a nipper from the age of five years and start learning about surf awareness and safety through a surf education program. At Glenelg, the nippers are placed in age groups starting at under-7s, which are the Tiny Tots, and then right up to the under-13s. The environment is very inclusive, with both boys and girls participating in the program side by side.

The junior nipper program runs each Saturday from late October, leading up to the state championships in March. The nippers participate in a structured program of beach running, beach flags, wading, surf knowledge, sun safety, first aid and a variety of fun learning activities throughout the session. Practising these skills helps the children develop confidence in the surf environment and allows them to compete in both the club and state surf lifesaving carnivals representing their clubs.

While competition is an important element, the surf awareness and education aspect is a primary aim. Children are taught from the youngest ages how to respect the surf, read the surf and use the surf to their advantage. The Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club certainly aims to encourage all children to do their best and to develop to their full potential whilst having fun.

Parents actively participate and join in the program, especially with the younger age groups. This can lead to involvement with other aspects of the club, including gaining awards, coaching, becoming age group managers or getting their bronze certificate and becoming patrolling members of the club. Certainly, this is the path that my wife and I took as we started our involvement with the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club, first as parents and then progressing to becoming active patrolling members.

The junior committee of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club work tirelessly to run a smooth program over the entire season. The junior chairman is Mick Marling, junior secretary is Kirsten Tocker and the water safety coordinator is the ever-present Jared Schenscher, who might as well live at the club, he is there so often. The junior competition officer and age group manager of the mighty under-10s is the ever-calm club legend, Steve Dalton, who also picked up a gold medal at the Aussies in April. The all-age competition officer is Anthony Merchant, who really gets the best out of the nippers and is involved in many of their training sessions. Anjie Collins looks after the Young Guns, which are the 14 and 15 year olds who are progressing into the senior ranks. Justin Ganley is the age group leader representative, and the junior training officer is Simon De Jong.

All their hard work over the season culminates in not only getting the Glenelg nippers prepared for the junior surf lifesaving state championships but also working with club president, Georgina Cole; deputy president, Pete Tidswell; and club captain, Shaun Armstrong, to set up and run the carnival over the three days. Georgie and Pete spent many hours working with the local Holdfast Bay council to lay out the beach and water areas on Glenelg beach, so thank you also to the council staff involved for their assistance.

So many of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club members, myself included, helped prepare for the event on the weekend of the Junior State Championships, with early morning starts beginning at 5.30 to prepare the various areas. To give one example, Leigh Bowbridge and David Hutchison, who both have won many state medals and help to coach the nippers in beach sprints and beach flags, were on hand to set up the sprint track, laying out the track ropes, digging them into the sand and then raking the track ready for competition.

The nippers themselves gave their all in the multiple events. The age groups range from under-8s through to the under-13s, and they competed in various events. On the Friday, the rescue and resuscitation event was held, and then on Saturday competitors competed in, firstly, the march past, marching behind their club's flags, and then onto individual beach flags, beach sprints, wades, swim, board and ironperson.

On Sunday, team events were held, starting with the very exciting all-age relay, where the fastest boy and girl from each age group combine in the one relay team from each surf club, while all the other competitors and parents line the track to cheer them on. You can see the pride of each of the runners as they showcase both their speed and club spirit in front of what is a very vocal crowd, with the noise reaching a crescendo as the final runners tear down the beach to the finish line.

Following the all-age relay, other team relays were held, including the board relay, swim relay, cameron relay and wade relay. At the conclusion of the weekend, Grange Surf Life Saving Club won overall, with the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club coming second and Port Noarlunga third. Not far behind was Brighton, which I know the member for Black is a member of, the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club, which the member for Gibson is involved with, and West Beach, which the member for Colton is involved with.

Congratulations must go to the Grange Surf Life Saving Club on what is an impressive effort for winning not only this year's state championships but also nine out of the past 10 championships. It is worth pointing out that the only other winner within that 10-year stretch was the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PATTERSON:** I had to put that one in there. All the competing clubs should be congratulated on the way they competed and on the fantastic opportunities they provided for their nipper contingents. A big congratulations also goes to all the young nippers who competed at the state championships. Just getting to the start line represents hours of training by each of them and, on many occasions, courage to face their fears and still keep going. Thank you also to all the volunteers and parents who made the junior state championships such a successful and enjoyable weekend for the nippers.

As I mentioned previously, the competition hones the nippers' skills and helps provide the surf awareness and education aspect of surf. As the nippers grow and gain more experience, they get firsthand knowledge and they can then go on to obtain their surf rescue certificate. This leads to further training and the opportunity for them and their mates to receive their bronze medallion.

I was lucky enough to recently attend the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club's Awards of Excellence presentation night. There I was able to see another batch of bronze medallion holders receive their certificates. Many of them had come through the junior ranks of the club, which is always a positive sign. These certificates allow the holders to become volunteer patrolling members of the club.

During the club's awards night, the club presented the Remeljej Award, this time to dual winners Peter Tidswell and Shaun Armstrong. This is the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club's most prestigious award, recognising vigilance and service. These two club members provide countless volunteer hours, organising training and patrolling to ensure that the beach is safe when lifesavers are present. In essence, this is the principal volunteer community service that the surf clubs up and down the coast provide to their local communities.

The Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club makes a massive difference to the fabric of our Morphett community by providing a valued service to all beachgoers from October to April each year. I would like to acknowledge club president, Georgina Cole, and both the senior and junior committees for their hard work in coordinating another successful season. I also warmly acknowledge the massive number of volunteer hours that the club has once again put into the community.

I look forward to the 2018-19 surf season and especially the Lifesaving World Championships, Rescue 2018, coming to Glenelg beach in November. Thousands of international, national and local competitors will combine to have a terrific carnival, hone their skills and proudly represent their clubs.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:38):** I rise to wholeheartedly support this motion. In doing so, I also congratulate the 'Collingwood of surf lifesaving' as I think it was referred to—the Grange Surf Life Saving Club—on their success at the recent junior state championships. Having heard both the previous speakers, it is lovely to hear so many names mentioned whom I remember as children from

when I participated, not competed, in lifesaving. I think this speaks to the enduring volunteering that goes on in lifesaving right along South Australia's beautiful coast.

As I have mentioned in this house before, surf lifesaving has certainly played a very special part in my life, having watched, from around the age of two or three, my older brother and older sister in their lifesaving pursuits and then joining them as a nipper from around the age of seven. Before girls and women were officially allowed to compete in surf lifesaving, my sisters and I hit beaches along the coast and competed in carnivals and junior state titles for many years.

I say 'a special place in my life' because my lifesaving clubs have always provided me and so many other people with a great sense of belonging to a great, big community family. Personally, I have found many great leaders in lifesaving are there to look out for you. I know this has been the experience of many people in our community. I also say 'special' because it is very hard to think of numerous other pursuits that simultaneously focus on engaging our young people in healthy competition whilst at the same time engaging them in learning vital surf safety and first aid skills and in serving other members of our community by volunteering week after week to keep fellow community members safe right along our coast.

Lifesaving is great fun, but it is also about saving lives. Lifesaving provides local, national and international opportunities to all people. As has been mentioned, our junior lifesavers from across South Australia participated in the state championships in Grange on 10 March. I want to heartily congratulate the clubs from my electorate that competed at these junior surf lifesaving state championships. I mention Port Noarlunga Surf Life Saving Club, which came in third overall, and also Christies Beach Surf Life Saving Club and South Port Surf Life Saving Club.

All those clubs had numerous individual successes, particularly in the board events and the swimming events. Of course, those are all clubs that are situated along our beautiful Mid Coast. I note the comments made before about perhaps having to generate some waves for the world surf lifesaving championships. I would say to that: perhaps come a little farther south, and you might actually find that you do not need to do that on our spectacular Mid Coast beaches.

My congratulations go to everybody—all the young people who participated from Port Noarlunga, South Port and Christies Beach surf lifesaving clubs. Also, my deep thanks and congratulations go to the presidents of each of those clubs: to Madeline Nurmi from the Christies Beach Surf Life Saving Club, Dick Olesinski from the South Port Surf Life Saving Club and Shaun O'Sullivan from the Port Noarlunga Surf Life Saving Club. I thank and congratulate them on their incredible leadership. They bring our young people together to compete, volunteer and learn vital surf safety and first aid skills, week after week. Together with their committees, they run some extraordinary organisations along our coast.

I also place on record my thanks to the thousands of surf lifesaving volunteers who patrol our beaches right across the coast of our beautiful state, week in and week out, keeping people safe and generously volunteering their time. I look forward to continuing as a patrolling member this summer, but I know that my contribution, in terms of patrolling volunteer hours, will be small compared with the thousands and thousands of hours that so many other generous volunteers contribute.

I also really look forward to continuing my work as the patron of Surf Sisters and continuing to involve more girls and women in surf lifesaving, including at the leadership levels of surf lifesaving clubs. I very much look forward to joining other members in supporting the world surf lifesaving titles later this year. I commend the motion to the house.

#### *Bills*

### **ROYAL COMMISSIONS (EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**The SPEAKER (11:44):** I was informed earlier that the number of noes recorded on division No. 1 was inaccurately recorded as 18. I advise the house that the correct number of noes is actually 19. I order that the Votes and Proceedings be corrected.

*Motions***GRANGE SURF LIFE SAVING CLUB**

Debate resumed.

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:44):** I rise today to support the member for Lee's motion and to offer my sincere congratulations to the Grange Surf Life Saving Club on winning the 2018 surf lifesaving Junior State Championships in March this year. I also note the fine performances of the West Beach and Henley surf lifesaving clubs at that competition. It appears almost that the member for Lee would like to suggest a change of colours perhaps for the Grange Surf Life Saving Club in the future if the Collingwood references continue, but it was certainly a fine performance by the club.

Surf lifesaving has a long and proud history in South Australia. As I have previously mentioned, and as was highlighted by the member for Lee, the first club was formed at Henley in 1925. This was 18 years after the first clubs were established nationally in Sydney in around 1907. Henley was soon joined by Seacliff in 1930; Glenelg in 1931, I am sure the member for Morphett would be proud to know; Port Elliot in 1933; and Moana in 1938. Then a period of difficulty emerged for reasons I am sure would be outlined historically. The coastal waters were declared as being inland as opposed to coastal, and a tussle occurred between a number of organisations as to how surf lifesaving would continue here in South Australia.

In 1952, Surf Life Saving South Australia was given affiliation to the national body, which led to rapid growth. It gives a good indication of how our beachside suburbs progressed from that time, with Port Noarlunga forming in 1952, joining the original five clubs, and then Brighton and Semaphore forming in 1953. Christies, Grange and, importantly, West Beach were formed in 1955 and then, as we work our way down the coast, Beachport was the latest to join Surf Life Saving South Australia in 2016.

As you can see, Surf Life Saving South Australia has taken off and, with 22 clubs across the state and membership continuing to grow, we can truly appreciate the remarkable effort of the Grange Surf Life Saving Club, particularly to highlight the fact that they have won nine out of the past 10 junior surf lifesaving championships. It truly is a remarkable effort, and the club should be extremely proud of that history.

Unfortunately, Colton lost the Grange Surf Life Saving Club due to the boundary redistribution last year, but gained the excellent West Beach Surf Life Saving Club and retained the Henley Surf Life Saving Club as well, two incredibly successful clubs in their own right. I, like other members, would like to thank Rae Lawson, the president of the Henley Beach surf club, and Peter Zuill of the West Beach surf club for the effort they contribute and their successful management of both surf clubs. The community in the western suburbs certainly thank them for their service.

The electorate of Colton has an incredibly strong surf lifesaving community and the support that they receive is an accurate and true reflection of the great service that they provide and a quintessential example of volunteers making a positive and substantial contribution to our local community. I am certainly a big advocate for volunteering and for local community groups, and I know that both West Beach and Henley surf clubs are always looking for people to join in and to volunteer.

Anyone can be a surf lifesaver. They often come from all walks of life, from all backgrounds, in all shapes and sizes. Surf lifesaving is built on volunteers who love the beach and who love their community, so I certainly urge anyone who is thinking about joining their local surf club to do so and to get involved. With summer just around the corner, or in the not too distant future I should say—certainly at this time of the year we hope that it gets closer—it is an opportune time to reflect on the valuable role of surf lifesaving in South Australia, and its volunteers.

I do not think enough can be said about the contributions of all our surf clubs to our individual communities. There are not many cases where a community organisation serves so many purposes. Surf clubs are a place of meeting, a place of contribution and a place of family. The number of hours dedicated by surf club members and committee representatives is truly a contribution to our great state, particularly to the western suburbs, that would be very difficult to replace if not for the work of those great organisations.

I am more than happy and very proud and thankful to be able to take this opportunity to place on the public record this house's sincere appreciation for the work that the Surf Life Saving organisation and all the surf lifesavers and volunteers do in our coastal communities across our great state. There is a very good reason that surf lifesavers exist. They play a very important role, as we have talked about.

But if you look at the numbers between 1 July 2016 and 30 June 2017 (the previous financial year), we still had 291 people drown in Australian waterways. A number of those were in inland waterways, but certainly a number of those were on our coast. It is important to reflect and remember that this number would be far greater if not for the service of our surf lifesavers and their dedication and commitment to ensuring that we keep our beaches as safe as possible.

In many ways, one of the biggest challenges for us is to try to reduce that number to one that is acceptable. Of course, zero is one that we would all want to reach, whether that is realistic or not. It is often very difficult to put the impetus on getting down to a point where we eliminate all drownings, but we certainly hope that number will be lower in future years.

For some of those reasons, I think the Liberal Party, in particular leading into the last election, acknowledged that water safety education is a big part of reducing that number, which is why we committed to supporting Surf Life Saving South Australia's Surf Babies program to ensure that those young South Australians, who are growing up in South Australia, a state that is surrounded by water and has some amazing coastal regions and beaches, have access to water safety education at a young age. It is an incredibly important thing and is obviously, given my background, something that I am very passionate about seeing delivered in South Australia.

On a more positive note, like many of the members in this house, I think we are very excited about welcoming the Lifesaving World Championships here to Glenelg, South Australia, later in the year in November. It is an opportunity for us to showcase our fantastic beaches. Despite the lack of swell, I think the three of us may get down there and try our very best to give some indication that there are beaches that need protecting that are quite substantial in their surf appeal. That aside, it is a fantastic opportunity to showcase the great number of surf lifesavers in this state.

I certainly join in passing on my best wishes to the members of the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club and the Henley Surf Life Saving Club, who will be participating in those championships. We have a number of very successful masters swimmers and surf competitors across the two clubs, and I am sure they will enjoy the opportunity to represent their club, their state and their country here in their own state in the Lifesaving World Championships later in the year.

It will certainly be a great opportunity for the state, from an economic perspective, to have so many people coming from both interstate and overseas to be here in South Australia to celebrate a pastime and a way of life, in many ways, that is surf lifesaving in South Australia. I certainly stand with all other members so far in supporting this motion, and I thank the member for Lee for bringing it to the house.

**Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:53):** I thank the member for Colton for his contribution and acknowledge the contributions of the member for Reynell and the member for Morphett. I think it is clear to see that all four of us are very proud representatives of coastal communities and communities that are well serviced and well protected by our surf lifesaving clubs. I am very pleased that they have made supportive and appreciative comments about the clubs in their electorates and the others that have been mentioned today.

Motion carried.

## INDUSTRIAL HEMP

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:55):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the state government approved the first cultivation licences for industrial hemp in April 2018;
- (b) acknowledges that it is anticipated that within five years an expanding industrial hemp industry in South Australia could have a farmgate value of \$3 million per year; and

- (c) highlights the excellent work undertaken by SARDI, particularly through industrial hemp trial crops in the Riverland and South-East.

Industrial hemp is a versatile product with diverse applications from clothing to building products and food. Industrial hemp is a summer crop and the sowing of the inaugural crops is set to take place in late spring through to early summer.

On 14 April 2017, parliament passed a bill providing the power to make regulations to establish an industrial hemp licensing scheme. I want to acknowledge minister Ridgway from the other place, who did a lot of work in getting this legislation through. In South Australia, the Industrial Hemp Act 2017 and the associated regulatory framework, which allows the cultivation of industrial hemp and the processing and manufacture of industrial hemp products, came into effect on 12 November 2017.

The Industrial Hemp Act 2017 requires that industrial hemp must be grown from certified hemp seed and that the certified hemp seed must be sourced from hemp parent plants with a concentration of THC in leaves and flowering heads of not more than 0.5 per cent and must be accompanied with a certificate from an approved laboratory testing the parent plants. It provides no psychotropic effect from its consumption.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA) is responsible for issuing licences to authorise the possession, cultivation, processing and supply of industrial hemp in South Australia. Under the regulatory framework growers, processors and suppliers will be required to be licensed. Licences will be issued by PIRSA in liaison with SA Police and SA Health. To support this new industry development, PIRSA has funded field trials of five varieties of industrial hemp.

These trials are managed by the South Australian Research and Development Institute in the Riverland and in the South-East to measure grain, fibre quality and yield. The trials aim to determine the crop's optimum sowing and growing period, assess different industrial hemp varieties and investigate the suitability of the Riverland and the South-East for hemp grain and fibre production. I think they are finding out what soil types are best as well and the amount of water needed and that kind of thing. Obviously, being a summer crop, it is reliant on high rainfall, and you have to be in the right area for that, but there is also the potential for irrigation under pivots and the like.

With regard to licence applications, the first industrial hemp crops are set to be sown in South Australia later this year following approval of the first cultivation licences. The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, the Hon. Tim Whetstone, announced in April the issuing of the first industrial hemp cultivation licences. This was a significant milestone towards the establishment of an industrial hemp industry in the state. It is the establishment of an exciting new agricultural industry here in South Australia that will grow our economy, particularly in the regions.

Based on current predictions, it is anticipated that within five years an expanding industrial hemp industry in South Australia could have a farmgate value of \$3 million a year. Under the regulatory framework, which is administered by PIRSA, potential industrial hemp growers, processors and suppliers will be required to meet certain conditions in order to be granted licences issued by the state government.

A licence can only be issued by PIRSA if the applicant and each associate of the applicant is deemed to be a fit and proper person by South Australia Police and the area of cultivation is greater than one hectare, so you have to be serious about growing it. Independent crop testing is conducted by authorised PIRSA inspectors to verify that the THC content of all industrial hemp crops meets legal requirements. Crops exceeding 1 per cent THC will no longer be industrial hemp and will potentially be referred for criminal investigation under the Controlled Substances Act 1984.

With regard to some of the market information about growing industrial hemp around the world, over 30 nations grow industrial hemp. The largest hemp seed-producing nations are France and China, and China and South Korea are the largest fibre producers. There are also substantial hemp industries in Canada and Europe. There has been significant global innovation, research and agronomy and the development of high-performance hemp products in the last 15 years. Canada's



export of hemp products grew from about \$10.4 million in 2010 to over \$90 million in the 10 months to October 2015.

The latest Australian figures from 2012, with only 630 hectares planted, equate to \$1.6 million in value. Hemp has been grown in the Eastern States and Western Australia for some time, with Tasmania having over 20 years' experience. I have been to Tasmania and seen not so much hemp crops but I have witnessed the poppy farming that goes on, obviously for legal pharmaceutical opium. There is quite strict compliance around that, obviously, and there are signs on fences warning that you should not be in there getting amongst the product. That will be very similar to the legislation around industrial hemp.

These compliance arrangements have been challenging. It has been challenging for people to meet the strict arrangements, and it has to be strict because you are dealing with a hemp product even though it has a low THC level. Growers first get excited about the opportunity to grow this product, but then they have to go through all the issues with the people involved in compliance, including the police. I have had discussions with people at all sorts of levels about not just industrial hemp but also medicinal cannabis. I have heard a lot of anecdotal stories. Some people say that medicinal cannabis is a great product, but it is highly regulated as, of course, it should be, and some say it is too hard to get to for the pain relief that they need.

There will be more work done in the future, but I believe, as far as medicinal cannabis goes, that there probably are opportunities into the future, as long as it is managed with the appropriate compliance. It is the same with industrial hemp as a fibre. It has been probably over 25 years since someone who lived not far from my place—a lady called Carolyn Graham, who now lives at Artherton in Narungga—was involved in trying to get industrial hemp production going then. It is just a matter of time to break down the mindset that it is a hemp product, and it is a legal hemp product, but you have to manage the legalities, the perceptions and so on.

It certainly provides another opportunity for South Australian growers who produce. By the time it gets through to finished food, I think it is over \$25 billion worth of product per annum in this state. You might say, 'In five years' time, we might only have a \$3 million hemp crop,' but it is like everything: you have to go through the process. You have to see how it goes. If it does go alright, you have to sort out the agronomy and understand the climatic conditions, understand how much water is the optimum amount to be put on, obviously in an irrigated set-up, and what soil type. In this state, there is a whole range of soil types. You can go from non-wetting sand through to light loams, loamy ground and rocky ground.

I think in the first couple of years, after these initial trials, when we get to broader scale production of industrial hemp, we will certainly see where it shines. For a lot of people, it will be about seeing how it works on their different farms and the different set climate for their area. When I say 'the set climate', obviously the climate is not set, but it will have variabilities that will not be the same as perhaps 300 kilometres down the road.

I think there is lots of opportunity. Certainly, as a summer crop, it can be sown on top of another crop. To me, it appears that it needs a reasonable amount of water, so there will be opportunities in groundwater situations, whether it is places like the Mallee wells in my electorate or in other groundwater areas like MacKillop and further down into Mount Gambier. People could quite possibly, and probably will, use their River Murray allocation water; that would be quite suitable.

It comes down to the economics. If people work out that the economics for the crop are going to work, they will grow it; it is as simple as that. Certainly, under irrigation, it is a lot better than I am used to over my lifetime, which is dryland farming. The one thing you always want to manage is the water. If you know you can manage the water, you just have to manage the soil type, the date of sowing and fertiliser inputs.

That is something else that will need to be worked out over time: what is the best time to sow; whether it is too cold or too hot, obviously going into a summer crop situation; whether or not to use urea, liquid nitrogen additions or trace elements; and what are the best inputs to get the appropriate output? As with anything in farming, especially cropping, you can go hard and get burnt at the other end because you get a tight finish. Under irrigation, it will be a bit different, because you can manage that water, as long as you have the appropriate amount under licence.

I think there is a lot of potential here. It will be very strictly controlled, which I fully understand, but I think it gives South Australian farmers who have the opportunity to grow this spring/summer crop another option for profitability and will help augment the great agriculture sector that we have in this state. It is certainly something that will benefit the regions, but not just the regions; it will benefit the whole economy going into the future. Like most people say, 'If farmers are making money, they spend the money.' If you can make money out of a crop or your stock, that is exactly what will happen.

I wish the industry all the best. There will be some headaches and there will be some failures, but if you do not have a go you will not know. To people who are proposing to get into industrial hemp growing and supply, I say: go into it with open eyes, but I wish you all the luck into the future.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the next speaker, I welcome to the parliament today students and staff from the Noarlunga Downs Primary School. Welcome today. We hope you enjoy your visit. You are guests of the member for Kaurna. The next speaker is the member for Giles.

#### *Motions*

#### **INDUSTRIAL HEMP**

Debate resumed.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:10):** I rise today to express our wholehearted support for the motion. I would like to acknowledge the work that was done in the upper house by the Hon. Kyam Maher and the Hon. Tammy Franks in providing a bit of impetus to get this industry going. I am aware that there are two trial sites: one in the South-East and one in the Riverland. Because of the regulations governing the industry at the moment, we are understandably not able to identify in detail where those particular sites are.

It is always very worthwhile to promote diversification, whether it is in the agrarian sector or in the industrial sector. The development of industrial hemp will assist in diversifying our agricultural base here in South Australia—and a very fine agricultural base it is as well. The work that has been done to date will hopefully see the development of a decent-sized industry and it might well be that we have underestimated the potential impacts of this industry, given the number of cultivars that are available—so there should be some flexibility there—and given the range of products that can arise as a result of the growing of industrial hemp.

I recall *Grand Designs*, a program that usually features houses that are way over the top. On one occasion, Kevin McCloud, the architect and presenter of that television series, put his own money on the line and got involved in developing a relatively low-cost housing project. There were multiple houses, and one of his choices of building material was hempcrete.

He chose to use hempcrete for a range of environmental reasons. One reason was that it was a store for carbon, but it had some practical benefits in that it was a good insulator, it was fire resistant and it was very easy to use. It could be used in panels. It could be used in a brick form. As you followed that housing project through to fruition, they ended up with a good result with that particular hempcrete.

Of course, there are a whole range of other applications for industrial hemp. Indeed, someone in my electorate approached me the other day interested in growing hemp to the north of Cowell. I am not sure whether conditions in that particular area would suit, given the rainfall and the soil types, but I did indicate to him to go and have a chat to PIRSA and the local economic development board. I imparted what knowledge I had, but there are clearly a lot of people around with far more knowledge. It was interesting to see that people were taking an interest.

I had a full speech prepared, but the member for Hammond gave a very comprehensive description of what is proposed, what is happening and what potentially might happen in the future, so I am not going to repeat any of that. I think one of the things about this house is that many words are spoken and a lot of it is incredibly repetitive. I suggest that if the productivity commission gets up and running, one of the first things to look at is parliamentary processes and how we could become more efficient in this place so that those of us who are country members can be out there in our

electorate where the real work gets done. That is just a suggestion, without reflecting negatively on the great work of this house.

The motion mentions SARDI, and I want to add my bit and bestow accolades upon SARDI. It is a fantastic organisation that has done great work over the years. I hope that the current government will have a greater focus not just in relation to SARDI but to the broader field of research and development—in agriculture and horticulture—with more resources provided to assist in applied science and some of the purer aspects of that; but this is largely related to applied science.

I was quite a proud owner of a hemp shirt at one time. I am not noted for my sartorial elegance, and I would have to say that the shirt itself was not particularly elegant, but it was a great shirt. It was very comfortable, and it lasted a long time. I had that shirt many years ago. I bought it in Newcastle in an upmarket little boutique that somehow I ended up in courtesy of my daughter. I ended up getting that hemp shirt, and it was a good quality product.

When you look back in time at the range of hemp products being produced, it is actually quite amazing: body parts for cars, and of course the shipping industry used to be, once upon a time, heavily dependent upon hemp. There were hemp ropes. It was a widely used product, and it was the introduction of petrochemicals that largely saw a lot of those uses for hemp hit the wall. But I can see a resurgence coming because the plant has a lot of worthwhile attributes.

At the end of the day, it will come down to the entrepreneurial flair of our farming sector—and also the manufacturing sector and the other people who have the capacity to value add—and they will look at what is going to make economic sense, which cultivars to propagate and where to propagate. Two trials is probably not enough, and there is going to be a lot of trial and error initially. Of course, we can build upon what other countries that have relatively mature industrial hemp sectors have done.

I commend the member for bringing this motion to the house. It is a motion that deserves our support. It is always good to see at times tripartisan support for the development of new industries in South Australia.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:18):** I have great pleasure in getting up and making a contribution to the member for Hammond's motion today. I can speak quite fondly of what has been achieved and what has been introduced into South Australia as another primary industry. It is a diverse crop, and it gives mostly primary producers, in essence, the opportunity to diversify their businesses.

We have seen two trial sites: one in the South-East and one in the Riverland, and those trial sites are an indication that the crop can be grown here in South Australia. Those trial sites were undertaken by the great, dedicated SARDI officials. I recently travelled to the South-East to look at the trial site down there. I noticed that they had different planting times and different strains of the plant, and it was interesting to see the diverse results. What I would say is that I have been given results for both the fibre and value-added products of hemp from the South-East and from the Riverland.

It is a very diverse plant. Not only do we look at producing building products and fibre to make clothing and other twine products but it also has the diversity to make pharmaceutical products, cosmetics, and the list goes on. It is a crop that can be grown in diverse situations. I noted contributions from the members for Hammond and Giles questioning whether the crop can be grown in different areas for different circumstances—yes, it can.

It is a hardy plant that is highly fibrous, so it can be grown at different times of the year and under different weather conditions, but of course it would be more successful under irrigation, given the type of plant it is and the root system it has. It is predominantly a surface root plant, but I am sure we will get different results with different planting techniques and inputs. This is an opportunity for South Australia to get on board and potentially use this plant diversely. Again, in April, as the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, I issued the first cultivation licences for industrial hemp in South Australia.

The details around licences are protected under the act, so we cannot reveal where the trials are based or where the licences are going to be issued. This is all for good reason: those who are

uneducated, thinking that they have stumbled across a perceived drug crop, have their facts and figures wrong. It has a very low THC content of 0.5 per cent, as I understand, and that is there specifically so that it is not an incentive for people to utilise industrial hemp for all the wrong reasons.

I can say that my department has had plenty of interest and inquiries into how people can participate and be a part of the industrial hemp industry. I must point out that of the two trial sites, the one in the South-East was in clay, which is quite heavy ground, and the water they used was quite saline. The trial site in the Riverland used free-draining sandy loam and the great water from the River Murray.

What the trial sites were able to prove is that hemp can grow in quite diverse situations, climate types, soil types, water types and inputs. Just like any form of agriculture or horticulture, it will be finely tuned as time goes on. If we look at any primary production crop, what we see is that different growing techniques and different input styles always achieve different results. I say to those considering expanding their horizons into industrial hemp, please contact the PIRSA office and they will give you the necessary details.

For the harvest that has concluded, SARDI is in the process of cleaning the grain for final weighing and subsampling. The grain quality will then be assessed by the University of Adelaide and the stem quality assessed by the CSIRO. These are just the qualities of the different strains of the plants to determine what they can best be used for. If we are going to grow high-fibrous type plants, they will potentially have a much bigger benefit within the building industries and produce better clothing quality. If we look at the oil content, then cosmetics, pharmaceuticals and other related products will also complement the oil content.

I expect that we will know the results of those trials in August, which will give a clear understanding of the strain types, how they will grow and the types of products the primary producer is looking to cultivate. Through PIRSA and SARDI, the government will continue to work very hard to realise the opportunities for industrial hemp as a diverse option for our agricultural industry in this state. I am very proud that I have been able to see the trials and undertake a lot of consultation with the trial sites to make sure that the growers and the potential entrants into the industry get good advice and good direction.

We take for granted that it may have taken decades to develop the strain of a wheat in a paddock. With horticultural groves, the citrus industry, almonds and grapes, it may have taken a century to get the right varieties in the right areas, to get the right growing techniques and the right outcome. It is an exciting time. These are early days, but it is an opportunity. I commend this motion to the house.

**Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:26):** I rise to support the motion and to thank the member for Hammond for bringing it to the house. While today we are noting that the first cultivation licences have been approved, it was Labor that backed the Greens' plan to legalise hemp cultivation for industrial use. We backed the legislation with amendments limiting the level of THC and subjected growers to testing and regulatory checks to ensure they were fit and proper persons.

The move to legalise hemp cultivation for industrial use aligned South Australia with other states. The Northern Territory is now the only other jurisdiction where cultivation has not been legalised, but I understand that crop trials are underway. Historically, when we look back on this industry, Victoria was the first state to legalise it in 1998, followed by the other states. When we think about hemp, many people think about marijuana, which of course is not what this is. This hemp is a cannabis type with very low levels of the chemical THC. It can be used to produce clothing, food, paper, textiles, plastics, insulation and biofuel.

Let's remind ourselves of the steps taken here. Labor was at the forefront of this new emerging industry in South Australia. To promote that, we held a round table with people interested in the economic opportunities. We needed people to come together to understand holistically the opportunities going forward.

Labor continues to back any industry offering an economic benefit to the state. It is an opportunity to build on what is still the most significant part of our economy: primary production. I look across the house and note that many people have family histories and continue to be involved

in our farming communities. We know that South Australia's climate is well suited not just to general primary production—wheats, oats and barley—but also to industrial hemp.

One of the key things about bringing this forward was to understand how the licences are approved. PIRSA (Primary Industries and Regions SA) is responsible for issuing licences to authorise the possession, cultivation, processing and supply of industrial hemp in South Australia. Of course, you can only sell the industrial hemp you grow to someone who holds an industrial hemp licence, which allows a licence holder to grow or use industrial hemp in a manufacturing process, food products—when authorised—or for research purposes.

When I looked into the background of this, the question that came to me was: where to from here? How do we build this industry? I understand that in November last year there was a significant coming together of representation from farmers, building and construction, clothing manufacturers, and the Office of Industrial Hemp and Medicinal Cannabis. They wanted to discuss how best the industry could be organised to take advantage of the new opportunities in South Australia. At that point the group heard that there were industrial hemp-growing trials being conducted in the Riverland and the South-East.

From that opportunity, there was general agreement about the next steps forward: a five to 10-year strategic plan would be developed; agronomy is critical to success; seed would be the initial target crop; it was important for us to quantify the cost and return for crops; markets would dictate the growth of the industry; and South Australia is likely to have a competitive advantage in food products. There was also the opportunity for a collaborative cluster development, looking at that as a potential industry model.

Some of the things people often say to us are, 'Where do we get help? How do we find how we can develop our business, our industry?' That is why we established the Office of Industrial Hemp and Medicinal Cannabis. They are two separate issues, but we made sure that we had a one-stop shop people could approach.

When looking into this motion, it was very interesting to note from the market insights that 30 nations grow industrial hemp and that the largest hemp seed-producing nations are France and China, while China and South Korea are the largest fibre producers. There are also substantial hemp industries in Canada and Europe. While we know that for more than 20 years it has been grown interstate, South Australia has approval for the first cultivation licence, and this is just the start of this industry developing here.

As shadow minister for trade, I am always interested to know about opportunities to develop our economy. While we might be using the product within Australia and exporting to the Eastern States, there might be an opportunity for us to gain a foothold in the international market. I thank the member for Hammond for bringing this motion, but once again I highlight that it was the Labor government that set this in motion.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (12:32):** I rise to support the motion. As members know, industrial hemp is cultivated for seed and fibre production, and its cultivation offers a new and versatile crop for mixed cropping farmers in South Australia. Hemp fibre and pulp can be used in industrial and consumer settings, including in the production of paper, building materials, textiles and, of course, hemp seed oil, which is prized for cosmetics, high-protein food production and for use in other manufacturing processes.

The low concentration of THC in industrial hemp crop plants means they cannot usefully be used to produce psychoactive effects in the same way for which illicit cannabis varieties can be cultivated and ultimately illegally produced and harvested. Industrial hemp production is regulated in South Australia under the Industrial Hemp Act and the Industrial Hemp Regulations, and I am pleased and proud that one of the first licences for cultivation of industrial hemp was granted for cropping on a 69-hectare property in the Adelaide Hills.

As well, I inform the house that a successful cosmetics business that uses industrial hemp products trades on Gawler Street in Mount Barker within my electorate. Hemp Hemp Hooray has established itself as a leading boutique cosmetics brand in the Hills, and I extend my congratulations to Teresa and Simon McDowell, who have built a successful small business in my community and

who have demonstrated the many valuable uses of industrial hemp. They have experienced growth in sales of about 56 per cent in the last 12 months and a corresponding increase in the production of the cosmetics products they retail has been necessary. Teresa and Simon are considering employing further staff, including trainees.

I mention these matters in the house to further illustrate the value of their business to my community and the value of their business model to our state. I thank the member for Hammond for bringing forward this motion.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:34):** I rise to support the motion:

That this house—

- (a) notes the state government approved the first cultivation licences for industrial hemp in April 2018;
- (b) acknowledges that it is anticipated that within five years an expanding industrial hemp industry in South Australia could have a farmgate value of \$3 million per year; and
- (c) highlights the excellent work undertaken by SARDI, particularly through industrial hemp trial crops in the Riverland and South-East.

In 2011, I was a finalist in the Telstra Business Women's Awards and was very fortunate at this time to meet another finalist, who is an outstanding, innovative and passionate businesswoman; her name is Teresa McDowell, as just mentioned by the member for Kavel. Teresa was on a mission to empower people to harness the hemp life and engage in healthy living. Teresa is the founder of Hemp Hemp Hooray and is a hemp living advocate. Since making her first and most popular hemp product, Skin Soothe, in Mount Barker, South Australia, Teresa has transformed her hemp skincare range into a brand with passion and purpose.

Teresa's story began 10 years ago when her passion for aromatherapy and her vision for industrial hemp collided. These two powerful forces resulted in the creation of a natural skin and body care range, using Australian grown hemp seed oil as the base for all her products. Frustrated by artificial and chemical-based skincare brands available to consumers, she took matters into her own hands and started making her own natural products, while raising three children, in South Australia. Her range quickly grew and gained a loyal following, with customers placing orders across Australia and overseas.

Teresa and I continue to cross paths with a group of impressive women in leadership who form the Telstra Business Women's Alumni. This provides me the opportunity to hear stories from across South Australia of smart women working hard and being innovative to make a difference in business and in our community. I have watched with great interest Teresa's advocacy for the industrial hemp industry and therefore would like to take the opportunity to share a statement from Teresa supporting the motion today:

As a long-time advocate for Industrial Hemp, Founder of IHASA (Industrial Hemp Association of South Australia) and business owner in this emerging industry I would like to highlight the incredible work of the Association and its dedicated committee.

IHASA along with regional advocates played a pivotal role in lobbying for the Industrial Hemp Bill SA, 2017.

After 14 years building Hemp Hemp Hooray natural body care, educating consumers and the public on the many and varied benefits of industrial hemp, it is wonderful to finally see the groundswell of support and awareness for all things hemp.

As SARDI continue to progress with crop trials and the first licenses are now being granted, it is my hope that government can further support farmers, producers, manufacturers and innovators to get on with the business of hemp—tapping into its local and global markets.

Thank you, Teresa, for your commitment to your passions and this industry. Thank you to the member for Kavel for also recognising this wonderful businesswoman. I look forward to this government continuing to support this new industry, particularly for new ventures in the cultivation and processing of industrial hemp. This government is certainly focused on improving economic and productivity growth in South Australia in order to achieve higher standards of living for all South Australians and more jobs for South Australians. I thank the member for Hammond and commend this motion to members.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:38):** I thank members in this house for the unanimous approval of this new, exciting industry coming into South Australia, which will be a boon for not just agriculture but the whole state. I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

### GENERATIONS IN JAZZ

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:39):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that Generations in Jazz is the largest jazz festival in the Southern Hemisphere;
- (b) congratulates the board and volunteers of Generations in Jazz on their efforts in facilitating this year's event;
- (c) recognises the significant financial contribution this event makes to the state of South Australia;
- (d) calls on the state government to award Generations in Jazz major event status; and
- (e) calls on the Premier of South Australia to invite prominent arts journalists from across Australia to be his guests at the 2019 Generations in Jazz festival to promote the event and South Australia, both nationally and internationally.

Over 5,100 students from 128 different schools travelled across the nation, gathering on the outskirts of Mount Gambier, to take part in the annual Generations in Jazz event held from 4 to 6 May this year for a monumental and inspiring weekend of jazz. Generations in Jazz commenced in 1982. The festival started as a school-based competition and is now the largest youth jazz festival of its kind worldwide.

In the days leading up to Generations in Jazz, there was no denying the uplifting of spirit in Mount Gambier. Buses were flooding in, students were exploring our vibrant city, a hum of jazz music was in the air. Bands and choirs spent any spare precious moment practising before the commencement of competitions the following day. I know the Premier will agree that the experience of being at the festival is unlike anything else.

On a sunny autumn day, we witnessed thousands of young Australian musicians gather to show their appreciation and shared passion of jazz music in what is the largest youth jazz festival of its kind in the Southern Hemisphere. Chairman of the Generations in Jazz festival and successful musician James Morrison AM said of the unique event:

There are plenty of music festivals that young people go to, but the big difference with this one is that it's all about jazz and everyone performs. What other festival do you go to where all 6,000 people who are coming actually play? If you just wander around these venues, you see all sorts of musicians of all different ages and standards all playing jazz. It's an amazing thing and it's incredibly inspiring for everyone.

Within 100 kilometres of The Barn Palais, the venue for the festival, all accommodation was fully booked. Students were sharing schools and sports halls, gyms and private homes, just to be accommodated. Housing over 5,000 people is no simple task, especially when they must also be provided with three meals each day. Catering is a major component of the event, but the entire Limestone Coast helps with the logistics of the world-class jazz extravaganza.

Coordinating the task is a team of dedicated volunteers who, year in, year out for the past 30 years, have volunteered their time to organise accommodation and find spaces for bands to play and choirs to sing. This year there were over 13 different venues and stages. One can only imagine the painstaking task of coordinating where 5,000 to 6,000 people are going to play in one weekend so that students in multiple bands and choirs are not overlapping.

The Barn served an estimated 21,000 meals over the weekend. An estimated 4,000 volunteer hours were spent on this year's event alone. This is an enormous effort, and I call on this house to praise James Morrison AM, the chairman of the festival for the past 30 years; the event organiser, Nethanel Sutton from Generations in Jazz; and the over 200 local registered volunteers, plus the unregistered volunteers, who have contributed to such a wholesome community event—an event completely unique to the South-East of South Australia.

Adelaide's Marryatville High School took out awards in the top divisions of all three major categories, including Division 1 Stage Band winner. I encourage Vickie Chapman, whose electorate this school is situated in, to attend next year's festival in Mount Gambier and watch this very successful school perform. The festival has unquestionably grown and continues to grow. This year alone there were over 5,000 performers, which is unique.

I understand that chairman, James Morrison, as well as the Generations in Jazz board members envisage that this event will become international with students travelling from Europe, Asia, America and all over the world to mix and play with our Australian students as they share their common interest in jazz music. Three schools from New Zealand have signalled their intent to come in 2019.

This year, The Cat Empire, James Morrison, US saxophonist Jeff Clayton, Madrid percussionist Nasrine Rahmani and Cologne-based trombonist Shannon Barnett entertained over 6,000 people seated in the James Morrison Pavilion, for which they needed separate sessions. US jazz sensation Patti Austin was a special guest artist at this year's event and described it as 'the most concentrated, soulful experience I have ever had in my life'. Such a unique festival not only increases the diverse culture of the Mount Gambier community but also boosts our economy. Generations in Jazz event organiser Nethanel Sutton said of the event:

Generations in Jazz has grown for three decades with no federal or state government support, solely relying on the generosity of donations, sponsorship and thousands of volunteer hours.

Government funding would assist in so many ways, whether it is securing artists for student workshops, appointing a more permanent event management team, improving upon our infrastructure or further expanding the festival.

The city of Wangaratta in Victoria has a population of just over 28,000 people. Each November for the past 29 years, the town has hosted one of the largest jazz festivals in Australia. They receive major support from the state government of Victoria through Creative Victoria, Business Victoria, the Australia Council for the Arts and the Rural City of Wangaratta, to name only a few.

To enable this event in Mount Gambier to continue to expand, I call on the state government to recognise this festival as a major event, and I call on the Minister for Tourism, the Hon. David Ridgway, to grant it major event status. Following this year's Generations in Jazz event, organiser Nethanel Sutton indicated that additional media exposure would increase the event's visibility and put 'regional Australia under the spotlight'. Mr Sutton went on to say that government support and funding would assist in stimulating the growth of the festival.

Generations in Jazz has grown for three decades with no federal or state government sponsorship. There is tremendous community collaboration and involvement in this event. Mr Sutton said that it also serves as a major fundraiser for sporting clubs, schools and charity groups that provide accommodation, catering, cleaning and other services. The economic benefit to Mount Gambier cannot be underestimated. The city council estimated that the festival delivered an economic uplift of \$1.4 million solely in accommodation bookings over the three days in Mount Gambier. The member for Florey might have a little bit more to say about that.

**Ms Bedford:** A thousand dollars of that was mine.

**Mr BELL:** To promote this event even further, I encourage the Premier to invite arts journalists as his guests in the coming years to ensure that our event and our region is put under the spotlight. It is truly a shame to read about such an inspiring and monumental event only in the Mount Gambier local paper. Invitations could be extended to Mal Stanley from ABC radio, who presents *Jazztrack* on Saturdays and Sundays, Jessica Nicholas from ABC Jazz and, of course, Peter Goers, who hosts *Evenings* on ABC and is a great champion of regional South Australia. Further afield, an invitation could be extended to Andrew McMillen from *The Australian*. US jazz sensation Patti Austin said of the event:

This experience is magic—so please take this magic with you and please spread this magnificent musical fairy dust on everyone around you.

I trust that support from the South Australian government, through granting Generations in Jazz major event status, will ultimately fulfil Patti Austin's assignment of sharing this hidden gem of a festival with the world.



**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Heysen.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:48):** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for the opportunity to rise in support of the motion. I would particularly stress at the outset paragraphs (d) and (e) of the honourable member's motion. It is particularly important that Generations in Jazz stays in South Australia. It is a South Australian icon. It is an event of which we should all be proud as a state. I lend my wholehearted support to its recognition increasingly across the state as the icon that we all know it is.

Generations in Jazz started in 1987. There are 5,000 performers who attend now. While James Morrison AM is at the heart and centre of the event, he has been mentored by Don Burrows and the elder generation. James Morrison in turn found Emma Pask at the tender age of 16, who is now his regular vocalist. From Don Burrows to James Morrison to Emma Pask, Generations in Jazz attracts the greatest from each of the generations to Mount Gambier, South Australia, to one of the great events in music, so I wholeheartedly support the motion.

I am very proud to say that members of Heathfield High School in my electorate are proud competitors in Generations in Jazz, and so it is certainly spreading far and wide to the Hills. I want to highlight the great work of DaDux, who have competed this year as they have for the last couple of years. Zoe Smith, Emily Possingham, Jennifer Barnett, Darcie Bills, Loui Savva, and Abi Newberry all played in the new category of Jazz Combo. They performed well, and they are typical of the performance spreading far and wide across the state. I also want to recognise, as the member for Mount Gambier did, the great competitive work of those from Marryatville High School, the alma mater of my friend the member for Waite. They have been regular participants.

From Adelaide to the Adelaide Hills, Generations in Jazz is a great event run by a great hero of jazz in James Morrison. I am sure that, from DaDux to Marryatville High and everywhere in between, there are young jazz musicians, performers and mentors of all the generations who wish to make sure that this great event continues to grow and thrive in our great state of South Australia. I commend the motion.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:52):** Apart from the member for Mount Gambier, I think I have the most experience of Generations in Jazz. I remember going down there with Modbury High School in my first year of being a member of parliament. They should be commended for being a non-special interest music school that has always managed to send a band down to Mount Gambier. Apart from Pedal Prix, Generations in Jazz is my favourite school-based function. It goes right back to those early days with Dale Cleves and some of his friends jamming in jazz.

I urge all members to read my *Hansard* speeches over the years. They will be enlightening because I go right back to the days when this was happening in the barn pavilion under the straw roof. Everybody fitted into that room and we now have the largest marquee in the Southern Hemisphere or almost the world by the look of it; it is just enormous.

The value of music cannot be underestimated. I cannot tell the house how concerned I am about the state of music education and the Department for Education through the instrumental music branch. I urge the minister to do as much as he can to make sure that music is not reduced. I must also put in a word for the volunteers. They make the event absolutely marvellous. It was a real thrill to see Soroptimist there again this year, providing food for the hungry hordes as they went through the days' programs over the full weekend.

As has been previously mentioned, there have been some outrageous hikes in accommodation over that weekend. I urge people to shop around and make sure they do not reward the people who go way over what would be expected to be normal in the costs of accommodation for the weekend. No matter how busy the place is, there is no justification for that sort of a hike.

I commend and congratulate the member for Mount Gambier. I assure him I am happy to come with him lobbying anyone he wishes anywhere in the state or beyond because, unless South Australia makes this its own, other states will try to poach it because it is an absolutely amazing event. Congratulations to everybody involved in Mount Gambier, especially all the music teachers who make sure their children in both public and private schools are ready for such a fabulous

weekend of exposure to international, world-acclaimed artists. Just to watch it is amazing, and I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:54):** I also rise to speak briefly on this motion. I commend the member for Mount Gambier for putting this on the *Notice Paper* and recognise that it is more than just a great event; it is actually a great South Australian event. In particular, as the member for Heysen highlighted in his contribution, it is important to note paragraph (d) in terms of giving this event major event status. I know there are Victorians across the border, and the last thing we need is those nasty Victorians stealing our very good event.

There is a strong Victorian presence in terms of the management board and committee members of Generations, including former premier of Victoria Jeff Kennett. I just want us to ensure that every single South Australian school knows about Generations. My alma mater, Marryatville High, is a great contributor to Generations and a frequent winner, which is fantastic. Every school in South Australia should continue to participate in Generations.

I acknowledge that it is a tremendous opportunity for schoolchildren from South Australia and across the nation to participate and also mention the economic benefits that it brings to the city of Mount Gambier. The emphasis that it places on the state, and the role that the James Morrison Academy down in the Mount plays and highlights to the state, is a fantastic opportunity. I would love for this government and minister Ridgway to ensure that Generations remains a major event in South Australia.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** A big welcome today to year 6 and 7 students from Rose Park Primary School, who are guests of the Premier. I see the President of the Legislative Council up there as well.

#### *Motions*

#### **GENERATIONS IN JAZZ**

Debate resumed.

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:56):** I rise today on my slightly broken heels, as the shadow minister for the arts, to support the motion of the member for Mount Gambier—and a great motion it is. Mount Gambier is on the map for many things, and each year Generations in Jazz helps to raise this regional city's profile and plant it on the map for arts and arts education. It dates all the way back to 1987 and has become a mecca for national and international jazz artists and helps to grow a passion in our young people—many of whom are here today—for art, for jazz and for music more generally.

I have been pleased, over the years as a journalist, to attend and report on the event. I can attest to the great energy in the town at the time that Generations in Jazz is being held. Over 5,000 young people in bands are drawn to the annual event each year. They bring their families and friends, and they boost the local economy. When those young people and their families leave, they take with them fond memories of Mount Gambier and the South-East to share with others and to entice them to visit our state and our regions.

In addition to the economic value is the cultural and educational value of the event. The value of the arts to children certainly cannot be underestimated. Not everyone has a gift for music. I certainly do not, beyond sometimes singing to pop songs in the car.

#### *Members interjecting:*

**Ms STINSON:** Yes, I am a big Iggy Azalea fan. Learning an instrument is certainly a wonderful educational exercise for children and young people. Pivotal to the recent success of Generations in Jazz has been the involvement of world-renowned jazz musician James Morrison. He has brought a passion, an energy and a profile that is unrivalled. He has driven the festival forward and boosted it to the high-profile and major event it is today.

That is why the Weatherill government was so proud to back the James Morrison Jazz Scholarship and James Morrison Academy of Music, which was opened by the then premier in 2015. That academy is a partnership with the University of South Australia, and they should also be commended for their investment. The academy was backed by seed funding of half a million dollars from the then Labor government, and as a reporter I remember attending and filing a story on it for 7 News. I most particularly recall the impromptu concert that we were all shouted to by James Morrison. It was just a glimpse of what an impressive musician he is and how lucky our young people are to be able to soak up his years of experience and talent.

This motion calls for Generations in Jazz to be declared a major event and we wholeheartedly support that on this side of the house. It will join the ranks of events such as the Adelaide Festival, WOMAdelaide, the Adelaide Cabaret Festival, SALA (which opens this week), Feast Festival, and the Guitar Festival, which is on very soon as well. I would like to commend this motion to the house.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:59):** I would just like to thank all members who have made a contribution on this debate.

Motion carried.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**ANSWERS TABLED**

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

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Ombudsman SA—Audit Survey Report, Assessment of state agencies' complaints management systems report June 2018 [Ordered to be published]

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. V A Chapman)—

Housing Trust Triennial Review, South Australian—2013-14 to 2016-17

*Parliamentary Committees*

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:02):** I bring up the fourth report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time*

**KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:03):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General stand by her decision to compensate Mr Henry Keogh, given the findings of the Court of Criminal Appeal? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** The court found:

The task of the jury involved consideration of all of the circumstances of the case, including the fact that a young and apparently healthy woman died suddenly while taking a bath in circumstances where the applicant may have had a motive to murder her and had the opportunity to do so on the night of her death. Nevertheless, the forensic pathology evidence was a central component of the prosecution case before the jury.

We do not accept the submission made by the applicant's counsel that there should be a direction of acquittal. To the contrary, we consider that the non-expert circumstantial evidence, when considered together with the forensic pathology evidence—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** It's very long.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That's right, it is. It's an important matter.

as it is now understood, is such that it would remain open to a properly directed jury to convict. However, we expressly recognise that a properly directed jury may consider that the evidence would not be sufficient to establish guilt beyond reasonable doubt. These are truly jury questions and this judgement should not be taken to express a view on whether the applicant in fact committed the crime with which he was charged. For our part, our review of the material does not establish a case for acquittal following this appeal. Accordingly, we would set aside the conviction and order a retrial. It is a matter for the Director to determine how the matter should proceed.

We grant permission to appeal and allow the appeal. We set aside the conviction of Henry Vincent Keogh for the crime of murder. We direct that Henry Vincent Keogh be re-tried.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Attorney-General, I point out that I would expect quite a broad answer with such background facts. I appreciate that they are of a sensitive nature. I call the Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:05):** I thank the member for the question. I would ask the apparently newly appointed shadow attorney-general in asking this question that, when he quotes from a Full Court judgement of the Court of Criminal Appeal, he ensures that he takes into account, or in fact even reads, the rest of the judgement to ensure that what is clear are that these are the facts.

The conviction in respect of Mr Keogh was quashed. There had been referral to a retrial. The DPP of the day instituted a further charge. He withdrew that under what we describe as a *nolle prosequi*. The situation today, as we speak, is that Mr Keogh has spent almost 20 years in gaol and his conviction was quashed. Consistent with that, the former attorney-general, who is still with us here in the chamber, received in his time a claim in respect of funds for taking into account those circumstances.

He instructed senior independent counsel to give advice to the then government as to the request and, obviously, risk to the state and had proceeded to enter into correspondence on behalf of the former government with those representing Mr Keogh. That situation was left unresolved when the new government came into office. We have considered all the material. I want to say that I appreciate those independent senior counsel who made themselves available to assist in the negotiations on this matter and indeed to those representing other parties.

I would ask that all those matters be considered by the opposition. In short, am I confident of the decision that was made by this government to settle this case and end the tawdry history of this in our legal history of South Australia? Yes, I am.

#### KEOGH CASE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:07):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Why didn't the Attorney-General recuse herself from the decision-making process in relation to Mr Henry Keogh, given her previous remarks on the Keogh case in parliament?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:08):** The simple answer to that is that there are no grounds upon which I would withdraw from representation in respect of making decisions on behalf of the new government in relation to that aspect. Upon being appointed Attorney-General, I did actually take advice from senior legal advisers as to any matters in which there would be a conflict of interest, or perceived conflict of interest, in relation to outstanding matters that I had participated in prior to the election of the new government.

There were a number of matters, including in respect of an application by a media outlet for a freedom of information application relating to the substantive case that has been referred to and a number of other freedom of information applications. In that regard, I received advice that it would be appropriate and, indeed, prudent to delegate authority in relation to those matters to, in this case, the chief executive of the department, which I did.

However, in relation to the substantive matter, there was no identified conflict of interest, and if the member is referring to any commentary made in 2005, which is asserted to be in the media arena some indication of support by me as to the guilt or innocence of Mr Keogh, then I suggest he reread that transcript. If he finds a question in relation to the then government's application of its own time to one of the many petitions of Mr Keogh via his counsel for consideration and the timeliness of that being dealt with as some indication of intent, then he is sadly mistaken.

#### **KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:10):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Is the Deputy Premier aware that the Cheney family raised concerns with the Premier regarding their perception of the Attorney's bias in relation to the case of Henry Keogh in relation to the murder of their daughter Anna-Jane Cheney?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:10):** What I am aware of is that, when the determination was made by the government to accept the recommended resolution of this matter, it seemed appropriate given the history of this case that the Cheney family be informed and that discussion was undertaken with a member of the Cheney family to offer myself personally to meet with them, if that was requested, to indicate to them before this became a media issue and was published, the government's decision.

Our government felt, and I completely endorse this, that, given this case has had a 25-year history which has been painful for the Cheney family, that is the least that we could do to ensure that they were, as much as possible, privy to what was occurring. As a result of that invitation, I received a request from the Cheney family directly, although later there was some apparent representation by a person purporting to represent the Cheney family, that they didn't want to meet but that they were concerned that their privacy be respected, and that when I on behalf of the government was to make an announcement in that regard that they would ask that we request that their privacy be respected and that that be conveyed to the media outlets, which I did.

If it assists the member in understanding the significance of this case and my involvement one way or another, let me say this: I knew Anna-Jane Cheney. She was a colleague of mine in the law. It was a very sad day when it became clear that she died. The circumstances that developed post that are another matter. But she was a bright young person—professionally, I think, competent and very, I think, looking forward to having a bright future in the law. When she died it was a sad day for those of us in the profession—a devastating day for the Cheney family themselves.

On the other hand, I have never met Mr Keogh. I have not requested to meet him. To the best of my knowledge he has not requested to meet me, and I have no intention of doing so. The decision that was made in relation to the settlement of this matter by the government was to take into account the interests of the state. We were sensitive to the circumstances in relation to the Cheney family, but the overriding consideration was the application that was before us, which had been before the previous government and for whatever reason had not been resolved.

The issues of what the previous government and previous attorneys have done is a matter for them to answer. We had this on our plate. It is important that it be resolved, and taking that into account I will say that I considered the prospect of further endless legal proceedings and public attention to this and the pain that that would inflict on the Cheney family as a factor that weighed on me personally.

Nevertheless, the overriding consideration in the envelope of advice given to us was to consider that advice, and, along with the negotiations in this matter, accept the advice and options given to us in those circumstances. I think it is a settlement—

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier's time has expired. The member for King.

#### **DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DISCLOSURE SCHEME**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:14):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier provide to the house an update on the rollout of the domestic violence disclosure scheme and its importance for all of South Australia?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:15):** I wish to thank the member for King for this important question. Along with the member for Elder, as the Assistant Minister for Family Violence Prevention—a bit of a mouthful, but she is on the job and doing it extremely well—both have been playing an incredible role in domestic violence prevention. The government had a strong agenda for domestic violence prevention at the March election, and we intend to continue to honour it.

Key facets of the commitment include co-locating services in safety hubs across our state; a personal protection app to link at-risk individuals directly to SAPOL and women's services; funding for the Women's Safety Services crisis hotline to operate 24 hours a day; improved communications with domestic violence victims about changes to the perpetrators' bail and parole conditions; and, importantly, the implementation of a domestic violence disclosure scheme. This is a key tenet of the overall policy, and I am pleased to announce that this scheme will be fully rolled out as and from 1 October 2018.

Members would be familiar with the other schemes that operate, known as Clare's Law in the United Kingdom, for a potential victim of domestic violence to seek information on a partner's history through an application made to the police. Those applying through this service will have their applications processed quickly and a report provided to them should any relevant criminal offending need to be disclosed. Importantly, it's a service that will be bolstered by the strong support from the Women's Safety Services and the Office for Women.

Recently, I met with the Minister for Women in New South Wales. Their Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme has been operating for two years, with the trial being extended. Over those two years, 50 disclosures were made to at-risk applicants. While this number is important, may I say that I wish to place more emphasis on another number, and that is that New South Wales has now linked over 300 other women with support services, that is, those who have exercised the request and had the disclosed material provided. It hasn't disclosed any criminal history.

Nevertheless, it means that these women have gone to the police after feeling there was something not quite right, they have applied, they have gone through the process and no relevant criminal offending was found. The key part of this is to ensure that those applicants are immediately linked with support services to assist them in relation to their concerns.

There is a reason why people come forward. They may not immediately be in a domestic violence situation, but they are worried. They have a feeling that something is not quite right in their personal relationship, and they need to be reassured or prepared for the worst. These are applicants that the Women's Safety Services would never have been able to contact previously because we didn't know that they existed. Under the scheme in South Australia, they will instead be able to receive support and assistance for why they felt the need to approach the police and what can be done.

By way of background, in the first 30 days of forming government, the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink in another place, the Hon. Corey Wingard and I hosted a domestic violence round table in the city. We are continuing to work with SAPOL, which has provided helpful guidelines in respect of how this should be operational and how it should be most effective, including protecting those who are involved.

Unfortunately, the former government were not committed to this scheme. I recognise the work of the members for Elizabeth and Reynell, who have consistently indicated their support for this, and I thank them for their continued support. We have committed to this, we are doing it, and it will start in October.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for West Torrens, I welcome to parliament today year 11 students from Cummins Area School, who are guests of the member for Flinders. I also acknowledge in the gallery and welcome again to parliament former Speaker the Hon. Graham Gunn. Welcome to you, sir. The member for West Torrens.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** His favourite standing order was 303.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens has the call.

*Question Time*

#### **KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:19):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Did the Attorney receive a formulated claim from lawyers representing Mr Henry Keogh?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:19):** The issue in relation to compensation/redress/ex gratia payment I can say is one where, to the best of the information I have provided prior to coming into office, in May 2017 the former government and cabinet, of which the member was a member, received a request for a very substantial financial payment. There was correspondence to consider whether that was to be in the form of a compensation/ex gratia/other-type payment. The correspondence that I viewed confirmed to me that it would continue as an ex gratia payment that was sought.

The member may not be aware of the particulars of these things, but sometimes the aspects of payment do take into account the applicant and any income tax liability, for example, that may apply and the like. These are normal things that occur in relation to these matters. The correspondence disclosed that in the event there wasn't a resolution of this matter, obviously, the proceedings would look. In relation to the nature of the question, I am assuming that what the member is asking is: were there any instituted proceedings in any court at the time of the consideration by this government of the matter? The answer to that is no and, to the best of my assessment, nor was it in the 11 months under the previous government.

#### **KEOGH CASE**

**Mr RAU (Enfield) (14:21):** A supplementary: my question is to the Attorney-General. Why did the government agree to the payment of \$2.5 million in the absence of a formulated claim? I think the Attorney knows what that means.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:22):** I thank the member for his question. I am very pleased that he has come into this debate because I think he knows what a formulated claim is, and I think I've got a pretty good idea after 30 years of being a legal practitioner, but I'm not sure that the member for Torrens understands—

**Mr Koutsantonis:** West Torrens.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —West Torrens understands it. Nevertheless, I think he is irrelevant for the purpose of this question. What is relevant in relation to the matter, which I think is well known to the member for Enfield, is that it is quite reasonable to consider what the risks are to the people of South Australia in relation to any financial claim against the state and, from time to time, ex gratia payments are made. In fact, one of the things that I have viewed since I have come into office were the very extensive lists of ex gratia payments made and authorised by the member for Enfield when he was attorney-general, which had been executed in the absence of any formulated claim.

#### **REGIONAL GROWTH FUND**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house about the opening grant round of the Regional Growth Fund?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:23):** It gives me great pleasure to respond to the member for MacKillop, one of the great regions in South Australia contributing to our regional economy through dairy, broadacre and livestock. It is a truly great electorate that I visited only last week. On Monday, applications for the inaugural round of the 10-year, \$150 million Regional Growth Fund opened. It is an exciting period for South Australia.

This growth fund is there to stimulate growth not only within industry but within communities and within commodity sectors, but it also about promoting what the regions have so long looked for, and that is a collaborative approach to having government support and for the government to come in and support one of the backbones of the state's economy: \$25 billion is generated by less than 30 per cent of South Australia's population.

**Mr MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order. The minister will be seated for one moment, please. Member for Lee on a point of order.

**Mr MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. This information that the minister is purporting to provide to the house is already freely and publicly available, both on the primary industries department website and also on the Eyre Peninsula Tribune website.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, members on my right. The Minister for Transport is called to order. The member for Lee has provided me with a link. I will be listening very carefully to ensure, as per past practice of the house, that the minister does elaborate on information in addition to what is publicly available. Thank you, member for Lee. Minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will continue to educate the member for Lee.

**The SPEAKER:** Please just answer the question, minister. Thank you.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. Thank you for your protection. The Regional Growth Fund provides grants that will benefit regional centres as a whole, in stark contrast to the previous government, who were focused on funding individual businesses above delivering broader benefits to growth in our great South Australian regions.

**Mr MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I do hope that this is not a bogus point of order. I will hear it, member for Lee.

**Mr MULLIGHAN:** Standing order 98: answers may not contain debate. The minister is clearly debating in reference to the previous government.

**The SPEAKER:** I do believe, with all respect, member for Lee, that this answer is germane to the question, but I will listen attentively. I also have the website in question and I am following it. Minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What I will say is that by supporting and growing our economy, it supports and grows an economy that has been long forgotten here in South Australia. That is the regional economy. The regions, as a whole, have been sadly ungoverned for such a long time that it really does point out that this government is prepared to stand up and back our regions here in South Australia.

As I said, 30 per cent of the state's population is backing up a huge economy that is screaming out for support. The commitments by the Regional Growth Fund will be based on the following principles: support for economic activity, activity that can be sustained without further intervention by government, activity that creates benefit for multiple entities, activity that contributes to the scale of an industry sector, and the application has a connection and a vested interest specifically related to regional South Australia.

This government is backing the regions in South Australia. We have put a 10-year commitment on the table to back our regions to make sure that we can support regional growth, regional population growth and make sure that we can grow our economy in our regions in South Australia—hashtag #regionsmatter.



**KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:27):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General receive advice that the risk to the state in the matter of Mr Keogh exceeded the payment to Mr Keogh?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:27):** The answer to the question is yes.

**KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:27):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Who were the solicitors acting for Mr Keogh in the matter of this settlement?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:28):** I think the question was: who were the solicitors representing—

**The SPEAKER:** Acting. Would you like to repeat it, sir?

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Yes, I would.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** My question is to the Attorney-General. Who were the solicitors acting for Mr Keogh in the matter of this settlement?

**The SPEAKER:** In the matter of this settlement, Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you. I think I am able to indicate who they are, but I will certainly take advice as to whether there is any confidentiality relating to that. Yes, an Adelaide firm was certainly on the documentation—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —just listen, please—in relation to this. I am more than happy to provide that information as to the name of the firm, if there is no reason why I shouldn't, to the member. The deed of settlement, I can say, was signed by Mr Keogh and not, that I know of, in the presence of a person who is identified as a legal representative. I would have to check as to whether that continued in the course of the time of representation, in any event, by the same firm. In short, if I am able to disclose the representatives for Mr Keogh, then I am happy to provide that information.

Let me say that it probably hasn't eluded the attention of the member for West Torrens that the terms of the deed of settlement did not require there to be a confidentiality in respect of the amount or terms of settlement. The deed of settlement has been made public with the announcement. The deed of settlement has been made public in respect of the terms of settlement. In the event that there is any reason whatsoever prohibiting us from providing the names of the representatives, then I am happy to provide that information to the member.

**REGIONAL MINING INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:30):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house as to how the mining sector is contributing to regional employment in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:30):** Thank you very much, member for Colton. I really do appreciate the question. It's terrific to have a question like that coming from a metropolitan member interested in regional employment, as we all are on this side of the chamber. We are very focused on the entire state. So thank you, member for Colton, for your interest in this.

We went to the last election with a focus on jobs, reducing the cost of electricity, jobs, growing exports, and jobs. We have a very, very strong focus on job creation, and we are very pleased to partner with the resources industry, with the mining industry, to create jobs. Those jobs will be focused in Adelaide and in regional South Australia, but the member asked about regional jobs particularly. One of the fantastic things about the resources sector is that we often focus on the direct

employment—for example, 5,000 people are directly employed in the mining industry in copper—but the mining industry itself also supports the METS sector.

It supports a wide range of service sectors to the mining industry, and that can be extended all the way through to the corner milk bar, hypothetically. It supports employment for Aboriginal people and, growingly and importantly, it supports employment for women in regional areas, too. We have some companies in South Australia that are outstanding with regard to their focus on providing equal opportunity and broadening the diversity of their workforce in mining areas.

This is a very important thing for us. We have too many people leaving regional South Australia for the city, and too many people leaving regional South Australia for other states and often overseas as well. The fact that we have employers growing the economy of regional South Australia through the mining industry is very welcome. Mr Speaker, you know that we support the mining industry when it is environmentally responsible, when it is responsible with regard to the safety of the people who work on or near the mines and when those operations are welcomed by their host communities. Within that, let's have as many jobs as possible in the mining industry in regional South Australia.

It is absolutely outstanding to be able to do that. Members on both sides of the chamber who were here before the last election will remember that with bipartisan support we put through legislation in this parliament that enabled renewable energy developments on pastoral leases in South Australia. Why is that important? Because that allows opportunities to get energy and electricity to remote mining ventures. It is very important that you get electricity, water and other things to a mine. The ability to build a wind farm or a solar farm and put up batteries in remote pastoral locations where very often there are mining opportunities is going to be very important for creating employment not only in regional, as in country, areas but also in much more remote places.

Very importantly, it is also able to keep the cost of that development down because no longer will it be automatically necessary that we have a high-voltage transmission line going to the mine, as we do at Olympic Dam, for example. It is very likely that there will be a much cheaper and easier way, and a far more environmentally responsible way, to get electricity to these mine sites to allow them to flourish, to allow them to employ South Australians in regional areas and to allow them to contribute to our entire economy not only with local employment but also with international exports.

#### KEOGH CASE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:34):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General make public the details of the clamp on Mr Henry Keogh now that the case has been resolved and the deed has been signed?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:34):** I am not sure of the extent of what is sought. I am assuming this relates to correspondence between the government and/or the Crown Solicitor's Office in relation to the negotiated terms of settlement. The answer to that is no, but I will check with our department if there is any aspect that is disclosable. But generally, in relation to the negotiations, that material is privileged, as it should be. I am sure even the member would remember, dim in the history when he was a member of cabinet, that there are occasions on which ministers and/or cabinet obtain legal advice and that is of course protected by privilege.

#### KEOGH CASE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:35):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney receive any legal advice to the effect that the state was at minimal risk of a successful legal claim by Mr Keogh?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:35):** As indicated in this matter, there was advice obtained from the two senior counsel independent of the Attorney-General's Department or Crown law. In fact, they were senior counsel nominated by the former attorney's office. They are, I would agree of course, eminent counsel. Our government had no reason to doubt the very comprehensive report and advice that we received from them.

I think the member for Enfield would agree it was a very long advice. Certainly in my history with the law, it is the longest legal opinion I've ever read. I hope I never have to read another one

that long, to be frank. Nevertheless, as you would expect, advice was obtained of these independent counsel in relation to this matter, the particulars of which were then considered. Advice was obtained further within the government to proceed with the negotiations to resolve this matter within the envelope of the applications that have been made and taking into account further correspondence presented by the former attorney-general and those representing the applicant.

Those are the matters. That is the process of what has occurred. Obviously, the particulars of that advice are privileged and I won't discuss it any further in relation to detail.

### **COPPER TO THE WORLD CONFERENCE**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the Minister for Energy and Mining provide an update on last week's Copper to the World Conference?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37):** I thank the member for Hammond, who I know is a very strong and genuine supporter of the mining industry. He understands the benefits to his electorate from it, and he himself has in fact worked in a previous life in the resources sector, so he does know it firsthand. His support is greatly appreciated by the industry throughout South Australia.

The Copper to the World Conference was an outstanding event. I think that both sides of this chamber can share some credit in that because the Department of Energy and Mining organised the event. I know that the genesis of that organisation was before the last election, so I think people on both sides of this chamber can share in the credit for having put it on.

It was wonderful to be asked to speak at the social evening the night before, which was at the South Australian Museum. It is a truly outstanding South Australian institution. It was wonderful to be there and wonderful for people to be able to enjoy an engaging social event to start the conference but also wonderful to be able to share the South Australian Museum with people from Adelaide, other states and internationally as well. It was also terrific to be invited to open the conference.

It was a tremendous event with about 300 people in attendance. It is fair to say that everyone there was very, very positive about the future of copper in South Australia, in Australia and other parts around the world as well.

I have a few facts and figures that might interest the house. Copper is one of South Australia's major export commodities. In 2017, South Australia produced over 260,000 tonnes of copper, worth \$2 billion. That represents 17 per cent of the state's goods export value. Australia is a major contributor to world copper stocks, as the world's third largest exporter of copper ores and concentrates, and the seventh largest producer of copper.

Copper royalties will contribute in excess of \$80 million to our state's economy in 2017-18, and we expect that to continue to grow. It is not surprising that everybody there was very positive, largely led by increasing international prices and equally led by ever-improving local capacity to get copper out of the ground. We really do lead the world in many ways.

There were international guests who came to attend the conference: Mr Jorge Cantallopts from Chile, Ms Vanessa Davidson from the UK, Mr Hal Stillman from the US, Andrés Pesce Aaron from Chile and Patricio Hidalgo from Singapore. They all spoke at the conference. They were all very pleased to be there, and the information that they shared, and the information that they received from an outstanding line-up of Australian speakers, was tremendous.

The Chilean Ambassador to Australia, His Excellency the Ambassador Patricio Powell Osorio was also there. I have to say that one of the great features of the event was the continuing appreciation for the opportunities to collaborate between South Australia and Chile. It was very clear that we in South Australia have things that the Chilean government really does need to connect with, and vice versa, so that both of our jurisdictions can benefit. Highlights of the conference included market trend indications, which were all very positive, growth of ethical sourcing of copper, and of course OZ Minerals' new venture at Carrapateena.

**KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:41):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General now table all advice in relation to compensating Mr Keogh?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:42):** For the benefit of the member for West Torrens, who perhaps wasn't listening or didn't understand what I said before, the answer to that is no. This is privileged advice to the government and it will not be made public.

**KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:42):** My question is to the Attorney-General. How much of the \$2.5 million paid to Mr Henry Keogh was for legal costs and disbursements?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:42):** The total amount was \$2.57 million, and the \$70,000 was in settlement of legal costs. And I am happy for him to look at the deed; he will see that's the case.

**KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:42):** My question is to the Attorney-General. On how many occasions has the Attorney-General met with lawyers representing Mr Henry Keogh?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:43):** I think I need to be clear about—in the last 20-odd years, there have been various legal representatives of Mr Keogh. Obviously, during 20 years of legal practice, I came across a number of them. Apart from Mr Kevin Borich QC, who represented him in relation to some petition matters, the most recent that I can recall was Marie Shaw QC, who represented Mr Keogh in the Court of Criminal Appeal.

In relation to the most recent application for an ex gratia payment, if that is specifically to be confined to, I don't think I have ever met with any of those personally. Obviously some of them are in practice and have been in the last 30 years, but I make the point that, in relation to this matter, to my recollection I certainly haven't met with them in relation to this matter. This is a matter which has been negotiated by independent senior counsel with the assistance of the Attorney-General's Department, the Crown Solicitor's Office.

They have been the negotiating party on behalf of the state. To the best of my knowledge, that's the same that prevailed under the former attorney-general from May 2017, but he may or may not have met with them; I don't know. But from the information I have seen, attorneys-general covering this period, which is the last 13 months or so, haven't had direct involvement in relation to the negotiations.

**AQUACULTURE TRAINING**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:45):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the work being done to encourage young people in the electorate of Flinders to gain skills in aquaculture?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:45):** I thank the member for Flinders for this question, and I acknowledge his particular interest in the young people in his electorate, and indeed their futures, and his particular interest in supporting the aquaculture industry that is so important for the economy of Eyre Peninsula and of South Australia. I am very pleased to identify that there's a lot of good work being done to ensure that those young people in the member for Flinders's electorate have the opportunity to have a better future with more jobs. One of the ways in which we are doing that is by delivering better services. That's what the new Marshall Liberal government is doing.

I can advise the member that TAFE SA and the Port Lincoln High School have commenced a new partnership, as of this school term, to offer hands-on aquaculture training to year 11 and year 12 students in the member for Flinders's electorate. It's great news, and I am very happy to share more information with the house. I am told that, under the partnership, year 11 students will be able to do the full Certificate II in Aquaculture, providing an excellent opportunity for hands-on training. It covers everything from feed stock, handle stock, harvest culture and health stock. As part

of the certificate II, year 11 students undertake safety units as well as applied deckhand skills, which, as the member for Flinders is acutely aware, is a very important requirement of employers in this industry.

In addition, I am advised that, for the first time, year 12 students at the Port Lincoln High School will be able to complete some units towards a Diploma of Aquaculture in collaboration with TAFE SA. This partnership is not only creating the opportunity for students to continue their studies in year 12, but they can also then go on to complete their diploma with TAFE SA after year 12, should they wish to do so. Mutually beneficial links with industry are providing more opportunities for students to gain valuable work experience and be job ready. This is a key part of the equation: being job ready in industries where there is a jobs need.

This government is very focused on ensuring that the skills needs of South Australia's economy in the future are met by South Australians who have been given the opportunity to apply their endeavours to attaining those skills. Students in Port Lincoln can use this pathway towards jobs that will exist in the future—careers that will serve them well for years to come. Additionally, I have been advised that the partnership agreement with the Port Lincoln High School enables TAFE SA to use its facilities outside school hours for its training. It's intending to provide a certificate II and a Diploma of Aquaculture to the wider community, starting next semester.

I am sure that this is a service that the people of Port Lincoln, particularly the students, the young people of Port Lincoln, will come to appreciate. I hope that many of them gain these skills and gain great jobs in the years ahead. I am excited, and I am sure many of them are excited, that this is a government that's delivering for the regions, because, as I am told regularly by the Minister for Primary Industries, regions matter.

#### KEOGH CASE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:48):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney met with the family of Anna-Jane Cheney?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:48):** I am not sure where the member for West Torrens has been in the last half an hour, but I think I have made it abundantly clear that, although I had extended an invitation to the person I was advised was the last known representative of the immediate family to meet and advise them of the proposed settlement announcement, that was declined. They requested that their privacy be respected and that when I made an announcement that that would be conveyed.

So, no, I haven't met with them or, in that case, that particular member of the immediate family who purported to be the representative. As best I understand, in the last couple of years it has been the representative personal spokesperson that our department has dealt with during the course of the events since the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal.

#### KEOGH CASE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:49):** My supplementary question to the Attorney-General is: did she contact the Cheney family to meet with them before or after the government had made a decision to compensate Mr Keogh?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:49):** In short, immediately after, to the extent that, of course, this was not to be a question of meeting with the members of the family to seek their advice—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —or their input in relation to the government's decision.

*The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The purpose of this invitation to meet was to inform—

*The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —the family of the government's decision that had clearly already been taken so that it would be a matter that they would be informed of before the public announcement was made. The terms of settlement, which would be evident from the deed, were signed last Friday and the announcement made, of course, on Monday with the opportunity to meet over the weekend if that was something that the identified person wished to do. That was declined. I think that answers the question. I hope it does.

#### KEOGH CASE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:51):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General consult with the victims of crime commissioner in relation to the payment to Mr Keogh?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:51):** The answer to that question is no. However, I did consider the question of whether the victims of crime commissioner ought to be advised in respect of the decision of the government and the invitation to coordinate any arrangements with the family, but I was informed by my department that in fact the victims of crime commissioner hadn't been involved in this case; that is, there were other parties, including the witness support program through the DPP's office, that had had most contact with the members of the family.

Indeed, it was through those personnel that we then set up the proposed invitation and arrangements for that purpose. So, yes, it was considered as to whether that was appropriate, and my advice was that there were other personnel who had taken up that responsibility within the government departments to support the victims in those circumstances.

#### FINNISS ELECTORATE

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister please outline to the house how the government is delivering on its election commitments in the Finniss electorate and prioritising infrastructure across regional South Australia?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:52):** I would like to thank the member for Finniss for his question and for the fact that he used the word 'please'. I think that is a level of civility that has been sorely missing so, member for Finniss, thank you very much for the question. I know that you are a very fierce advocate for your local area and you, like a number of other MPs, have been discussing how we can make sure that we deliver on our election commitments.

Unfortunately for those opposite, this is going to be an answer that provides information that suggests we have once again delivered on another election commitment. It's difficult for those opposite to hear but, with the new government coming in, I think the people of South Australia are beginning to realise that they can trust politicians who will actually do what they say they are going to do.

What we have been able to negotiate in the last couple of weeks is an agreement with the Alexandrina Council to give them \$300,000. I think councils like to negotiate when you are giving them money, but they have also put \$396,000 on the table to deliver an upgrade to the Mount Compass Recreation Park.

I think that is absolutely fantastic, especially for a small town like Mount Compass, which dearly needs an upgrade to this facility. I know that broken bones probably aren't as much of a problem for young children in the town of Mount Compass because everybody drinks a lot of milk and their bones are like titanium, so I know that all the kids of the town will get fantastic use out of this facility.

What this highlights, I think, are a couple of things. First off, it highlights the fact that there is a state government and a local government sector that are willing to work together, that in the light of some of the difficult challenges that we are putting to local government about how they operate their business and how they go about collecting money from ratepayers we are showing a commitment to continuing to work together with them on joint priorities and the fact that we can maintain a very good, constructive working relationship to help deliver for local communities.

However, it is extremely important that these kinds of projects happen, especially in towns like Mount Compass, because we know that our regions are fantastic places to live in. In trying to encourage more families to go and live in those places, amenity of the regional area, and amenity of the town, is something that is very much front of mind when families look at where they are going to live. In fact, I bought a house based in no small part on the fact that there was a park across the road for the kids.

By helping to invest in regional communities and small towns like this, we help to encourage people to live in our beautiful regions and we help to make them more liveable, and I think that is extremely important. I know that the council is getting on and doing some early design works that will be finished by September when the tender will go out, and we look forward to construction being completed in early 2019.

I look forward to potentially going down to visit for a glass of full-cream milk—I dare not say whether or not it has been homogenised or pasteurised, but we will see—and going to visit this new facility, and again reinforce our commitment to regional South Australia that we are here to help them.

This is one of many commitments that we have made in regional areas. We have successfully negotiated with a number of councils to help to deliver on projects like this. I look forward to being able to talk more about those in the remaining time. I can also put on the record the fact that I am looking forward to finalising negotiations with The Barossa Council about a couple of dog parks that the community up there would dearly love to see, and I look forward to helping to deliver yet again on another Liberal election commitment.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Has the government been advised or sought advice from the commonwealth on any impacts to GST distributions to the state of South Australia?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:57):** I can't answer that question specifically, but what I will say is this: there are and have been over the last few years considerable conversations about how GST should apply in Australia in its distribution. We have heard, of course, of a Productivity Commission report and recommendations put. Fortunately, productivity commissions don't make decisions about these matters. Mature governments resolve how they progress and ensure that if there is reform in relation to goods and services tax distribution, it be subsequent to that discussion. That is progressing and the Premier and Treasurer are active in that arena.

Consistently the Premier has made the statement, supported by the Treasurer, that any diminution of funds distributed to South Australia in respect of the GST distribution would disadvantage our state and is not something that would be acceptable certainly to our side of the parliament and in government. I think it is a matter that all South Australians need to be aware of and understand the significance of. Tax reform which has a detrimental or deleterious effect in relation to the overall revenue for this state is very significant given the reasons why, obviously, we are part of a fiscal equalisation program which we have continued to fight for on this side of the house.

What I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to do on behalf of the opposition in this state is to make sure that he has a commitment from the federal Leader of the Opposition, Mr Shorten, in respect of his taxation reforms, which clearly will have a deleterious effect on the whole of Australia but particularly our state. If he wants to take up—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —tax reform—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —as a matter of which there is dialogue—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —in the interests of South Australians, then pick up the phone and speak to Bill Shorten and make sure he has a very clear view from South Australia's opposition as to what you expect of him, because woe betide the day—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —if he becomes the Prime Minister of this country.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader! The member for Frome has been patiently waiting.

### CLARE VALLEY BRIDGES

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Minister, can you give the house an update on the replacement of the two bridges on Farrell Flat Road between Clare and Farrell Flat?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00):** I will—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Much like I did yesterday, in getting a swift answer back to the member for Florey on her question, I will get an answer and bring that back to you personally, member for Frome.

### RECYCLING ACTIVITY SURVEY

**Ms HABIB (Elder) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister please update the house on the performance of South Australia's waste industry in light of the recent results of the 2016-17 Recycling Activity Survey?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:00):** I thank the member for Elder for her question. It's good to be able to update the house on waste management, and I'm not talking about the aftermath of 16 years of Labor government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I have obviously been waiting to say that for a long time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Protect me, Mr Speaker! Protect me!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my right will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It gives me great pleasure to be able to update the house on the results of the—

*The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries is warned.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —2016-17 Recycling Activity Survey. I am sure many members of the house will be interested to know the very good news that that survey has revealed.



Last week, I had the pleasure of being able to attend the Waste Management Association of South Australia's launch of the Recycling Activity Survey, and I was able to unveil the fact that in 2016-17, out of 5.27 million tonnes of waste generated here in South Australia, 4.4 million tonnes was diverted from landfill, a total of 83.4 per cent. To break that down a bit further, the statistics show that out of municipal solid waste 54 per cent was diverted from landfill; out of commercial and industrial waste, 87 per cent was diverted from landfill; and when it comes to construction and demolition waste 90 per cent was diverted from landfill.

These results are the best we have had in the survey to date and really are a tribute to a long-term waste management strategy that has been supported by both sides of politics over many decades here in South Australia. We know that our state leads the nation if not the world on some measures in terms of waste management. We have a situation now where, with 83.4 per cent of all waste being diverted from landfill, we really do have a very exciting story to tell the rest of the nation and the world as to how we got here.

You can look back to the 1970s, when we brought in the nation's first container deposit legislation, some 42 years ago now, which really set in place a very strong foundation for waste management in our state, diverting bottles and cans (both plastic and glass) from landfill and really changing the mindset of South Australia when it comes to effective waste management and driving forward innovation.

In the vein of innovation and waste management, it was great a few weeks ago to be able to launch the state government's \$12 million industry assistance package for the waste management sector in response to the China sword policy. It has stopped taking South Australia's recyclable waste and, in fact, waste from across the Western world. That change in policy, and our subsequent response, is a real opportunity for industry to reform, to focus towards innovating and to create jobs in the sector.

We know that we lead waste management here in Australia. It's an area which does create jobs. It's an area where we can take good news stories to the world, and I look forward to being able to update the house on an ongoing basis of the things we are achieving here in South Australia in the waste management sector.

#### *Ministerial Statement*

### **HOUSING TRUST TRIENNIAL REVIEW**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:04):** On behalf of the Minister for Human Services I table a ministerial statement, which she has tabled in another place.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **KEOGH CASE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:05):** Today, we have learnt that the Keogh payment was not based on a request from legal representatives of Mr Keogh on the basis of a traditional formulated claim. What we have learnt today is that the Attorney-General made an ex gratia payment to a man the Court of Criminal Appeal felt should have been retried for the charge of murder. I would have thought that if the government was going to pay \$2.507 million to a man who was not acquitted—who the court still felt should have been charged with the murder of his fiancée—it would have been something that the Attorney-General would have done a bit more research on, rather than just simply making an ex gratia payment.

She has told the house that she received no advice and that the state was not at risk of not being able to defend this claim successfully. What we know is that the Attorney-General has told the parliament that at no time did she have any advice that there was any risk that the state would be at great risk of having a claim against it. That advice should be made publicly available to the house and to the public.

This is not a matter that has ongoing consideration: it has been settled. The government has signed the deed and paid the money. They should absolutely table that advice so that we can all see on what advice the Attorney relied. Because if the Attorney did not rely on the advice, and if Keogh's

lawyers did not put in a formulated claim to the Attorney, we would like to know on what basis that payment was made. Was it on the basis that if Mr Keogh had sued the state his payment would have been in excess of \$2.507 million, or was there advice saying the opposite? We would like to know.

We would also like to know why it is appropriate that the Attorney-General, who, before the Criminal Court of Appeal had made their findings in relation to Mr Keogh, had made some very strident remarks in this parliament in support of Mr Keogh. I would have thought that, at the very least, to give the appearance for the family of the victim, Ms Anna-Jane Cheney, the Attorney would have at least recused herself from the decision-making process and allowed her colleagues to independently assess whether this money being paid to Mr Keogh was meritorious.

We have seen the statement from the family, who are deeply hurt by the government's actions. In fact, they were deeply hurt that within their first hundred days the government felt fit to pay this money quickly. This story does not end today. I think the responses of the Attorney-General and Deputy Premier have raised more questions rather than answers. What is concerning for us is that the question of the guilt or innocence of Mr Keogh has not been settled. He was not acquitted by the court.

The conviction was set aside and the court ordered a retrial, and the court found that a jury could find Mr Keogh guilty of murder. In those circumstances, you would have to ask yourself—indeed, I would like to know what the Treasurer was thinking, or what the rest of the colleagues in the cabinet were thinking, or what the Premier thinks of the fact that the state has paid out this amount of money in what seems to me to be a very low-risk case of Mr Keogh successfully taking the state on.

It is also very interesting that the Cheney family has not had their correspondence replied to. I have received an email sent to the Premier by the father of Ms Cheney making comment about the impartiality—or lack of impartiality—by the shadow attorney-general at the time. Obviously, you can see in that a father's concerns about the impacts it might have later on. I can only imagine what the family is going through now, but I say to the family that we will continue to ask questions and continue to probe into what exactly has gone on and why.

### GREAT WINE CAPITALS

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:09):** Today, I rise to speak about a recent visit to the Riverland by members of the prestigious Great Wine Capitals global network. This is a world-renowned network of wine and industry leaders. I joined network members in the Riverland, including Napa Valley president, Clay Gregory; dean of the Wine and Spirits Academy at Kedge Business School in Bordeaux, Jacques-Olivier Pesme; and the general manager of the Monverde Wine Experience Hotel, Miguel Ribeiro from Portugal.

We met at Banrock Station and conducted a workshop there, which was attended by some of the great minds within the wine industry as well as tourism operators. It was all about collaboration and clustering, which this government is very supportive of. As the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, I see that as a pathway forward, not only for generating interest and development within the primary industry but also as a great way for regions to build strength and knowledge and to remain relevant. We know that when we have economies of scale or economies of populations, they create strength because there is strength in numbers.

During the workshop at Banrock Station—the now great, world-renowned Banrock and Wetland Centre at Kingston on Murray—there were a couple of luminaries in the room. One of the success stories was, obviously, Whistling Kite Wines. The Barich family were recently awarded the Great Wine Capitals Best of Wine Tourism Award for their sustainable wine practices.

As a member of the Great Wine Capitals global network, Adelaide and South Australia join a group of international cities whose wine regions are recognised as significant economic and cultural assets. The Great Wine Capitals group came to Banrock and we travelled from Banrock to Waikerie before we hopped on the Caudo River Express, which is a great addition to the Caudo family's stable of tourist attractions, including their cellar door and their great property on the river at Hogwash Bend, just below Waikerie.

The members of the Great Wine Capitals network said that they had been to McLaren Vale, they had been to the Barossa and they had been to Clare, but the Riverland wine experience was something they had never experienced before. In all their travels around the world, the Riverland offered a unique experience. That is something I say to everyone in this house: anyone who ever wants to have a unique wine experience, come to the Riverland.

One of the other benefits to our wine regions and wine companies is being able to learn from international best practice within the wine industry. Our state is strengthening its reputation and its ties and outcomes with other Great Wine Capitals members. It is about coming together, sharing knowledge and a collaborative model, and recognising some of the world's best practices, just as they do in Bordeaux, Porto and the Napa Valley. They are the world's great wine centres, just as we are here in South Australia.

We know that here in South Australia the very best of South Australia's wine industry is always showcased right around the world. Experiences that sit alongside the wine really excite international tourists. When they come to South Australia, we have so many diverse wine experiences that really are something to behold.

There are 10 wine capitals of the world. The network's other members are Bilbao in Spain, Bordeaux in France, Mainz in Germany, Mendoza in Argentina, Porto in Portugal, San Francisco and Napa Valley in the US, Valparaiso in the Casablanca Valley in Chile, Verona in Italy and Lausanne in Switzerland. I must say that the Riverland's wine region is the engine room of the wine industry in the country. It is a critical part of the wine industry, just like the network of wine industries is here in South Australia.

### ROAD UPGRADES

**Mr GEE (Taylor) (15:15):** I rise today to speak about another two dangerous intersections in the Taylor electorate. I have previously spoken in this place about three other road safety hotspots that need attention in my electorate. Sadly, I have more to speak about today and in the future mainly due to increasing population, poor driver behaviour and changing road conditions. I want to start by adding to my remarks from my previous contribution two weeks ago in relation to the intersection of Womma and Stebonheath roads in Davoren Park.

A new Drakes distribution centre will be built adjacent to this intersection. Whilst this is fantastic news for local jobseekers, it also makes the upgrade at this intersection even more pressing. Another matter is the dangerous Curtis Road-Heaslip Road intersection at Angle Vale that I spoke about recently. I have written to both the Premier and minister Knoll on behalf of our community regarding all the dangerous road safety situations that I speak about in parliament, making them aware of our concerns and seeking action.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

**Mr GEE:** I am yet to have a response on those issues. It appears, anyway, that all the work by our community has paid off and the minister has agreed out of nowhere to appear at the intersection on 28 July, hopefully to make an announcement regarding speed limits and the provision of a roundabout. I want to thank Tom Staggard from *The Bunyip* newspaper for continuing to support our campaign to get these intersections fixed.

I do not want to take the foot off the pedal on this issue until action is happening and not just talk and more delays. I have said many times that we do not care who fixes this intersection—we just want it fixed. I will be the first to thank Playford council or the state government on behalf of our community for making roads safer in our community.

I will now speak about another intersection I briefly touched on two weeks ago, the intersection of Andrews Road and Womma Road. This intersection is on the urban fringe, with a similar crash history to the Womma Road-Stebonheath Road intersection. It is a very busy intersection with both passenger vehicles and an increasing number of heavy vehicles using Womma Road to travel between Elizabeth and the Northern Expressway and cars using Andrews Road to

travel in and out of Andrews Farm and the surrounding development, mainly to access the Northern Expressway.

Three of the four approaches to this intersection are signed at 80 km/h, and one is signed at 60 km/h following a campaign for a reduction by the residents of the Northern Residential Village. The ideal solution for this intersection would be a roundabout with additional lighting. I am advised that this is five to 10 years away as part of an agreement signed with the developers of the Eyre development at Penfield.

The intersection of Womma Road and Andrews Road has alarming crash statistics from Location SA. Over the five years to 2016, there were at least 23 crashes resulting in 23 casualties and two serious injuries, with more than a quarter of those crashes occurring at night. There is no lighting at this intersection. Following lobbying by me and the local community, former minister Mullighan advised that a review of the intersection had occurred and an upgrade was planned.

The upgrade was to include raised traffic islands on the Andrews Road approaches to deter vehicles from driving straight through the intersection at speed. Further, DPTI was approaching SA Power Networks about installing additional flag lighting on the existing Stobie poles. As mentioned previously, there is no lighting at all at this intersection.

I ask that the Minister for Infrastructure consider a review of traffic conditions at this intersection, the installation of lighting and a reduction of the speed limit to 60 km/h on all four approaches to this intersection. This will have little effect on the road network as the speed limit currently changes to 60 km/h very close to this intersection, and 60 km/h would be a more appropriate speed on Andrews Road.

I would further ask for consideration to be given to the installation of stop signs on the Andrews Road approaches and larger signs on the lead-up to the intersection to alert drivers travelling on Womma Road. This intersection is in desperate need of an upgrade. On behalf of my community, I call on minister Knoll and the state government to take urgent action at this intersection before more crashes occur.

I will now turn to an intersection that requires action from the City of Playford. The intersection of Curtis Road and Frisby Road is one where vehicles from all directions should be travelling at 60 km/h. The intersection sees of hundreds of right-turn movements from Curtis Road into Frisby Road and right and left-turn movements out of Frisby Road into Curtis Road. Angle Vale residents and visitors, users of the Angle Vale sports clubs and customers shopping at the Bunnings Warehouse on Frisby Road use this intersection.

Time expired.

#### **SUNDERLAND, MR J.**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:20):** Today, I rise to pay tribute to a truly great radio man and a great man all round, Jeff Sunderland or Sundo, as he was known. On Monday 2 July 2018, South Australia lost a radio and media legend, Jeff Sunderland, who was expected to celebrate his 74<sup>th</sup> birthday next week. Despite the best efforts of colleagues and emergency services personnel, unfortunately he died suddenly on Monday at 5MU radio station in Murray Bridge.

Jeff was a highly respected and loved host at 5MU and had been a dedicated member of the team for the last 10 years. Each morning, Jeff—or Sundo, as he was known by many—would host the morning breakfast show on 5MU and provide entertainment to listeners. Sundo was known for his humour and this was often reflected throughout his segment each morning. On 2 July, Sundo had finished his morning segment and was preparing for the next day when he suddenly collapsed and died. The 5MU radio family are devastated at the loss of Sundo and stated:

The 5MU family has lost a very much-loved colleague and friend today. As an SA Radio Icon, we were honoured to have Jeff Sunderland as part of our team. Our thoughts are now with his family. For our 5MU listeners we will celebrate Jeff's career tomorrow morning [Tuesday July 2] on 5MU from 6am. For the last Sundo's Big breakfast.

5MU general manager, Steve Walker, also described Sundo as an icon at the station and said:

He always had time for a kind word or a joke, whichever you needed ... and to rib you when Geelong had won. He was a legend in a time when those on the mic were true superstars. He would talk about his time when he

met this musician or that musician and when the Beatles rocked up. One of the things he would do would be to tell you a joke which probably shouldn't go on air and then change it slightly when it went to air. He always had a quip at the ready and was ready to lighten the mood when it got too serious.

Prior to continuing his successful radio career at 5MU, Sundo graced the media scene for decades, dating back to the seventies. Sundo was best known for his breakfast show with Keith Martyn and was one of the biggest personalities at the former Adelaide station 5AD. At the time of Sundo's departure from 5AD, their breakfast show was reportedly the highest rating program on the airwaves during the early 1990s. Anne Wills OAM was quoted in *The Advertiser* paying tribute to the late Jeff Sunderland, whom she considered a close friend and co-worker since his arrival in Adelaide 45 years ago. She said:

I never worked with him until 2004 when we did breakfast together for a whole year. He was fabulous, I was never there until one minute to six and he would always cover for me.

I have been working with him doing movie reviews every Monday on 5MU for I don't know how many years. This morning he said it's going to be warm tomorrow and when they rang me an hour after he died I couldn't believe it...

Truly one of our radio greats is gone. He was one of the great announcers. There will never be another Sundo. We will never have anyone else with that voice and that command and a fabulous attitude about everything.

Ms Wills also stated that Mr Sunderland had an incredibly kind heart and was such a dedicated man. Unfortunately, the airwaves have lost a true radio champion. I take this opportunity to express my sincere condolences to Mr Sunderland's wife of 26 years, Marianne; his son, Jeffrey; daughter, Laura; and stepdaughter, Rochelle.

Sundo's influence on the radio scene will be remembered, along with his love for quality food, wine and his staunch support for the Geelong Cats. He was always out for a quick quip if ran into him in the corridors of 5MU. A champion bloke. What a gravelly voice. He will be sorely missed. Vale, Jeff Sunderland.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **SESSIONAL ORDERS**

**The SPEAKER (15:24):** While I await the next member of the opposition's grievance debate, I take this opportunity to rule on a matter raised earlier today. Earlier today, the member for Kurna raised a matter about the potential breach of the sessional order concerning the provision of answers to questions given on notice. I note that the sessional order adopted by the house on 30 May 2018 requires that once notice of a question has been given and placed on the *Notice Paper* pursuant to standing order 102, an answer to the question shall be delivered to the Clerk pursuant to standing order 103, not more than 30 days after the date on which it had been first printed on the *Notice Paper*.

The member for Kurna referred to two questions he asked the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing on 16 May 2018 and, it now being 49 days without an answer being provided to the two questions, he believes this is a breach of the sessional order. Firstly, I draw the house's attention to the fact that, on 16 May 2018, notice was given of the two questions referred to by the member for Kurna, which predates the adoption of the sessional order.

While there may be some doubt as to whether the sessional order applies to these questions, undoubtedly sometime into the future the house may be confronted with the situation where answers to questions have not been provided within the 30-day period set out in the sessional order. As the sessional order does not provide guidance as to the process to follow, or sanctions to be incurred should a minister fail to furnish answers within the 30-day time period, the house is in uncharted territory. I therefore refer to other jurisdictions that have provisions in place where replies to questions are not provided in a specified time frame. For example, standing order 105(b) of the House of Representatives states:

If a reply has not been received 60 days after a question first appeared on the Notice Paper, the Member who asked the question may, at the conclusion of Question Time, ask the Speaker to write to the Minister concerned, seeking reasons for the delay in answering.

Further, in the Western Australian Legislative Assembly, if no answer is received after one calendar month to a question on notice, standing order 80(2) provides that the member who asked the question may rise at the end of question time and ask the minister why no answer has been received.

Having considered this matter, I do not have the benefit of standing orders or established practices to guide me in assisting the house at the moment. While I am of the view that the practices and procedures in place in other jurisdictions provide a measured and sensible approach, ultimately resolution of this matter is up to the house to determine.

*Grievance Debate*

**MODBURY HOSPITAL**

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:27):** I am very proud to be part of a government that is committed to restoring key services to Modbury Hospital. Modbury Hospital is very important to my local community, and it is very important to the north-east in general. In fact, over the course of the campaign, many residents raised with me the fact that so many chose to live in the area because they believed they would be living near a hospital that would provide the services they would need if they were in trouble.

I myself live only five minutes from the hospital and have used it, along with my family. I must say, I could not be happier with the work of the staff there, including the doctors and nurses, who do a fantastic job in a system that is well and truly letting them down. However, the Marshall Liberal government has committed \$110 million to the restoration of key services, including a high dependency unit; an extended care unit; an acute surgical ward to increase the range of surgeries that can be performed; an acute medical ward, which enables patients to stay longer to support their recovery; a purpose-built palliative care ward; and also funding to refurbish the hospital's general infrastructure.

People who may have been there in recent times may have noticed scaffolding being set up around the hospital. That was to catch bits of the façade that were crumbling and falling off and, obviously, to protect people from wandering around below. Clearly, they were being let down by the previous Labor government.

Shortly after being elected, I visited Modbury Hospital, along with the Premier, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the member for King and also the member for Florey. We met with senior clinicians and other people across the northern Adelaide local hospital network to discuss our plans about restoring services to the hospital. This is in quite severe contrast to the previous Labor government, which was cutting services from Modbury Hospital. I must say that it is disappointing to see, in recent times, that the member for Wright is still championing the cause of Transforming Health spin and still not listening to the wishes of the people of the north-east.

In fact, according to the member, the people of the north-east have apparently been hoodwinked, as though they have been somehow tricked. I am not in the business of insulting the intelligence of the people of the north-east because I think they know exactly what was going on. I think that they could see right through all the spin of the previous Labor government, and they are still seeing through the spin of the member for Wright.

People saw the previous government stripping services out of Modbury Hospital, and this was despite the Liberal Party's opposition and despite opposition from the local community. Throughout the last term of parliament, though, the previous government was acting like, 'There's nothing to see here. There's really nothing to be worried about. We're actually upgrading the hospital.' The problem was that so many residents knew that was not the case because they had experienced it for themselves. They had seen what had been taken away.

Then, of course, as is so often the case when it is five minutes to midnight, the previous government suddenly promised rivers of gold for Modbury Hospital and then wanted to be thanked for it. It is like setting the house on fire and then trying to claim credit for someone else calling the fire brigade. Nothing was actually ever delivered. The only thing that was delivered was taxpayer-funded advertising: shiny brochures that were stuffed into letterboxes, including mine, the plastic wrap on the Messenger newspaper and various digital displays, whether it was in Tea Tree Plaza or on bus stops. Of course, the people of the north-east saw right through this spin.

Where the previous government cut services, we are bringing services back. Where the previous government failed to consult properly with people at the coalface, we are working with both clinicians and other professionals to implement our plan. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing is working diligently in partnership with health professionals, patients and the community to deliver on a commitment to provide better services for the people of the north-east—fixing up the mess that Labor created.

### **DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DISCLOSURE SCHEME**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:32):** I rise to make a surprise addition to this grievance debate, and I am very pleased to have the opportunity to do so. I was very pleased today to hear in question time, in response to a question from the member for Elder, the Attorney-General go through some of the detail about the introduction of a domestic violence disclosure scheme.

As members will know, this is something I have been proposing for quite a fair while in this place. Several years ago, I caught the attention of the then premier and set the wheels in motion for a very comprehensive discussion paper around responses to domestic violence and, ultimately, a trial of the domestic violence disclosure scheme, beginning in October.

As people know, this idea was first mooted in the United Kingdom in response to the death of a young woman at the hands of someone she met online. There were concerns from her family that were not heeded, particularly by the police. There were no grounds, as far as the police could see, quite rightly at the time, to release information about this person. The rest is history, and the young woman ended up dead at the hands of this person who had an extensive history of violence against women, and violence generally, and had served extensive gaol time. It was a situation that may well have been avoided had such a scheme been in place.

The evolution of that idea, which first came to my attention when I was in the UK, went through various incarnations in Scotland, then Wales and most recently in New South Wales, where a trial in three separate police districts yielded some pretty good results, as the Attorney-General alluded to, so I am really pleased that finally the scheme is being trialled and that it is being trialled on a statewide basis.

Although New South Wales is a larger jurisdiction, the trial was in fact a smaller trial by virtue of it being only three districts. In order to get a fair idea of how well these things work, and to have it functioning correctly, I would argue that it needs to have a fairly wide scope, that ultimately these schemes would be interconnected throughout the states and that information sharing throughout the states would be streamlined to such an extent that these schemes could work in a very streamlined way. That is yet to be seen, of course.

I have had some informal discussions with some SAPOL members who have been working towards the implementation of this scheme. I had another tour of the MAPS (Multi-Agency Protection Service) facility just last week and spoke at length about the implementation of the domestic violence disclosure scheme and how MAPS might help. MAPS are doing an amazing job. I can only hope that, pursuant to the election promise not to touch front-line police services, etc., in the 1.7 per cent efficiency dividends, MAPS is included. MAPS needs to be expanded, if anything. It certainly does not need to be the victim of the cuts that are coming inevitably to the Public Service.

I congratulate the Attorney-General on finally bringing something together. I initially thought it was the responsibility of the police minister, but clearly it has gone to safer hands and the Attorney-General will be guiding this through. I wish the trial every success. I hope that it can be properly funded in this year's budget and in further budgets, as well as MAPS and the services it provides generally. I congratulate the Attorney-General and the government on their domestic violence disclosure scheme.

### *Bills*

### **INFRASTRUCTURE SA BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July 2018.)

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:37):** I point out to the house that I am the opposition lead speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** It always amazes me when governments introduce what they claim to be autonomous bodies into the parliament to do the work that, quite frankly, agencies should do. This government seem to think that they do not have the ability or capacity to be able to give us a forward plan for infrastructure. They seem to believe that they are not qualified, or that their agencies are not qualified, to give independent expert advice to the people of this state on the basis of which we should be spending their hard-earned wealth on future infrastructure plans.

I suppose it goes fundamentally to the question of trust. It is obvious to me that the government do not trust the people who serve them. They do not trust the people who work for them. They do not trust the independent advice they receive, and what we see the government attempting to do is to sideline the public sector as far as possible. They would claim that they have been given a mandate to do so. They would claim that 36 per cent of South Australians cannot be wrong and that the other 64 per cent of people can go suit themselves.

We would argue something very different. We would argue that creating another level of bureaucracy could be seen to be an abdication of your responsibilities as the executive and a massive vote of no confidence in your infrastructure agency. From my understanding, this new body will be answerable to the Premier, not to the transport and infrastructure minister, which I find again very interesting because it seems again to try to duplicate federal bodies which, like Infrastructure Australia or the Productivity Commission, have varying roles depending on who is in office.

The idea that somehow DPTI, or whatever incarnation the government settles on over the next four years for its infrastructure agency, cannot do the forward planning for five, 10, 15 or 20 years is pretty offensive to all the engineers and hardworking planners who are in those agencies. What the government is basically saying to all of them is, 'Look, we don't have confidence in what you're doing.' However, to the government's credit, they did promise to do this. They did say for a long time that if they were ever able to form government they would introduce this legislation, introduce Infrastructure South Australia.

They made commitments that, within the first 30 days of office, they would give us a list of the people who would be on the board. We still do not have that information, which is, I think, disappointing. There have been names flagged in the public debate, in the media, about who may or may not sit on this agency to give advice. I note that the former member for Mayo, Mr Briggs, is being considered as either a chair or an ordinary member. I understand that other prominent members of the Infrastructure Australia community have been recommended, as well as former members of parliament.

It would be disappointing, I think, without making any adverse criticism of the ability of Mr Briggs, to populate a body that is meant to be independent with former politicians, and the opposition will be flagging amendments to be made in the upper house—not in this house—on some measures that we think will help maintain the independence of any body created by this parliament.

I think it is fair to categorise this measure in two ways. It is a long-term commitment of the Liberal Party, but the implementation of it has been a broken promise. So give them a tick on one point that they have introduced legislation, that they are attempting to establish it, but you can also give them a cross for not meeting the time lines that they set for themselves. We did not set these time lines. We did not set these waypoints for them to meet. The government did and they have not met them.

The objects of Infrastructure SA are to promote efficient, effective and timely coordination of planning, prioritisation, delivery and operation of infrastructure as is necessary for the economic, social and environmental benefit of the state. It sounds pretty much like the mandate DPTI has, but obviously its new political masters do not believe that they are capable of them.

It is also, I am told, to promote the adoption of policies, practices and information analysis to support sound decision making in relation to infrastructure. That sounds like a criticism of the nonstop



north-south corridor decision, which was, let's face it, a political decision—a political decision that started in the time of Diana Laidlaw. It was Diana Laidlaw who first made a political decision to divert thousands of semitrailers away from Portrush Road, down to Cross Road and then right onto the north-south corridor to head to our port.

There is an important distinction here. You have to ask yourself these fundamental questions when it comes to infrastructure: would the north-south corridor have come to be had it not been for political decision-making? If we had left it to the bureaucracy to decide or independent experts where infrastructure goes, how it is paid for and the most efficient use of money, I suspect the private sector would probably say that it would use as much taxpayers' money as possible, leverage the state's balance sheet as much as it possibly could, divert as much cost as it could away from the private sector and build the shortest, fastest possible route to market to lower their costs.

Of course, for the bureaucracy and decision-makers in that equation, the uncomfortable truth is people. When you have people involved in decision-making, you get politics. The former premier rightly says that politics exists when there is disagreement. When there is universal agreement, there is no politics in the issue. It is all about whether there is disagreement. The question then becomes: what does this mean in the future for advocacy by local communities about infrastructure?

What does this mean for the power of local communities in our representative democracy to be able to lobby their member for parliament for infrastructure to get things built and done that is in their interests, as opposed to what might be seen as an economically efficient outcome? I am all for economic efficiency, given that four days ago South Australia became the only state in the federation not to charge conveyance duty on real and non-real property. That was a great step forward in economic efficiency.

Infrastructure SA is a piece of legislation that quite frankly weakens the political involvement of communities in the decision-making processes. What concerns me the most about Infrastructure SA is that the government has decided to take the powers available to the Essential Services Commission and give them to an infrastructure body—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, you have. Those powers are to be able to compel information to be given to Infrastructure SA that could be commercially sensitive to competitors.

The reason we give ESCOSA these powers is that ESCOSA's job used to be to regulate monopoly assets. When you privatise transmission lines, distribution lines or generators, it is important that the regulator who sets the price of these monopolies has access to the financials of those corporations to be able to adequately regulate them. It is highly appropriate. The Australian Energy Regulator has those powers and the ACCC has those powers.

It is appropriate that bodies that regulate monopolies in essential services have these powers. That is why ESCOSA has these powers. It has not been made clear to me why Infrastructure SA needs these powers to compel information from private companies. I assume that includes freight companies and infrastructure companies that build roads and bridges. I assume it includes anyone who wants to participate in the construction and delivery, or have participation in state-owned infrastructure. That leads me to the conclusion that the government is going to attempt to get into the books of private contractors.

If you had told me that the Liberal Party of any jurisdiction around the country wanted to give a government agency those types of coercive powers to investigate the private sector and have the private sector hand over this information, I would have said, 'I don't believe you.' But this Liberal Party is more than happy to give those powers to Infrastructure SA. I note when the Premier walked into the parliament he said, 'No, those powers aren't being given to Infrastructure SA.' I am not going to give the Premier gratuitous advice, but it seems to me from the briefing I received and the legislation I have seen that that is exactly what Infrastructure SA is proposing to do, and I do not think the opposition can support that.

Despite there being some media about us being anti business, we have a competitive environment in South Australia where businesses compete in tendering for works. They need to keep information in confidence, especially if it is commercially sensitive. The government can arbitrarily

use this committee, which will comprise chief executives appointed by the Premier, the CE of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet—whoever that will be—the Under Treasurer, the chief executive of DPTI, a chair and, I understand, three other members.

The legislation gives these people, who are unelected, the ability to set out not only a framework for 20 years of infrastructure spending of taxpayers' money but also the ability to have coercive powers to call for information without regulating monopolies that are privately owned. You have to ask yourself why. What is the long-term aspiration of Infrastructure South Australia?

If I were a cynic, I would ask: is it perhaps because the government is attempting to formulate a long-term plan for toll roads, where a toll road would be a wholly owned asset of a company and the ability to set charges and fees would of course be determined by the cost and allocation of funds, or corporate overheads and the like of that company in running, maintaining and building that piece of infrastructure? If that is the case, the government should tell us in advance. If it is not the case, then why are these powers needed?

I am a bit concerned that you would set up a committee that is made up of chief executives who answer to the Premier, and I will tell you why, Mr Speaker. Every member of every board in South Australia has a legal responsibility to act in the interests of that board. There is a problem here. There is an inherent conflict. The chief executive of DPTI answers to his minister and has a contract with the Premier. The Under Treasurer answers to the Treasurer and has a contract with the Premier, as does the chief executive of the DPC.

I am not sure how a chief executive can undertake their duties and act in the interests of Infrastructure SA in an impartial, independent way, acting always in the interests of that board, and answer to an external body, which is the cabinet. We are all accountable to someone and, ultimately, for the executive it is the Crown. Ultimately, for chief executives it is the Premier, and for the Premier it is to the parliament and the Crown.

But what happens if there is a conflict and the chief executive of DPTI disagrees with the board and agrees with the Premier, and then acts in the interests of the Premier, or his agencies on the board, rather than acting in the interests of the board? The protection for public servants here is murky at best. There is nothing in the legislation to protect them from maladministration inquiries or what have you, or the inherent conflicts that will follow.

The conflicts are jumping off the page here. I just do not know how chief executives will be able to conduct themselves on this. There are examples where we have chief executives who sit on boards and act in the interests of those boards. SAFA, the Financing Authority, is one of them. We have public servants who sit on those boards, and they answer to the Treasurer but they act in the interests of the Financing Authority.

But the truth is that when you are in Treasury and you are on the Financing Authority, there is no real conflict because we all want to keep the prices of capital down. We want to make sure the state gets a good return because ultimately it will be a cost to the budget. So it is very hard for there to be conflict, but when you have an infrastructure body that sits outside of DPTI and you have the chief executive of DPTI on that board, I am not sure that that conflict can be resolved. However, I am sure there are smarter minds than mine who have contemplated this issue and who will have answers for us in the committee stage.

Another point is that I heard on the radio the other day Mr David Bevan talking about this organisation, Infrastructure SA. He put to his listeners a very important question. Sorry, it was not David Bevan, it was Mr David Washington from InDaily, my apologies. He said that these people—

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** He is watching.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Is he?

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** David Bevan.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** David Bevan? He is watching, is he?

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** He swears he is. He swears he does.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I don't believe him. What Mr Washington said on radio was, I thought, an important matter for the parliament to note. The people on this board will make decisions and file reports that will have a lasting impact on the people of South Australia, and a majority of them would not have been elected by the people. The people would have had no say in their appointment.

You could argue that, no, the Premier has been elected by the people, by all 38 per cent of them, and that the Premier has made these appointments in Executive Council and they are legal. I do not dispute his legal authority to do so once this act passes. However, there is a moral question here about whether or not the parliament should allow people to hold such influence on such boards for such a period of time without the parliament being allowed to have a say in their appointment, or in whether or not they would at least have the power to disallow.

We make other appointments like this where the parliament has a say. The ICAC commissioner is one of them. If my memory serves me correctly, it was the opposition that moved amendments to the ICAC Act when it was being introduced by the then attorney-general, the member for Enfield, to allow either the Statutory Officers Committee or the Statutory Authorities Review Committee to make a recommendation that is disallowable by either house of parliament.

The reason the parliament went down that path—and I think it was a good reform, even though the government of the day had not thought of it—was that we were appointing someone for a seven-year term who would have extraordinary powers of investigation and the ability to call for evidence and to compel people to answer questions.

That is a lot like the power that Infrastructure SA will wield with private corporations, yet the parliament, under the passing of the legislation, will have no say. In effect, what I am flagging to the House of Assembly today is that the opposition in another place will flag amendments and work with the crossbench to see if we can give the parliament a say, at the very least, on who is appointed to these boards. There are a couple of reasons for this.

I have to say that I am not one to attack former MPs receiving roles, because they do have a certain expertise. Let's face it, you do not enter parliament without having certain expertise or the trust of your community, and you do not conduct yourself as a minister, as a senior opposition shadow minister or as any other member of this place without having a certain level of acumen and ability. I do not make the point that any former MP on any board or committee is a mistake—I disagree. I think there should be a wealth of former experience that can come back and give advice to governments as they move forward.

One of the great strengths of our Westminster system is that change is often slow, in order to give new governments a moment of pause. I have always thought that that is a very good safety valve that we have with our upper houses. You can see what happens in Queensland where you do not have that type of safety valve. You can get quite skewed results. The same goes for boards and committees.

I get the sense that this board is already on the path to hyperpoliticisation. That concerns me because there is an opportunity here for the government to be quite proactive and to do the right thing. There is an opportunity for the government to actually do what it says and mean what it says, which is that they want a long-term infrastructure plan for the state that is non-political. However, I am not sure how you achieve that by appointing people who are hyperpartisan.

I would caution the government on their thinking on this, and I would caution the government on appointing people who are hyperpartisan on these committees. Not only can they do damage to the institution but, in the long term, people will lose faith in the process. When they lose faith in the process, you get no benefit from the independent analysis that the body does.

I think there are exceptions to that. There are joint committees with people of high standing from both political parties who do exceptional work. I had a lot of time for former deputy premier Goldsworthy. I took his advice often on matters of mining because I thought he had an exceptional mind for the long game. I took advice on many occasions from other former Liberal MPs. I had occasion to offer former Liberal MPs statutory office positions because I believed that they had good ability, good independent thinking and that they would serve the state well.

But you have to pick and choose your targets quite well, and I think that this committee might be, to use a pretty poor pun, a bridge too far. There have been similar bodies established interstate like Infrastructure SA to try to inform the process. Often these bodies are established to try to convince Infrastructure Australia that ultimately the work has been done on a project and that it should be funded, but we see with Infrastructure Australia, on occasion after occasion, the ultimate political interference in the decision-making. There is one thing Infrastructure Australia does not have and Infrastructure SA will not have: the ability to decide budgets.

In the end, it is called the golden rule: who has the gold makes the rules. In bilaterals, the Treasurer and the cabinet will decide infrastructure spending. From what I am seeing in this bill, DPTI will become simply an implementation body rather than a planning body. I caution the government on this again.

In 2013, when the Abbott government came into office, they pushed forward Darlington on the north-south corridor ahead of other parts of the north-south corridor. To be fair to them, they had won an election overwhelmingly with a considerable mandate. The then minister Jamie Briggs said, 'We're doing Darlington next, but that's it.' We said, 'Fine.'

They were able to consult with us on plans, and we were able to consult with the commonwealth agency about timing and the implementation of that construction. I am sure I can hear the bureaucracy saying that will still continue under Infrastructure SA, but like any form of outsourcing—and I have seen it over time in agencies—the moment another agency or body becomes responsible for this type of infrastructure planning, what occurs is a slow degradation of the ability in other agencies to respond.

It is slow. It is not apparent immediately. It is like a frog in a pot: it does not boil immediately so the frog jumps out; it is a slow boil. What we will see over time is DPTI lose the ability to do forward planning. I cannot tell you how valuable it was to know that, when Torrens to Torrens was coming to an end, we were again able to achieve savings because of the expertise of the contractors in DPTI and the long-term planning all being centralised in one body. They were able to advise the commonwealth and the state that we could do more and amend the plans accordingly.

I am not saying you cannot do that with an Infrastructure SA in place, but it makes it harder. I often talk about this internally: none of us should die on the cross of process. Process is important. It is important for probity and it is important for transparency, but you should not lose the initiative, and bureaucracy sometimes can take away initiative. I would caution the government on taking away the initiative of an independent agency that can move quickly like DPTI can and give advice quickly to the Treasury and to the cabinet about moving on something, whether it is costs or something opportunistic.

You also have to ask yourself if a lot of the infrastructure that we spend money on improves the efficiency of the economy, if that is the sole test in a cost-benefit analysis on the efficiency of the economy. They claim there are social and environmental factors, but my instinct here is that the economic virtues will outweigh the others. You have to ask yourself: how much money would be spent by Infrastructure SA improving freight routes to the heart of Port Lincoln because of grain congestion? Or how much thought would be put into putting money in to upgrade a port in the hope that a mining project gets up?

The best example we have of that is the ship lift at Port Adelaide. There is no economic modelling that could have been done in the early 2000s that would have said that that will pay for itself—none. It was a bipartisan approach, where the Bannon government, the Brown-Olsen government, the Rann-Weatherill governments invested in infrastructure that would not pay back for decades. We have seen the fruit of that now.

You have to ask yourself: if you had an independent body set up with economic experts who talked about the efficiency of the economy, would you be investing your treasure in a project that might not pay back for 10 or 15 years? Imagine if we had said, 'If we get the frigates, if we get the air warfare destroyers, we will build the ship lift.' Would we have won those contracts? By building the ship lift and being prepared, we were able to outdo our competitors.

The same goes for infrastructure. The Northern Connector will not be at capacity when it is built. The South Road Superway will not be at capacity and has not been at capacity since it has

been built. The Torrens to Torrens project is another example. All these projects have long time lines for their economic benefits. Some of them are immediate and important, but over the longer term you have to ask yourself whether these are projects that bodies like Infrastructure Australia and Infrastructure SA would prioritise over other things.

Would the Oaklands Crossing have been built if it was considered by Infrastructure SA? Would the electrification of the Gawler line have been considered if Infrastructure SA was a decision-making body? It may have. Would you seal the Strzelecki Track? Would you duplicate the Joy Baluch Bridge? Would you build a rail line from Whyalla to Port Bonython? Would you build an upgraded rail line from Whyalla to Port Lincoln? Would you build a transmission line from Port Augusta to Carrapateena? Would you build a pipeline from the Cooper Basin to Port Bonython?

When Tom Playford and the former governments decided to nationalise ETSA and build an oil and gas industry, these were political decisions to grow the state, and they were good decisions. You have to ask yourself: if the oil pipeline from Eyre Peninsula to the Cooper Basin had been considered on the basis that Infrastructure Australia considered infrastructure, would it have been built? I suspect it would not have been built.

I would caution against outsourcing your economic sovereignty to a board. I am not going to get ridiculous and say that this board will attempt to undermine South Australia economically. Of course it will not. But sometimes you need cabinets to have the ability to make a decision that is in the long-term interest of the state.

I will give credit to the Premier on one of his decisions, which is GlobeLink. I think it is a massive waste of money, but he has made a decision that he thinks we should dig up the Goodwood interchange, the Torrens Junction, all the work we have done to those freight lines, and bypass the city of Adelaide for a freight link, adding time and cost but for the social benefit of people in the Adelaide Hills. Obviously it is a political consideration.

My suspicions are that, if anyone looked at this project, they would say 'fail' because it just would not stack up on any criteria, especially a freight-only airport, given that there is no freight-only airport in the world that has a train line go in, because of the double-handling required to unload freight that is packed a certain way for a rail line and put it on a plane. The double-handling and the cost would be excessive, and it just does not stack up, but I give him credit for coming up with something different. Whether or not it stacks up, I think I will be proven right on this, and the Premier will be proven wrong.

If you have these bodies, you take away the imagination and free thinking of politicians to come up with ideas reflective of their communities. It is not always apparent to central decision-makers what is occurring in local communities.

For example, there is much talk about building an import facility for natural gas into South Australia, Victoria or New South Wales. My instincts are that a lot of that gas would be contra deals where you would have gas coming off from the North West Shelf into tankers and, rather than those tankers going to Japan, they will simply sail around the coast, land in Adelaide, Melbourne or New South Wales and unload their gas as a swap, or they will send gas down from the Cooper Basin as a swap, or whatever it might be.

When it comes to nation-building infrastructure, you need to be able to listen to locals and take a helicopter view. It is quite difficult to do both, and that is why I have concerns about these types of committees. I understand the committee will publish annual reports. I have been told that those reports will be made available to the parliament but that there is no requirement for them to be made available to the parliament.

I think the parliament has every right to see what these boards are doing in our name, and to have their reports and their work tabled in the parliament annually, so that we can see exactly what they recommended to government, and what government accepted and did not accept, so that we can compare and contrast. That is the role of the parliament.

The role of the parliament should be to give a critical analysis of what our independent boards are doing. For example, if Infrastructure SA advocated further work on the north-south corridor but the state government did not want to partner any further with the commonwealth government, we

would like to know the reasons. Or, if there is some other piece of infrastructure that pops up out of nowhere, we would like to know Infrastructure SA's views on that. It is important that you have this transparency to allow greater debate.

Given the government came in on much fanfare of being open and transparent, I see no reason why they would oppose any amendment to increase the transparency and openness of bodies like this.

**Mr McBride:** It's a good thing.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** It would be a good thing, as the member for MacKillop says. I agree with him; it would be a very good thing. I see he is being cautioned by the whip now; he is probably in contempt of the parliament. Members of this house are free and unfettered to speak their minds!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Free to speak their minds. When you see that type of bullyboy behaviour, it makes you nostalgic for the CFMEU. The bill allows for this body to do things on its own initiative, or at the request of the minister. However, I note that it does not allow this house or the upper house to resolve to look at something.

Most parliamentary committees—in fact, I think all parliamentary committees—can have work referred to them by the parliament. Given that we have a Public Works Committee, an Economic and Finance Committee and two houses of parliament that have a great deal of interest in infrastructure—the Penola bypass being one of them; that is one I funded when I was infrastructure minister and then treasurer, and I am very proud to have done that, and I received no thanks for it whatsoever, but—

**Mr McBride:** It's only half done.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** It's only half done, yes. Tony Pasin has failed everyone by not giving us any more money to get it done. Everyone is used to being let down by Tony Pasin, although he did very well on the weekend with the preselections. What a great job of dirtying up Senator Lucy Gichuhi. That was spectacular. I have to say that I have seen some stitch-up jobs in my life, but that was first class.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, return to the bill please.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I will, sir. I will leave the smoking ruins of her career in our past, and we will see how Mr Alex Antic goes in the third position, whether he is elected, whether or not it was all worthwhile.

**An honourable member:** A good regional member.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** A good regional member. Yes, he likes Adelaide and North Adelaide.

**The Hon. C.L. Wingard:** He would be an outstanding regional member in your mob.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** He should run then, in West Torrens.

*The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Again, from the Minister for Police—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, back to your contribution on the bill, please.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** If we did not have him, we would have to invent him, Mr Deputy Speaker, but back to this bill after my distractions by the police minister. I believe that the parliament should be able to refer matters for consideration to Infrastructure SA, and I will tell you why. There is a lot of debate in this parliament from regional members. Regional members are never going to make up a majority of this parliament; they just will not. The population does not justify it, so regional members will always be in the minority in the parliament. They might be the majority in a political party, but overwhelmingly they are in the minority.

In the upper house, the Legislative Council, the only person who lives north of Gepps Cross is the Hon. Clare Scriven, who lives in the South-East of South Australia. All the rest live in Adelaide. No Liberal member in the upper house, as I understand it, lives in regional South Australia, which I think is a first for the Legislative Council. Only one Labor member does. As a regional member, you have to ask yourself if the regions are having a real say in how infrastructure is allocated.

In Canberra, there is the unwritten rule of a quota system. The National Party has a certain number of votes in the parliament that decide how big their cabinet representation is. I have even heard of unwritten rules about how much infrastructure spending is allocated. The National Party does quite well in comparison with the Liberal Party for regions. The National Party is able to get an 80:20 funding split for infrastructure. Regional Liberals are able to get only a 50:50 funding split. Labor has been able to achieve an 80:20 funding split on the Northern Connector and Darlington.

However, this current minister, who is in breach of standing orders by talking to his advisers in the gallery—I thought I would point out that unparliamentary behaviour to you, Mr Deputy Speaker—is again an example of how regional members are being disenfranchised. The one way you could enfranchise regional members is to allow them to refer, as a member of parliament, projects from their community to Infrastructure SA for consideration. The great thing about this parliament is that there is a good, healthy streak of independence in regional members.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** Keep talking.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you. Those regional members have often had very good suggestions, and they are worthy of consideration. But in a government dominated by metropolitan members on either side, I think it would be a very useful amendment to allow the houses of parliament, or even individual members of parliament, to refer projects for consideration to Infrastructure SA. I know the government would say that that could be quite costly. You could see an overwhelming number of projects referred to Infrastructure SA for consideration. I am sure that the government would want backbenchers to be seen and not heard and not make any such public representations for fear of being let down.

However, I put this to government members: think of the benefit to a foreshore community that is looking for upgrades to infrastructure. Imagine the power of their local member of parliament being able to advocate for Infrastructure SA and the pressure that it would put on the minister then to fund that in the budget process. It would basically arm what were once muted missiles—voices that were not heard. It would basically give a voice to regions.

What the government would have you believe is that, simply through the power of their election, regions are now being heard. That may be true; we will find out in the budget. We will find out how much more the people of Eyre Peninsula will get in this budget. We will find out how much more the people in the Mid North will get, how much more the people in the South-East will get, how much more the people of Kangaroo Island will get and how much more our regional and remote communities will get from this budget.

The one thing I do know about the budget process is that discipline above all else is the most treasured commodity in the decision-making process of a budget. There will be many disappointed people. There will be some confused and some disappointed. The ones who will be disappointed will be the ones who put up projects for funding that have been rejected in the name of some other project.

I can only imagine the frustration of some regional members and backbenchers having their infrastructure wish list pushed to the side where no-one knows about it. I say, let 1,000 flowers bloom. Let's allow the will of regional members to be heard. Let's allow the upper house to refer projects for consideration. Imagine the power of regional members, in a bipartisan way, putting in a funding application for the duplication of the Joy Baluch Bridge, or the political power of regional members in a united voice—Labor, Liberal and Independents—saying let's seal the Strzelecki Track and putting that to Infrastructure SA.

Once they have put it there and they have considered it, according to the government, it is up to them whether they fund it or not. At least then we will know whether the government, whoever it is, Labor or Liberal—

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** This is the Nick Xenophon approach.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Please.

**Mr Pederick:** It is. Nothing is funded. We promise all and don't fund any of it.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Please. Allow those projects to be scrutinised not only on an economic basis but on the social impacts and the political impacts. I can flag to the government that the opposition will be moving amendments in another place giving them as a parliament—or the chambers, we have not resolved that yet—the ability to refer projects to Infrastructure SA for consideration. I think that would give a greater level of transparency and openness to the body, give regional members a greater voice and indeed allow backbenchers, who are forced into this cone of silence and cannot speak up publicly on behalf of their communities when they are let down in the September budget, to have an avenue to come out and speak.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will have his opportunity in due course.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Let me remind the house that this is 4 July. It is a day for bringing down the executive of the Crown. It is a world-renowned day.

**Mr Brown:** No taxation without representation.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** No taxation without representation. It is important that regional members are heard and that they have their views.

**Mr Brown:** Don't tread on me.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Exactly: do not tread on me. Liberty or death. This bill has quite considerable powers. I am surprised at the powers that the minister wishes to give this bureaucracy. I always considered the minister one of the more sensible members of the Liberal Party and someone who was a true conservative, or a tory maybe. That is harsh, maybe. I would consider it harsh. He would probably go home and be very happy that I called him a tory, but I always considered the minister to be someone who valued the private sector and their ability to make commercial considerations in confidence without the bureaucracy or the heavy hand of government putting their hands in their pocket, or their hands in their boardroom, to extract information that is commercially sensitive.

As I said to the house earlier, for the benefit of the minister who was preoccupied doing important work—I do not want to criticise him for not being here—I would just point out that ESCOSA have those powers for a reason. ESCOSA have those powers because they are an independent body that regulates monopoly assets. This is not such a body. I think it is important that I make my point known to the minister. I have grave concerns about these powers being given to this body.

We will be flagging amendments in the upper house to remove those powers with Infrastructure SA, unless I am given some explanation either in another briefing or in the committee stage by the minister that allays my fears that this is nothing more than the bureaucracy or the government attempting to coerce commercially-sensitive information out of contractors and tenderers.

Companies should be able to operate in South Australia without the fear that the government is going to step into their boardrooms and find out exactly how they fund, what their borrowing costs are, what their allocations for capital are for their head office and other things, to try to work out exactly what they should be charging for an infrastructure project. I think that is unfair unless they are operating a monopoly asset, and the only monopoly asset you can think of in this area is a toll road.

The government has been very clear that it opposes toll roads. So I take the minister on his word that this is not a consideration for the development of toll roads, but I want to understand why exactly this body needs these powers. The bill also gives the power for Infrastructure South Australia to disclose this information. If it has the ability to go in and get it, it then has the ability to publish it under the protection of privilege.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** We can have a mandate.



**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Well, sir, the power of the spoken word has worked. My speech has now pushed the government into a cowering position where it will amend the bill and take out these regressive powers, and I congratulate the government on listening to me. It is my first victory as an opposition member and one that I will remember—4 July, a great day for independence, again.

**Mr Pederick:** Yes, man the trenches.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Staff the trenches, mate. It's 'staff the trenches' on this side. I was given a briefing by the agency on Friday, and we are making our considerations on the bill this week. I do not think that the government will be disappointed in the opposition's views, although I have flagged some amendments.

I am a bit concerned about the level of consultation with the industry on this bill. Again, it is out of character for the minister. The minister is someone who comes from business, from the private sector, and importantly from a family business, a very good family business. It is important that, when the heavy hand of government interferes in the operation of businesses, there is a level of conversation.

**Mr Brown:** You sound like a Liberal.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** No, no—I walk upright and have funds.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Too soon? It is important that consultation occurs for a couple of reasons. I do not think that any of the bodies that represent freight or industry and that operate in the infrastructure space are opposed to Infrastructure SA. I do not think that they are opposed to what the government is attempting to do. They are concerned, I think, at the level of bureaucracy that is being placed over DPTI and at how the minister is having a lot of powers taken away from him by having this sit in Premier and Cabinet, which is also basically making his role nearly redundant other than as a delivery agent of infrastructure decisions decided by someone other than the infrastructure minister.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** What you say doesn't matter anymore.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I love how the police minister laughs because he thinks it's funny. He does not know why it's funny, but he thinks he knows why it is funny. That is an impressive trick.

I find that interesting and I also find it concerning for the long-term independence of the agency. As I said in my earlier remarks, when I was treasurer I enjoyed knowing that there was an independent agency in DPTI that was able to take the argument to Treasury about infrastructure. It has been very easy for the Treasury to take money back from DPTI from projects like Torrens to Torrens that were coming in under budget and scope that money somewhere else.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** For projects that were over budget.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, and, again, when projects are over budget, I enjoyed the ability of Treasury going into those agencies and being able to argue it out and find out exactly why, what occurred and how it occurred. Adding a level of bureaucracy over the top of all this will not help. One of the things the Premier has said that I agree with is that he wants clear lines of reporting from agency to minister to cabinet. I think that is very clever and very astute. This bill dilutes that. Bodies like Infrastructure Australia and Infrastructure SA often do not give us the best impact that we think they will. As I said earlier, we would like the representatives appointed to this body to have more of a say.

Another thing I want to mention to the minister as an important reflection is that ministers often run out of time to sit back and think about long-term strategic goals. I imagine that for a government coming into office, and having been in opposition for 16 years in opposition can be fairly demoralising, a whole kitbag of plans and ideas have been left behind, especially in parts of South Australia that members opposite may think have been ignored or forgotten.

Taking the decision-making process away from the cabinet and giving it entirely to Infrastructure SA and the Treasurer—bypassing the parliament's advocate for infrastructure, that is, its minister—is very dangerous, and I will tell you why. Infrastructure is not just about roads and rail. It is also about jobs, it is also about connecting communities and it also has social impacts. I know that the bill sets out that the intentions of the board are also to look after and prioritise the social and environmental benefit of this state, but that is often hard to do when you become an agency that overwhelmingly looks at the economic efficiency of infrastructure projects.

As I said earlier, a lot of communities look at infrastructure very differently from the way politicians and cabinets do. When we build a grade separation for freight at the Goodwood Junction or the Torrens Junction, for instance, often agencies and politicians see it in terms of improving the efficiency of that freight, minimising delays on roads, and of course of queuing, and allows the nonstop movement of freight through our city to our port to be put on ships and sent away. Communities view it very differently. Communities view it as noise mitigation by often lowering freight lines or having fewer crossings, which improves amenity and property value. The same can be said for crossings and grade separation of roads. It can mean safety. It can mean all sorts of other things.

Infrastructure SA and Infrastructure Australia overwhelmingly always publish their decisions on what infrastructure to back on the basis of improvement of economic outcomes, and the social outcomes are often forgotten. That is why we have politicians. The reason we have politicians is that we do not let the bureaucracy decide where the money is spent. Cabinet decides where the money is being spent. It is important that we have that level of intervention within the decision-making process, and I am not sure that this strengthens that. I think it weakens it.

The reason I think it weakens it is that for whatever reason Infrastructure SA will not sit with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure; it will sit with Premier and Cabinet. The concern I have with that is not so much a machinery of government issue but an accountability issue. I have never liked the idea of agencies that are responsible for delivering infrastructure being moved and subverted into other agencies where you get perverse outcomes, and those perverse outcomes can be wide and varied. Premiers often have pet projects. Treasurers have things they want to fund and not fund, as do infrastructure ministers and the rest of the cabinet and, of course, parliament.

I still have not seen a clear explanation of how this body will operate in that bilateral process. From my understanding of the briefing, this body will make recommendations on infrastructure and set out a long-term plan with varying reports at intervals over a 20-year process, and the cabinet will consider those on an annual basis—five years, the minister says. I understand that there will be interim reports every two or three years but that there is no requirement to publish those. We think they should be published and tabled in the parliament annually so that we can see what they are and see the progress of this independent body.

I hope the government agrees to these amendments we move in the other place because they will improve the efficiency of this committee and strengthen the arm of the infrastructure minister in his deliberations in cabinet. In the end, after 16 years of government, I think it is fair to say most South Australians would look back and say, 'Look, they built a lot of infrastructure.' A lot of things that had not been done were done.

Often they were political decisions: duplicating the Southern Expressway, the South Road Superway, the Torrens to Torrens, electrification of our rail lines, cooperation with the commonwealth government on a lot of those projects, Oaklands, starting the work on sealing the Strzelecki Track, duplication of the Joy Baluch Bridge, fixing last mile issues all across South Australia and improving road maintenance. You got the sense that the government was spending money on infrastructure. You got the sense that the government was actually actively involved in building new infrastructure, whether it was education, hospitals or roads.

My concern with this body is that it is not being designed to try to facilitate that in a more efficient way: it is being designed to stop that. I note in the Liberal Party's costing documents that there was only one piece of capital infrastructure spend: \$37 million for a right-hand turn on North Terrace. Depending on what happens with the commonwealth government, whether they go into caretaker mode at the end of July or not—I do not know where the Prime Minister's mind is, as it will probably depend on a whole number of scenarios, but he may go to an election this year or he may not—we might not have a Liberal MYEFO; we might have a Labor MYEFO. I do not know.

I do not know what the Treasurer and the minister are planning for the state budget in terms of their capital infrastructure spend. My instincts are that the Treasurer will do everything he can to get net lending into positive terms. His whole strategy, because he has such a heavy spend on the operating balance, is that he will attempt to do as much as he can with debt and net lending to try to improve his reckless spending in the operating balance. That is why the infrastructure minister was so unsuccessful in getting any election commitments up in the costings document.

We will see in the budget how well he did. Hopefully, the Pym to Regency road is in there and we will see some money allocated across the forward estimates for the completion of that. I hope his discussions with the commonwealth government are successful and we could bring forward some of that money. I do not like his chances, but I could be wrong. I will be the first to congratulate him if I am wrong and he has brought that money—

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** I am going to hold you to that.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Absolutely I will congratulate you. Anyone who finishes off our legacy I will be very happy to thank. My concern is that there is not going to be a big infrastructure push in the budget, that the minister has lost the argument and that one of the delaying tactics will be, 'But we are establishing Infrastructure SA.' If that is the case, I feel very sorry for the minister because it is an act of political bastardry to give him that portfolio and then offer him only \$37 million in infrastructure spending.

But I am sure I am wrong because I do not believe that his colleagues would do that to him. I think they have far too much regard for him to do that to him. That would honestly be something that would give the minister a great deal of concern because he knows, internally, what that means. It means there has been a concerted effort to make sure that there is no new capital spend, that the entire aim of the budget is to get net lending into surplus and just to rely on the former government's infrastructure spend over the last four years and use Infrastructure SA as a delaying tactic.

That would be a sad outcome for the minister and probably pretty demoralising, too. But I do not think that will occur because I think the power of his persuasion is pretty impressive. I am sure he is doing exceptionally well in bilaterals. I also understand that he is on the budget expenditure review committee—I hope he is; you always want your biggest spenders on those committees, generally to keep them under control. I am sure he is there and I am sure he is putting the argument forward for infrastructure.

However, if all we get in this budget is \$37 million for a right-hand turn, then that is not mission accomplished. That is pretty appalling. I think he will do better than that, and I will congratulate him when he does. I will get up in the parliament and say, 'Good job, well done. You landed a man on the moon and returned him safely to the Earth. Congratulations.' But we will wait and see. I think this bill will probably pass the parliament and we will have a body. The question is what that body does, how it conducts itself and whether it will be politicised. As I said in my opening remarks, the great tragedy of new governments is their not learning from the folly of past governments.

Politicising independent bodies like this can be quite dangerous because, as I said earlier, the public lose faith in the system. If it is simply used as a political instrument, to refer things off in order to slow down spending, it will show up. It will show up in the unemployment figures, it will show up in the budget, it will show up in the economic efficiency of the economy, and it will show up in the cost of doing business in the state because freight costs are a big part of doing business in South Australia.

One of the great things that we did, which I think is testament to our forward thinking, is that we assumed the mantle of the former Olsen-Brown government. We did dredge the Port of Adelaide, we did build the Port River Expressway, we did build the Northern Expressway, we did build the South Road Superway and we did cooperate with the commonwealth government and call for the Northern Connector. Why? To get our produce to its marketplace as quickly and efficiently as possible. The next stage of that puzzle is the north-south corridor.

Imagine the economic advantage that this state would have if you could get from Port Augusta to Port Adelaide without passing through a set of traffic lights. Imagine the advantage you would get from being able to get from the southern suburbs and the southern areas of this state to

the Port of Adelaide without passing through a set of traffic lights. These are aspirations that are bipartisan, and these bipartisan aspirations need to be delivered. I hope that this body is not being established to stifle those aspirations simply to slow down spending.

In finalising my remarks, I think it is important to say that we will be a moving number of amendments in the upper house. The minister himself has flagged some amendments for the House of Assembly, I understand. I am not sure whether he will be moving them here or in another place. If they are about removing the coercive powers of the board, then I would like to consider those amendments to make sure that all those powers are removed. I certainly do not like the idea of them being published, as I think that is very dangerous for the competitive advantage we have in tendering.

One of the great things about a competitive tender market is that the outcomes are for the taxpayer. If you have these coercive powers and people are operating and building infrastructure projects in South Australia—and I think the government has realised this—and you have the ability to go in, get their commercially sensitive information and then publish it to their competitors, people will not operate here or tender for road projects. I think the government has come to its senses on that issue. I do not know how it came up, but I assume that it was a flight of fancy by a relatively new and inexperienced government. Thankfully, common sense has prevailed and that is being removed.

To cap off, I do not like the idea of there being chief executives on this board. There is an inherent conflict that they cannot act in the interests of the board and their masters because it is just too difficult. I cannot imagine the chief executive of DPTI having three masters: a contract with the Premier, answering to his minister and having to operate in the interests of Infrastructure SA. That is an impossible task for any person. They cannot do that properly and they are being set up to fail.

That is something the government should be very wary of. My advice to the government is that Infrastructure SA probably does not need to have chief executives operating as board members, but that is the government's decision. We support it, but I am very concerned about the conflicts it will raise. Again, I do not know how they will be able to remedy that. In an age of ICAC, misconduct-maladministration inquiries and corruption inquiries, it would be a minefield for these poor individuals on this board having to answer questions such as, 'Whose interests were you acting in when you were making this decision? Was it your employer, was it your minister or was it the board?'

How do you answer that? It is very difficult, and that is what I am concerned about. These are smart people. No matter who the government appoints to be a chief executive, they are going to be smart. If any of them have done any sort of work in roles as directors or board members, they will know exactly what their responsibilities are, but they will also have a contract, and they will also have a statutory responsibility to their minister. Good luck sorting that out. I am sure that the minister can answer all these questions for me in the committee stage of the bill and explain how the DPTI chief executive will serve three masters without any conflict.

Another part I again want to talk about is our fixation with infrastructure for roads, rail and bridges. There is more to infrastructure than just those works. There are ports, pipelines, transmission lines and, of course, more and more there are satellites. Before the election, we gave a grant for a mission control to be constructed here in South Australia to monitor and launch nanosatellites. These satellites do a great deal of work in logistics, allowing constant contact from produce packing right through to final shipment and final delivery, which will give our producers and manufacturers a competitive advantage over others.

There is a question regarding infrastructure on how we unlock more of our mineral wealth. South Australia is blessed with abundant resources of uranium, copper, oil and gas. It might surprise members opposite to know that South Australia is the largest onshore producer of oil in the country, more than Western Australia. A lot of that is locked up in the Otway Basin because of a poor decision by the government, but that's the breaks. Infrastructure to unlock those resources, in partnership with the private sector, could create a lot of jobs. We found Carrapateena. We found Olympic Dam. Geologically, we know—

*The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** For the benefit of the police minister interjecting out of his place, when I say 'we', I am not talking about me: I am talking about the state. These concepts might be a bit too rich and detailed for the police minister, but never mind. We know that if we find deposits like

Carrapateena and Olympic Dam within proximity to each other in a geological anomaly like the Gawler Craton, there are going to be others. If there are others, does the state, like Mr Playford and others before him and after him decided, invest our treasure in an uneconomic way to help unlock those for future generations, giving us an economic return much later than might be economically efficient?

I think the answer to that is, yes, we do and we should. There is a great example of that, which I mentioned earlier, and that is Techport in Port Adelaide. It is a great example of bipartisan building that has given us some remarkable outcomes, which we all celebrate in a bipartisan way. You have to ask yourself a very serious question: would Infrastructure SA have approved those? Would Infrastructure SA have agreed to nationalise ETSA? Would Infrastructure SA have agreed to build these pipelines that I talked about earlier? Probably the answer is no. So we need to be cautious about outsourcing our thinking.

In the end, we are all elected here to make decisions. We come to this place in order to exercise executive function and make decisions. That is why we are here. That is why the public sends us here. There is a terrible trend around the world of politicians washing their hands of decision-making and handing it to others. Those others often make decisions in secret. Decisions are often made without the interest of the public being paramount and without the interests of the taxpayer being paramount, and often they are politicised.

There should be a greater line of accountability not only from politician to chief executive to cabinet; there should be another point there that is missed, which is the public directly to the decision-makers. I cannot imagine Infrastructure SA sitting in the electorate offices taking calls from constituents concerned about a grade separation or a train line making noise, or whatever the infrastructure issue might be. They might, but I doubt it. With those remarks, I flag to the house that the opposition will be moving amendments in the upper house. I welcome the amendment tabled by the minister. Have you tabled it yet?

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** Yes.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I will give that a good read and make sure it does what the minister says it does. I flag to the government a whole series of amendments to the bill in the other place. I hope that the minister does remain vigilant about the weakening of the agency, because one of the great treasures we have in this state is our public servants. When I was Treasurer and infrastructure minister, I used to always say that I wish the public could see our public servants in action behind closed doors because they really do work very, very hard for the people of the state and get very little credit for it.

They are often punching bags. They are often used to try to deride government waste or used as a symbol of government waste when in fact they are people who work very, very hard to try to get great outcomes for the people of the state. When you ignore their advice, you ignore their advice at your peril. I have often seen members of this place on both sides of parliament ignore the advice of their independent officials and they have come unstuck.

Let's hope that that decision-making and advice-making is still treasured and still taken seriously by the government. I hope they do not politicise this board. I hope they improve their consultation with industry between the houses about the impacts of Infrastructure SA. I hope the budget gives us a clear line of a long period of works for infrastructure and that this body and this bill is not used as some sort of symbol for a delay in infrastructure spending, pending its establishment and inauguration. That would be a cop-out, and the opposition will call it out if it is.

With those few remarks, I congratulate the minister on seeing sense with my amendment suggestions and adopting them. I commend the bill to the house.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If the Minister for Transport speaks, he closes debate. Minister, I understand you are finalising debate on behalf of the Premier; is that correct?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:53):** I certainly am. I do not know where to begin. In the beginning, the shadow minister for government accountability said that ISA is too political. His solution to that is to make ISA more political. I do not think I need to argue against what he said; I

think he was too busy arguing against himself. In fact he really struggled to come to some sort of coherent position.

I thought that, as somebody who has been here as a minister for the last five or six years—after he got over his speeding fine issue and he got into the cabinet—maybe he understood this process a little bit better. Here is the thing: the reason we are setting Infrastructure SA up in the first place is that the former government's decision-making around infrastructure projects was too political.

The reason that you need Infrastructure SA is to depoliticise, to the greatest extent possible, infrastructure development in South Australia. It is the fundamental reason that you do this thing. We have seen it work everywhere else, and we have seen the models everywhere else. We have been lucky enough to be able to look at the best and worst of what these I-bodies look like around the country and build what we think is the best model in the country.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** What I am trying to understand is that, as part of it, the former government and their representative were trying to suggest that cabinet needs to remain sovereign but somehow ISA is going to supplant a cabinet decision-making process. It will not.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Then why are you having it?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** It is there to provide better information—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The minister is finalising debate; he will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We want this body to be honest, to be transparent, to be accountable and to provide the truth. At the end of the day, that is what we are trying to get to. What is the truth in answering the question: what are the best infrastructure projects that we should be delivering for South Australia? In seeking to do that, having another voice added to the debate is extremely important.

I will wait to see the opposition's amendments in the upper house before making a final decision, but when he tried to suggest that somehow ISA had supplanted the cabinet process, and the answer to that is to give referrals to individual parliamentarians to this ISA body, those two remarks are utterly inconsistent.

If ISA was really the final decision-maker in relation to infrastructure projects, à la Nick Xenophon's comments before the election, then why is it better that we essentially give powers over to the parliament to instruct ISA to give them the power to do that? The answer is: they should not. With all the I-bodies around the country, there is a model of those that are extremely independent, and I look at the Victorian model. Then there are those which are essentially an adjunct of a government department, which is very much the Queensland model. In the middle, therein lies the truth, and therein lies where we need to head.

The way that we do that is by providing ISA with enough independence to feel confident that they can go out there and do the job that they need to do, but we do not need them so independent that the rest of the government sector does not respect what they have to say. You need buy-in. You need buy-in from cabinet and you need buy-in from agencies. Agencies will respect ISA if they see that cabinet respects ISA, but at the end of the day, cabinet has to make the decision.

The thinking we have had in developing this bill is to provide what I would call the right amount of tension in the system so that we have ISA having enough of a voice to be able to speak truth to power when they feel that the government has the wrong priorities, but are also not so far out of the realms of reality that they are on a completely different tack from a broader government agenda. We need all parties to buy into this process, from the private sector, to agencies, to cabinet and to ISA. Everybody needs to head in the same direction.

That is why these five-year statements, as well as the 20-year, long-term vision, are all about agenda setting that provides the framework by which ISA and the agencies can develop projects. If

I take a step back, the reason we are doing this is that I think the view of South Australians about how we spend money on infrastructure projects is that they are pet projects based around marginal seats in electoral cycles. That is a phrase that the Premier has used time and time again. What we want is for ISA to give people the confidence in the decision-making that is being had.

I will not disclose specifics, but a lot of the discussions I have had over the past three months confirm to me that decision-making has been more political than it ought to have been. In saying that, this new government, with the best of intentions, is delivering on the promise of more open, transparent and accountable government, and ISA is central to that. This body is not designed to stifle anything. This body is designed for us to actually view infrastructure in a more positive light than we do now.

Do you know what happens when you deliver projects that are not the best projects on the table that should be delivered? You devalue the view of spending money on infrastructure in the first place. When you spend money on bad projects, you devalue the spending on infrastructure projects overall. You make the reputation of spending on infrastructure worse overall.

The idea behind ISA is that we can prove to Treasury, to the cabinet, to the parliament and to the people of South Australia that there are projects worth investing in. If we do that, we are going to see our state become a greater place, a more productive place, a more efficient place and a more livable place. We will do that through an open, transparent and accountable process.

There has been some difficulty over the past three months in relation to the development of ISA, but we have a desire to get on and keep South Australia moving, and in fact accelerate the movement in South Australia. When we came to government, the cupboard was bare, especially in relation to federal government infrastructure funding for South Australia. The cupboard was bare. There were existing projects on the table, but the forward pipeline did not exist. It did not exist. That is why, upon being sworn in, one of the first things the Premier said was, 'Stephan, you've got to get across to Canberra and you've got to fix this.'

To do that, we had to take the existing projects that were in the pipeline, head across to Canberra and ask for some money, based on the program that was there. That is why we asked about Pym to Regency, Gawler electrification, the Joy Baluch Bridge—even though we were still at stage 1 in relation to business case development—and about the remaining sections of the north-south corridor. The federal government came on board and funded 100 per cent of the things we asked for, and we asked for everything that was in the cupboard to ask for. There was nothing else that we could have asked for. We got everything that we wanted.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Member for West Torrens, I was the one in the meeting. I know what I asked for and I know what we got.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Show me the forward estimates.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The minister will not respond to interjections. Member for West Torrens, you have had your opportunity. You will get another chance in committee. Minister, continue.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** What we have is a situation where we were left with an empty cupboard. The cupboard was bare, and we have essentially had to scramble around for what was available to us in the short term to put on the table. I agree that there is a natural Rubicon we need to cross at some point, and that is this: when we go from funding infrastructure projects in the old model and look at the projects that are on the table currently to fill this pipeline—and we have done that to a certain degree with Pym to Regency, the Joy Baluch Bridge, Gawler electrification as well as a number of other projects that are on the table—we will be able to fill that short to medium-term pipeline as we see the three projects on the north-south corridor coming to completion later this year, next year and beyond.

Really, we are working to an 18-month window to get projects up and running to fill that pipeline. We could not have waited for ISA to be up and running to evaluate those projects before they went ahead. We have had to rely on the IA process in relation to Regency to Pym and Gawler

electrification. We already have the money for the Joy Baluch Bridge, knowing that it is a project that every single industry body as well as the local community up there supports. It is extremely likely to be a very good project. We could not wait for ISA to come on board to evaluate that project; we have to get on and deliver it to fill the medium-term pipeline before ISA comes on board.

One of the fundamental reasons we took a more modest spending proposal on infrastructure projects to the election is not that we wanted to spend less money on infrastructure; it is that we wanted to give ourselves the greatest flexibility possible, upon coming to government, about the decisions we could make in relation to future infrastructure priorities. To do anything other than that would be to devalue the Infrastructure SA policy in the first place. I think it is very inconsistent to say, 'We want to develop a new way of evaluating infrastructure projects in South Australia but, by the way, here is the next four to eight years' worth of infrastructure projects that we are going to deliver.' Those two things are inconsistent.

We very much had regard to filling the short to medium-term pipeline, which kept the work going and kept people employed with regard to the jobs that are needed and their families who rely on government to do their work in this sector—a job that was made a whole lot harder because we have had to start from scratch in relation to a lot of proposals. It is why we took to the election 10 major projects that we want ISA to look at, so that people could understand the kinds of things we were looking at, but we did not want to presuppose what ISA would say.

Again, everything we did—everything from the modest infrastructure spending proposal to identifying these projects and having the ISA policy in the first place—was to tell South Australians that the way we are going to deliver infrastructure in South Australia is changing. It will change as quickly as we can get this bill through parliament and we can start to get this body up and running.

The way that we are committing to this change is by taking a more modest infrastructure proposal to the election, by only putting ideas up because we want to test those ideas. We want to show South Australia, whether that be individuals, industry associations or individual contractors, that we are going to respect the ISA process. Everything was designed around achieving that outcome, and we have. It seems to me that the only people who are trying to conspiracy theorise are those opposite. Why? Because they are struggling to find a reason to oppose this thing, but I think they are doing a pretty good job of trying to find a few spurious reasons.

There is a natural tension and we need to get this right. We believe that in the model we have put on the table we have got this right because, unless cabinet buys into the ISA process, nobody else will respect the process. Cabinet intervening in this process to essentially sign off and agree on some common goals with ISA was an extremely important factor and it is why these capital statements are so important.

What we have also done is give ISA an independent enough voice that, where they disagree with the government, they can say that. It is important that they do have the ability to have that voice so that they can go on and be that trusted voice that industry can respect. The amount of goodwill and good feeling I have had around this policy from inside government, as well as outside government, has been overwhelming. This is a consensus policy for everybody except, it seems, those opposite and I can understand why.

They are a little bit sheepish about the fact that this idea has been on the table for a long time, but they were too strong willed to steal it and bring an ISA body before the election, which is why a lot of the comments that those opposite have made really need to be ignored. If they were serious about this, with the virtue now that has suddenly popped up out of nowhere since 17 March, it could all have been fixed if they had done this in the first place, but they did not because they did not want anybody to be able to speak truth to power and to speak truth to the stupid decisions that have been made.

We are not afraid of that. We know that this body is going to cause governments problems into the future. We have seen it around the country. The reason you set up an ISA body is so that you can get an independent voice, but when that independent voice is exercised sometimes they are going to say things that the government does not want to hear, and that is exactly what they are supposed to do. The reason we do it now is that the first term of a government is the point at which a government is at its most honest.



I look at the last 16 years and, had this ISA body been put in place for a while, it could have challenged some of the increasingly odd and bizarre decisions that were being made, but, alas, that is not the case. I am sure that when we are into our 16<sup>th</sup> year of government the policies we have put in place and the structures we have put in place now around Infrastructure SA, our productivity commission and a whole host of other things, will do well to serve to keep governments honest, and that is exactly what we are trying to achieve.

With regard to board appointments, I am not going to be lectured by a former government that put some of the people on boards they did. It really is a laundry list of mates who needed to be looked after. I do not know what sorts of deals were done in relation to, 'If you retire now, we will make sure that you get kicked onto this board, but don't worry. We're here. We'll look after you.' There is a whole host of people whose appointments have to be viewed as political, and to try to look at the qualifications that these people may or may not have had would have belied the fact that there is a difficulty there.

In relation to the board, there will be seven people on the board. That is best practice. The reason you need three chief executives on the board is that you need buy-in from the agencies. You also need the agencies to have visibility over what is going on. You need DPC and DTF at the table because they are the money and the boss, and you need DPTI at the table because they probably have some expertise because, as the former minister pointed out, the DPTI chief is likely to be quite smart about building things.

Also, you need the four independent people on the board so that you have a majority independent board providing that right tension between external independent advice and independent departmental buy-in. If the member for West Torrens had done his homework he would have seen that, across the country, many of these bodies have chief executives that sit on those boards. Again, we are looking to implement best practice.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I think we need to move on to other priorities. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (RULES) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July.)

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (17:11):** It is good to be here speaking on this bill and I commend the minister for introducing it. I commend the ministerial council for its speedy introduction. One of the great frustrations of the Energy Council is—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, pardon me for interrupting, are you the lead speaker on this bill?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Could you indicate that to the house, please?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I indicate that I am the lead speaker on this bill. One of the great frustrations of the ministerial energy COAG is the frustration of delay at the rate of change. When Dr Finkel was given a mandate by the commonwealth government and the MCOE (Ministerial Council on Energy) to do his review, one of my greatest concerns was the timeliness of the implementation of those reviews.

To say that the politics and structures of the National Electricity Market are Byzantine would be a compliment. They are archaic, undemocratic, difficult to navigate, difficult to understand and there are many little empires that people attempt to defend, which is completely understandable. There is an inherent conflict between the market operator, the Australian Energy Regulator and the Australian Energy Market Commission, and now we have an Energy Security Board.

The Energy Security Board has been tasked to implement the recommendations of Finkel—99 of them, excluding one—and to implement a new one. I have forgotten what it is called. It is Turnbull's latest incarnation—the NEG, the National Electricity Guarantee, which I suspect will be amended again in one form or another because it is in fact a de facto energy intensity scheme without, of course, the baseline set for emissions, but no doubt the national bodies will eventually sort that out.

What this legislation does is finally give the ministerial council, once there is unanimous agreement (which is no easy task) of all the NEM states, the ability to then agree to make a rule, which is done through the South Australian minister's lead legislator. My concerns about this when I was minister was the delay in attempting to get change through the COAG. That delay often took years—sometimes four or five years.

In fact, I think one reform that I saw through had been instigated by the Hon. Paul Holloway. So we are talking about long periods of time. Every time there is a review or a referral, it goes back to the MCOE, goes off to another agency, and the rule maker takes a long time to consider the implications of all this. What this does is allow a much faster reaction time to the problem at hand. Fundamentally, it goes to who is the decision-maker of the National Electricity Market?

One of the first things Josh Frydenberg said as energy minister at the first COAG meeting was that he wanted COAG to unanimously agree that ministers were responsible for the National Electricity Market regardless of the ownership of the assets. I thought that was a very interesting first gambit by the national energy minister. The reason he said that is: do not underestimate the illiteracy of people in the energy industry about the political process around rule making, the permutation of those rules and how the market operates, and, indeed, even amongst some bureaucracies.

We are very lucky here in South Australia to have some of the most well-versed and skilled public servants who understand this market. When they read it their ears do not bleed, but the eyes and ears of the people they explain it to bleed as it is explained it to them. It is very, very complex. This ignorance of how the system operates has allowed some behaviours in the market to flourish. Some of those behaviours in the market are reprehensible. The way some gentailers behave should be criminal, but they are allowed to get away with it.

As politicians attempt to reform the process, you run out of runway, you run out of time, because the process is so long. The whole idea—and I hope I am right about this—is to try to shorten the time between a unanimous decision of the council in rule making. If we were able to achieve that I will be very impressed but I am sure there are people, as we speak, who are going through this legislation attempting to find ways and means to still insert themselves.

One of the concerns I have about the ESB is its first foray into policymaking, which I think was appalling, and I told the Energy Security Board such. They appeared in a partisan way with the Prime Minister backing a policy of the commonwealth government which it did not have the power to do, which I thought was an appalling foray and was the spark for much of these reforms here today. I can tell you that in a bipartisan way across the national energy COAG there was universal condemnation of the way they conducted themselves, which is quite rare and, I thought, a very sad day for national reform in the electricity market.

However, that is in the past now and the NEG is on its way to the next COAG, and we will see how they go there. I have no idea how states are going to vote to implement the NEG. I know that this government agreed sight unseen to support the NEG and good luck to them. We will see how that operates.

I have grave concerns about the NEG operating in South Australia given the way it is structured, given that we are a gas state and we have generators setting the price. If you have the NEG load over the top of it you could have some very perverse outcomes in South Australia that could give market players with a lot of market power a lot more market power. I am very concerned about its applications in South Australia. But we will wait and see. We have been assured by the government that the NEG will lower prices and not increase prices in South Australia, so we will wait and see what its operations are.

In terms of this legislation, it is a national reform, so there is a very long tradition in the parliament of bipartisan support. I thank the minister, when he was shadow minister, for always

supporting national reforms, which made the South Australian parliament an exemplar for national reforms. This is quite unique. What occurs at the national COAG is that when a decision is made the South Australian minister has the responsibility of legislating on behalf of the entire country here in the parliament.

That can be quite difficult, especially with time lines in the parliament, but there has always been bipartisan support. It would have been very difficult for the minister to always win the day in the party room, but I am very pleased with the way he conducted himself during that process. I offer the same bipartisan support for national reforms, whether we agree or disagree with them.

I want to make it very clear today, excluding this bill, that if we support national reforms because they are part of the COAG process it in no way implies political support for those processes, but we accept that if the national COAG decides unanimously, as it should, that all states will implement this change, we will support that. But, of course, we reserve the right, if elected, to then argue for a change in that policy. We should not differentiate this voting here with political support. I just make that very clear, as did the minister, about his support, when he was shadow minister.

Without taking up too much time of the parliament, I look forward to reining in the ESB and the bodies that operate the National Electricity Market. I am sure they await this legislation with eagerness—probably not—and we will see if this COAG can actually implement the recommendations of the ESB and the Finkel inquiry quickly, in a timely way, so that, in the end, consumers can actually get the benefit of lowering power prices. For far too long, since the privatisation of ETSA, South Australians have suffered under increased prices through no fault of their own.

There is nothing more frustrating for a consumer than when, no matter how much they improve the efficiency of their home use, they still see their power bills go up. There is nothing more demoralising. I hope these reforms have a speedy, unamended passage through both houses of parliament. I wish the minister all the very best in the implementation of the Finkel recommendations. I hope that we can get some quick decision-making done at a national level. This will not be the last time he is in the parliament making reforms. I will track with great interest his success or failure at the national COAG about reforms that he wishes to move.

The relationship at the national COAG is always interesting, as is how new ministers are brought up to speed with reforms. It is quite complex, but it is a very collegiate group of people and they work exceptionally well and often in a bipartisan way that is not seen. You do see a lot of bipartisanship, although I think that has started to fracture over the last couple of years, but hopefully that can be rebuilt relatively quickly and we still get some common-sense decision-making in the National Electricity Market.

I think the NEG's days are numbered. I could be wrong. I stand to be corrected, but I think, as a proposal, it will not succeed, but again I do not know when the Prime Minister is calling the election. If he calls the election before it is implemented, I think it is dead because I suspect he will lose the election, but I could be wrong.

If he is successful, I think the NEG will be implemented. Depending on the margin, depending on what the make-up of the commonwealth backbench is, there might be a very different emissions target. I do not know what the baseline will ultimately be, but I think there has been a lot of manipulation of the National Electricity Guarantee.

Fundamentally, what the Australian Energy Market Commission has done is convince the commonwealth government to accept an energy intensity scheme by another name with very different emission settings, which is fine, but I have always believed that the simplest solution is often the best. The simplest solution to this is trusting the science and the market-based solutions. The market-based solutions are an energy intensity scheme.

Alas, those days are behind us—it is the NEG. We will see if that is implemented in full. We will see what happens at the next federal election with the NEG. Again, this legislation empowers politicians and ministers who are accountable to people to actually implement change, which is the whole frustration of the COAG. I commend the bill to the house and I urge its speedy passage through the parliament.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:23):** I thank all those who have spoken on the bill before me, but particularly the shadow minister, the former minister. It is well worth putting on the record that he was one of the key people to get this COAG agreement formulated. I think it is a very good, sensible agreement to put forward. He has articulated his views on this bill, and I concur. He has also articulated some other things, but I certainly agree with his comments on the bill.

It is a good, sensible thing and it is important to speed up the process. It is important that the ministers and the governments who are responsible for making these decisions have a greater opportunity to be involved in them in a more timely fashion. It is important that the Energy Security Board be part of that decision-making process as well, given the skill, ability and talent and the fact that they represent the other, larger, national NEM bodies.

So as not to delay the house, I also commend the bill. There is a series of 20 amendments, which are identical and can be moved in three blocks because they only apply to three clauses. It is the only change that I have, and I know that the shadow minister's office has been advised of them. Every single one of them is simply to remove the word 'proposed' from the relevant clauses and that is a technical change recommended by parliamentary counsel. It is essentially a small oversight from when the bill was drafted.

I thank everyone who has spoken, and I thank the opposition for their support of this very sensible development, which commenced before the last election. I am glad that the previous Labor government got it started and I am glad that the current Liberal government can get it finished.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Have these amendments been approved at officer level by the COAG?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** No, they were not approved at officer level, but it was considered by our department and by parliamentary counsel that they were a minor drafting issue and that it was not necessary.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** It is my responsibility to ask a second question. Can the minister assure the house that the amendments do not change the intent of the ministerial COAG?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Absolutely.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 7 passed.

Clause 8.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I have had advice from the Clerk that amendments 1 to 8, which all refer to clause 8, can be moved in a block. I move:

Amendment No 1 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 4, line 31 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(2)(a)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 2 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 4, line 35 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(2)(b)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 3 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 5, line 6 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(4)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 4 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 5, line 7 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(4)(a)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 5 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 5, line 14 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(4)(b)]—Delete 'proposed'  
Amendment No 6 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 5, line 18 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(4)(c)]—Delete 'proposed'  
Amendment No 7 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 5, line 20 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(5)]—Delete 'proposed'  
Amendment No 8 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 5, line 30 [clause 8, inserted section 90F(5)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 9 to 16 passed.

Clause 17.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I move:

Amendment No 9 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 8, line 28 [clause 17, inserted section 238B(2)(a)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 10 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 8, line 31 [clause 17, inserted section 238B(2)(b)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 11 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 8, line 34 [clause 17, inserted section 238B(3)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 12 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 8, line 35 [clause 17, inserted section 238B(3)(a)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 13 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 9, line 1 [clause 17, inserted section 238B(3)(b)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 14 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 9, line 5 [clause 17, inserted section 238B(3)(c)]—Delete 'proposed'

Again, I move these en bloc. They are all identical and remove the word 'proposed'. Amendments Nos 9 to 14 all apply to clause 17.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 18 to 24 passed.

Clause 25.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I move:

Amendment No 15 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 11, line 15 [clause 25, inserted section 294G(2)(a)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 16 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 11, line 19 [clause 25, inserted section 294G(2)(b)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 17 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 11, line 22 [clause 25, inserted section 294G(3)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 18 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 11, line 23 [clause 25, inserted section 294G(3)(a)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 19 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 11, line 28 [clause 25, inserted section 294G(3)(b)]—Delete 'proposed'

Amendment No 20 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 11, line 31 [clause 25, inserted section 294G(3)(c)]—Delete 'proposed'

I move amendments Nos 15 to 20 en bloc, as they all apply to clause 25 and they are all identical.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (26 to 29) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)**  
**(17:32):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:32 the house adjourned until Thursday 5 July 2018 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***EXPORT PERFORMANCE**

**71 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay)** (6 June 2018). What is the value of South Australia's merchandise exports and services exports to China for the years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017, in both original value and chain volume terms?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment that:

The value of South Australian merchandise exports to China, in original price terms, was \$2.77 billion in 2013, \$3.01 billion in 2014, \$2.41 billion in 2015, \$2.09 billion in 2016 and \$2.38 billion in 2017.

Export data reported in chain volume terms is available for South Australian merchandise exports as a whole, but is not published at the level of specific country markets.

Services export data from South Australia is also not available at the level of specific country markets in either original price or chain volume terms. Therefore, I cannot give any China specific information on services exports.

**INVESTMENT ATTRACTION SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**72 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay)** (6 June 2018). What is the progress on Investment Attraction SA's assistance to Australian Crane and Machinery's project to establish a second manufacturing facility?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment that:

Australian Crane and Machinery Pty Ltd has advised that its expansion into South Australia is progressing according to plan.

Based on progress to date, Australian Crane and Machinery expect to be operational in South Australia by early 2019.

**INVESTMENT ATTRACTION SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**73 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay)** (6 June 2018). What is the progress on Investment Attraction SA's assistance to Babcock Mission Critical Services' proposal to relocate its helicopter services to South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment that:

Babcock has confirmed that its relocation of Australian Helicopters to South Australia was completed in 2017 and currently employs 48 FTEs.

Investment is continuing to engage with the Babcock Group and confirm that the group continues to meet its contractual obligations to the South Australian government.

**INVESTMENT ATTRACTION SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**74 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay)** (6 June 2018). What is the progress on Investment Attraction SA's assistance to Becker Helicopters proposal to establish a flight training centre at Whyalla?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment that:

Becker Helicopters have commenced their business development activities, with the relocation of their first helicopter pilot and a helicopter to Whyalla. Becker Helicopters have also engaged a contractor for the design of the facilities and have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with TAFE SA to form an ongoing training partnership. Training is expected to commence before 2020.

In accordance with the funding agreement the first instalment has been paid to Becker Helicopters.

**INVESTMENT ATTRACTION SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**75 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay)** (6 June 2018). What is the progress on Investment Attraction SA's assistance to Technicolor to establish a visual effects centre in Adelaide?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment that:

Investment Attraction South Australia finalised the contract with Technicolor on 16 February 2018.

Technicolor is currently:

- working towards its Visual Effects Academy to be operational by December 2018
- working towards its Mill Film Visual Effects Centre to be operational by December 2018

- working with South Australia's Universities, TAFE SA and vocational education providers to develop the South Australian talent pool for VFX
- working with local business to design and fitout its Mill Film Visual Effects Centre and Visual Effects Academy; and
- recruiting for its Mill Film Visual Effects Centre and Visual Effects Academy.

The company has advised it is on track to meet the milestones specified in the contract Deed of Agreement.

#### **INVESTMENT ATTRACTION SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**76 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay)** (6 June 2018). What is the progress on Investment Attraction SA's assistance to Pirate Life to expand its brewing capacity and establish retail premises?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment that:

Investment Attraction South Australia is actively working with Pirate Life Brewing Pty Ltd to formalise the agreed terms of the \$2.2 million (GST inclusive) grant awarded to Pirate Life from the Economic Investment Fund.

#### **GOODS AND SERVICES TAX**

In reply to **Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (5 June 2018).

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised that:

The South Australian Liberal Government's position on the distribution of GST revenue is clear. We will not support any changes that disadvantage South Australia.

Rather than writing to the Federal Treasurer, the South Australian Treasurer has met one on one with his federal counterpart and firmly made the point that the government will not be supporting any change to GST funding arrangements which disadvantages the interests of South Australia and South Australians.

It does not matter if it is a federal Liberal government or a federal Labor government, both the Treasurer and I will be fighting for the interests of South Australia.

#### **COMMISSIONER FOR VICTIMS' RIGHTS**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 June 2018).

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised that:

No, because the Attorney-General went on leave on 15 June 2018 and Mr O'Connell returned to Australia several days afterwards while the Attorney-General was still on leave.