

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 11 September 2019

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. V.A. Tarzia) took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students of year 6 from Norwood Primary School, who are guests of the Premier. Welcome to Parliament House.

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2019.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:33): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	24
Noes	20
Majority	4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

NOES

Bell, T.S.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:38): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	24
Noes	20
Majority.....	4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

NOES

Bell, T.S.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

Motions

TONKIN GOVERNMENT

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (10:44): I move:

That this house notes that 15 September marks the 40th anniversary of the election of the Tonkin government and pays tribute to the significant achievements of that government over its three-year term in office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr HARVEY: It is my pleasure to move this motion, which recognises the significant achievements—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I want the member for West Torrens to hear this. Order! I would hate to eject him so early in the day.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr HARVEY: It is my pleasure to move this motion, which recognises the significant achievements of the Tonkin government in South Australia during its relatively short period of government. As I do not think it is unfair to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr HARVEY: —as one of the younger members of this place, that I do not have the benefit of being able to recall the days of the Tonkin government. I was not born until nearly the end of the first term of the Bannon government—I do remember that. To move and speak on this motion, then, I have had to brush up on my history, which has certainly been a worthwhile exercise.

As I am sure most members will agree, it is important for us to take opportunities to reflect on the efforts of previous governments to improve our state. Whilst of course the efforts and achievements of particular governments will be viewed with more or less favourability depending on which side of the house you are sitting on, it is incumbent on us as leaders to acknowledge, and in doing so appreciate, the impact that those who came before us have made.

From the perspective of a proud Liberal, it is also important that we make the effort to recognise achievements of Liberal governments. This has been a particular focus of our current Premier and something which, admittedly, those opposite do quite well for former Labor governments and figures. As a younger member, I have found reflecting on previous governments—particularly Liberal governments—incredibly valuable. Not only are we able to learn from the experiences of previous governments but there is a sort of grounding effect of looking back through history and realising that, despite the now constant media coverage and commentary of political events, the business of governments and members of parliament remains the same and that no matter how swept up we might get, it is unlikely that our circumstances are entirely unique.

The Tonkin government was elected on 15 September 1979. It lasted for only one term. In that one term, however, the Tonkin government managed to steer South Australia into the future despite difficult economic conditions, particularly in the manufacturing industry at the time. The Tonkin government had many achievements which continued to be of great benefit to our state long after its term had finished and which are continuing to be of great benefit today.

The Olympic Dam mine is an enormous economic contributor to our state, employing thousands of South Australians. Without the Tonkin government, this would not be the case. The fight to allow uranium mining at Olympic Dam was tough, but the Tonkin government, led by David Tonkin and his deputy, Roger Goldsworthy, pursued it and ultimately succeeded, knowing that the benefits to our state would be extraordinary. The Olympic Dam mine typified the forward-looking attitude of the Tonkin government, which was prepared to endure tough battles in order to implement policies it knew would have an overwhelmingly positive impact on our state.

Of a similar visionary nature was the Tonkin government's establishment of Technology Park, which was established with the full intention that it would become a hub of economic drivers for our state and today is occupied by over 100 high-tech companies that contribute much to South Australia. The fact that the Olympic Dam mine and Technology Park are both continuing to make significant contributions to our state is a testament to the foresight of the Tonkin government.

It was not only in the area of economic development that the Tonkin government left its mark. The Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981 granted land rights to over 10 per cent of the state to its traditional owners. This was a groundbreaking agreement, the first of its kind in Australia. It demonstrates the awareness of the Tonkin government of the importance of governing for all people, of listening to legitimate concerns and acting accordingly.

It will be impossible to properly acknowledge the Tonkin government without touching on its leader, David Tonkin. Although I never had the opportunity to meet David Tonkin, in preparing for my speech today I read a number of the speeches that were given in this place following his passing in October 2000. There was a consistent theme throughout each of the contributions, that being how genuinely kind and decent David Tonkin was. It is obvious that these traits flowed through to his government and were reflected in his personal involvement during negotiations for the APY land rights agreement.

His determination to make positive changes to society existed long before he became Premier. His introduction of a private member's bill, which then became the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, was historic. It made South Australia the first state to introduce legislation dealing with discrimination on the basis of sex. Spurred on by the injustices his mother experienced during his childhood, the grit and determination to stand up on matters of principle and to prevent injustice would have been on full display as David Tonkin introduced his private member's bill into the parliament the day after the passing of his mother.

A great lesson from the leadership of David Tonkin and the performance of his government is that, to be a great political leader, it is not necessary to be a conniving negotiator, an accumulator of favours or to have a sense for stunts. The ability to empathise, to see injustice and be prepared to stand against it and to persist with worthwhile reforms in the face of vocal opposition are characteristics that David Tonkin showed are crucial for great leaders to have.

The legacy of the Tonkin government is particularly strong in my electorate, with the O-Bahn bus service being the most popular public transport service in Adelaide, servicing tens of thousands of South Australians each day. The O-Bahn busway project was yet another achievement of the Tonkin government that has continued to provide significant benefits to South Australia long after it was implemented.

Shortly after my election last year, I met with the first Liberal member for Newland, Brian Billard, who represented the electorate for the length of the Tonkin government and travelled during this time with other members of the government to Essen, Germany, to study its busway. The Essen busway became the model for our O-Bahn, and Brian was kind enough to provide me with a picture from the study trip of that busway, which I have on display in the foyer of my office.

The Tonkin government made a significant and long-lasting impact on our state, leading South Australia into the modern age while at the same time taking historic steps to acknowledge and deal with the legitimate grievances of our state's Indigenous peoples. It was a government which was far too short lived but which used its time to fundamentally prepare South Australia for the decades to follow. As the 40th anniversary of the election of this visionary government approaches, it is timely for this house to pay tribute to its monumental achievements. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (10:52): There are startling resemblances to the Tonkin government in what we see today. The Tonkin government, as I remember it as a young man, came into being after a long term of a Labor government. It came into office and then left very quickly after that, ushering in another very long term of a Labor government, and the similarities are overwhelming.

I do give credit to the Tonkin government for the work of its deputy premier, Mr Roger Goldsworthy, who I think was an exceptional individual. I have been lucky enough to strike up a friendship with Mr Goldsworthy, who I think is probably the state's best-ever mining minister. He is a man who took on the world to bring in uranium mining in South Australia, and my party at the time was wrong. We were wrong, and it is important that we acknowledge that we were wrong at the time.

Subsequently, what we have seen is Olympic Dam and its nearly 4,000 employees underpin the economy of this state. It is one of the largest customers in South Australia. It is one of the largest customers who expend money in South Australia, and Mr Goldsworthy had the foresight to do that. He deserves a big tick and a place in history for that and that alone. However, that is where the similarities end.

It is pretty ridiculous that this parliament is spending time congratulating past governments and past politicians. This is the people's house. Our time should be spent debating the people's business today. If you want to honour David Tonkin, hold a reception. If you want to honour David Tonkin, have a cocktail party. If you want to honour David Tonkin and his three years in office, hold a party somewhere in Burnside and celebrate his being the member for Bragg—the last good member for Bragg we had. Celebrate the work that he did in his community. Let's not waste the time of the parliament looking back on what happened 40 years ago because the Liberal Party wants to honour what it calls a hero. I have to say that if a one-term Premier is a hero, the bar is pretty low.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is important that we learn from history. What is it that can cause a one-term government? In Mr Tonkin's time, I understand that Australia was in the grips of a recession. If you listen to the Premier, we are in a recession right now as well. We have had two consecutive quarters of state final demand negative growth, which, under his definition, is a recession. We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation, and the government's answer to this highest unemployment rate and two negative quarters of negative growth in state final demand is to aggregate land tax to hit mum-and-dad investors with overwhelming tax bills.

Yesterday, I went and saw a constituent of mine after he was interviewed by the TV news because he talked about—I saw on Twitter—the land tax imposition being put on him by this government. He was a salaried worker who was made redundant eight years ago. Eight years ago he lost his job. He sustains himself and his family by owning four investment properties. They are not four investment properties that he inherited; they are four investment properties that he and his wife borrowed money to buy and invest in, rather than superannuation.

These people missed out on holidays. These people sacrificed and worked hard. They are not millionaires. They live in Mile End. They are humble people of humble means who aspire to be self-funded in retirement. To my great horror and shock, he has never voted for me. Living in Mile End, that is rare. But there is good news: I suspect at the next election he will.

This man is a scientist; he is a biochemist. He was born in Athens and migrated to Australia at the age of 12. He said to me that he has done the calculations on the Premier's revised plan. He goes from a land tax liability of \$5,000 to a land tax liability of \$19,800 under the aggregation principles. Members opposite are hitting people who would have voted for David Tonkin and would have voted for small 'l' liberals, and they are hitting them hard. Why? Why are they doing this?

Members opposite do understand that aggregation actually makes the tax-free threshold redundant. Members opposite do understand that. They understand what they are doing to people who own one, two or three properties. Talking about having a lower rate is irrelevant if you own multiple properties. It is only relevant if you own one very expensive investment property, such as a \$5 million investment property or a commercial property. Then it is very relevant. But if you are an investor who lives in Colton, for example, in West Beach or Henley Beach South or Henley Beach, which, I am reliably informed, has the highest percentage of self-funded retirees in Australia per postcode, I bet watching your local MP cheer aggregation would horrify you.

It is important to note that the Tonkin government was carried by people such as the residents of West Beach. They have been loyal Liberals for a long time. I won the booth once in 2006 and lost it in 2010, and then it was redistributed into Colton, and I bid them farewell reluctantly. They are now in a marginal seat that will be targeted by Labor at the next election. It will not be us who will have to explain to those self-funded retirees why a Premier who came in on the promise of better services and lower costs is aggregating their properties. Premier Tonkin would not have been stupid enough to do that. Premier Tonkin lost because he could not get the economy out of a recession. The similarities are growing, and I will say to members opposite that if you do not learn the lessons of history you are going to repeat them.

It is telling that a marginal member would move a motion in recognition of a one-term Liberal premier. It is almost like fate is calling. It is almost as if history is about to repeat itself. Premier Tonkin came in on a wave after a long-term Labor government; it was time for a change. He implemented his policies to the shock and horror of their own supporters—recession—and of course the wider public. Things are starting to feel a lot the same. Labor regenerated, rejuvenated; a new, young, energetic leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Cregan interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry; I can't hear the noises of the fantastic supporters of land tax. Where are they?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Kavel!

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, yes—

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens might like to use this footage. I ask members to respect him as he respected the government's members most of the time. Thank you.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I look forward to the public meeting in the seat of Colton. I look forward to the member for Colton attending those western suburbs meetings and talking about land tax aggregation and how he is ending a rort. I also look forward to talking about why it is just and wise to put a surcharge on law-abiding citizens of established trusts; I look forward to that conversation with the member for Colton because I know he is on top of this. I know he knows every detail about land tax. I know that the member for Colton, the standard bearer of the Liberal Party in the western suburbs, like David Tonkin, will be—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for West Torrens. The point of order is for—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Relevance to the motion at hand.

The SPEAKER: In fairness to the Minister for Education, he makes a fair point. The member for West Torrens is beginning to deviate from the Tonkin government. I respectfully ask him to come back to that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The question will be: can modern-day Liberals carry the same Tonkin Liberals as they did last century and overcome the fate of history and overcome the folly of the Tonkin government? I suspect not.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education) (11:02): Forty years ago the Tonkin government was elected, and it was an outstanding government that extraordinarily overachieved for South Australia, in three years delivering far more than the Labor decade prior and the Labor decade that followed.

The fact that when the Labor Party representative on this motion seeks to use his entire time criticising the Tonkin government for the fact that it did not win re-election, with complete disregard for the extraordinary achievements it delivered during its three years, goes to the heart, to the core, of what is wrong with the Labor Party at its soul. They are interested in political re-election, they are interested in whether or not—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —there are votes, and completely uninterested in achievements for the people of South Australia—which is, of course, the core of what we swore we would do when we came to this parliament.

The Tonkin government's achievements were very profound in three years, but some of them they do not get credit for; some have been wrongly ascribed to the Dunstan era or the Bannon era. The Dunstan era was a long period of time, and there were a good number achievements. Things like the Adelaide Festival and a number of arts events and infrastructure were actually started under Playford, under Steele Hall, and much of these were reinforced by the Tonkin government.

There were a number of other achievements that Tonkin himself achieved. The member for Newland talked about the Olympic Dam development, and even the member West Torrens has admitted the extraordinary importance of that achievement.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Adelaide International Airport and South Australia's first international-quality hotel were developed during the Tonkin government with the support of its ministers. There was the establishment of Indigenous land rights in the APY lands in the state's north-west, and the establishment of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. The member for Newland also talked about the O-Bahn busway, which is important for my constituents as well as his.

David Tonkin was also personally critical as a legislator, as a member of the House of Assembly, in delivering on equal opportunity laws. He worked very closely with Don Dunstan and members of the Labor government through the seventies; indeed, he moved private members' bills of his own. From the Liberal Party's point of view, through the 1970s, after the real damage caused by the split between the Liberal Movement and the Liberal and Country League, David Tonkin demonstrated extraordinary personal capacity in bringing together the broad church of the Liberal Party.

I think a lot of that work was instrumental, and it was looked on by people like John Howard later on, in seeking to govern as a strong Liberal leader identifying the strands of conservatism, that respect for institutions that is at the core of that philosophy and the strands of liberalism, the importance and the fundamental primacy of individual freedoms, rights, responsibilities and opportunities. Those two strong philosophical traditions coalesced around a political movement that is capable not only of winning elections, particularly as we have done at a federal level and we will continue to do at a state level, but also, most importantly, delivering achievements for the people of South Australia and Australia.

This is the movement that, in that Tonkin tradition, is best able to find outcomes that will help our community to live better lives, to help people to live better lives. That is David Tonkin's tradition and that is why it is important to celebrate 40 years of it. It helps us remember the critical role that he has had in influencing South Australia's present and its future. For the last 40 years, we have been on that trajectory set by the David Tonkin government.

The member for West Torrens asks why we are spending time discussing this in the parliament. It is an interesting question the member for West Torrens has raised, looking at some of the other things we are discussing. I think it is worthy that this time be set aside each week for discussion and motions that members bring to the parliament. Later this morning we will be talking about issues, including child protection and DonateLife Week, which have been brought to the parliament. They are worthy motions brought by members of the opposition that we will get to shortly.

Of course, if we get through those quickly, we will get to the member for West Torrens' motions. The member for West Torrens criticises us for talking about past political achievements. He might like to have a word to the member for Giles because further down the list we have an acknowledgement that it has been five years since the former Labor government established country cabinet meetings.

The member for West Torrens himself seeks to bring to the chamber—and it is on the list—a motion about the time passed since the launch of the world's largest lithium-ion battery at Hornsdale wind farm near Jamestown. Indeed, motion No. 12 from the member for West Torrens talks about the 20th anniversary of the privatisation of ETSA. It is an extraordinary point to be raised by a fellow who is clearly making smart-arsed political commentary rather than actually considering the motion at hand.

I encourage all members to take the time to learn a bit about what happened during the Tonkin era. It was a one-term government. I think a significant amount of the political commentary would suggest the difficulties of the Tonkin government. It was elected with a one seat majority and then faced the people again in 1982 at a time when, if it had been after the election of the Hawke Labor government federally, there may well have been a different time; a four-year term may well have seen a different result. However, that is actually less important than what was done, the reasons why things were done and the courage shown by the Tonkin ministers in standing up to vested interests and traditional points of view. Things like the Olympic Dam achievement were profound.

I never had the opportunity to meet David Tonkin, which is something that I regret. I was in the fortunate position after his passing to be vice-president of the South Australian Young Liberal Movement. In that role, I reached out to Prue Tonkin, his widow, and asked if we could have the honour of establishing a memorial dinner in his honour; indeed, I note the member for Bragg established a scholarship as well.

The Tonkin family has supported that dinner, which has now been going for 19 years since his passing, in my recollection, in the year 2000. It is the 19th this year or possibly the 20th. People, including former premiers and former prime ministers, have spoken at that dinner and reflected on the points of view in the Liberal philosophical tradition that can encourage our party to offer the best philosophical and practical approaches to help our community in the future.

The first speaker was Jennifer Cashmore, former member for Coles, the seat that I now have the honour to hold. She was able to offer personal reflections on her time as a minister in that government, as indeed have other ministers been able to do: people like Dean Brown, John Olsen and other luminaries, including Nick Minchin, Malcolm Turnbull, Jeff Kennett, Nick Greiner, Baden Teague, the member for Bragg and others who knew David Tonkin or who are familiar with his tradition.

That has been something that I am really pleased the Young Liberal Movement continues to do. I am very pleased that the Tonkin family, and in particular Prue, is able to continue their involvement in that because it is important, as we seek to find new ways to deliver for our communities, that we reflect on the achievements of those who have passed.

It is really important that, as members of parliament, we focus our energies on the people living in our communities: how we can best help them to live happy lives; how we can help our children to be successful. By success I mean, as I always do, the opportunity for a child to know that they are going to grow up into a life where they can look forward to each day being able to pursue an activity, whether a career or other engagements, that they are going to look forward to as they wake up, knowing that their day will be better. The sorts of policies that David Tonkin pursued when in government and that his government pursued were to that mind. They sought to make their community better and stronger and they succeeded in doing so.

They sought to establish strong foundations upon which the state could thrive and prosper and they succeeded in doing so. The legacy that they have left has been with us for 40 years. The best of what South Australia, has to offer going forward is based, in my view, on what we have been given by our predecessors, and that was given to us by the Tonkin government. David Tonkin's legacy is misunderstood or not sufficiently understood, in my view, and that is something that this motion provides us the opportunity to start redressing.

I will finish my contribution by commending the member for Newland for bringing this to the house and by encouraging all members to reflect on the legacy that David Tonkin and indeed his family have offered through his service to community, his focus on community and his focus on what the people of South Australia want and need. Finally, I also reflect, as others may or may not do, that David Tonkin, when he was no longer in politics, continued to give his life as a life of service to the community, to the state, to the nation and indeed to the entire commonwealth through a range of roles that he was able to fulfil post politics. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:12): I rise to make a few comments about the debate we are having on the member for Newland's motion to remember and celebrate the brief life of the Tonkin Liberal government. Although I usually, almost without exception—almost—hold the member for Morialta in high esteem and put great faith in what he advises the chamber, I do think we have to take with a grain or two of salt his assurances that it is proper and appropriate to be debating this motion, particularly at this time, given that we are debating a private member's motion.

The *Notice Paper* sets down the time from 10.30 to 11.30 in the morning for private members' bills, all of which were adjourned off by the majority numbers of the government, preventing their discussion and debate. These important matters include trying to ban the outrageous, sexist and misogynist advertising which occurs on Wicked campervans, trying to prevent that from being extolled out in the community, as well as making sure that we have some debate on the South Australian Public Health (Immunisation and Early Childhood Services) Bill, the Road Traffic (Drug

Testing) Amendment Bill and so on. These are all important matters which need to be dealt with in this place and which have been deliberately parked, deliberately adjourned off so that we can celebrate the brief life of the Tonkin government.

Why are we giving up the precious hour that we have once a week to discuss private members' bills for this? I agree with the member for Morialta that there were some significant achievements during the time of the Tonkin government. He made reference to Aboriginal land rights and the passage of the APY Land Rights Act, and I completely agree that was in fact a monumental piece of legislation for this parliament to pass—not that we did not have form as a parliament for passing monumental pieces of legislation, but that certainly is up there with one of them.

We have been national, if not global, leaders in many areas. To my mind, that is certainly one of those areas. Although there continues to be, decades on, a lot of work that needs to be done to improve the livelihoods of those who reside in the APY lands, certainly the passage of that act at that time under the Tonkin government was extremely important and it should be congratulated on it. However, there is some revisionism which goes on when it comes to people, usually members of the Liberal Party, in recounting the achievements of the Tonkin Liberal government.

Of course, people are quick to say that the O-Bahn was a wonderful achievement of the Tonkin government. It is true that the transport minister under the Tonkin government did come into office and cancel the rail line, which was to be delivered out to the north-eastern suburbs, and had to scramble around for another project to put up in its place and so took a number of trips to Germany to investigate a guided busway system in use in West Germany.

The purpose of that guided busway was to run along a shared path where buses could share the same corridor as rail vehicles. Of course, for a partisan Liberal politician that still would not put enough distance between a former Labor plan for a rail project and a different public transport plan under a new Liberal government. So the shared running concept of the West German system was binned as well and the O-Bahn project was announced, not delivered but announced. The O-Bahn first started its operations in 1986, not by 1982 when the Tonkin government was turfed from office.

What did happen during 1980, 1981 and 1982, were the very loud bleatings and complaints—and I have experienced some of this—from residents of Hackney about an O-Bahn project. How history does repeat to reinforce the point that the member for West Torrens makes! There seems to be an unfortunate cohort and demographic of people who do not like supporting public transport projects and, unfortunately, it was just as true for the Tonkin Liberal government as it was for the former Labor government.

Unlike the former Tonkin government, we successfully delivered a public transport project rather than just talked about it, and that is a substantial difference between saying and doing when it comes to the performance of former governments. Maybe that is a good point at which to remember the rather rocky start that the Tonkin government commenced under, because there was an extraordinary election victory with 55 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, the best performance by a Liberal or Liberal and Country League, or whatever iteration of the Liberal Party in the second half of the 20th century we were confronted with at the time. But remarkably, only 25 seats were won.

In fact, I said 25 seats were won. That would be misleading; 25 seats were initially thought to have been won, but that was reduced to 24 seats after the first successful appeal to the Court of Disputed Returns by the Hon. Greg Crafter, who was contesting the seat of Norwood after the retirement of the former premier the Hon. Don Dunstan. He was contesting the seat against a Liberal Party candidate whose name I have forgotten.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Webster.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is remarkable. Someone remembers the person who was found guilty of an offence under the Electoral Act by the Court of Disputed Returns, and that was for distributing misleading material in Italian to residents of the electorate of Norwood which claimed that that Liberal Party candidate was in fact the sitting member, rather than just a Liberal candidate in what had been held for quite some time as a Labor seat. The Court of Disputed Returns found that to be so misleading that there needed to be a fresh election. Once the electorate of

Norwood was not misled at an election, they of course elected a Labor member of parliament, the Hon. Greg Crafter—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: And they continued to do so.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and they continued to do so time after time, as they had done throughout the 1970s.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Now we have an even better one.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Bragg interjects to say that the 1980s were a wonderful time for the South Australian Liberals, when they lost election after election after election. Unfortunately, that start to the Tonkin government did not bode well, neither in the transport policy that I just mentioned nor in the very germane contribution made by the member for West Torrens.

The Tonkin Liberal government was responsible for the superintendence of the Land Tax Act in that act's 94th, 95th and 96th years of operation. As I understand it, the Tonkin government sought to introduce changes to that act—although perhaps ran out of time, given the brief period of their government—to ensure that land tax could not be passed on to residential tenants.

This approach was very different from the approach of the subsequent Brown and Olsen governments, which sought, in an effort to raise additional revenue—is this sounding familiar, about the superintendence of the Land Tax Act?—to lower the tax-free threshold from \$90,000 a year to \$50,000 a year, capturing thousands of additional landowners into the tax net. Subsequent Labor governments successively reformed the Land Tax Act to lift the then treasurer Rob Lucas' tax-free threshold of \$50,000 to over \$360,000. This meant that over 200,000 landowners were no longer liable for land tax.

I do not want to talk about a former Liberal administration for much longer, as I feel I have exhausted all there is to say about the Tonkin government. I will however say that by the end of that government—which had won in a 55 per cent two-party preferred majority—when they lost the 1982 election, they lost the seat of Newland, they lost the seat of Henley Beach (or Colton as it is now known), they lost the seat of Brighton (or Gibson as it is now known) and they lost the seat of Mawson. We cannot draw a direct parallel there because the honourable member for Mawson sits on this side of the chamber. I think the warning from the member for West Torrens is correct: bode history well.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:22): I rise to speak in support of the motion presented by the member for Newland and thank him for reminding us, with this motion, of the importance of the Tonkin government, which served from 1979 to 1982. I also recognise that Dr Tonkin came into parliament in 1970 in the newly formed seat of Bragg. He was the first member for Bragg and I am proud to be the third.

Recognition of David Tonkin has been comprehensive in our own area, not only for his community service but also for his political life and his work as an eye specialist. Dr Tonkin was a family man with many children. In his honour, upon becoming the member for Bragg I established the Tonkin Room, which is the meeting room at the Bragg electorate office. It was opened by the then Liberal leader, Mr Rob Kerin.

As has been expressed, we have continued to support the Tonkin Scholarship, which is available to students who either live or go to school in the Bragg electorate. It is supported annually by his widow, Mrs Prue Tonkin, who most graciously attends and provides a personal gift (often a book from Dr Tonkin's collection) during that time. The scholarship recognises outstanding service, including community service, and it is a tradition that we are proud to continue.

As has also been mentioned, the Minister for Education, during his time with the Young Liberal Movement and when he worked at my office, established the David Tonkin annual address. He and I also appreciate the Young Liberal Movement's continued recognition of this fine tradition. I have kept a number of the speeches of that time, including my own and that of the member for Heysen's father—that was a very long speech, unsurprisingly, but it was an excellent one.

It was established with the first address by Jennifer Cashmore, who was a member of the Tonkin government. Her summary of the pioneering work of David Tonkin as a new member and of a number of his government's initiatives was outstanding. It has also really been a forerunner to the

establishment of a scholarship in Bragg in recognition of Jessie Cooper and Joyce Steele, who were, of course, the first women elected. The 125-year celebration this year of women's suffrage and the right to stand for parliament is the type of tradition we want to continue to employ.

Often, I have recognised Dr Tonkin as a pioneer in the Lions association in our electorate, with the establishment of a now international program to support those with eyesight deficiencies. Even today, projects such as the preparation of very large crosswords for people who are sight challenged all emanate from an era in which Dr Tonkin was a pioneering member.

My father, Ted Chapman, was the minister for agriculture in the government that we today recognise, but he was also a good friend of Dr Tonkin, who gave my father significant advice on the subject of girls' education and the opportunity to have that. I do not think that I would have had an opportunity to come to Adelaide and undertake matriculation—year 12, as it now is—had it not been for the advice of Dr Tonkin. He also suggested that I attend what was to be the newly formed Pembroke School in the 1970s, and I have regularly credited him for having that opportunity.

Today, I have one of his sons, Peter Tonkin, as the leading counsel and adviser in the division of the Crown Solicitor's Office that deals with native title matters. I frequently rely on his advice, and through him South Australia continues to benefit from the service of the Tonkin family. I thank him for that.

Given that one of the most outstanding achievements of that government related to the forming of the APY act, I always like to give credit to the Hon. Graham Gunn, who was a long-term member of this parliament as well. He added a clause into that bill at the time to ensure that members of parliament, along with police, would have the right to enter property that was to become part of the APY lands jurisdiction, but otherwise respect needed to be maintained with the permit system to be able to enter.

I encourage members to understand that, although members of parliament do not require a permit, as a matter of courtesy I think it is appropriate that a permit is always sought before entering into the APY lands. As a general custom, that has been supported, so I would urge members to maintain that.

Finally, can I say that, yes, the Tonkin government did come in in 1979, and much has been said about that, but let me tell you something else that happened. There was a longstanding government, the leader of which, Don Dunstan, had retired earlier in that year. There was a big press conference and he was in a wheelchair in his pyjamas, vacating the space. The Corcoran government came in short term, of course, because the election washed him from office. I remind members to look at that time.

The meat scandal alone that was exposed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital was a huge issue at that time. It involved Samcor trucks loading up carcasses to the hospital for the purposes of providing meals for patients, which was done on site in those days—they were not done externally—and a number of these carcasses being stolen and on sold by operators at that time. That is the type of government that operated prior to that change of government. That meat scandal was exposed, and there were other serious failings in relation to the previous government, which deservedly swept it from office.

Members ought to remember, if we are going to have these types of motions in recognition of governments, that they should not just come to the parliament with one side of the position in relation to that. For the member for Lee's benefit, Frank Webster was the member of parliament against whom a challenge was made to his election for the seat of Norwood, and the Court Of Disputed Returns under Roma Mitchell declared that there was to be a by-election. We of course now have our Premier of South Australia who is the member for that electorate and we are proud to say has been a welcome addition.

Finally, can I say that if ever there is to be a time for land tax reform it is now, in recognition of the Tonkin administration, who were, as has been mentioned, clear in ensuring that land tax was not to be passed on to tenants but, most importantly, was not to apply to people in their principal place of residence. These are the sorts of gifts that came from a Tonkin administration. He did care about the people of South Australia, he did do what he said he would do and he did serve us well.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:30): I would like to make a small contribution to this debate. I thank the member for moving the motion. As the member for Bragg has said, it is important for these motions to come forward and it is a time to reflect on previous occasions. It is interesting to point out that the member for Bragg said, when we reflect on the history of these previous governments, that we should look at both sides of the argument. I think her speech would indicate that it was a case of do as I say rather than do as I do, because I do not recall any critique of the government but, rather, all the wonderful things the government did. She then went on to besmirch the previous Dunstan government, which led this state nationally in terms of a whole range of reforms.

One contribution I would like to make in terms of this debate, which I think is relevant and I do not think has been mentioned by previous speakers, and certainly not by Liberal Party members who have spoken today that I am aware of, is that the Tonkin government was elected in September 1979. I remember the year well. I am actually old enough to remember that year. It was the year I joined the Labor Party, so 40 years ago in July this year I joined the Labor Party. That was motivated in part by Don Dunstan's period and also a growing awareness that I needed to act rather than just talk about things, so I joined the party then.

I remember the election. It was the first election I was involved in and, sadly, it was an election that we lost. Mind you, since that date we have not lost many. Since 1968, I think the Liberal Party has won only three elections. I think there was a one-term government, which was the Tonkin era, and I understand from what Liberal Party members have said so far, being a one term government, it was very successful. Hopefully, we will hold you to that at the next election because you will consider yourselves successful if you only serve one term.

You do not judge re-election as a barometer of what the people think of you and what the electorate thinks of you, because that is not important. The fact the Tonkin government survived only one term and was booted out after one term is not an important point apparently to current members of the Liberal Party, so I look forward to their shifting sides of the parliament after the next election, because they do not consider winning again as important. I think some may disagree with that but certainly not the ones who have spoken.

The House of Assembly first sat on Thursday 11 October that year with the opening of parliament. The other reason I remember the election quite well is because of the opening of parliament. In fact, on that occasion the Tonkin government lost the very first vote on the floor of this house. It is interesting that this successful government lost its very first vote. It is a bit like Boris Johnson is doing at the moment in the House of Commons, where he cannot quite get his numbers together to win votes.

Even though Dr Tonkin enjoyed a majority in this chamber, he lost the very first vote on the election of a Speaker. I mention that because the winner of the vote was my previous local member, the member for Light, Dr Bruce Eastick. The person who lost it was the member for Goyder, which is now the electorate of Narungga.

Over the years, I have heard many stories about the intrigues behind that election ballot, why it happened, etc. I will not go into those details; they were private conversations. Suffice to say that Dr Tonkin nominated Mr E. Russack, the member for Goyder, and it was seconded by Mr Roger Goldsworthy, then a member for a Hills seat. Then Mr Blacker, the member for Flinders, nominated Dr Bruce Eastick, who was a former leader of the Liberal Party.

In fact, Dr Eastick had a very difficult time as leader of the Liberal Party, not because of his own expertise. I have high regard for Dr Eastick. He was the member for Light for many years, over 23 years from memory, and served that electorate extremely well. He is highly regarded by people on both sides of politics and has continued to serve the community since his retirement from parliament back in the early nineties.

Mr Blacker nominated Dr Bruce Eastick. That was seconded by John Bannon, then leader of the opposition, who would become Premier of South Australia three years later. When it went to a ballot, Dr Eastick won 24 votes to 22 votes. So the Liberal Party, under the new premier Dr Tonkin, lost the very first vote of parliament. That is a historical fact that I think I should perhaps remind the parliament about. There was a whole range of speeches congratulating Dr Eastick, which is

appropriate. It was perhaps a more civil time in this chamber because they were very civil and polite speeches, even from the people who lost the ballot.

It set in train a whole range of political machinations in northern Adelaide, particularly my area of Light and those general areas. The Russack forces and the Eastick forces have been at some sort of unholy civil war since that day. Certain parties who supported the election of Russack, the member for Goyder, were very displeased that one of their own members would put himself forward against the party wishes. I think this government has lost a few votes from time to time, but Dr Tonkin also lost their very first vote.

I would like to take the opportunity to reflect on the service that Dr Eastick gave to this parliament, particularly as Speaker. He gave outstanding service to this chamber and the parliament, and that was recognised quite appropriately later on. Ever since he left this house, Dr Eastick has continued to serve the community. In fact, I do not think a day goes by when he is not spending time out at some community event. He is still involved in Rotary, where he was a foundation or charter member. He is involved in a whole range of other community organisations and is still a patron of a whole list of organisations; that is the regard he is held in.

I was fortunate enough to be able to attend Dr Eastick's 90th birthday party. Irrespective of his age, he continues to serve the community accordingly with a great sense of pride. As the member for Bragg has said, when we look back, we should remember the good, the bad and the ugly of all governments because all governments have them. The challenge now is for the Liberal Party to acknowledge and learn from that government to make sure that they do not repeat history and become a one-term government. I am happy for them to become a one-term government, quite clearly. That said, there are certainly a number of parallels between that government and this government that indicate that history may indeed repeat itself in 2022.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:38): I rise to support the motion of the member for Newland. It is a truly appropriate motion to bring to this house to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the election of the Tonkin government. A lot has been said about the reforming steps taken by the Tonkin government in its albeit too brief period in power in this state between 1979 and 1982.

What I would like to reflect upon in the few short minutes available to me today is the shift in the electoral context of the Liberal Party that took place in the context of the Tonkin period. Dr David Tonkin was a true Liberal, a reforming Liberal, a thinking person and, very significantly, a unifier, someone who demonstrated the capacity to unite and in many respects to modernise and bring the Liberal Party into the form that it now takes.

In being elected in 1979 to government, Dr Tonkin led a party that achieved 55 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. It was the first time since 1959 that the Liberal Party had achieved a majority of the statewide vote and therefore the first time that the Liberal Party had achieved such a statewide majority in the post-Playford era. It was a whacking majority: 55 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. It signified the result of unification and tremendous leadership by Dr Tonkin.

What bears reflecting upon is that, notwithstanding the substantial endorsement of the people of South Australia with that 55 per cent two-party preferred result for the Tonkin government, that result garnered just 25 seats in the 47-member House of Assembly in what was to become a familiar refrain. The election of the Tonkin Liberal government in 1979 really set the tone for the following 40 years, in terms of the new norm being that the Liberal Party would routinely receive a majority of the statewide vote in this state—routinely. In fact, it is so much so that it has been a rare event when the Liberal Party has achieved the majority of the statewide vote since.

It really does bear reflecting on because the election of the Tonkin government in 1979 followed on from a decade or so of reforms to the electoral process that had been begun by Steele Hall in 1968 and continued by Dunstan, and had resulted steadily in the end of what has been colloquially described as the Playmander, the era of malapportionment that had been prosecuted for all sorts of good reasons over that period of time.

We had come to a point where both sides of politics recognised that it was electors and not geography who were at the core and that there should be reform in relation to that era of malapportionment. That had resulted in the establishment of the independent commission, the

introduction of part 5 of the Constitution Act and the era that we are now well familiar with, that has evolved over that 40 years now to involve a review and redistribution of boundaries after each election according to those principles.

Tonkin led a government that was elected on that basis by a whacking majority. He did not get the seat return that that whacking majority deserved. It was not until post 1989 that the parliament took the necessary further step in reforming that process to ensure that the statewide vote was more faithfully reflected in the result on the floor of the house. It is important to reflect on that 40-year period from that point of view. It signalled the beginning of the new norm—that is, the Liberal Party garners the majority of the statewide vote—and, secondly, the beginning of a new era in which there was, rightfully, reflection on the importance of the statewide vote as an indicator, indeed an imperative, as to which side of politics should form government.

I reflect on the issue—perhaps the signal issue—that brought Dr Tonkin to prominence in the mid-seventies. He was elected as the member for Bragg, as the current member for Bragg reflected on just now, in 1970. In 1974, Dr Tonkin made a stand to outlaw sex discrimination in this state. Indeed, he was the first to take such a stand in Australia. It signalled his intent as a reformer and brought him to significant prominence and eventually led to his leadership and taking of government in 1979. That was but one of many social and economic reforms that Dr Tonkin was able to lead in the reforming era that his period in government brought about.

There can be no disputing that this was a period in which there was considerable reform coupled with unification. It has left the Liberal Party with a tradition of unity and a tradition of garnering the majority of the statewide vote. I can think of no better indicator of one's electoral compass being appropriately calibrated than by that measure, and although that period in government was, as it turned out, relatively brief, it set the tone and laid the groundwork for a period of growth and success in South Australia that we do well to remember and celebrate.

To Dr Tonkin's widow, his children and all of his family, I hope that they have a chance to reflect at this time on this motion and to appreciate that the work of Dr Tonkin is so very much appreciated by this parliament 40 years down the track. I hope that we all, as legislators 40 years down the track, reflect on the tremendous achievements that Dr Tonkin brought 40 years ago. With those words, I commend the motion.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:48): Firstly, I would like to thank all members for their contributions on this motion, particularly the member for Morialta, the member for Bragg, the member for Heysen and also the members for West Torrens, Lee and Light. I do think it is important that we look back and reflect on what our predecessors in this place have achieved and particularly reflect on those achievements that continue to have a benefit for South Australia today. I think this is important because it helps us do our job to the best of our ability and ensure that we are improving the lives of those we have been elected to serve.

The Tonkin government made a very significant contribution to our state, albeit in a short period of time, and many of those benefits are very much still felt today. I would like to commend the Tonkin government for that contribution to South Australia and commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

DONATELIFE WEEK

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:49): On behalf of Ms Cook, I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises DonateLife Week from 28 July to 4 August;
- (b) recognises the importance of organ donation;
- (c) encourages families to discuss the importance of organ donation and to register their decision on the Australian Organ Donor Register; and
- (d) encourages the Marshall government to support comprehensive publicity and education programs focusing on both the public and healthcare professionals.

I support the motion by the member for Hurtle Vale recognising the importance of organ donation. Some issues surpass politics and state borders, and I believe that organ donation is one of them.

A bit of interesting history about the Australian Organ Donor Register, established in 2000, is that it is a national register for people aged 16 years or older to record their decision about becoming an organ and tissue donor. Prior to this, questions on state driver's licences was the main way a person's intentions could be noted.

A study was conducted in 2002 on the number of people prepared to donate their organs and those numbers were 45 per cent in New South Wales and Tasmania, 47 per cent in South Australia and 52 per cent in Queensland. Information was incomplete for the remaining states. Over the years, many states have scrapped driver's licence donor registration. South Australia is now the only remaining state in Australia where residents can record a donation decision via their driver's licence.

When we tick the box to become an organ donor at the motor registry or online, that information goes directly to the Australian Organ Donor Register. It is a decision that we are reminded of every time we renew our licence. At 68 per cent, South Australia has the highest registration rate of any state in Australia, while the national average is just 33 per cent. This is a fact we can and should be proud of. Statistics from 2018 show that 93 per cent of families agreed to organ donation if their loved one was registered on the Australian Organ Donor Register. It is the ultimate way to let your wishes be known.

At 73 per cent, South Australia also has one of the highest consent rates in Australia, versus the national average of 64 per cent. Consent for donation was given in seven out of 10 cases when the family had prior knowledge of their loved one's wishes. This dropped to five out of 10 families agreeing to donation when the family was unsure of their loved one's wishes.

While it is vitally important to have that conversation with your family about your wishes, it is equally important to register the decision with the national registry. If registration increases, consent rates will also increase, and more people will be given a second chance at life. As we are all aware, successful organ donation can be a bit of a lottery of odds and circumstance. Less than 2 per cent of people who die in hospital are eligible to donate their organs through circumstances often beyond their control.

Their organs may not be in the best condition for transplant or not compatible with those on a waiting list, so it is critical that registration is as high as it can possibly be to increase those odds. The more people who are registered, the more likely that organ donation will occur. Last year, a record 95 South Australians received organ transplants from 36 donors. One of these was Mount Gambier's Kimberley Telford, who had the state's first kidney/pancreas transplant and who I know personally and have spoken to many times and also relayed her story in this house.

Currently, one in three Australians is registered on the national Organ Donor Register, which is a positive figure, but it could be higher. Just like dying without a will, I imagine sometimes that people die without making their intentions clear about organ donation. The intent is there, but they just have not got around to formally completing the task. Something needs to prompt people into action. If other states were to adopt our licence scheme, that call to action would occur every time someone renews their licence.

Often I look at what colleagues are doing in other states for ideas that could also assist our state, and I hope that by raising this issue today it will prompt discussion in other states on reinstating state-based licence schemes. As a nation, we could be leading the way on organ donation. As we often get up here and draw attention to things that are not working, I also feel it is important to talk about when something is going right and give credit where credit is due. I feel proud to live in a state that is leading the way on organ donation rates. It shows that education campaigns by DonateLife SA are working and attitudes are changing. I commend this motion to the house.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:55): I would like to thank the member for Mount Gambier for moving this motion on my behalf today:

That this house—

- (a) recognises DonateLife Week from 28 July to 4 August;
- (b) recognises the importance of organ donation;

- (c) encourages families to discuss the importance of organ donation and to register their decision on the Australian Organ Donor Register; and
- (d) encourages the Marshall government to support the comprehensive publicity and education programs focusing on both the public and healthcare professionals.

It is certainly a subject that we, across all parties and Independents in this place and the other place, agree on, that organ donation is something that is vital and is a subject that we must keep front of mind and on the political and public agenda.

While we talk about organ donation today like it is a routine part of the surgical process for many conditions, it actually started way back in 1869—a century before many of us were born—when the transplantation of skin was performed. We then saw vision being restored through corneal transplants at the turn of the century. It was not until the mid-1950s when the first kidney transplant was undertaken. Of course, now kidney transplants are reasonably frequent and common in most cities of the world.

The operations now almost seem routine to healthcare workers and, thankfully, recovery is at most times rapid and complete. In fact, recovery for an organ transplant recipient is often easier than for a live donor of a kidney, for example, for whom it is more uncomfortable and difficult from a surgical recovery process. We see hearts, lungs, livers, or a combination of all three being transplanted. Extraordinarily, we now see facial transplants and entire limb transplants, not even just bones—it is quite incredible.

The community awareness campaigns being run by DonateLife are extraordinary and raise the profile of organ and tissue donation in Australia. High-profile cases of organ donation and organ recipients also do a great job of lifting awareness in the public sphere. This year, DonateLife used a different type of event, the Amazing Race, to help launch DonateLife Week. As parliamentarians, we were given an opportunity by DonateLife attending here in this place to have a chat. Many members of parliament—in fact, most of those to whom I am speaking in this house today—visited the DonateLife team and took the opportunity to learn more and make commitments to promote organ donation within their electorate.

I would like to thank DonateLife director, Dr Stewart Moodie, who is an extraordinary physician working with some of the sickest people in our state, for helping to progress organ donation in the public sphere through DonateLife and through conversations and changes in procedures within our hospitals.

To be placed in the situation to make the decision about donating the organs or tissue of your loved one can be, could be and is the most difficult time of your life. It is very difficult for a family to make that decision, particularly if you are unaware of the wishes of your family member. The member for Mount Gambier pointed out some statistics. Only a couple of per cent of people in hospitals are eligible to donate their organs. The circumstances have to be right from a medical and emotional position. DonateLife have a priority of ensuring that all patients who die in critical care areas within hospitals are screened for donation when medical consensus about their end of life is achieved.

There has been a rollout at the Royal Adelaide Hospital of the end-of-life follow-up service, and it is hoped that this will be implemented at all SA Health intensive care and emergency departments. They report an increase in annual donors within South Australia, particularly at the Royal Adelaide. In the year to date, 40 South Australians have donated organs for transplant. Nationally, it is 375, so we are batting above the average, so to speak. If the numbers continue at that rate, we should achieve our highest annual total from 2008, which was 43. Nationally, there are some telling stats as well, which I will not repeat, but we do very well in Australia, and there have been conversations about how we can lift that rate.

Often, people will talk about making it an opt-out rather than an opt-in process, so people would automatically be an organ donor unless they say, 'I don't want to be.' There is no evidence to say that that lifts transplant or donor rates. I have looked at this, and asked many of the experts, and it has been investigated by parliamentary committees. The evidence is that the conversations that we have with our families and our friends, the very positive conversations and the very positive campaigns, are the weightiest in terms of influence and where we see the results of organ donation

and organs being received. If the family knows, if the intention has been made, if it is very clear, then it is easier for a family to decide.

I do speak on a couple of levels. I am an intensive care and retrieval nurse, and I have been involved in many cases where families have been supported through the process. I have been privileged to look after people who have been worked up for organ donation in the intensive care unit. It is a highly emotional time, but the most beautiful time as a nurse to be connected to that patient, knowing that they are going off to provide a gift to many people, in some cases. I have often come back and looked after people after that who have been a recipient of the organ from the person who has given it. It is an extraordinary privilege to be able to be involved in that.

Yesterday would have been my son's 29th birthday, but in 2008—the year when they did have the most organ donors in South Australia—he was an organ donor. He gave life to four people. Sadly, it could not be more because his body was not able to hold out for long enough. I was involved in that process as a mother. When he got his driver's licence he proudly showed me that he had highlighted that he was going to be a donor, because we had spoken about it. We had talked about how important it was, as sometimes mum would come home from work most upset about what had happened at work; I would explain why and we would have conversations. I think those types of things are very powerful.

I would encourage everybody to follow the request of DonateLife and people associated with organ donation in our state, and that is to register on your driver's licence, because that indicator itself is linked with a higher level of organ donation, and then follow through by going to donatelife.gov.au to make your intentions very clear by completing the forms online and registering as a donor.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank DonateLife for all the wonderful work they do and to thank all families and all individuals who have made the choice to be part of this very special process of becoming an organ donor. Whether it is by wish for the future or, if it has already happened, thank you very much for the lives that you have given and the support and the hope that you offer to people who suffer from the most debilitating and crippling lifelong illnesses. I thank in advance the people in this place who will speak on this motion, and I commend the motion to the house.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:05): I also thank the member for Hurtle Vale for moving this motion. I know she is very passionate and real about this issue and the importance of organ donation. I thank the member for Mount Gambier as well. In the time the members for Mount Gambier and Hurtle Vale and I have been here, similar years, we have constantly been raising this matter.

I do support the motion, as organ donation does save lives. Of course, the motion acknowledges DonateLife Week, which runs from Sunday 28 July until 4 August. Obviously, that was celebrated about a month or so ago. The week is about raising awareness of organ and tissue donation. It is about encouraging all Australians to register their donation decision on the Australian Organ Donor Register and discuss their donation decisions with their loved ones, their families and those who are close to them.

As the member for Hurtle Vale said, every time someone registers to become an organ donor and every time that that donation is accepted and used at some point, a life is saved or a quality of life is improved. I thank everyone who is an organ donor from the bottom of my heart. I also want to thank the families of everyone who has donated an organ. It is one of the most important things you can do to transform a life. I would like to, once again, as I do every year, put on the record my thanks to that family that donated an organ to my mum, which ensured that she can have a fuller life, which is so important. In my family, we are very grateful to those who choose to make organ donation available, so thank you very much.

A lot of people, as has been discussed, do not actually know what their obligations are in terms of the process to go about donating their organs. I think it is so important that we as parliamentarians, as a government and as a community raise that awareness so people know how they can easily make a difference to someone's life by merely putting their name on the register and the simple process of doing that. The more we talk about this issue and the more we raise it, if we get just one extra person every day putting their name on the register that is a fantastic thing.

Australia has one of the best transplant success rates in the world, and research shows that the majority of Australians support organ and tissue donation. In many fields of transplant, whether it is kidneys, livers or harvesting of other parts, we have been doing this for many, many years, and many of the people who practise in this field are world leaders, which is a fantastic testament to our Australian medical profession.

At times, it can be a hard decision for families to accept the consent of a loved one who has said they would like to be an organ donor. By and large, that donation is made at a time when loss of one's life gives the ability for organs to be donated, and that is quite often a hard conversation to be had at the time by the families. But I do urge everyone here to go home and discuss organ donation with their families and friends to make it clear that you would like to be an organ donor. While the majority of Australians, about 71 per cent, think it is important to talk about the situation with their family, only about half of those Australians have discussed whether they actually want to be a donor.

How does one become a donor? The Australian Organ Donor Register is the official national register for people 16 years of age or older to give them the intention to be a donor. Recording your decision on the register ensures that authorised healthcare professionals anywhere in Australia can check your donation decision at any time. In the event of your death, information about your decision will be provided to your family.

There are currently about 1,400 Australians on a short list waiting for life-saving organ transplants. A further 11,000 Australians are on kidney dialysis, many of whom would benefit from a kidney transplant. In 2018, 554 deceased and 238 living organ donors and their families gave 1,782 Australians a new chance at life. More than 10,500 Australians have benefited from eye and tissue donation.

The majority of Australians—69 per cent—have indicated they would be willing to become an organ or tissue donor but, as I said before, only about one in three are on the register, so it is really important for us to translate the desire of the Australian community into a practical outcome. Nine in 10 families say yes to donation when their loved one is a registered donor, and that is so important. Our national consent rate currently sits at about 64 per cent but, if our consent rate and take-up rate get to hit about 70 per cent then Australia would be in the top 10 performing countries in terms of organ donation.

Another interesting statistic is that, of the 36 per cent of Australians who feel confident they know if their loved ones are willing to be a donor, 93 per cent say they would uphold their wishes. As the member for Hurtle Vale commented, having those conversations is so important so that your loved ones actually know your wishes and to make sure that wish is carried through at the important time.

People who need organ transplants are usually very sick or dying because one or more of their organs is failing. They are all of us in the community: they are our children, they are our parents, they are our families, they are our grandparents. Organ donation has progressed over the years and, of course, the success of transplants and the technologies have greatly improved to make the process a much more seamless transition.

We never know when illness could affect a family member, friend or colleague who may need a transplant, and how many of us would be enormously grateful to receive a donor organ if we required one. The gift of life is the most amazing gift anyone can give. After I am gone, I will not have use for my organs, and maybe not all of them will be any good to anyone, but that opportunity will be there. Hopefully, we can all make a difference in this important issue.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (12:11): I thank both the member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Mount Gambier for moving this motion today. It is such an important motion, that we continue to do anything we possibly can—as a government, as a parliament, as a state—to increase organ donation rates, to increase the awareness and acceptance of organ donation in South Australia. We know what an important difference it makes to families, those people who are waiting on donations, and we also know what a great gift it can be out of tragic circumstances for those who are lost.

We have had a great record, in South Australia, of organ donation. We have the highest sign-up rate of any state, and that is largely due to the fact that we have an excellent system of

signing up through driver's licences. This is something other states, which had previously had such a sign-up system, discarded, opting instead for the national register. Here in South Australia we have kept that through driver's licences, and it has been an enormous success. It has led to greater sign-up and greater acceptance, and I think other states are now looking to reinstate the driver's licence method of signing up.

I would like to give credit to the hardworking clinicians, who do excellent work in this space, led here by Stewart Moodie at the RAH, who does an excellent job as the head of DonateLife in South Australia. Right the way through, our clinicians at every level do an excellent job in terms of undertaking transplants where appropriate and also caring for people who are at the end stage of their life, having those conversations—that can be difficult at times—with loved ones about how they can make sure their loved one who is passing away can contribute to bettering the lives of other people.

We know from international evidence that having that conversation, having trained people, loving people, doing that work and having those conversations plays a large part in increasing the donor rate, something we have done well in South Australia. I hope that continues to be resourced; I hope we see continued resourcing of that work here in South Australia.

Probably over the last decade there has been a significant amount of increased attention, focus and funding in this area since DonateLife was established under the Rudd government. There was also significant work done here under the Rann and Weatherill governments at our state level. I hope that we see that work continue and I hope that we do not see any reduction of that effort or funding in the future.

I congratulate all the hardworking staff who undertake that work. It is because of them and their hardworking efforts that other people's lives are able to be saved. I particularly thank those families, those loved ones, who have given their permission to make sure that organ donation can occur, because that is a gift that continues. Obviously, the member for Hurtle Vale has spoken many times about her personal experience, but there are so many other families in South Australia as well. Thank you to all of them for the gifts that they have provided to other people. It means that they can go on to live a fulfilling and healthy life in this state or in other states thanks to those gifts and sacrifices.

This is an area where there is always some policy debate about whether you change to an opt-out system. I think the evidence is that it is not necessarily successful or that it would lead to an increased rate; in fact, it would lead to a number of people opting out, people who may well consider it in the future under the current system in South Australia, particularly when we have a state with such a high sign-up rate already. I do not think the evidence has been shown on that. Obviously, we will continue to look at any possible effort to increase our donor rate and the number of successful organ donations.

I am happy to look at any possible advice, but we need to make sure that we do not sacrifice the excellent strides and efforts that we have made in the state already. I therefore wholeheartedly endorse this motion.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): Before I go to the member for Elder, although they have left the chamber, I want to acknowledge another class of year 6s from Norwood Primary School who were in the house today, hosted by the Premier. The member for Elder.

Motions

DONATELIFE WEEK

Debate resumed.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (12:16): I rise today to support the member for Hurtle Vale's motion, moved by the member for Mount Gambier, regarding DonateLife Week and the vital nature of organ donation. It is clear that many of us from both sides of the house actively support organ and tissue

donation, and we will certainly continue to advocate its crucial importance in the community. Pleasingly, South Australia has the highest percentage of registered donors in the country, at nearly 70 per cent of our population. In this respect, as many of the members have mentioned, we lead the nation.

I think the fact that so many people have given thought to how they can help another should the worst happen to themselves is something that we can all be very, very proud of as South Australians. What a great and powerful legacy: to save a life when one's own life has come to an end. This is not all, because saving lives means saving families. Through the generosity of organ donation, one less family can be devastated by the loss of a daughter, mother, father, sister, brother, son, aunt, uncle, husband or wife grieving the passing of a loved one.

This of course does not make one's loss any less should a member of one's own family pass away. Despite the ultimate generosity of organ donation by someone you loved, you will always wish that it did not happen. Perhaps, during this time of grief we can all call upon the fact that one day we or our loved ones could be saved by organ donation. In such sadness, comfort may be found. This can be made possible only if people continue to register as donors.

When organ donation occurs, it is a rare event, even if you have registered. Only 3 per cent of people who pass away in hospital can actually become an organ donor due to the difficult or the particular circumstances required for a patient to be a suitable organ donor. As a government we recognise it is critical to continue these nation-leading numbers of organ donor registrations.

I had the opportunity to promote the cause when the DonateLife team attended parliament during DonateLife Week last month with snaps and pictures with some of my parliamentary colleagues to encourage other people to find out more about donating an organ. It is easy to do: you can register with the DonateLife team or through your own driver's licence.

South Australia continues to be unique, with people retaining the option to indicate their intent for organ donation through the state's driver's licence arrangements. I think this remains a great prompt to think about one's own wishes regarding organ donation. As a state, we have also continued to implement improved hospital procedures to explore all donation opportunities. This has resulted in a steady increase in hospital referrals for possible donation since 2015, nearly doubling from 82 referrals in 2015 to 151 referrals last year.

DonateLife Week continues to be an important health event on our calendar, and it is a pleasure to join so many of my parliamentary colleagues today to celebrate and acknowledge DonateLife Week, as it reminds all of us to discuss our donation decisions with our loved ones. This is critical because, should the time come, they can make the ultimate decision about what happens with their donation. Anybody who has been confronted with the loss of a loved one will know that this time is already difficult in so many ways.

There are so many decisions for family members to make in terms of funeral arrangements and all sorts of things, so if there is anything that you can do to make that time a little bit easier for your family, by their knowing what your wishes are, then I encourage everybody to do so. You can perhaps talk not only about whether or not you want to donate organs but also about what you want regarding funeral arrangements and those sorts of things which we do not like talking about but which can certainly make things a little bit easier because you have informed your family of your wishes. If you do decide to donate, you know that you could potentially be saving other lives.

In concluding, I would like to thank the team at DonateLife for the incredible work that they do in prompting people to think about this matter. It is often a difficult conversation and topic for many of us. I would like to especially acknowledge all those people who have passed over—to, I do not know, the other side or whatever people believe in—and who have donated organs. I particularly acknowledge those who have registered to be a donor. They may not yet have passed, but they have indicated their wishes to make a profound difference to somebody else's life. I acknowledge them all and commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:22): I rise to move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises Child Protection Week;
- (b) recognises Foster and Kinship Care Week;
- (c) acknowledges that protecting children and young people is everyone's responsibility;
- (d) recognises the individuals, organisations and communities who have played their part in creating safer communities for children and young people;
- (e) appreciates the invaluable work of foster and kinship carers and the contribution they make to the lives of children and young people; and
- (f) recognises the enormous impact a foster or kinship carer can have in improving outcomes for children and young people who have faced significant challenges in their early life.

We are in Foster and Kinship Care Week at the moment. The role of foster and kinship carers is at the very heart of our child protection system. They are the beating heart of our care system and without them we simply would not have a system, or at least we would have a radically different system, a system that would be a lot more expensive and would obviously have quite a different dimension to it in terms of the type of care provided to children who really need the state's care and protection.

Foster and kinship carers have been critical to our child protection system, our formal legislated system, for many years. However, when we look back at the evolution of the family structure, foster carers, and in particular kinship carers, have always been there and have always been a part of bringing up children, not just in Australia but all over the world. That has been done in many different ways by many different cultures. But, really, foster and kinship carers have existed for a very long time, well before they were legislatively recognised.

Right now, there are more than 1,800—almost 1,900—foster and kinship carers in South Australia. Each one of them deserves our deep thanks for the job they do, and it is not a job in the traditional sense. They are classified as volunteers but they really give up a lot. They sacrifice a lot themselves, for their families and also financially for the good of someone else's children often, sometimes members of their extended family.

At the moment, of those 1,900 foster and kinship carers, about 57 per cent are kinship carers. I think that deserves noting. Both the previous government and the current government have worked hard to make sure that, wherever possible, children can stay within their families. I think it is good that we have seen an increase in the number of kinship carers, or the percentage of carers who are kinship carers; that is a great thing. The current government should be commended for its work on that as well as previous governments that have worked hard to ensure that that balance was achieved, and long may it continue.

I also want to point out that there is a type of kinship carer that is not recognised in those formal figures, and largely that is grandparents but also others. I can see the member nodding at me; she knows exactly what I am talking about. There are a large number of people who are not statutory carers, who take on the role of caring often for their grandchildren but also for other members of their family. They do not have formal arrangements. Out of the goodness of their heart, out of a need in their family, they take on the care of children and make sure that they are brought up without the intervention or the involvement of the state.

I think when we talk about Foster and Kinship Care Week, we should be talking about those recognised foster and kinship carers through the statutory system and also those who are informal or non-statutory carers who are also giving of their time and sometimes in much more trying and testing circumstances than those who may be able to lean on the assistance of the state sometimes.

I have mentioned this in this house in the past, but obviously I have a personal connection, particularly to kinship carers and grandparent carers. When I was quite little, when I was growing up, my family had some troubled times and, for a period of time, my sisters and I went to live with my grandparents—my grandfather and my step-grandmother. We went all the way from one side of the nation, from just outside of Perth, right across to a place called Byabarra, which had about 50 residents. It was out the back of Port Macquarie on the mid-north coast of New South Wales.

I think my grandparents had only met me once, maybe twice, in their whole life and suddenly these three little girls rocked up on their doorstep. Well, it was a little more organised than that. I will forever be grateful for them looking after my sisters and me at a time when we really needed it. It was a different kind of life. I realise now the huge sacrifice that they made, the huge contribution they made to my life and that of my sisters but also the life of my parents as well, giving us the opportunity to be stronger as a family.

I realise now the huge sacrifice that they made. They were expecting a retirement. Much like all grandparent carers who take on the role, they were expecting to be able to have some time to themselves to do some of the things that they wanted to do in retirement and they found that it did not quite pan out the way they might have envisaged. I always thought we were pretty well behaved, but now I look back and realise that maybe we were not always. Maybe we were quite a handful for them to have to deal with. I think it is a different experience when you are at that stage of your life, when you are in your 50s or your 60s or even your 70s, and you are taking on a parent job again.

I think it was a very tough line for them to walk, as well, between being a grandparent and a parent. When we think about our grandparents, we think about those special people who come into our lives on special occasions and spend special time with us. They pamper us and gives treats. They take us to the Royal Show and buy us a showbag. You have a very special relationship with your grandparents and they generally do not have to dole out too much discipline or look after the day-to-day tasks of running a household. However, grandparent carers have to do that. They have to be the disciplinarian. They have to be parents and grandparents as well.

Once I reached my 20s and 30s, I realised just how difficult their job was, even for a relatively brief time, and how it altered their relationships with me and our family. I also realised how grateful we should be for the contribution they made. I am sure there were also some financial impacts. They spent a lot of their money looking after us, as all grandparents do. For many grandparents, there are also health impacts. Raising a child when you are in your 20s or 30s is completely different from raising a child when you are in your 50s, 60s, 70s or even older.

There is also little respite available. There are structures, particularly if you are a recognised kinship carer, to enable you to have respite care; however, a lot of the time, grandparents do not take advantage of that, and they should. I call on them to take advantage of the support that is available to them. Often, they do not take advantage of that respite, and that can be mentally and physically taxing on older people who were not expecting to be caring for sometimes quite young children.

Some children come to grandparent care, kinship and foster care with complex emotional and behavioural issues. That is difficult for any parent or grandparent to deal with, but it is particularly difficult if you are in an environment where you may not be as supported as you might like to be. As last week was Child Protection Week and this week is Foster and Kinship Care Week, I also want to take the opportunity to recognise the role of professionals in the child protection sector. That includes people who work in the department—and I acknowledge the work of the minister in leading that department—and it also includes professionals working in the non-government and for-profit sectors as well.

These workers are often maligned, and that is a terrible, terrible thing. The actions of a few have often reflected very unfairly on members of a workforce who, by and large, are there because each wants to make a life out of helping young people, children and families to build stronger family units and prosper in South Australia. These jobs are sometimes low paid, or at least not very lucrative, and it requires a lot of training and ongoing professional development to hold one of these positions. That is a lot of investment for people who may not be earning the high wages we might see in other similarly trained professions. I think they deserve a lot of our recognitions.

Few fields have changed so much, certainly in the social services sector, in such a short space of time. If we look back at what we knew about child development 10 or 20 years ago, we have learned a lot about the development of a child's brain. We have learned a lot about the influences of social impacts and what they mean in terms of how a child grows up. Our professionals have had to keep on top of that.

In South Australia, they have seen a lot of change through a number of inquiries and royal commissions. Each time, there have been recommendations and changes to the way we do things, and they have had to keep up with that. That is quite a burden in any profession, and I think they should be recognised for the fact that they are constantly trying to improve and move with the times and applying the current knowledge we have to try to get the best outcomes for kids.

Sadly, they are often a target for criticism when a tragedy occurs. Sometimes that criticism is warranted, particularly when we look at the department. We need to hold a light up to these things to make sure that failings do not happen again and that we are keeping children safe. However, a lot of the time the fact is that, when a tragedy happens, we do see blame put on people who work in the system, whether that is in departments, NGOs or in other parts of the system.

I think sometimes we as a public have been too ready to blame workers who have actually dedicated their lives to working with incredibly troubled families in incredibly complex circumstances that, arguably, without their intervention may have been worse or may have come across a negative trajectory, at least. Where we really need to focus our blame when these tragedies happen is on adults who have not cared for children properly, who have neglected them, abused them or even whose actions have led to the deaths of children. That is where blame most properly lies.

All too often, I think that people who work in the sector feel they are being unfairly targeted for what happens in some incredibly complex environments. It is an extremely difficult job and there is no easy fix. We know that a lot of the interventions that we have, even our best interventions, do have high fail rates. Success is really measured on a scale. It is not the same as when you go to the GP, he diagnoses the problem, you are given some sort of remedy and then that problem is fixed. It does not work like that in the social services sector.

Human relationships are really hard to build, particularly with people who have not had the benefit of positive, productive and trusting human relationships in the past. That is the task of social workers in this space: to develop those relationships and to try to figure out what is best for children and what is best for families. We need to value our workers within the department, in our NGOs and private organisations much more than we currently do. We need to build the esteem of the profession and we need to boost our view of people working in the sector and better understand the complexity of their work. That goes for foster and kinship carers as well.

There is not a good understanding in the general public of what social work is, its challenges and how that work is executed on the ground. It is certainly a responsibility of mine and I think all parliamentarians in this place, when we are asked about how these things work, to wherever possible explain to our constituents the complexities that confront our social workers, particularly in the Department for Child Protection and the associated NGOs.

I will use this opportunity to touch on a few things that I learned while I was in the UK over the winter recess. I was very lucky to travel through Scotland and many parts of England and meet with council leaders, academics and NGOs who are working in the UK. The UK is held up as an example of maybe where some progress is being made and an example of some key projects that Australian jurisdictions are certainly looking at and seeing if we can adapt or adopt.

Time expired.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:38): I rise in support of this motion. Last week, during Child Protection Week, there were many events held across the state to acknowledge the work of all those in the community who support children and families impacted by child abuse.

Significantly, the eighth national conference of the Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care, commonly known as SNAICC, was held in Adelaide. As the largest conference of its type in the Southern Hemisphere, over 1,000 delegates gathered to workshop and hear from a variety of stakeholders to assist in achieving their vision for their people. I had the great pleasure of speaking at the conference dinner and detailing the initiatives of my department and the government to improve outcomes for Aboriginal children and young people in care.

Last Friday, I opened the Q&A forum of the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN) in Adelaide. Building on the theme that 'child protection is everyone's

business', this year saw the introduction of child development communication to promote the message that kids do well when parents are supported and that, to raise thriving kids, parents need support to navigate life's choppy waters.

As a government, we are better supporting families. We have committed \$2.8 million into intensive family support services to work with families in the hope of keeping children safe at home. This has commenced in the north and will be starting soon in the west. Our government has also committed \$1.6 million to family group conferencing to help identify and build capacity within families and avoid removals where it is possible to keep children safe at home. Our child and family assessment and referral networks are located in the north, the south, the west and Mount Gambier and work with families from pre-birth to the first 1,000 days in order to better support families—again, to keep children safe at home with their families.

The government also has a tender process underway for social impact investment aimed at improving outcomes for children and young people in care, after they leave care and to reduce the number of children in care. Last week at the Royal Adelaide Show, the Department for Child Protection joined Connecting Foster and Kinship Carers—the state's peak carer body—to host a stall promoting foster care at the Show. The stand generated a great deal of positive feedback throughout the 10 days and was supported by many of the foster care agencies.

This week, Foster and Kinship Care Week, the focus shifts to our carers. At the end of June, there were 1,536 children and young people living with foster carers, and 1,854 children with kinship carers. I am pleased to report that family-based care has risen from 83 per cent to 85.8 per cent over the last two years; however, there is still a long way to go to reach the national average of around 93 per cent. We have also delivered an election commitment to extend foster and kinship carer payments to 21 year olds, which commenced in January this year.

From opposition, carers would approach me and share their frustrations about the child protection system. I heard about the lack of information they received about children in their care, that calls were not being returned in a timely manner, and the limited circumstances in which they could make decisions in relation to children in their care.

Since forming government, I have been motivated to improve our carer experience. The Children and Young People (Safety) Act has been fully enacted for almost 12 months. Under this legislation, carers are to be involved in decision-making related to children and young people in their care. There is also a duty on the department to provide carers with certain information both before and during a placement, and the voice of the child is now strongly recognised. As a government, we also introduced the broadening of qualifications for front-line staff, filling long-held vacancies, freeing up more time for our staff to return these calls and have more interaction with children and their carers.

This week serves to raise awareness in our community of the contribution of our carers. Through the month of September, more than 20 lunches and dinners are planned across the state to say thank you; however, throughout the year as a government we will continue to be supportive and respectful of our carers, who do an incredible job.

With the wonderful help of our foster care agency partners, my goal of a net increase of 50 new foster carers was achieved last financial year but there are always more needed. To anyone interested in fostering, I would encourage you to call 1300TOFOSTER or to take the quiz on my department's new foster care website fostercare.sa.gov.au

Last week, I announced that the government will consult on the details of a policy on the practice of open adoption as a genuine permanency option for children and young people in care. Although the Adoption Act already provides for adoption from care in South Australia, the provisions have not been used for the last five years. Some of you may have heard adoptee Emmah Money, who was on the ABC last Friday morning talking about her experience, and I will quote:

I've gone on to do amazing things myself y'know I've published a book, I've got two children, I've travelled the world. I've done a lot of amazing things and it's because of being adopted and having my parents have so much love for me. And I always say I feel like I was the chosen one.

Emmah also goes on to say that having the option to be adopted could be a really positive thing for so many kids. It is irrefutable that the evidence shows that for children and young people who cannot

safely live at home, family-based care is the most desirable option for the vast majority of these children. Open adoption will simply be another permanency option to be considered when it is in the best interests of the child. There are many heartwarming stories.

At the Royal Adelaide Show last week, I had a touching conversation with a lady who was there with her daughter and her foster son, whom she had had in her care for seven years. I asked if she had heard the new announcement. When I asked if she had heard that adoption was now going to be available, she could not even speak. Her eyes welled up with tears. She was so overcome with emotion at the thought that this little boy, whom she already considered to be her family, could actually become her family.

It really made very clear to me just how emotional this is and how many foster carers are out there who have dreamed of this moment of being able to adopt. I spoke to a foster carer in Whyalla a few months ago, floating the idea of how she would feel about adoption. She has five children in foster care. She said, 'If you offered me \$1 million on one hand or the ability to adopt my foster children, I would take the adoption any day of the week.'

There are a lot of heartwarming, wonderful stories of foster carers helping out throughout the regions and in the city areas. There are sisters who have taken on siblings so the children can stay together and Port Pirie grandparents who have been carers for over 22 years and supported over 100 children. I extend my sincerest gratitude and thanks to each and every carer who has chosen to care for these children and young people who could not safely remain at home. The kindness, love and support you give them allows them to embark on the path of healing in a safe and stable environment.

I am committed to reform. I will continue to meet with stakeholders, service providers, community groups, carers, children and young people and the non-government organisations and listen to suggestions on how to improve our child protection system. I thank the member for Badcoe, and I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (12:46): I rise today in support of this motion. It is clear that all sides of politics agree on the enormous importance of protecting children and young people and supporting families to be the best that they can be. Integral to that are those individuals, organisations and communities who come together to create safe environments for children, including foster carers, guardians and kinship carers. Foster and Kinship Care Week acknowledges and thanks them for everything they do for children who need them, and Child Protection Week promotes the messages that kids do well when parents are supported and, to raise thriving kids, parents need support to navigate life's often difficult waters.

Extensive research has shown that the need for support among South Australian families with child protection concerns is far more complex than previously understood. Included in this is domestic and family violence, which is frequently present for many of the children notified to family services. As the Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, my priority and that of our government is supporting the safety of all South Australians. Addressing domestic and family violence and reducing its prevalence not only creates more respectful relationships and safer home environments but helps to reduce intergenerational trauma and create environments where kids can thrive.

As a government, we have been working on delivering \$11.9 million in a suite of initiatives to address and respond to domestic and family violence. We also have a focus on early intervention and prevention across the board to support families. Our Minister for Human Services in the other place, the Minister for Child Protection, the Department of Human Services and the Department for Child Protection have together been developing a strategy to consolidate efforts to keep children safe from neglect and abuse.

As part of this, the state government is working in partnership with non-government organisations, front-line workers, service users, Aboriginal community members and other government departments to design a more coherent, connected system. As the saying goes, it takes a village to raise a child, and this is true in all respects no matter the circumstances. All families face challenges; all parents face challenges. Unfortunately, many families face numerous and complex

issues such as domestic and family violence as well as homelessness, mental illness, drug and alcohol abuse and other factors that challenge parenting capacity.

This government strategy will be about pulling together expertise from all the relevant areas to create coordinated service pathways that lead to real improvement in life outcomes for children and their families. We must have a system where we can work together to address issues before we reach crisis points. By using trauma-informed practices, staff will be equipped to work with families in a healing-focused manner. We know, as one of the key things of Child Protection Week reminds us, that when parents are supported kids do well.

As a local member, I am absolutely committed to and passionate about creating a whole community that thrives, one that feels supported and knows where to go for advice. Of course, this includes the family and parenting community. I am really pleased that I am soon going to be holding my first Bubs and Tots Community Event in my electorate of Elder for this very reason. Creating capable communities is one of my key priorities as the local member, and I look forward to providing the opportunity for mums, dads, grandparents, carers and all of us who are involved in children's lives to come together, to feel a part of the community, to meet and connect with other local parents who might be grappling with similar challenges, and of course to enjoy the joys of parenting. It is a time for them to come together and access some advice from parenting experts and from their local neighbours.

It is free and all are welcome. There will be stalls by The Sleep Doctor, Playgroup SA, CHILD SA, Bamboo Baby Bum, The Little Oak Tree, Head2toe First Aid, Kindergym, Mitcham Library and much more. We have an incredible guest speaker who is going to talk about the three things that every child needs to be resilient and happy, which is so important. We recognise the importance of resilience and raising resilient children in today's modern society more than ever before. Of course, this community event is also about celebrating and welcoming some of our youngest members to our local community: the babies, the bubs and the tots. I look forward to meeting them all.

I support the member for Badcoe's motion, and I would particularly like to recognise the front-line workers, the individuals and the organisations that are doing amazing invaluable work in child protection across our state, often in very challenging circumstances, as the member for Badcoe mentioned. I would also like to acknowledge all the foster and kinship carers making enormous contributions to the lives of children and young people and the Minister for Child Protection's absolute commitment to supporting foster and kinship carers and ensuring that those who are under the care of the state are as safe as possible. Indeed, we can all play a role in supporting families so that children thrive, and this will remain a priority for our government. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:52): I would like to make a small contribution to this debate. I thank the member for Badcoe for bringing this matter to the attention of the house and also acknowledge the contributions made by other members on this important issue. In supporting every part of this motion, there is a small part of it that I would like to highlight, and that is the contribution made by grandparents in raising grandchildren.

An increasing number of grandparents in our community now have the responsibility—in a lot of cases, full-time responsibility—for caring for grandchildren because their own child cannot care for their children. A whole range of issues are raised by grandparents raising grandchildren. First of all, I would like to acknowledge the selfless act of these grandparents in actually doing this. It is a huge responsibility.

For those of us who have been parents, raising your own children is a challenging task at times, but raising grandchildren can be quite challenging as well because you are at a different stage of your life and there is also a whole range of other pressures on you. Having said that, the grandparents I have met who do raise their grandchildren would not have it any other way. They love their grandchildren dearly and want to make sure that their grandchildren get the best possible opportunity to thrive.

The issue I want to raise, in addition to the obvious financial cost of grandparents raising grandchildren at a time when perhaps they have less income because they may be retired, is the issue of opportunities in life. Often, we plan our life ahead. We plan the lives of our children—to settle down, get partners, have their own families, etc.—and then that is the time when we can retire from

paid work and it is a time for us to travel and do a whole range of other things. In some cases, that whole life plan comes to a standstill because your grandchildren need your care.

I think that sometimes we underestimate the impact that that sort of new caring and late life caring for others has on grandparents. As a society, we need to make sure that we make it as easy as possible for those grandparents who have to look after their grandchildren, that we do not put any unnecessary bureaucracy in front of them and that we also provide financial support.

In 99.9 per cent of cases, a child being looked after by a grandparent is much better than the state looking after a child because of the importance of understanding the child's culture. I do not mean culture in a multicultural sense but where the child has come from. They also gain and learn a lot from grandparents in that period of time. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the grandparents who do this marvellous work in our community.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:55): I rise to speak in support of this motion. I thank the Minister for Child Protection and the member for Elder. I thank the member for Badcoe for raising this motion and the member for Light for his remarks.

In 2019, National Child Protection Week's focus was on introducing a child development communication frame to promote the messages that kids do well when parents are supported, that to raise thriving children Australia's parents need better support, and that children's brains are built over time. The early years provide the foundation for future learning. We need to support parents to lay the strongest possible foundations.

Recently, our hardworking and dedicated Minister for Child Protection opened the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Q&A Forum in Adelaide, and our minister emphasised our government's commitment to supporting parents and carers. I can tell that there is much more to do because today carers still approach me and share their frustrations with the child protection system and department. I am still hearing about the limited circumstances in which carers can make decisions in relation to a child in their care. We are committed to improving our carer experience.

I have personally advocated for and continue to advocate for carers to have the support they need to achieve the best life outcomes for children they are caring for. The minister's staff have been great in helping me learn how to help and in seeking support for carers. Recently, a carer approached me about the lack of therapeutic support for children who had experienced trauma and this must improve. We must help these children who have experienced trauma recover so that they have the opportunity to live their best life possible. They deserve the right to reach their full potential. As a government, we are so grateful for our carers who do an incredible job and make a difference every day to a South Australian child's life.

Today, I say thank you to Backpacks 4 SA Kids. Since 2013, they have supported just over 30,000 children with their four programs, including Backpacks, Christmas presents, Anchor Packs and Home Starter Packs. These backpacks have been given to 30,000 kids in South Australia who often have nothing. They are often removed from unsafe homes or they are homeless. I thank everyone who works for, volunteers for and donates to Backpacks 4 SA Kids.

People living in King and across the state have told me they care about child protection. They have told me they want tougher penalties. We must invest in primary prevention to stop children being hurt and to stop the cycle of abuse in our community. One of the key reasons I became involved in politics was to become a voice for those vulnerable children. I have said many times before that I would take every opportunity in this place to talk about child sexual abuse because it is so prevalent and so that it becomes a topic that we openly talk about, just as we talk about DV today.

We must talk about how to prevent and stop child sexual abuse because these children are being silenced and they will suffer lifelong adverse health, relationship and social outcomes. It is estimated that one in five children in Australia will be sexually abused, and these are the children where the abuse is being substantiated. Child sexual abuse does not discriminate. It knows no socio-economic or cultural barriers. Ninety-five per cent of children sexually abused are abused by someone they know and trust. Only 3 per cent of victims will disclose and only 2 per cent of perpetrators will be convicted.

Parents do not like to think about, contemplate or talk about child sexual abuse, and even the language shows how uncomfortable we are with this topic. Often it is child rape, but we call it child abuse. One in five is unacceptable. Child abuse is not like a child falling over or scraping their knee. When that happens there is no-one saying, 'Don't tell anyone. This is our secret. No-one will believe you. Don't tell anyone or I will hurt your mum, sister, brother or pet. If you tell, this will destroy our family.' Last week, I was told that a five year old had just disclosed that her dad had told her that 'stop' is a naughty word and she is not allowed to say 'stop'. I seek to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale): Presented a petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reverse its decision to discontinue the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme from 31 December 2019, and to continue the scheme indefinitely akin to other Australian jurisdictions, or engage with the disability sector in helping to create a new scheme enabling South Australians the transport freedom and flexibility they deserve.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:03): I bring up the 24th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr TEAGUE: In accordance with the 24th report of the Legislative Review Committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation, I advise that I no longer wish to proceed with Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation, Notice of Motion No. 1.

Question Time

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Does the minister agree with the Premier that it is absolutely disgraceful for South Australia to have the highest unemployment rate in the nation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04): The great news for South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, you have asked the question. Let's hear the answer, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The great news for South Australia is that employment continues to grow in South Australia. It's growing every single month. One of the things that we are very proud about on this side of the house is that we currently have the record employment rate here in South Australia at the moment. More people are employed in our state at the moment than at any

time in the history of South Australia and that is something to celebrate. Since coming to government, we have created in excess of 15,000 jobs in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in just 17 months, double the rate achieved by those opposite. The good news is there is much more to come because every single one of the policies that we are putting into place is designed to grow the size of our economy, to grow jobs in South Australia, to provide a future for the next generation in our state. That is our focus. That's why earlier this year—in fact, on 1 January this year—we abolished all payroll tax in South Australia for small businesses. Now we have a situation that every single business in this state with a payroll of up to \$1½ million pays not a cent. The threshold before was \$600,000.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Now a business with a payroll of up to \$1.5 million doesn't pay a cent. I will tell you what this is doing: it is inspiring confidence—business confidence, consumer confidence—in South Australia. This is resulting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in a participation rate that we haven't seen in South Australia for a very, very long period of time. My understanding is the current participation rate is 63.4 per cent, just 0.4 of the per cent off the record participation rate in this state. My goal, our goal, is to smash that participation rate. We want more and more people participating in the turnaround, the recovery which is underway in South Australia. This is a great state. It was let down for a long period of time by people opposite, who were in government with oppressive—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —costs and regulation which were strangling business in this state. Well, it's a new game in town: a government that is focused on delivering for the people of South Australia, delivering for businesses, creating jobs and providing a future for our next generation.

The SPEAKER: The leader will be seated. Before I call the leader, I call to order and I warn the member for Badcoe, the member for West Torrens, the member for Cheltenham, the leader, the members for Playford, Wright, Elizabeth and Mawson. The member for Ramsay is called to order and warned a first time, and I call to order the member for Narungga. The Leader of the Opposition.

JOB CREATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question, again, is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister explain why jobs growth in the first 12 months of this Liberal government has slowed to almost half the rate of Labor's last year in office?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): Isn't it embarrassing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left, contain the excitement please. The Premier has the call. Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Isn't it embarrassing for those opposite?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were in for 16 years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —sixteen years they held the treasury bench in South Australia, and what do they want to do? They don't want to look at their performance over 16 years. They want to carefully handpick a couple of months here, a couple months there and compare them. Well, we are happy for a comparison for every single day that we have been in power. What we have demonstrated is a massive turnaround in terms of employment in South Australia. Let me give you an insight.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let me give you an insight.

Mr Malinauskas: Worst in the nation!

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let me give you an insight into what those opposite did in the lead-up to the last election. It was a cynical exercise. They realised how far behind the eight ball they had put South Australia, how far behind the fast-growth states in Australia, so they embarked upon a massive spending spree providing employers that created a job \$10,000. Was this sustainable? The answer to that is, no, it wasn't sustainable: it was political. It was all designed to create a sugar hit for a few months in the lead-up to an election.

On coming to government, we found that this was an unsustainable way to continue. What we have done instead is to put that money into programs which are all designed to grow the economy, grow jobs in South Australia, and that's precisely what we have done. We have put our focus—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left and right!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on helping sectors, helping industries, helping regions—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Well it's not working!

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and making sure that we can make it a more attractive place to invest in South Australia. We are lowering taxes, reducing regulation, building productive infrastructure—all the things that businesses need to get on and provide employment. And they hate good news. They hate good news—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the fact that we have continued to grow employment—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —every single month—

Mr Gee interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —since coming to government. They talk about the increasing participation rate as if it is a disaster, because it would have been a disaster under those opposite who presided over the worst statistics not for one month, but month, after month, after month, after month. That's what they left us, that's what we inherited, but I am very proud. Every single person on this side of the house is focused every single day—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on improving business conditions in South Australia, putting the people of South Australia first—forgetting about the politics, putting the people of South Australia first, doing the important reform that is needed, not going weak at the knees at the first whiff of any discontent out there in the public but getting on with governing for the people of South Australia.

I am very proud to lead this passionate team, and that is why we are sitting on the government benches, and that is why they were thrown out of office. The people of South Australia didn't want the politics anymore: they wanted a government that was focused on delivering for them. That is precisely what we are doing, and that is why South Australia is now open for business.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I warn for a first time the members for Wright and West Torrens, and I call to order the members for Torrens, Hurtle Vale, Lee and Taylor.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today year 12 students from that august body called Rostrevor College. They are guests of the member for Morialta. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

JOB CREATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question, again, is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Why does the government's budget forecast jobs growth to continue to fall since the 2017-18 financial year?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:11): Isn't it extraordinary how, after the wreck that the opposition left this state in after 16 years, they are standing there throwing stones from the sideline.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, you wanted him to answer. He is trying to answer.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Let's look at the record here in South Australia: from March 2018 to July this year, 15,700 brand-new jobs here in South Australia—8,200 of them full-time. Let's contrast that to the same period—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —of the re-election of the Weatherill government. When the Weatherill government was given the mandate, jobs growth was 5,400 jobs—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —one-third of the jobs delivered by the newly-elected—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —Marshall government over the same period.

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is warned.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: How many full-time jobs did Labor deliver in that same period? Minus 2,500.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The economy was so fragile—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —people were shedding full-time staff like there was no tomorrow. The good news about what has happened since the election is that businesses have regained their confidence. They are hiring full-time staff because they know their future in business has a long-term future. They are prepared to invest in full-time staff because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —they have long-term plans for their businesses—something they weren't prepared to do under Labor. Let's look at Labor's record. They talk about a blip in the seasonally adjusted unemployment figures, one month on the unreliable seasonally adjusted unemployment figures. This is what Labor—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —delivered for the first three years of their re-election—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —in 2014. They delivered the highest, or the second highest, unemployment rate in the country for three years, and what else has been good news for South Australia? If you can compare the hours worked in 2019 in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —2.9 million more—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —than in March, the last month that Labor was in control of this state, there were 2.9 million more hours worked in South Australia, delivering \$103 million in extra wages to South Australians, who are spending it in this economy. They are spending in this economy. This is a snowball effect, and why is that happening? Because there's confidence back in the economy. Businesses have confidence back.

People are seeing their mates getting jobs and they're saying, 'Well, I'm going to have a go now.' There are jobs that are being delivered by this government. That's why they're getting back into the workforce. That's why the participation rate is going up. We have a lot more work to do. We can see that, we know that, we are up for it, and that's exactly what we are doing.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Morphett, I respectfully ask the member for Cheltenham to leave for 20 minutes under 137A for those constant interjections during that answer. Thank you, member for Cheltenham.

The honourable member for Cheltenham having withdrawn from the chamber:

STATE ECONOMY

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:15): My question is for the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how lower costs will support growth of the South Australian economy and also create more jobs?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): I tell you what, sir, this is turning—

The SPEAKER: Premier, one moment.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is turning into a very, very—

The SPEAKER: Premier, just one moment.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry.

The SPEAKER: If members on my left are going to interject between the question and the answer, they are going to be leaving relatively soon. If that is your intention—

An honourable member: What would you prefer, sir?

The SPEAKER: I'm indifferent either way. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, sir, can I just say that this is turning into—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a very enjoyable question time for the government, because every day that we are in here talking about the economy, we are talking about making South Australia stronger. Talking about the economy is the bread and butter of a Liberal government here in South Australia, anywhere in the country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That's what we're here for: to create more opportunities. I thank the member for Morphett for his question and I congratulate him on his first 18 months in this chamber, in this parliament. He's doing a great job representing the people of Morphett. He, like every other person on this side of the chamber, is vitally concerned about making sure that we lower costs in South Australia. We were elected—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We were elected because we had a real plan—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for genuine change here in South Australia: to create more jobs, to lower costs in South Australia. That's precisely what we promised and that's precisely what we have delivered. Already this week, we have announced a brand-new regime for land tax in South Australia: a \$70 million cut to land tax in South Australia, providing much-needed relief for businesses, investors and individuals in this state. Under those opposite, they presided over the highest marginal land tax rate in the nation. It was a massive disincentive to invest in South Australia. It was a massive disincentive for jobs—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: We cut it for families instead.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in South Australia. We've done three things. We've moved forth with three key reforms: one is the aggregation of properties in line with what's happening in other jurisdictions like Victoria, like New South Wales and like Western Australia. In addition to that important reform, we have also been able to significantly increase the threshold from \$391,000 to \$450,000, thus taking 9,000 people in our state away from paying land tax moving forward. That's great news for people who hitherto had that burden of land tax on them every single year under those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We've lifted it from \$391,000 to \$450,000 at the same time as bringing that top marginal rate down. Of course, this has been a major disincentive—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to people investing in our state—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the South Australian economy. For too long, people who have been looking at South Australia have said, 'Do you know what? The land tax rate there is too high.' In fact, in many cases, the annual land tax rate was over half the yield that they were getting on properties in South Australia so they bypassed South Australia, thus supressing capital values in our state.

Moreover, South Australians were not spending money investing in South Australia; they were continuing to invest in other jurisdictions with more attractive land tax rates. This is a reform that has been needed for a long period of time. Those opposite want to sweep these difficult reforms under the mat. We've exposed them. We have the ticker for this type of reform. We don't cower, we don't go weak at the knees at the very first sign—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned, as is the member for Playford.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of any groups that want to make adverse comments, because reform—genuine reform—requires a backbone. That is something that is completely and utterly missing from those opposite. At the moment, we have a weak—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —Leader of the Opposition, who is not up to any reform whatsoever. He is going to have a forum after sitting in cabinet for all those years, presiding over the highest land tax regime in the country. We have decided to push ahead with reform. We care about growth and we care about jobs for the future.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, it would pain me to eject you again, for a second day—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It would. I really don't want to, but if I have to, I will.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. With the highest unemployment rate in the country, including more than 25,000 young South Australians unemployed, does the minister agree with the Premier's statement that there is no problem whatsoever with unemployment in South Australia?

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Leader, be seated for one moment. The point of order is for the fact that there might be facts that have been introduced into the answer. On a number of occasions, I have asked for those kinds of points of order to be left to the end of the answer so that I can judge the context.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you can leave for 25 minutes under 137A, thank you.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I will listen to the leader's answer. I ask him to take standing orders into consideration. They do exist to keep members on the straight and narrow. I don't want to be over the top with their enforcement, obviously, so I am going to allow the leader an opportunity to ask his question and then I will judge accordingly. Leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question again was to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. With the highest unemployment rate in the country and more than 25,000 young South Australians unemployed, does the minister agree with the Premier's statement that there is no problem whatsoever with unemployment in South Australia?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: leave not having been sought nor granted for any of that to be put in the question, that question is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Because of the fact that it has been introduced?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Facts, arguments—the entire structure is completely alien to the rules of this house.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I am going to uphold that point of order. The leader can move on to another question. If not, I will swap to the other side. Leader.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Fine. My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. What impact did the government's decision to cut 29 job-creating programs, including the Future Jobs Fund and the job accelerator grants, have on South Australia now having the highest unemployment rate in the nation?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:22): It is obvious: more jobs than in the state's history. There have never been as many people working in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —as there are now. There have never been as many hours worked by South Australians as there are now. There has never been as much money earned by South Australians as there is now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Let's look at the contrast between March 2018 and July 2019—

Mr Gee interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is warned.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —with hours worked here in South Australia: an extra \$103 million earned in July by South Australians than in March last year. Let's look at the comparison with July 2015 under Labor and March 2014: minus 1.8 million hours worked. Those work programs were really working for them, weren't they?

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The highest or the second highest unemployment rate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —in the country for the first three years of the return of the Weatherill government, when the member for West Torrens was the treasurer. When he was the one—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —pulling all the purse strings, that was the result. That is a very long time for training wheels, I will tell you. That is a very long time as a new treasurer, coming into South Australia.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Another thing the member for West Torrens did in chasing that so-called surplus he said he had in 2017 at the Mid-Year Budget Review was cut \$12 million from the training budget—\$12 million. Don't just take my word for it: read the RoGS report, the Report on Government Services for that quarter. It will tell you; it will confirm—\$12 million. That is on top of the cuts that were made to TAFE by the previous government. One-third of TAFE staff was removed—no strategy in that. One-third was just removed. Overnight, independent or non-government training providers had their funding pulled in May 2015.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: They didn't think that was going to have an impact on job opportunities here in South Australia. Well, it had a massive impact on job opportunities and skills bases here in South Australia because, over that same period, half of the traineeship and apprenticeship positions in South Australia disintegrated. They deteriorated; they actually disappeared. That's their record.

Ms Stinson: How many have you got? Are you going to reach your target?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We don't need to pay advisers—

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —to go and fill out CVs for kids who should have learnt that at school. We need those kids to make sure that they have the skills that they need to deliver the services and the skills that employers will need to employ them. We have massive skills gaps here in South Australia because of the legacy that those opposite left South Australia. Remember how they used to treat the training portfolio? It was either a junior minister or a minister who had been sacked in that space.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That is who they used to put in that position. They never, ever gave it the priority it deserved. We now have—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite can leave for half an hour for constant interjections.

The honourable member for Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —a dedicated department for skills and training, a dedicated department, a dedicated minister for that space and we are getting runs on the board for the first time in seven years. For the first time in seven years, we have an increase in the number of apprentices in South Australia. Again, let's compare.

An honourable member: Time.

The SPEAKER: The leader and then the member for Elder.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Thanks, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. What impact did the government's decision to increase fees, charges and taxes by more than \$513 million in the last state budget have on South Australia now having the highest unemployment rate in the nation?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:26): This government, when it was elected, in its very first budget put an extra \$200 million, in conjunction with the federal government, into skills training. We reduced the burden of tax on small business. Not a single small business in South Australia with a turnover of—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles is called to order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —\$1.5 million or less pays payroll tax. Let me tell you a story about that. I was on a skills mission just recently and Paul Denver was on that from Enable College. Do you know what he did with the saving he made on his payroll tax? He employed someone extra for his business. That is the impact of the changes in government policy when you have a government that understands business and knows what levers to move so business will respond.

The thing about South Australia is that we are predominantly small businesses. Small businesses respond very quickly to changes in government policy, and that is what we are seeing: 15,700 new jobs since the election, 8,200 of them full-time jobs. This is a sign of confidence returning to South Australia after the dark days, the clouds that hovered over South Australia for 16 years, particularly under the stewardship of the former treasurer, the member for West Torrens. They were the darkest days in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I can tell you that there are clear skies for the South Australian economy—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —under the leadership of Premier Marshall.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell is called to order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We have a record number of South Australians working in South Australia, a record number of hours being worked and more money being earned in wages—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —in South Australia than ever before.

ELECTRICITY INTERCONNECTOR

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on how the New South Wales and South Australian interconnector will deliver lower costs for people living in my electorate and all South Australians and a higher growth future for our state?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:29): Yes, I can. I thank the member for Elder very much for her question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: She is a tireless advocate for lowering the cost of living for people in her electorate, and she knows that getting electricity prices down is a key part of that. This interconnector, as I hope those opposite now accept, is going to be critical, a key part of our energy policy. We have many facets of our energy policy: small batteries, grid-scale batteries, demand management and supply integration.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Of course, the interconnector is very important. It has been independently modelled to reduce electricity prices for the average South Australian household by \$66 per year, for small businesses by \$132 per year and, in fact, for some of our largest employers by tens of thousands of dollars per year. This is a very important piece of infrastructure. An enormous amount of work has been done by ElectraNet and TransGrid to put the proposal forward to the AER (Australian Energy Regulator). The project is with them at the moment.

In addition to those benefits of lower electricity prices—and this is very much what the member for Elder was asking about—there are other benefits. We saw today the announcement by the company Neoen that they intend to build a wind farm, solar farm and grid-scale storage project in my electorate, in fact, near Burra. This is a tremendous opportunity. They have said that they would not progress with stages 2 and 3 if the interconnector is not built. They will progress with stages 2 and 3 if, when, the interconnector is built. We are talking about 300 jobs during construction. We are talking about another 20 jobs in the ongoing operation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: This is very welcome news for a community that is at the moment in the grips of drought. Members who care about regional communities would have seen newspaper articles recently about this particular part of the state in a dreadful, diabolical situation, so those jobs will be very welcome. There are four grid-scale solar farms lining up to hook into the interconnector. While this interconnector will give us the opportunity to bring electricity into South Australia at times when we need it, we will export far more electricity—renewable, clean electricity—out of South Australia into New South Wales through this interconnector.

This is a terrific opportunity for South Australia and a terrific opportunity for New South Wales. Neoen has not put forward their development application yet. I have complete confidence that the Minister for Planning and his team will do a very thorough assessment, including deep community engagement about whether their project is appropriate from a planning perspective. Of course, all of us will accept whatever decision comes out of that process, but let me tell you that, from an energy perspective, this is a terrific opportunity.

Both the Premier and I have said numerous times that we do not need any more wind farms in South Australia that do not come with associated grid-scale storage, but we welcome new wind farms, and we welcome new grid-scale solar farms, that have grid-scale storage attached to them.

This project from Neoen, the same company that runs the Hornsdale wind farm and operates the Tesla battery, has 1,200 megawatts of wind, 600 megawatts of solar and 900 megawatts of storage. This is exactly the type of example that we have been talking about for years now, getting the mix right so that South Australians have cheaper, more reliable and cleaner electricity.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Why is the minister including short courses, some of which last as little as four weeks, in the overall apprenticeship and traineeship numbers?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:33): Let's look at what Labor was delivering—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —prior to the election and what we are doing.

The SPEAKER: Minister, just be seated for one moment. There appears to be a point of order. I anticipate it is for debate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: It probably didn't assist that the minister began an answer in that way, which is leading the member for West Torrens to conclude that it is debate. I have the point of order. I understand why you are raising it. I will listen to the minister's answer. If he does deviate from the substance of the question and debate, then I will pull him up, but I am willing to give the minister a go.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you, sir. What was released last Thursday in the NCVER figures showed what happens when you don't prepare employers and you don't prepare apprentices or trainees for apprenticeships and trainees: they don't complete. Labor's commencements that were counted in last week's NCVER figures—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order. With respect to the member for West Torrens, the point of order is for debate. I have always allowed a little bit of compare and contrast, and I am being very consistent in this, so the minister is able to relate to things that did go on under the former government, to an extent, all in a matter of context. So I will listen carefully, and I uphold my original finding. Minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you, sir. So another fall in completions was recorded in the NCVER figures last Thursday. That is because traineeships and apprenticeships that began under the previous government weren't prepared. These apprentices and trainees weren't prepared, and even employers may have not been prepared for those apprenticeships. What we are introducing are pre-apprenticeships and pre-traineeship programs under the national partnership that we have signed with the federal government. We are counting, as part of our training targets, the same programs that the NCVER are counting.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Does the minister believe that spending \$34 million for the creation of 115 extra apprenticeships is good value for the South Australian taxpayer?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:36): Good news from last Thursday's NCVER figures: after seven years of decline of apprenticeship and traineeship numbers here in South Australia, we have an increase—we have an increase in South Australia. In the first full quarter under the Skilling South Australia program we see an increase, the first full quarter that's been reported by the NCVER. The NCVER is counting the same traineeship programs that are being delivered by this government, that were being delivered by the previous government. Nothing has changed; it's the same. What we've seen is a reversal of the decline. And how big was that decline?

Ms Hildyard: And how many have you delivered?

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: In seven years, it was 66 per cent. So, in other words—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: They don't want to hear it. They do not want to hear it because they should be embarrassed about these figures.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Is the minister finished his answer?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Shut them down overnight.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government is called to order. Is the minister finished?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The minister has finished his answer, member for West Torrens. If it was for debate, he was beginning to deviate and I would have upheld that point of order. The member for Ramsay and then the member for Flinders.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister explain why he hailed his training figures as a success when his department told him that South Australia's in-training figure as at 31 December 2018 is the second lowest figure on record since 31 December 1997?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for the introduction of facts in that question—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Without seeking leave.

The SPEAKER: —without seeking leave. I uphold that point of order. I am willing to give the member for Ramsay another go at rephrasing. If not, we will move to the member for Flinders and I will come back to her.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: How would the minister deliver his government's promise of 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships over the next four years when, if he only managed to deliver 115 additional apprenticeships—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, for—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: —standing order 97. Just to be crystal clear, I will repeat it:

In putting any such question, a Member may not offer argument or opinion, nor may a Member offer any facts except by leave of the House...

I have given the opportunity for the member for Ramsay to correct it. I think that still does go over the threshold. I will move to the member for Flinders. I will come back to the member for Ramsay.

SCHOOL INTERNET SERVICE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the government's rollout of improved internet services for schools?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:39): I am very grateful to the member for Flinders for this very sensible question and appreciate the support that he gives to the very many schools across his electorate, serving a large regional community with very many schools in that community. Many of those schools, of course, are amongst the many South

Australian schools that had no high-speed internet when we came to government in March last year. Indeed, fewer than a quarter of South Australian schools had fibre-optic internet connections. This was the lowest in the mainland.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: that is debate.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is debate, sir. That is introducing facts, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the Premier has lost control of himself. The Premier is interjecting, sir.

The SPEAKER: If ministers want to carry on like that, I have no hesitation in ejecting them to restore decorum to the house. The member for West Torrens has raised a point of order. He is entitled to raise that point of order. At this stage, I don't believe he is engaging in debate, but I will listen carefully and, if he does, I will pull him up. If the member for West Torrens continues to carry on the way he does, he will be leaving.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: And the Premier?

The SPEAKER: And anyone else.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I'm well aware of what he is doing and he's about to leave. Minister.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for Flinders, as I said, for asking this very sensible question. As per the standing orders of the parliament, I'm very pleased to provide, as standing order 98 requires, some facts about the way the rollout of school internet services is being improved across South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: There is a significant improvement that is required because on coming to government we had fewer than one in four of our schools connected to our high-speed fibre-optic internet. This is something that our schools need and this is something that our government is seeking to deliver. Through an \$80 million investment, partnering with Telstra, we are delivering high-speed fibre-optic internet connections to more than 500 schools right across South Australia from Port Lincoln to Elliston to Poonindie to Karcultaby, across the electorate of Flinders.

Indeed, just in the last week, we have had, in the member for Flinders' electorate, four connections: Port Lincoln High School, Port Lincoln Primary School, Port Lincoln Junior Primary—our last junior primary school in the state—and, right at the moment, Kirton Point Primary School is being finalised. Throughout the rest of term 3, we will see connection at Elliston Area School and the Poonindie Community Learning Centre and, before the end of the year, Lincoln Gardens Primary School, Port Lincoln Special School and Karcultaby Area School.

They will join the more than 220 schools that have been connected. Forty-one per cent of schools across South Australia have been connected to the new swift high-speed internet connection which this government has rolled out since the end of last year and which we are very proud of, and 115,000 of our students have been connected to high-speed internet access. More than 13,000 of our teachers and educators are now connected to high-speed internet and that transforms what can be done in the classroom.

Prior to the commencement of this program, which is a Marshall Liberal government program of which we are very proud, schools were not able to rely on the internet necessarily. If they didn't have high-speed connection, they weren't able to rely on the internet not dropping out if another classroom next door potentially started using the internet as well. They weren't able to integrate the use of high-speed internet into the curriculum. They weren't able to integrate the use of high-speed

internet, which is particularly important in regional areas, into professional development opportunities for their teachers.

We made this an election commitment because we had the worst internet services for schools on the mainland, and that is why those opposite, after 16 years, admitted that they had failed the people of South Australia and failed the schools of South Australia and they, too, committed to it. But was there money in the budget? They thought there was money in the budget, according to the deputy leader.

What they promised was that they were going to use whatever the best technology was, whether that is the NBN or maybe wireless or potentially cable, and they were going to use money from part of a federal agreement that they hadn't signed up to. That was what they offered. We have actually delivered the program. More than half of our students are connected and it's a great story—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —funded and happening on time and on budget.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL BLACKOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. When was the Premier informed of a blackout today at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and what was the cause of the blackout?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): I have only been informed about it in the last hour or so and my understanding is that it came as part of routine testing that was taking place at the hospital. There was an outage for approximately four minutes, and the hospital was quite aware that this routine monthly testing was underway and that there were no adverse patient outcomes from this failure.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL BLACKOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:44): My question again is to the Premier. What is the Premier's response to the patients who were undergoing procedures at the time of the blackout that happened at the Royal Adelaide Hospital today?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): As I just outlined in my answer to the house a few moments ago, the hospital was fully informed about the testing. This testing is done on a monthly basis. It responds to the 20-minute unscheduled blackout that occurred in February 2018. This was scheduled testing, which the hospital—

Mr Picton interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —knew about and there were no adverse patient outcomes.

COASTLINE PROTECTION

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is strengthening Adelaide's coastline?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:45): I thank the member for Colton for his question and his passionate advocacy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —for the protection of all our coastline in South Australia but particularly the coastline that he is fortunate enough to represent around Henley Beach and West Beach. We know when we came to government that the previous government had really had their head in the sand for far too long when it came to the protection of our beaches. The protection of our beaches, particularly in metropolitan Adelaide, really is the first line in the defence against—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —climate change in this state—the first line in the defence against climate change.

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

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It has been so disappointing that the opposition have chosen to oppose our coastal protection strategies.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: claiming the opposition has a view on anything is debate.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to the minister's answer.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The 2019-20 budget included almost \$50 million to be invested in the preservation and revitalisation of Adelaide metropolitan beaches. We know the 100 or so kilometres of coastline along metropolitan Adelaide are particularly vulnerable, but we know the most vulnerable spot lies around West Beach, Henley Beach South and drifting into the Grange area. We know that those beaches are literally disappearing into the sea.

Our policy and project strategy is to reverse the declines being experienced on those beaches and to install a reticulation pipeline to reticulate the sand from north to south. In order to do that effectively, we also have to inject a large amount of sand into the cell at West Beach to ensure that it remains resilient in the short term. We are gaining that sand from the Semaphore area, an area of our metropolitan coastline that naturally obtains sand from our littoral drift process and has for many, many years contributed hundreds of thousands of cubic litres of sand back to West Beach and the beaches further south.

This has happened for many years and we don't think that ongoing sand carting is acceptable. We don't want that to happen in the long term. It is inconvenient for residents along the metropolitan coastline, so that is why we are investing in a sand pumping pipeline to ensure that sand carting and the disruption that creates ends once and for all.

On this side of the house, we want to take effective action against climate change. We are not just going to whinge about climate change: we are actually going to do. That's what we are doing when it comes to fixing Adelaide's metropolitan beaches. We are not climate whingers: we are climate doers and we are creating that resilience in Adelaide's metropolitan coastline. The advocacy, the strong advocacy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that the member for Colton has applied over the long term, we have listened to that advocacy and we have been reacting. It must be a terrible shock for the member for Lee to see that while his beaches could fall away under the position of the opposition, which is to leave our beaches and continue to have those trucks come, disrupting—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Speaking for the opposition, sir, is a point of debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have given the minister fair rein. I uphold the point of order. Is the minister finished?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I have finished.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL HYDROTHERAPY POOL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:49): My question is to the minister for mineral resources and energy, representing the Minister for Health in this chamber. When is the hydrotherapy pool at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, first announced in 2015, expected to be completed, and is this date before or after the existing pool in CALHN at the Hampstead Rehab Centre will be decommissioned?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:49): It's a very fair question. Let me get a specific answer to that very specific question for the member from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing so that she can be fully furnished with the information she needs.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL HYDROTHERAPY POOL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:50): Supplementary: is that likely to be forthcoming, because I am still waiting for several questions to be answered that I have directed to you for the Minister for Health? In what sort of time period might I expect an answer?

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: They're all ramped.

Ms BEDFORD: Well, I am just asking because this is a very important question.

The SPEAKER: This is not a speech.

Ms BEDFORD: It is an important question for the people who work at Hampstead.

The SPEAKER: Yes, member for Florey, thank you.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:50): As quickly as possible, member for Florey.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL BLACKOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier consider it appropriate for generator testing at a hospital to occur while patients are undergoing procedures?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:50): You have to test your generators under live, real-life circumstances. Let me just explain the information that I have. This has only just arisen, but let me share it with the house as clearly as I possibly can. You don't test backup generators at times when everything is perfect, everything is safe and you haven't got load.

What happened in the hospital was that there was a test of the backup generators. All the staff were aware that this test was happening. One of the generators failed. Part of the hospital was blacked out for four minutes. There were absolutely no adverse medical outcomes from this whatsoever. To be quite frank, this is exactly why you do testing.

We know how many generators in hospitals let patients down back in September 2016 when the previous government plunged the entire state into a blackout. It happened in my electorate in Port Augusta and it happened in other places. There was a dreadful situation that happened with the loss of embryos down at Flinders hospital. We are doing everything—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: it is highly emotive debate to say that the opposition, the then government, plunged the state into darkness.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond can leave for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. It's a fair point of order. The minister is entitled to compare and contrast, but the point of order has merit and I do respectfully ask the—

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The point of order does have merit, let me say that.

The SPEAKER: Yes. The minister has made his point. I ask you just to keep to the substance of the question, thank you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I also ask the member for Adelaide to withdraw the accusation that I killed embryos.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. The Minister for Child Protection, if that is what she did utter, would she like to withdraw that comment—if she did say it? I didn't hear it. I am giving her an opportunity to withdraw it.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As a result of the blackout, embryos died.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: So—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left and right, I will deal with this. If you said it, I ask you to please withdraw it.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Let's not descend to a level of decorum that we don't want to be in. Let's get on with it. There are 11 minutes to go. The minister has the call, thank you.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We are all aware of the potentially dire consequences of having blackouts; there is no doubt about that. What we are doing and what any sensible government would do is to test these backup generators. What we have had today is a test that the staff were made aware of. They were told, 'We are going to test the backup generators. We are going to test the backup generators under live circumstances,' which is entirely appropriate.

One of the generators failed. Very, very quickly power was restored to the hospital. Part of the hospital went without power for four minutes. There were absolutely no adverse medical outcomes from that, as far as we are aware. I can tell you, Mr Speaker, to have done that test, to now know that that generator needs attention and could not be relied upon if we had any more serious a situation than that is actually a positive thing and we will move on.

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing will deal with this, no doubt, within the hospital, but testing these generators is a very sensible thing to do. I am pleased there were no adverse health outcomes. I am pleased that we now know that, with no cost having been borne in a medical sense, the generator needed to operate better, and I have no doubt that that generator will get attention very, very quickly.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL BLACKOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:54): My question, again, is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his previous comments that there is no way generator testing should be done when patients are in the operating theatres as it would put lives at risk?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I think that the Minister for Mining and Energy has clarified the situation. What occurred—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —under the previous regime, which for some unknown reason those opposite find of some amusement, was a very dangerous situation that occurred, because the operator of the hospital was doing the testing on the generators but without the knowledge of the hospital.

We now have full information provided to the hospital so that they are perfectly aware of the testing. It is a completely different regime to what existed under the previous government where there was a very serious blackout, interruption to the energy supply, which had serious ramifications in February 2017. It is a completely different scenario now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and it is like comparing apples to oranges.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! The member for Kavel, and then the member for Kaurna.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet. The member for Kavel.

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please provide information to the house on how the state's Home Battery Scheme is reducing energy costs for South Australian households?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:56): Yes, I welcome this question from the member for Kavel and, yes, I can certainly answer it. It was a pleasure to be with the member for Kavel in Mount Barker in his electorate about a week and a half ago talking to his very good constituents. In fact, I bumped into a constituent of mine who was actually staying in Adelaide for a while and who thought it was interesting to come down and have a listen as well.

We know that we can make as much solar energy as we want—just about—through rooftop solar for the homes, but we also know that the majority of electricity is consumed in homes in the evening, not during the day when the electricity is generated. So, by bridging that gap, by allowing energy that is generated through the day from solar to be stored through the day, through the afternoon into the evening and then consumed by that household in the evening saves money for households.

Even when you consider forgoing the current levels of feed-in tariff that are available—I am not talking about the previously very high feed-in tariffs—if you are getting 15¢ feed-in tariff repaid for electricity you put into the grid but then paying 40¢ at night to consume, why not forgo the 15¢ that you get during the day, store the energy and use that energy so that you can forgo paying approximately 40¢. It works very well.

Our program to provide a subsidy plus a low interest loan towards the purchase of batteries and solar and installation is proving to be very successful with the benefit for an enormous number of households that they can pay the loan back from the savings in their electricity bills—so, no money up-front, no additional cash outlay.

We have 1,900 homes so far that have taken up the Home Battery Scheme. We have about 1,250 homes as part of the Tesla VPP, and about 300 of them do not actually even have the equipment: they are the ones that are benefitting from receiving lower electricity prices because of the Tesla VPP in the other 1,000 or so homes that do have the equipment.

It comes to the point, which I know the member for Kavel is very aware of, that this is work we are doing not just for those homes that actually invest in the equipment but it is work that we are doing for all South Australians. We want to reduce the electricity costs to all South Australians. We know that, through the Home Battery Scheme, when we take a good chunk off evening demand, that takes downward pressure on wholesale prices and that flows through to lower retail prices for all household electricity consumers, even those who don't have the equipment installed.

We already know that through the VPP, that hundreds of homes can benefit through a virtual power plant even if they are participants but they don't have the equipment installed. This market is evolving very well, very positively. There are now four virtual power plant opportunities that South

Australian households can sign up for. AGL, Tesla, Sonnen and Simply Energy all have virtual power plant opportunities out there, which are voluntary to participate in.

There is no obligation for anybody to do that, but if you have the equipment which is virtual power plant enabled, as is a requirement with our Home Battery Scheme and the Tesla Virtual Power Plant, then homes can sign up. They can get lower electricity prices, but then other homes that are part of the VPP but without the equipment can also get lower electricity prices.

We are determined to get the supply mix right. We are determined to get demand management right. We are determined to make electricity more affordable, more reliable and cleaner for all South Australians, from the smallest household all the way through to the largest employers.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL BLACKOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his previous claim that keeping the lights on in a hospital is surely one of the easiest things a government needs to provide for in a hospital?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurna is called to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): Thank you, sir. I just refer the honourable member to my previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There are interjections on the right and on the left. The member for Kaurna.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL BLACKOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:01): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier telling the people of South Australia that a hospital blackout under a Labor government puts lives at risk but that a hospital blackout under his Liberal government is entirely appropriate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:01): I refer the honourable member to the previous answers that I have provided to the house on this matter.

BILBY OAT VARIETY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: Fig jam.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay can leave for the remainder of question time for that outburst, thank you.

The honourable member for Ramsay having withdrawn from the chamber:

Mr ELLIS: Can the minister inform the house how a new super oat variety is helping to grow the South Australian grain industry?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:01): I certainly can. I thank the member for Narungga for his very important question. We know that over on Yorke Peninsula—one of the more reliable grain-growing regions in South Australia—we will have the opportunity to grow the Bilby super oat variety. Last week, I attended the Golden Grain Pavilion at the Royal Adelaide Show, along with the SARDI scientists, representatives from Uncle Tobys to announce a project that has been 13 years in the making—a great initiative.

It is a new super oat variety that has characteristics that are win, win, win for all users and growers. Farmers will now have better capacity for higher yields. The millers will now have a better oat to mill. It has a much better return to product that goes through the miller. It also has health

characteristics in reducing blood cholesterol, and that is a really good outcome for what is now one of the eight varieties that have been bred in the last decade up at Waite, through SARDI.

This is a great outcome for the cereals industry. It is a great outcome for the farmers because it not only gives them more diversity in their portfolio but it also gives them the undertaking that they can put a new Bilby variety of oat into their rotation and they can get better yields. They will get better prices. It is an oat variety that will be predominantly used for the breakfast cereal market, and I think that's also important.

The collaboration between the National Oat Breeding Program, the SARDI scientists, Uncle Tobys and the farming communities has seen a great outcome. Again, it's supported by a government that has continued to bring those R&D programs into Waite. Many of you would know that Waite is the largest R&D campus in the Southern Hemisphere, and they continue to breed new seed varieties, new cereals. That is what Waite is world renowned for. The Bilby super oat is a great addition to the rotation of our farmers, it's a great addition to the millers and it's also a great addition for human health.

Grievance Debate

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:04): Suffice to say, the government's handling of the land tax changes has been an absolute shambles. It was clearly a decision made late in the budget process. The Premier was reportedly absent from nearly every meeting of the budget cabinet committee, in particular the one where the land tax aggregation measure was canvassed. It was a rushed decision late in the budget process to prop up a budget surplus, a \$40 million estimate shoved into the budget with no work and no modelling behind it and no details about who may be impacted and by how much.

There was no legislation for the budget measures bill to be tabled before the house, despite the government claiming that this same measure had been legislated in New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. No modelling had been undertaken; at one point, they even asked for the modelling from the Property Council to be provided to better inform their estimates. There were three months of uncertainty before the government could finally release its third iteration of land tax changes here in South Australia, three months of paralysis for the housing construction industry and the property development industry.

Everyone was telling the government that \$40 million was far too low an estimate. Liberal backbenchers were backgrounding the media, calling cabinet's process a train wreck. Other Liberal MPs were boldly telling constituents that the aggregation measure was a mistake. We now find out that aggregation is actually forecast to raise \$118 million, nearly three times higher than the government claimed it would be.

No-one can rely on the current claims and the facts and figures that are now being touted by the Premier and the Treasurer. Nobody can believe the claims they make about their latest changes. Parliament must immediately be provided the detailed modelling that has been undertaken by Treasury as well as by the private consultants who were directly contracted to do work for the Department of Treasury and Finance.

We are now told that landowners will be paying an extra \$86 million of land tax due to aggregation, net of reductions in the top rate—typical, old-school Liberal tax policy: cuts for those with the most in life and tax increases for the majority with less. Let's have a look at some examples. A landowner with \$5 million worth of land will get a tax cut of \$50,000 under these changes. There are 400 landowners with holdings above \$5 million, so over \$20 million of relief is provided to these lucky 400 people.

Meanwhile, thousands of landowners will be forced to pay the extra \$86 million in higher land tax bills. These are South Australian families and retirees relying on rental income from their property investments who have structured their investments according to the law as it has stood for decades in this state. They will be hit for an extra \$86 million in land tax. The Liberal government is retrospectively changing the investment rules on thousands of these retirees and families.

The Premier talks about courage and the courage that he has in doing this to South Australians. I can tell you what is courageous—being up-front with the people of South Australia before a general election that you are going to increase their taxes by \$86 million. It would require courage for the Premier to face nurses and tell them that he is going to increase their car parking fees by \$725 a year.

It would take courage to front motorists before a general election and tell them that they are going to see their motor registration fees increase by over \$20 million, and it would take courage to tell motorists that they are going to face \$30 million of higher fees and charges. It would also take courage to put all those changes to the parliament in the form of legislation. All these things the Premier has run away from.

He did not have the courage to tell South Australians he was going to increase taxes to the highest they have ever been. He did not have the courage to front those thousands of retirees, those family investors who are relying on these properties to provide them an income in their retirement, and tell them that he would be increasing their tax bills by thousands of dollars if not tens of thousands of dollars.

For people in my electorate, people who have come to me and said, 'I've got three investment properties with a land value on average of \$400,000 each. This provides me a net rental income just so that I can survive in retirement,' their land tax bill is going from a few hundred dollars to nearly \$10,000. It would require courage from the Premier to front them and, of course, he will not. It is this Premier who lacks courage. It is this government that lacks the courage to front South Australians about the tax increases they are imposing, and the Liberals—all of them—should be ashamed for supporting a Premier who can do this to South Australians.

LIMESTONE COAST REGIONAL SPORTING ACADEMY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:09): I rise today to talk about the Limestone Coast Regional Sporting Academy. Obviously sport plays a very strong part in Australia's culture and is ingrained into our psyche. Getting to the top, representing your state or even your country in a sport, is the dream for many young athletes. Being an elite athlete of course is hard work, but being an elite athlete in a regional centre is even harder—harder on them and harder on their families and the community. It is hard to get the coaches, the facilities, training and competition of a particular level and the motivation and support that is needed.

In capital cities, all of this is within reach, but if you live in a regional city or a small town you have to travel for anything up to a 10 to 15-hour round trip to a capital city and it becomes the norm. There are many people from the Limestone Coast who travel up every weekend to compete, and sometimes twice a week for training and competition.

The Limestone Coast Regional Sporting Academy began in 2017 and aims to close the gap between the facilities and opportunities offered to young athletes in the city and those living regionally. The program offers an intensive, year-long strength, conditioning and education program to athletes aged between 13 and 18. The athletes receive the education and skills required, including diet, sport, psychology, resilience and planning, all delivered by top-level coaches. Tony Elletson is the academy coordinator and he is incredibly passionate about giving young athletes equal opportunities no matter where they live.

The academy has four objectives: to identify regional talent, to educate and develop youth in the region, to provide pathways to state and national representation, and to develop the skills of regional coaches. It started with 12 athletes in the first year and this year they have 42. Next year, they aim to take that to 80 promising young athletes. This academy is kicking some major goals. You only have to look at their Facebook page to see the successes the current athletes are having. Every week, athletes are off competing in state and national competitions in hockey, motocross, athletics, AFL, swimming, tennis and cycling.

It is even a possibility that the academy will see its first Olympic chance. Mount Gambier's Jordan Freeman, depending on competition results next year, will qualify for the 2024 Olympics in taekwondo. Aside from successes on the sporting field, Tony says there are other benefits to the program as well. Parents are telling him that the sport psychology and time management skills taught

through the academy are also having a major benefit at school, rather than taking the focus from education.

In New South Wales, regional academies like this have been operating for 30-plus years and Tony says you can actually see how they are having an impact in high-level competitions. At the 2016 Rio Olympics, nearly 14 per cent of the medals won by Australian athletes went to those who had been involved with a New South Wales regional academy. With the Limestone Coast academy doing so well after just three years, just imagine if they had been going for decades. The academy has formed multiple partnerships, including with the University of South Australia, Hockey SA, Athletics SA and the South Australian Sports Institute, to provide dedicated programs.

Next year, the academy will partner with local foundation Four Reasons Why to offer five scholarships to the academy for low socio-economic and at-risk young athletes. Currently, the program is jointly funded by the Limestone Coast Local Government Association and the state government, but these funding arrangements are in place only until the end of 2020, so the end of next year. For the program to grow and be sustainable they need additional funding and confidence going forward that that funding will be there.

Tony would also like to take this model to other regions across South Australia that would benefit from this access. The opportunities for this academy's growth are incredible, and an important program such as this deserves surety for the future.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:14): I rise today to talk about the case of Mrs Beverly Sawlwin. Beverly is a 78-year-old lady who lives by herself in Modbury Heights. She has had problems with cataracts for many years and had treatment successfully on one eye at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital over a very long period of time. Not long after that successful treatment, though, her other eye started to deteriorate as well.

She commenced treatment on that eye at what is now the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Unfortunately, her eyesight became so bad that she felt she could no longer travel safely from Modbury Heights to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. She did not drive and did not feel she could catch public transport safely, so she did the logical and sensible thing and requested a referral to her local hospital, Modbury Hospital.

When she went to the ophthalmology unit at Modbury Hospital, Beverly was told that she would have to wait up to eight years for an appointment. That would make Beverly around 87 years of age before she could get treatment for her eye. Just to provide a bit of context, Beverly's eyesight is so bad now that when I visited her home and asked her to fill in an authority to act form so I could make representations on her behalf to the Minister for Health, she asked me to take her pen and place it on the dotted line so she knew where to sign because she could not read the words in front of her.

Those representations were made to the minister on 14 May. On 29 May, Channel 9 ran a story on Beverly's case, which precipitated a flurry of activity from the minister's office. I think we have already learned from other cases in our system recently—sad cases—that this is often what is required to get action from this minister. Members in here might recall the tragic case of Mr Claus Burg, who was incorrectly diagnosed at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital some years ago as not having stomach cancer. Unfortunately, the radiologist who put together the report did not include in the conclusion of the report the key finding about the lining of Mr Burg's stomach thickening. The oncologist who read that report did not read the body and only read the conclusion.

Because of that, some time later, after Mr Burg had suffered some pretty dramatic weight loss, he attended the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which was his local hospital. He was informed that he had stomach cancer, that it had progressed to a stage so severe that the only treatment options available to him were palliative and that he would not have long to live. Mr Burg wrote to the minister about what had happened and received no reply. In desperation, he sought my assistance, and I, too, wrote a letter to Mr Wade on 5 April this year. On 24 April, 8 May, 14 May, 21 May, 23 May and 27 May, my office followed up with Mr Wade's office asking where our response was.

Eventually, Mr Burg became so frustrated that he asked to speak to the media about it. With the assistance of Mark Mooney from Channel 7, who ran a series of stories on the case, all of a sudden letters were couriered to their home in Brahma Lodge. Mr Burg is now in the final stages of legal action that he quite rightly took against the government for the mistakes made that will ultimately cost him his life. I digress, although only to highlight the stubbornness of the minister's office and the recurring need to involve the media to get something done.

The flurry of activity that I referred to in the case of Beverly quickly resulted in her having an appointment to have her eyes checked. Unfortunately, the appointment that was made was at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. A very upset and frustrated Beverly had to explain that the reason she had ceased treatment at that hospital in the first place was that her eyesight was so bad she could not get there. The reason she asked for a referral was so that she could get to her local hospital to get treatment safely.

That was approximately 12 weeks ago. Since then, all Beverly has had is contact from a person advising her that she is back on the waiting list and that she will have an appointment on a date still undisclosed. This is nothing short of pathetic. If this minister cannot even get an ophthalmology appointment for a near-blind 78 year old, then he has failed at his job. What excuse can there possibly be? It can really only be one of two things: either he has no influence whatsoever over his own department, or he really does not care about the plight of Beverly.

One of the fundamental characteristics of our society we always proudly point to as something that sets us apart from other countries is an affordable healthcare system that ensures that all Australians, regardless of their means or where they live, can get the basic care they need. This system has failed Beverly. If minister Wade in the other place cannot, for whatever reason, get one elderly person an appointment to have her eyes fixed, then it is time to step aside and have someone else have a go at the health portfolio.

GLENELG ROTARY CLUB COLD PLUNGE

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:19): Here in parliament today I take the opportunity to speak about a fantastic volunteer organisation in Morphett, the Glenelg Rotary Club. On Sunday 25 August, the Glenelg Rotary Club held their annual signature fundraising event, the Cold Plunge, at Glenelg beach to raise valuable funds to help fight homelessness.

The Cold Plunge was started in August 2014 by former Glenelg Rotarian Jessie Vun. Jessie brought the idea of the Cold Plunge back from her time spent in Russia while she was on a teaching stint. Her reasoning was that, while a few minutes in cold water in winter cannot compare with spending night after night on the streets, she hoped it would act as an eye-opener and raise awareness of the cold experienced by those living on the streets.

The Cold Plunge has been running for six years, and I can tell you, Mr Speaker, the water over those years has not become any warmer. Most years, while the water is cold, we have usually had blue skies and calm waters, which certainly helps ease the trepidation that plungers feel as they line up on Glenelg beach ready to run into the freezing water. Last year, however, the plungers were confronted with the Glenelg 'stormy', with waves pushed up by strong offshore winds and waters churned up with sand. Despite these harsh conditions, the brave plungers went ahead and entered the water, including the member for Black and myself.

Luckily, this year's Cold Plunge, which was two weekends ago, saw a return to calmer conditions, although unfortunately numbers may have been down because of last year. Amongst those brave plungers were those from the Glenelg Rotary Club and other Rotary clubs around Adelaide. I was also joined by the members for Colton and Reynell and councillors from Holdfast Bay council. We were also thrilled to see the first South Australian to win Miss Teen Diamond Australia, Arundhati, taking part. We were all sponsored to dive in and stay in the freezing water for five minutes.

Alison Rogers from the Glenelg Rotary Club sent us off into the water, and you could hear the air sucked out of the plungers as they hit the icy cold water followed by what some might say were shouts of exhilaration; others might say pain. Alison kept a running commentary on the time remaining—from the safety of the shore, I should add—and it has to be said that it felt like time

slowed down over those five minutes. While the waves were not as big as they normally are, it certainly meant you could not get comfortable. Alison made sure we all went underwater at some stage rather than keep our heads dry.

At this stage, I should mention the volunteer lifesavers from the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club who gave up their morning to go into the water to keep the plungers safe. Thanks to volunteers Eddie Waugh, Rob Warne and Conner Jones. Conner is a young lad who, at the recent surf lifesaving awards, was recognised for performing over 150 volunteer patrol hours, so all credit goes to him. Certainly, once the Cold Plunge was over, we were able to dry off, warm up a little bit and make our way back up to the front lawn of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club, where the Glenelg Rotary Club made a roaring trade from the barbecue and cake stalls.

Current president, Rosie Erasmus, thanked the plungers and introduced me to the two charities that this year's plunge was raising funds for. One of those charities was Helping Young People Achieve (HYPA), which provides services and support to assist young people in securing a safe, stable home environment to make it easier for them to stay in work or engage in learning. The other charity was Our Street Family Matters, which provides a street service run by volunteers for homeless people in Adelaide. Liz O'Connell from HYPA and AJ from Our Street Family Matters were both present and they were very thankful for the support that the Glenelg Rotary Club was giving them in raising much-needed funds.

While the Cold Plunge is certainly an important fundraiser, the club is also active throughout the rest of the year raising funds and supporting other community organisations, including Meals on Wheels, Glenelg branch. At the recent AGM for the Glenelg Meals on Wheels, it was certainly a pleasure to be present to see Wayne Sachs accept a 45-year service award on behalf of Glenelg Rotary Club, which recognised the longstanding relationship and support that has been provided by the club to Meals on Wheels to provide meals to those in need in the local community. Congratulations to president Rosie Erasmus and the entire Glenelg Rotary Club on a successful year. I look forward to next year's Cold Plunge.

GAWLER RALLY

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:24): Today, I would like to talk about a rally that was held in Gawler on Sunday. The rally was held at the Niina Marni Cafe for people who wanted to express their concerns about the Marshall Liberal government's agenda of cuts, closures and privatisation of public services. The rally was organised by me and a number of other people and it was in response to comments posted on social media by local residents concerned about the axing of learner driver testing in Gawler and the pending privatisation of train services and Service SA centres.

The rally was addressed by Gawler mayor, Karen Redman, who spoke about the negative impact that the axing of learner driver testing was having on local youth and their families. Mayor Redman said that, as a growing community, Gawler needed new and additional services, not the axing of existing public services. At the rally, a petition signed by 547 staff and students at Xavier College, Gawler, objecting to the Marshall Liberal government's closure of learner driver testing in Gawler was presented to me to table in state parliament. The petition demonstrates how upset local people are about the cuts to basic services in the area.

The axing of this service was made worse by the fact that the decision was made without any consultation with industry, parents or learner drivers. This decision means that it will cost young people and their families more to obtain their Ps, while driving instructors will incur more costs and a loss of income. I can tell you that small business people are not happy with this particular government and this decision. Unfortunately, this decision by the government to axe this particular service means that local people and small businesses are the losers.

I have been in parliament for some 13-odd years and it is the first time I have received a petition signed by parents, students and staff at a school. It is interesting to note that the whole school community has been outraged by the decision to axe this service, which is very important to young people, and it also goes against the mantra of this government about reducing costs and improving services. It is certainly not true in this case.

There has been a lot of disquiet in my community about the pending privatisation of our rail services. Darren Phillips, State Secretary of the Rail, Tram and Bus Union, who also spoke at the rally, warned about the pending cuts to services and security on trains and increasing fares once the trains are taken over by a private operator. He also highlighted the failure of train privatisations in Melbourne and London.

Mr Phillips highlighted those two because, interestingly, they were two examples that the Marshall Liberal government gave to justify privatising the services. A number of these services, both in London and in Melbourne, have again come into public hands because they could not run them without additional funding, or they have gone into private hands and then public hands again because they just could not operate the service.

The reality is that train services—public transport services—are a natural monopoly. Despite all the rhetoric, it is very hard to get competition into a market when you have only one operator. If there is one thing worse than a public monopoly, it is a private monopoly, because there is no capacity to control them through the political process.

The rally was also addressed by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Peter Malinauskas, who spoke about the anger right across the metropolitan area from people who were expressing their concerns about the long-term damage the Marshall Liberal government's privatisation agenda is doing to the community and the economy.

At the rally, we also heard from a SA Pathology employee, who talked about the effect the current cuts to services are having on patient care and how the threat of privatisation was undermining a highly respected pathology service in this state. She warned about how a privatised pathology service could result in delays in obtaining test results, with samples likely to be sent interstate and overseas to cut costs and boost profits for the new private operator.

I will just mention a couple of things from her talk. She talked about how proud they are of the work they do and that the work they do is very manual work requiring staffing levels that have been cut at the moment, again threatening the quality of their work. She also talked about patients in the future having to wait longer periods to get the results of their tests. She finished off by saying that she does not actually believe this government cares about the patients and people of South Australia.

RUFF-O'HERNE, MS J.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:29): Today, I rise to honour the life of a courageous and heroic woman who lived in my electorate and who sadly passed away on 20 August 2019 aged 96 years and that is, of course, the life of Ms Jan Ruff-O'Herne AO, Dame Commander of the Order of Saint Sylvester, holder of the ANZAC Peace Prize and Centenary Medal. Jan suffered beyond comprehension and yet lived her life with grace, faith and a fearsome desire for justice.

Jan was born in the then Dutch East Indies and lived happily until 1942 when, during the war, the Japanese Imperial Army brutally occupied the island of Java. Jan, her mother and two sisters were among many women imprisoned in the labour camp at the disused Ambarawa barracks. The women worked under very harsh conditions at this time.

Two years later, in 1944, then aged 21, Jan was separated from her family members when a high-ranking Japanese official lined up all the single women aged over 17. Ten young women were chosen and transported to another location. They thought they may have other jobs on the island and be used for propaganda for the Japanese Imperial Army. Sadly, these women were to face three months of torture at the hands of Japanese soldiers.

The words Comfort Women do not convey the reality of what these women were to the Japanese during the war. They were, indeed, wartime sex slaves. The 10 young women were placed in a colonial house, which became a military brothel. Their photos were taken so the soldiers could choose their women at their will. Jan Ruff-O'Herne was one of these women. She and the other women endured three months of rape and brutality. Jan suffered further brutality by fighting against the soldiers each and every day under this torment.

As you can imagine, such trauma was not a topic that could easily be spoken about by that generation of people. When the 10 women returned to camp, the other women suspected what had happened to them, but no-one spoke a word. In fact, it would take 50 years before Jan could take to the world her message of being a wartime sex slave. After the war, Jan married a British serviceman and had two daughters, Eileen and Carol. They migrated to Australia in 1960. Although they owned very little at first, Jan and her family lived a life of faith, joy, creation and innovation.

But for many, many years Jan held a terrible sad secret. It was in 1992 that Jan bravely broke her silence at the International Public Hearing on Japanese War Crimes in Tokyo and told of her experience in that military brothel. Two years later, her memoir *50 Years of Silence* was published, describing the plight of those forced into sexual slavery by the Japanese Army in World War II. I quote from Jan's book:

During the time in the brothel, [they] abused me and humiliated me. [They] ruined my young life. They had taken everything away from me: my youth, my self-esteem, my dignity, my freedom, my possessions and my family. But there was one thing they could never take away from me. It was my deep faith in God that helped me survive all that I suffered at [their] brutal, savage hands...

Jan continued to speak out about the experience of sex slaves in Japanese war camps and in 2007 appeared before the United States House of Representatives as part of a congressional hearing on Protecting the Human Rights of Comfort Women. She told that hearing:

Many stories have been told about the horrors, brutalities, suffering and starvation of Dutch women in Japanese prison camps. But one story was never told, the most shameful story of the worst human rights abuse committed by the Japanese during World War II: The story of the 'Comfort Women'...I have forgiven the Japanese for what they did to me, but I can never forget. For fifty years, the 'Comfort Women' maintained silence; they lived with a terrible shame, of feeling soiled and dirty. It has taken 50 years for these women's ruined lives to become a human rights issue. I hope that by speaking out, I have been able to make a contribution to world peace and reconciliation, and that human rights violation against women will never happen again.

As I said, that was Jan's contribution to the congressional hearing. Ms Jan Ruff-O'Herne, wife, mother, teacher and faithful parishioner at the Kingswood Catholic parish, our Lady of Dolours, would become a hero for all women and men who have been subjected to wartime sexual slavery. May her legacy live on. My condolences to her family and I would like the house to extend its condolences as well. Vale, Jan Ruff-O'Herne.

Bills

SURROGACY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 September 2019.)

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:35): I believe that I was on my feet the last time this bill was considered by the house and so I will briefly conclude my remarks. I do not have a great deal to say. As I mentioned when this bill was before the house yesterday, I said that I was broadly supportive of the directions of the bill. I will, of course, look at each of the amendments that are going to be put before the house and make up my mind on each individual amendment, but I am broadly supportive of the direction of this bill.

I do believe—and quite strongly believe, in fact—there is a place for surrogacy as a way for people to be able to have children, and I think that it is worthy that in 2019 this parliament is taking the time to consider law reform in this area. The bill has a range of features outlining what lawful surrogacy agreements would look like and focusing on the desire by the proponents of this legislation to ensure that commercial surrogacy is not something that South Australians will be able to have access to.

People who enter surrogacy agreements will be able to cover the costs borne by the woman who decides to carry the child on behalf of another person or another couple, and that is more than appropriate; however, commercial charges will not be allowed as part of this legislation. There is no doubt in my mind that providing the opportunity for commercial charges to be allowed as part of the

surrogacy legislation is drifting into a moral area which, in my mind, is not appropriate. It is obviously good to see that this legislation will take all appropriate steps to outlaw commercial surrogacy.

The legislation also covers off on counselling requirements for those entering a lawful surrogacy agreement and requires intended parents to ensure that counselling is available to the surrogate mother, not only during the pregnancy and during the decision-making period but also after the birth. There is also an amendment before the house from the member for King, who is looking to amend the legislation to insert a clause that will require a working with children check before the surrogacy service is accessed. I believe that is an appropriate protection.

I know that the safety of young people in our society is something that the member King is particularly passionate about. She has worked hard on this amendment and, having only just seen it today, regardless, I certainly agree with the spirit of this amendment and would see myself supporting that as well.

Really, that is all I wanted to say on this piece of legislation that is before parliament. I think it is necessary legislation. I have already congratulated the Hon. John Dawkins on taking the time to pursue this legislation over some 15 years, he tells me, and I look forward to seeing this legislation pass into law and become an avenue for people in our state who are unable to have children for whatever reason. Surrogacy will give them an option that they are not currently presented with, and I commend the legislation to the house.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:39): I rise to make some very brief comments on the Surrogacy Bill and indicate to the house that I will be supporting it through to the committee stage. I also congratulate the Hon. John Dawkins on his tireless work in this area.

In the committee stage, I will be reserving my right on the final vote on this bill because the strength of any legislation is not proven when things are going well and things that can be foreseen occur. The strength of legislation, how robust that legislation is and how it holds up to factors that may not have been thought of or contemplated at that time, is proven when things do not go well.

I just want to touch briefly on a couple of concerns as a forewarning, I suppose, for the committee stage when I will be asking questions really around the rights of the surrogate and also the donors, or what I will call the parents, of the child. When it is going well it becomes a not simple but logical transaction. Of course, in Thailand we had baby Gammy, who was born with Down syndrome, and I reflect on that situation when it comes to this bill. How is this legislation going to handle something like this, which can occur?

I reflect on that situation where the parents no longer want the child, as happened with baby Gammy in Thailand, because of a disability. Where is the onus on who is looking after that child or the legal guardian of that child if that contract breaks down for whatever reason? I am just using the reason of a disability. What occurs if in that transaction phase of nine months or 10 months, the parents separate and no longer wish to pursue having that child?

These are the things that I really want to explore in the committee stage, that is, what this legislation does to address some of those issues within the bill not when things are going well but when things potentially go very badly and this legislation is then before the courts, or people are before the courts. I keep coming back to one part that I really like about this, and that is the best interests of the child.

As I said, there are other questions that I will have through the committee stage. I congratulate the government on bringing this forward. It is a conscience vote so there will be many people with diverse views on this. While I segue a little away from the bill, I also congratulate the Minister for Child Protection on her push for adoption and increasing the ability for people in South Australia to adopt children.

I really do congratulate the government on putting the child first. Looking at that through the lens of what currently has been going on, I would argue quite strongly that perhaps in a lot of instances, or some instances particularly, what is best for the child has not been held up in the highest manner it can be.

I also indicate that I support the member for King's amendment regarding criminal history checks or police checks. I will be interested to ask some questions around the introduction of that and how it is going to play out as part of this bill. With those very brief comments, I indicate that I will be supporting this through to the committee stage. I will certainly be engaging heavily with questions during that stage and reserving my right on the final vote.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:45): I also take the opportunity to speak on the Surrogacy Bill 2019. The South Australian Law Reform Institute (SALRI) defines surrogacy as the practice of a woman (the surrogate) becoming pregnant with a child that may or may not be genetically related to her and carrying the pregnancy and giving birth to the child for another family (the 'intending parents', as this bill refers to them), who then become the legal parents of the child.

A more simple definition of surrogacy is that it is an understating or agreement by which a woman (the surrogate mother) agrees to bear a child for another person or couple. At the outset of this debate, I acknowledge that surrogacy is a complex and sensitive subject that raises many ethical and legal issues and other implications. It is certainly a topic that attracts strong and often conflicting views. As such, we are certainly considering an extremely sensitive area of policy for the community.

In terms of the present law in relation to surrogacy in South Australia, it is contained in part 2B of the Family Relationships Act 1975. I acknowledge the valuable contribution the Hon. John Dawkins MLC has made to surrogacy law reform in South Australia—notably, the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Act 2015 and the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill 2017.

As a consequence of the 2017 amendments, in December 2017 the South Australian Law Reform Institute was asked by the former attorney-general to inquire into and report on the law regulating surrogacy in South Australia as outlined in part 2B of the Family Relationships Act, and to suggest a suitable regulatory framework for surrogacy in South Australia. One of the recommendations of the review was:

SALRI recommends that, for ease of reference and application and accessibility, the current scheme for surrogacy contained in Part 2B of the Family Relationships Act 1975...be excised and replaced with a standalone Surrogacy Act for South Australia.

The current Attorney-General (member for Bragg) supported this, and introduced the Surrogacy Bill 2019 that we are currently debating. It is certainly a practical reality that some form of surrogacy is an established feature of all Australian jurisdictions except, I believe, the Northern Territory. That is on the basis that surrogacy is non-commercial and suitably regulated.

Added to this is the acceptance of IVF and adoptions. As some submissions to SALRI stated, it is unreasonable, as part of this process, to seek to wind back the law to exclude surrogacy. I concur with this view, as I will outline in my comments relating to this bill.

I have been incredibly fortunate to have met a wonderful lady who, for some strange reason, agreed to marry me, and we have been blessed to have four children naturally. My life has been made complete by having this opportunity to guide and nurture a family but, in return, this family has given me so much more. Again, acknowledging the different viewpoints of the community, if surrogacy can give the opportunity for couples to share in this experience, it is an aim worthy of support in general terms.

Additionally, in my considerations I have been guided by the Hon. John Dawkins' previous statements: the aim of the current law in South Australia to secure the welfare of children born through surrogacy, to widen accessibility of surrogacy arrangements in this jurisdiction, to limit overseas use of the commercial surrogacy process, and to ensure that commercial surrogacy remains banned in South Australia.

The Surrogacy Bill 2019 retains many aspects of the present part 2B of the Family Relationships Act. For example, parties to the surrogacy arrangements must enter into a written agreement relating to the surrogacy prior to conceiving the child, parties must have received counselling and legal advice before entering into the agreement, the surrogacy agreement must not be commercial, the surrogacy mother is considered the legal parent of the child at birth and she cannot be forced to relinquish the child, and if a child is born under a lawful surrogacy agreement, the intending parents are entitled to apply to the Youth Court for an order transferring parentage of

the child. Importantly, this order can only be made if it is in the best interests of the child and with the consent of the surrogate mother.

Looking in more detail at various clauses within the bill, clause 3 of the bill provides a simplified outline of the act. Subclause (1) provides:

- (1) This Act provides a scheme allowing for certain forms of surrogacy in South Australia. However, all other forms of surrogacy remain unlawful, and the Act provides for a number of offences relating to surrogacy.

Part 2 of the bill then goes on to outline the guiding principles that will apply to this bill. I feel that clause 6—Best interests of child paramount is a very important clause within the bill. In particular, subclause (1) provides:

- (1) The best interests of any child born as a result of a lawful surrogacy agreement is to be a primary consideration in respect of the administration and operation of this Act.

One of the reasons this should be elevated to such a primary concern is that the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) requires the best interests of the child to be the primary concern of all actions concerning children. That is incorporated into that clause. Importantly, the CRC prohibits the sale of children. The sale of children is defined as:

Any act or transaction whereby a child is transferred by any person or group of persons to another for remuneration or any other consideration.

With this in mind, it is therefore imperative that any laws relating to surrogacy must protect the child's rights and, importantly, prohibit anything that could involve a child being sold. In light of this, I am strongly of the view that laws relating to surrogacy should apply only to non-commercial surrogacy and certainly look to make unlawful the act of commercial surrogacy, which this bill does.

The bill also outlines what constitutes a lawful surrogacy agreement. That involves an initial counselling session with the parties and then also, at every stage of the process, the ability for counselling to occur right through to the birth of the child and any subsequent court order granting or declaring parentage. The best interests of the child principle certainly should be considered across all these processes, not just when the courts are deciding to transfer parentage.

Clause 7 refers to the surrogacy principles in relation to the lawful practice of surrogacy in South Australia. Subclause (1)(a) provides that the human rights of all parties must be respected. This point is worthy of discussion, because we have multiple parties to this agreement: the surrogate mother, the intending parents and also the child. They may be in conflict, you could postulate, in some form, so which would take priority? If we refer back to a report to the United Nations Human Rights Council, it outlines:

...it is recognised that there is no 'right to a child' under international law. A child is not a good or a service that the State can guarantee or provide, but rather a rights bearing human being. Hence providing a 'right to a child' would be a fundamental denial of the equal human rights of the child. The 'right to a child' approach should be resisted vigorously, for it undermines the fundamental premise of children as persons with human rights.

While this may be quite confronting to intending parents, the SALRI report did note that any such rights of the intending parents do not extend to a right for them to utilise surrogacy to have a child. Certainly, as such, a lawful surrogacy agreement should be entered into only if it is in the best interests of the child, rather than primarily in the best interests of the parents. This is borne out in clause 7(3) that 'surrogacy principles do not displace, and cannot be used to justify the displacement of, section 6', which deals with the best interests of a child.

Moving on to clause 10 and lawful surrogacy agreements, part 3 of this bill sets out the scheme for surrogacy agreements that are lawful and legally recognised, involving the surrogate mother and the intending partner. Section 10(2)(b) defines intending parents as:

a person, or both persons...on whom parentage of the child or children born as a result of the lawful surrogacy agreement will be conferred in accordance with this Act.

I think this is worthy of discussion because under the current law surrogacy is only available for couples who are legally married in a registered relationship or who have lived together in a marriage-like relationship for a period of three years, which I should note does include same-sex

couples, whereas in this new bill access to surrogacy would be opened up to single intending parents or de facto couples who have not yet lived together for a period of three years.

Just thinking around this issue about single parents being given access to surrogacy, I think the best interests of a child are well served by having two parents. That is my view, but I do acknowledge that there are single parents out there who, not for deliberate reasons, would want access to children. In grappling with this concept, it is pertinent to point out that other jurisdictions do allow single parents to have access to surrogacy. The argument that not giving single parents access to surrogacy would be discriminatory might be a worthy one but, again, precedence has to be given to the rights of the child first. There are certainly questions around this that I will be interested to hear in further debate and in committee.

What led me to accept that it is in the best interests of the child was an example of a wife and husband who are married and the husband is terminally ill and they are able to collect the husband's sperm, even after he has died from the effects of cancer, and the wife is able to undergo IVF and have a baby. The example given to SALRI was the flipside of this, where a loving husband and wife were married and the wife was unfortunately diagnosed with cancer, a terminal illness.

She was able to store her eggs while the husband and wife were going through the surrogacy process, and they were able to find a surrogate mother with whom they would have been able to have a surrogate child. Unfortunately, the wife died before this could get enacted and so the husband was left stranded in terms of having a surrogate child in South Australia because the current laws do not allow for a single parent to have a surrogate child.

Under those circumstances, I can see that it would be restrictive to deny access to the husband. I would like to think that, as part of the counselling that goes on, precedence could be given to the counsellor to really work through it so that the singles understand what the best interests of the child are and that a bit of weight be given to that.

I moving on to clause 10(4)(f) and 'the following circumstances must exist in relation to the intended parent'. The existing law allows arrangements where neither intending parent is genetically related to the child but a medical practitioner must certify that both intending parents appear to be infertile or that it is medically preferable not to use their reproductive material—so in cases where it might put the mother in harm's way by going through to term.

The bill before us proposes to remove the need for an infertility certification for surrogacy agreements in which neither intending parent provides the genetic material. Of course, this opens up the possibility that intending parents who could use their genetic material may choose not to. It will be interesting to explore this in the committee stage, looking at some of the submissions to the SALRI report. SALRI looked into this concept and formed the view that, for embryo donation in lawful surrogacy agreements, where possible the genetic material from at least one of the intending parents should be used.

Again, in the committee stage, I would encourage exploration of having, where possible, at least one of the parents use their biological material to create a biological relationship with the child. SALRI also explored views for and against whether this had any long-term impacts on the relationship between the intending parents and the child. While there were differing viewpoints in terms of the best interests of the child, if there could be a genetic relationship because at least one of the intending parents had the ability to provide genetic material, that would certainly be my preference.

I will move on to one of the amendments that the member for King has brought out around potential criminal checks that should be part of the standard procedures that intending parents are subject to. In the SALRI report, there was a lot of investigation into this and the fact that the laws currently do not require the intending parents to have extensive criminal checks.

While not about surrogacy, an example was given where parents were able to purchase a young child through overseas adoption and groom it for sexual activities both among those parents and also with their associates, which is reprehensible. It is something that should definitely be avoided as an unintended consequence of a law here in South Australia that looks to provide children to people who genuinely want them because of the joy and love that will create both for them as a family and for the children.

The bill also looks into using other jurisdictions for fertility treatment. At present, both intending parents have to be residents of South Australia and the fertility treatment has to be undertaken in South Australia. This has proved to be problematic for some and has caused some South Australians to try going outside our jurisdiction. While the bill requires both the surrogate mother in clause 10(3)(c) and the intended parents in clause 10(4)(c) to be Australian citizens or permanent residents, it does accommodate cross-jurisdictional arrangements, which would remove the requirement for fertility treatment to occur in South Australia and also allow interstate lawyers to provide the lawyers' certificates.

With those remarks, I think it is also worth noting that the bill requires a review within five years. That will certainly be important to find out any complications that arise from the bill as it is rolled out. Again, I will reserve my right through the committee process pending some of the questions that come up around this. Overall, I commend the Hon. John Dawkins for his work in this area and the Attorney for bringing the bill to the house.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:04): I would like to make a small contribution to this debate but certainly not repeat what has been said. Generally speaking, I support the principles of the bill. For my support, I would like to see addressed and put into the process of the bill my concern to ensure that the interests of the children are paramount. I agree with the member for Morphett that, while there is a strong desire for adults to have a child, that desire must come second to the wellbeing of the children who are delivered through this process, so I would certainly support that.

The member for Mount Gambier also quite rightly raised the issue of what happens when a child is unwanted at the end of the process. Again, highlighting the wellbeing of the child is very important. While there is a number of parties, including the intending parents, surrogate mother and child, I think it has to be very clear that as the legislature we must put the child's interests ahead of everything else.

I apologise that I was unable to make the briefing this morning, but one aspect that I think is very important and, if it is not covered, I certainly want covered in this bill for my support, is the child's right to know who their biological parents are. In other words, the child should have access to information about the child's biology or genetic material, as it is referred to. I think that children's identity as human beings includes social identity, which we get from socialisation, and there is also a strong desire for people to know things like their genetic and biological history to the extent that laws in other areas are changing to accommodate that. Certainly, there are people who have been adopted or otherwise who have spent many years of their lives seeking their natural parents. I think it is very important for their health information and also to understand their history and how they came into this world.

I also support the amendments put up by the member for King. If those amendments were removed, I am unlikely to support the bill. I would certainly support those amendments. I would like to ensure that the bill also addresses the issues the member for Mount Gambier and I have raised. Without those amendments to cover those issues, I am unlikely to support the bill. Having said that, I do support the general principle. I think it is sound public policy as long as we put the rights and the wellbeing of the child first.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:07): I wish to commence by thanking all the honourable members for their contributions on both the development of this bill and the contribution to debates. In particular, can I acknowledge the member for King, who has foreshadowed some amendments during the course of this debate and who I have absolutely no doubt is resolute in her motivation to do everything she can to ensure that we protect children. She has demonstrated that in a number of areas in the parliament already. Children who might be born as a result of a surrogacy agreement should be no exception. In that regard, I value her contribution.

I will have a little to say shortly in relation to the applicability of draft amendments that I have seen to date. Nevertheless, I want to assure members in the house that, in the circumstances, particularly as a number of other members will be sympathetic to the proposition, there should be some kind of capacity to do background checks on prospective parents and/or surrogate mothers. We need to do it, though, in a manner that will be both valid and capable of being implemented and

not in breach of other agreements and/or create restrictions in other legislation. It is a little bit complicated, but I think the motivation is there. I think other members have presented to me the view that we need to have some sort of check. In that regard, we need to work to ensure that ultimately occurs.

The work that was previously done in the parliament to provide an appropriate and modern regulatory framework for surrogacy with minimal government intervention should also be acknowledged. As some members have pointed out, when we attempted to deal with this under the dying days of the previous government on the last parliamentary sitting days, there were other priorities of the former government. I think the person who was most disappointed by that was, of course, the Hon. John Dawkins, who spent a decade trying to support the previous government to get this right to be able to advocate in this parliament. The former attorney was deeply disappointed about the priorities that were displayed on the last day. Nevertheless, that happened.

A lot more work has been done and I think there is capacity for us to ensure what we are trying to do, which is to set up a regulatory framework that will enable South Australians to enter into lawful and enforceable agreements in relation to a surrogacy contract, can occur here in South Australia and to ensure that we provide that opportunity so that our residents do not have to go and live in another state and/or so the privileged few who might have the money do not have to go and effectively buy a baby via a process in other countries.

We have all heard and no doubt read in the SALRI report about some of the unscrupulous practices—it is the kindest way I can describe them—that operate in some other countries that leave particularly women vulnerable to not only being exploited as the carrier of a child, as a surrogate of a child, but left in either financially impecunious circumstances and/or left a child, the product of the agreement, whom receiving parents, for whatever reason, consider not to be satisfactory for them to receive.

That, of course, is no further exemplified than by the baby Gammy case with the rejection of a child who was considered by the receiving parents to not be to standard as a result of a disability with which he was born. If that is not bad enough, they took the child they considered to be in a wholesome state for the purposes of being acceptable to them. They took the good child, from their perspective, and left the one with difficulty, and we are left with a mother who is having to raise a child who is severely disabled.

Everyone in this parliament who has knowledge of that case will forever have etched on their minds the memory of that child being held by its natural mother—surrogate mother, as such—in a foreign country in an impoverished circumstance. The fate of that child's future is just too horrific to think about.

We are all trying to strive towards the same outcome. The previous parliament set up a register system with ministerial oversight. I think that even the minister of the day, the attorney-general (Hon. John Rau) was not at all pleased about having to try to operate that, and I think he was right. Nevertheless, it was something that needed to be fixed. Unfortunately, he did not fix it but, anyway, we are here. We have a chance to do this. We have a chance to give a future to parents who will rely on the surrogacy arrangements in South Australia and be able to have that come to fruition.

There were a couple of matters that were raised in the course of debate that I wish to place on the record. The first is access to genetic information for donor-conceived children. I am advised that a child's access to donor information depends on whether the donor was known or unknown. For known donors, if the parents used a known donor, they are required to list the donor on the birth registration statement, as per section 14(2) of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996. This is the case for both clinic and do-it-yourself donor insemination and would cover donors to a surrogacy agreement.

Section 46(1a) of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act states that information about a biological parent—that is, a donor—cannot be released without the permission of the donor. Births, Deaths and Marriages' current processes require the donor to sign the birth registration statement and acknowledge therein that they understand their information will be released to the child at age 18. Therefore, they acknowledge their donation and give permission for the information

to be released at a certain time, satisfying section 46(1a). The child can then be provided the official record of their genetic parents when they reach the age of 18. However, their legal parents may have provided that information to them earlier.

In respect of anonymous donors, I advise members as per the advice I have received that the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Regulations 2010 provide that all ART clinics operating in South Australia must comply with the National Health and Medical Research Council guidelines. These guidelines require the fertility clinic to collect and maintain identifying information and medical history about the donors, which must be provided to any children born from the donors' gametes once they reach the age of 18. The clinic may provide such information to a person under 18 if they determined that the person has sufficient maturity.

The next issue that was raised was in relation to the Youth Court processes and the best interests of the child. I advise members that the advice I have received on that matter is as follows. Intending parents under a surrogacy agreement are entitled, after the birth, to apply to the Youth Court for a transfer of parentage of the child. The order to transfer parentage must be in the best interests of the child. This is an express prerequisite for the order under clause 18(4)(a) of the bill.

Respect for the human rights of any child born under a surrogacy agreement is also a fundamental principle of the bill, which applies to the court and is set out in clause 7. The court must also be satisfied that the intending parents are fit and proper and assume the role of parent of the child. In deciding this and any other consideration, the court may inform itself as it thinks fit and therefore can seek any further information it requires. That is in relation to clause 18(11).

Further, clause 18(9) expressly allows the court to require any party to the proceedings to provide an assessment of a specified kind in relation to the matter from an accredited counsellor. That is obtained at the expense of the intended parents. The court must also be satisfied that the surrogate mother consents to the making of the order unless there are certain prescribed exceptional circumstances, such as the surrogate mother has died.

Regarding an issue raised in respect of the counsellor role, the bill covers two types of counselling: mandatory pre-agreement counselling for all parties and optional further counselling for the surrogate. On the question of the mandatory pre-agreement counselling, I am advised as follows. Firstly, prior to entering a surrogacy agreement, each party to the agreement—that is, the surrogate mother and all intending parents—must receive counselling on the implications of the agreement in order to help them come to an informed personal decision about whether to go ahead with the arrangement.

Secondly, the counselling must be provided by a counsellor accredited in accordance with the regulations. The expected requirement to be prescribed is eligibility for full membership of the Australian and New Zealand Infertility Counsellors Association (ANZICA), as recommended by the South Australian Law Reform Institute. Thirdly, the counselling must be consistent with the guidelines published by ANZICA and the National Health and Medical Research Council and any other requirements set out in the regulations. Fourth and finally, the counsellor must provide a certificate certifying that this required counselling was provided.

In respect of the optional further counselling for the surrogate, I am advised as follows. Clause 15 of the bill provides that intending parents must ensure counselling is available to the surrogate mother and her spouse or domestic partner, if any, during the attempt to become pregnant, during the pregnancy and for six months after the birth of the child. Costs are to be paid by the intending parents and the costs are recoverable as a debt. This ensures that the surrogate has access to appropriate professional support throughout the surrogacy process and after the birth.

There may have been other matters that I have missed in relation to contributions that were made. I listened with interest to the member for Light's contribution near the conclusion of the debate and I am hopeful that the access to genetic information for donor-conceived children material I have just provided covers his query. If I have missed other members' concerns or questions that they wish to foreshadow as being an impediment to them being completely satisfied with the bill, then I am more than happy to cover that as soon as I get further information on that.

Obviously, we are yet to go into committee, and we will certainly make every effort to make sure that members have all the material available and that they have their questions answered. I appreciate that this type of legislation raises a lot of questions about how it is going to operate. It is a new concept. It is a new procedure. It is a new process. Whilst I get a lot of advice in relation to these matters as the person who is moving this bill, it is fair to say that it is not without its complications. I fully expect members would want to be completely satisfied in seeking the approval.

Another matter I want to briefly raise is that the member for King has foreshadowed some amendments. One of the matters that has been raised that I do not think is proposed to be advanced as a formal amendment relates to the question of the definition of 'impaired decision-making capacity'. I just place on the record the principal reason why it is important that the bill maintain a consistent position in relation to the definition. It largely relates to the fact that the definition in this bill is not novel, it is not new and it is not peculiar: it is actually the same definition of 'impaired decision-making capacity' that is the standard definition across the statute book.

That includes such legislation as the Mental Health Act 2009, the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995 and the Advance Care Directives Act 2013. Just in case any other members had the view that we needed to somehow or other have a different standard for the definition in relation to the decision-making capacity of the parties in a surrogacy agreement, when issues such as mental capacity for contractual arrangements are developed and the law relating to that is developed, consistency is pretty important for two reasons.

The first reason is so that we have the interpretation by the courts in a consistent manner, and the second reason is so that we do not set up, in this instance, a different set of arrangements for persons who might have a disability in one area of contractual decision-making from the arrangements of another.

It recognises the advancement, I would suggest, of the definition that applies across our legislation now—the advancement of the recognition of persons who have the disability and who may have episodic or intermittent interruption to their mental capacity but who are still recognised as being competent for the purpose of exercising contractual obligations.

That develops over a period of time and recognises, as I say, those who might have that impediment but where the law across other pieces of legislation recognises their capacity, and that is to ensure that the person is able and capable of understanding, retaining and using relevant information in the course of making a decision.

The member for King is quite right to raise the concern about making sure that, in this instance, we are ensuring that the people who are able to sign up to these agreements, these contractual arrangements for which they are seeking approval by a court, are competent to do so, because these are very important decisions. So are advance care directives for people who want to give instructions about their future care, and so are Mental Health Act determinations and decisions which they make and which they are capable of making, and things such as consent to palliative care or medical treatment.

That consistency is very important, that is true, and within the envelope of this legislation I certainly have been advised and am satisfied that maintaining that consistency is important. Having said all that, I thank the member for King for raising it because it also makes us reflect on making sure that what we have is exactly the best option in these matters for consideration; so, I thank her for that.

In relation to the second matter that has been foreshadowed, that is, to introduce some form of mandatory criminal history reporting or access to information in relation to criminal history of intending parents, again this is really a fundamental question which has quite rightly been raised by the member for King and which, I think, has general attraction when you ask yourself the question: 'Are we going to set up a restructure in relation to enforceable agreements for surrogacy in South Australia and in so many other ways in dealing with the protection of children require criminal history checks and the disclosure and the real-time updating of that information for other areas of care of children; why shouldn't we apply it to this?'

We do not have a criminal history check on couples who might partner and/or marry to have children of their own; we do not require that. However, more importantly and leaving aside that

arrangement, where we have a regulation as to the competence, I suppose, to be a prospective parent, such as IVF treatment, which is able to be accessed by certain persons and cost provisions are made and guidelines are set up as to what is to occur (and, in fact, there is a very significant fee frequently paid for that by persons who are seeking to have IVF), in those circumstances we do not impose on them some form of criminal history check. The adoption of children under the Adoption Act in South Australia is again through a court process and a number of different checks are required in relation to that process.

Notwithstanding all that, let's assume for the moment that there is a desire for us to have some kind of assessment or check available to be considered and available as part of the information—if the parties seek to have it—for when the court makes the order in relation to an application under the surrogacy proposal.

I say 'if the parties seek to have it' because I think it is reasonable to assume that in a number of cases—most likely in a circumstance where a sister, mother or cousin is going to be the surrogate of the receiving parents and is volunteering to provide this service to their relative—it is probably unlikely that they will say, 'I want you to have a police check before you come into this arrangement.' So, 'Mum, thanks very much for offering to have a baby for me, but I want you to have a police check.' That is not necessarily something that the parties would want to do.

These are the sorts of things that we need to have a look at. I have discussed the matter with the member for King and I think we can probably come to some arrangement as to how we can progress this without breaching our obligations under the use of the current data we collect for the purpose of checks. I have undertaken to work with her overnight to see what we can come up with in that regard.

I just place on the record that, having received the 99(2) amendments that have been tabled, today I have been advised the use of the central assessment unit under the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016 to undertake working with children checks in the surrogacy process would actually breach a national COAG agreement in relation to the disclosure of data and its purpose. I have only just received preliminary advice in that regard, which I am happy to read into *Hansard*, but essentially it indicates that the use of this information would breach that agreement. If an amendment in that form were to pass, we would have to renegotiate, at the COAG level, access to that unit for the purpose of using it for surrogacy agreements.

One of the matters that has been raised is in relation to what else we can do. I have received some preliminary advice on that, and overnight I will be considering how we could use an alternate method to be able to do what I think the member for King wants; that is, if we are going to have surrogacy agreements in South Australia, we need to know that the parties to them—and I suggest the surrogate mothers as well, not just the receiving parties, as she has indicated in the amendment—do not have a record that obviously identifies them with convictions in relation to child offences. We will work to try to ensure that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney, can I just come in here, please. Can I remind the Attorney that the second reading speech needs to relate to the content of the bill, rather than the amendments in particular. We will deal with the amendments when they come up during the committee stage.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct. Members have raised it in the contributions they have made; therefore—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, and I have been listening carefully—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that is the reason why I am indicating that—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Excuse me?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, I will speak with the Attorney just at the moment. We have had a pretty good run at this, and probably for the past 10 or 15 minutes you have been discussing the amendments themselves. So, with all due respect—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Let me put it in this context. Members have raised, in the course of the contributions made in this debate, the imperative and benefit of having checks in relation to children who are going to be parties to these agreements. Without foreshadowing amendments that have been put, I indicate that I think the submissions in those contributions have merit.

I am happy to work with any of the members, including the member for King, on how that can be effected without causing there to be a breach of a whole lot of other processes. I think we can probably do that and I am happy to continue to work on that. I mention that because I think there has been a general discussion on this issue—and there has been public reporting, of course—and it is reasonable that I indicate to the parliament my position as the mover of this bill to accommodate that as we can. In relation to that aspect, I think I have covered it sufficiently and otherwise commend the bill to its second reading.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

**INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (INVESTIGATION POWERS) NO 2
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June 2019.)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:38): I now resume my remarks, which the house generously gave me leave to continue from the last session. I thank the house for the leave it has granted me. To summarise the opposition's position, I can indicate that we support the bill with the amendments of the Legislative Council. I will have lots to say about the amendments filed by the Deputy Premier in my contribution; for the record, Labor opposes all of them.

By way of background, I am advised that on 10 May last year the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Investigation Powers) Amendment Bill 2018 was introduced into the parliament. That bill was withdrawn. It was withdrawn and referred to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee on 26 July 2018. I am a fortunate humble servant of that committee on behalf of this parliament.

We diligently went about our work on this committee investigating the executive's wish to dramatically expand the ICAC's role. The Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee handed down our report, which was unanimous, on 20 September 2018. That report made eight recommendations on the government's proposed legislation. I am sure all members have read it thoroughly and could quite easily recite it word for word.

On 15 November 2018, almost two months later, the Treasurer in another place, the Hon. Rob Lucas, introduced the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Investigation Powers) No. 2 Amendment Bill, a second bite of the cherry. That same bill was received here from the other place with amendments on 2 April 2019, some two months later and, of course, it is now September and we are still discussing this legislation.

Finally, we are considering this bill. I am not sure why the Attorney-General delayed the bill and I look forward to the Attorney enlightening the house perhaps in her response, in her closing remarks, or in committee about why it has taken so long to get here. I do have some theories. I think there is some internal disquiet amongst the backbench of the government and perhaps even within the cabinet.

I think, if there is disquiet amongst the backbench, it would be fascinating to see within the Liberal Party—which has boasted over another debate the autonomy and independence it gives to its members to speak out—whether or not its members have reserved the right on this bill, and

whether they will exercise the independence they claim the Liberal Party affords them, or whether they will en bloc vote with the executive to create I think something very, very dangerous here in South Australia.

As I mentioned earlier, the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee made eight recommendations. It is important to note that not all of those recommendations were dealt with in the government's legislation. Shockingly, they did not adopt all of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee's recommendations, even though it was unanimous and chaired by a Liberal MP, the Hon.—mental blank—Dennis Hood. What confused me is I said 'government Liberal MP'. He used to be an Independent in a number of other parties and this is a certain manifestation of his political ideology now.

Not all of the recommendations were dealt with in that bill, which I was surprised, because the committee is made up of, I think, some very learned government members who are quite reasonable in my experience. The great thing about the committee process is that a lot of the partisanship that besets this parliament, especially in question time, is cast aside. I often say that I really wish the public could see the good work done on committees in a bipartisan way for the betterment of the state. You really do see the best of this parliament in the committees because that is where you get that crossing of the streams as it were when members work together collegiately to try and get a good outcome.

This was quite a rare outcome because there was no dissenting voice to my knowledge. I could be wrong, but I do not think there was a dissenting voice. We had on that committee who made those recommendations Labor MPs, Liberal MPs, SA-Best MPs, and there was a uniformity of view, which is quite rare.

As I have said, the opposition supports open hearings, but we want to ensure that there are adequate protections for those who may be adversely impacted by the trial-like nature of public hearings. There is a reason why police interviews are not done in public. There is a reason why interrogations are not done in public. One reason is that people are afforded certain rights.

As I said in my remarks a few months ago before this bill was adjourned and I sought leave, in a hearing where the ICAC commissioner is sitting in an elevated position—much like you are now, Mr Deputy Speaker—with a very large crest above his or her head saying 'Independent Commissioner Against Corruption', witnesses are sworn, a counsel assisting the ICAC is asking questions and the witness before the ICAC is seated in the chair, the reasonable viewer would look at that and think, 'This isn't a tribunal. This isn't the executive using coercive powers in a tribunal-like process. This is a trial.'

Indeed, from memory I think the ICAC Act even has minimum criteria for who can be the ICAC commissioner. They are either a senior counsel or a retired judge of some sort. I do not want to bind the house to that, but that is my memory of the qualifications of an ICAC commissioner. It is reasonable to think that the public viewing this may previously have seen the person sitting in the ICAC's chair delivering verdicts on television or in the paper as a justice or a senior counsel, giving comment in all their regalia.

People might assume for a moment that these proceedings were conducted with some sort of adversarial approach, where the judge sat in judgement in this adversarial system and made a final judgement, whereas of course it is nothing of the sort. It is very dangerous, so my colleague in another place the shadow attorney-general, the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC, filed a raft of amendments to put into place the sort of protections and procedures that have evolved around the court system over centuries.

They are rights and protections that we all take for granted when the state attempts to make an accusation or a case against one of its citizens. What are they? Well, one of the most basic tenets is the right to a lawyer. For the life of me, I still do not understand why the ICAC commissioner, although I understand he has yielded on this position, did not want people before the ICAC to have some form of legal representation. There is a right to know who your accuser is and what the accusations against you are.

Remember, this is not a closed hearing where, for example, if you are the suspect in a crime, police interview you with your lawyer, they tape proceedings, presumption of innocence is there and there are certain rights by statute and under common law. You have the right not to give evidence that may incriminate you, the right to a lawyer and other rights that, again, we all take for granted. Here, the questions that are asked of you are asked in public.

The thing about being asked questions in public that may embarrass or incriminate you unfairly, given the nature of the question, is that they cannot be taken back. The reason they cannot be taken back is that we are asking reasonable people who have grown up in a system of justice that is adversarial, where people assume it is a court-like procedure, when in fact it is not.

People at home will not know that you do not have the right not to answer. People at home will not know that this is not an adversarial system, that this is a lot like the police or the parliament passing a law saying that the process for anyone suspected of murder, when they are interviewed by police, will be made public. The ICAC commissioner would say that corruption inquiries will still be done in private. We are talking about maladministration and misconduct. Let's say for administrative issues, another form of civil litigation, there is an adversarial process.

It is fair to say that many of the amendments that the opposition moved in the other place were recommendations that came out of part of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee or were recommendations from the Law Society or the Bar Association. What is important about these two associations?

It is easy when you are in the executive to find organisations that trumpet protecting the rule of law inconvenient, as I did when I was a minister. The Law Society can be annoying, especially if you are attempting to pass laws to protect people. You are doing your best, but the Law Society point out long, hard-fought rights for individuals, even if they are ultimately guilty, because that is the system of justice that we have in this country, the system that defines us as an open, democratic, free state.

When bodies like this raise concerns about the executive attempting to interrogate people in public that could completely destroy their reputations fairly or unfairly without the protections that accused murderers and paedophiles have in a court system, they speak up. You only have to look at what occurs in other jurisdictions where there are these open trials to note that often the outcome is humiliation but no conviction.

The other place did not support all our amendments, but, importantly, the legislation we are considering here today does include many amendments that are vital to the rule of law in this state. In broad terms, the amendments have succeeded to do a number of things: the commissioner himself or herself must head the public inquiry. Why is that important? We do not want public inquiries outsourced to people who have not been selected by the democratic representatives of their state to conduct these inquiries. The ICAC commissioner is ultimately chosen by the Attorney-General and the cabinet. The unique thing about the cabinet as a form of executive in the Westminster system of government is that they are elected by the people. There is a broad mandate there.

The idea that the ICAC commissioner, who is unelected, could then delegate to someone else to conduct this inquiry, when the people have had no say whatsoever in choosing them, is a mistake. It should not be allowed to occur. I hope members agree with the opposition's amendment here because it is vitally important that we do not have people who perhaps may not be qualified or, even more importantly, are undemocratically appointed to sit in judgement of our fellow citizens.

All our judges are appointed, through the Crown, by elected members of parliament, whether they are in cabinet or are recommending it to the Governor in Executive Council. There is a broad mandate there. The idea that somehow a judge or a senior counsel, after receiving that mandate from the elected body of this parliament to form cabinet, can then delegate that again further to conduct open hearings I think is a mistake and we should stop it. That is a democratic principle that we should enforce.

The insertion of a review of the act by the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee was successful. The person heading an investigation must act in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness and, in the case of a public inquiry, an examination of a witness must be

conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence and the practices and procedures applicable to a witness giving evidence in a summary proceeding in a Magistrates Court.

To an ordinary person, I submit to this parliament that that sounds pretty bloody reasonable. In my view, it is pretty reasonable that, if you are going to have a public inquiry that looks like, sounds like and acts like a court and if you are going to put to them accusations and questions, you do so with the provisions of procedural fairness. It is no good allowing a lawyer to stand alongside you while you are being tried if they cannot act like a lawyer. It is important that lawyers, as much as we all may have our views about them, are allowed to do their jobs.

It is no good saying that you can have a lawyer if the lawyer cannot do anything. If they are just there as a witness to watch, it is of no use to anyone. Lawyers need to be able to object and to enforce through objection procedural fairness, to know who the accuser is. Of course, a system that most South Australians, and indeed most Australians and most people in western democracies around the world, would be familiar with would be the type of procedural fairness afforded in courts like our Magistrates Court.

The next point was that a witness in a public inquiry can call their own evidence and then also be allowed to be represented at other witnesses' examinations. Why is that important? Let's say that, hypothetically, there is someone waxing lyrical about the Deputy Speaker in a maladministration inquiry. It is highly unlikely because of the character of the man, but you never know. Someone may have a grudge against him. If these proceedings are publicly aired, the Deputy Speaker's good reputation that he has spent a lifetime building up on Eyre Peninsula could be ruined overnight because he is not afforded the ability to have a lawyer there to say, 'I object to what this witness is saying. Please substantiate your allegations.'

Do you know why we do not publicise those things? It is because in an inquiry we usually have a police officer, or some sort of tribunal officer, taking evidence from people in secret and transcribing it. If they feel there is a case, they go to the DPP and the DPP then presses charges. We all go to a court and he has the ability to test those accusations in an adversarial system and that is how we get justice. It is not perfect, but it is better than anything else.

In this system, you are tried by the accusation. In secret, it does not really matter that much because, ultimately, no-one's reputation is harmed, unless the ICAC commissioner, at the end of all this process and after hearing submissions from everyone, forms a view, which is appropriate. But the idea that before the ICAC commissioner forms a view you can be tried, convicted and found guilty in the minds of the public because of the airing of a TV program or the 6 o'clock news is abhorrent to everything we stand for in this parliament. It might be fun to do that to your political opponents. It might cause five minutes worth of glee, but think of the long-term ramifications for the public and the long-term ramifications of what this actually means.

The state, with all the power of the Crown, is allowing these things to be aired in public without the adversarial system or the proof that we allow in an adversarial system. Even to this day, unless I am incorrect, the Supreme Court still does not let cameras inside their proceedings to film proceedings and publish them live in South Australia, or allow witnesses' evidence to be filmed and aired that night. Generally, judges like to wait until the very end. That is why we still get the court sketches and the vision of people leaving court outside, but I could be wrong about that.

It is important to protect people's rights and liberties if we are to go down this path of public inquiries, which I understand the argument for. If you want to have justice and justice seen to be done, and if you want an open ICAC, why not allow the public to have a look as long as we protect the people involved; otherwise conduct them in private, as police investigations are currently conducted now. Is it really a good idea at any stage of any investigation to have it aired publicly from start to finish? Think of the consequences of the police being forced or wishing to air publicly all the interviews of their suspects.

We believe that these amendments provide transparency and, importantly, protections for witnesses. That should not preclude the commissioner from holding public inquiries. Earlier, I alluded to the government's filed amendments to the bill that I think, in essence, undo everything the Legislative Council has sent to us. I think that is good work. Amendments Nos 1 and 2 the government has provided to us can be considered together. As I understand them, the amendments

remove the ability for the Supreme Court to extend a time limit for appeals. Why would we want to do that? Why? What is the purpose of limiting a citizen's right to go to a higher court or a court and lodge an application? Why should we do that? Why is that appropriate?

Apparently, the government thinks two business days is appropriate time to find a lawyer, brief them and have them make an application to the court from the moment you get your subpoena—two days. I do not know about you, Mr Deputy Speaker, but unless you have lawyers on hand, on retainer, it is pretty hard for an ordinary, reasonable person to get organised that quickly to lodge an application to the Supreme Court, let alone what it does to the ability of a lawyer to adequately prepare and make submissions to the court on behalf of their client. I would be fascinated to know from the Attorney-General whose idea that was. As I said, engaging legal counsel over two days is exceptionally brief.

I am informed by my parliamentary friend the shadow Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher, that he asked whether a person could file an intent to appeal and provide a full submission at a later date. Given the short time frame, can an individual lodge an intent to the court that they want to lodge an appeal and provide the submission later? The staff at the AGD, who were briefing my honourable friend, did not know. 'Did not know' should send a level of alarm through the parliament. Again, we are talking about democratic liberties here.

I also understand that during the briefing the opposition had with the AGD staff about this bill, my honourable friend the Hon. Kyam Maher asked AGD officers if they could point to a single example of where else appeals to the Supreme Court or any other court are limited in this manner. Shockingly, they could not.

We are introducing in this bill a new precedent that when the state comes after you to put you into an inquiry—a coercive inquiry with coercive powers, with all the awesome powers of the Crown at the fingertips of the ICAC commissioner—you have only two days to find, brief and submit to the Supreme Court an application for an appeal. That seems to me like the state is cheating and attempting to use this parliament to subvert people's basic democratic rights—that is, access to appeal to a court—and that is unacceptable. I think, quite frankly, most reasonable members would agree.

What is wrong with seven days? What is wrong with 14 days? What is wrong with 21 days? What is wrong with no time limit? If the ICAC's case is as good as they think it is, and they want you to appear and give public evidence, then surely it is just a matter of making the argument to the court and the court says, 'I am sorry, Mr Koutsantonis, or Mr So-and-so; the ICAC is perfectly reasonable to call you before them and give evidence. You have wasted your time and your money—off you go.' Or are they really worried that the court might say, 'Actually, no.' But, at the very least, you have been given the ability to seek justice, but apparently that is too much for the Attorney-General and I think it is a shame.

I think, and the opposition believes, that this is an attack on the protections and procedures that have evolved around court systems for centuries. Alarmingly, we have still not received answers to those questions. I really want to draw members' attention to amendments Nos 7, 8, 9 and 10. These amendments, proposed by the government, are entirely opposite to the will of the other place—entirely—and remove what I think are protections that most South Australians would ordinarily think were in place as a matter of course.

But, given that we are debating whether they should be removed here or not, I have to say that I never believed in my 22 years in the parliament that I would be standing up watching a government attempting to remove some of these rights from a public hearing. The effect of amendment No. 7, filed by the Deputy Premier and the Attorney-General I am advised, is to delete the requirement for the rules of evidence, procedural fairness and Magistrates Court proceedings. Let's think about that for a moment.

I ask members of the house to go back to their constituencies after we rise and walk into any year 11 legal studies class and ask those students whether or not the state should conduct itself in an inquiry using the principles of procedural fairness. I bet you that each and every one of those young South Australian citizens would say yes.

In fact, I reckon that if you went to the local footy club, or the local soccer club, or netball club and spoke to the mums and dads or the players there and said to them, 'When the state is conducting an inquiry that could lead to your humiliation, your embarrassment—even imprisonment—should the state use procedural fairness in the conduct of its inquiry?' If you ask them if all of that should come with procedural fairness, I think that most people would say yes. I think that there are probably farming families who claim that there is not procedural fairness when others attempt to access land—maybe. Procedural fairness is one of those things that underpins democratic societies.

I am no expert on the rules of evidence, I am not an authority on the rules of evidence, but my understanding of the rules of evidence is that it has been borne out over a long, long, tortuous evolution from the Crown handing over power to a democratic institution, and through the separation of powers through the courts and the legislature, that we have established broad principles about what the rules of evidence should be and that those rules of evidence, again, define us differently from countries that are governed by regimes and dictatorships as opposed to western liberal democracies. I have to say that I am surprised that any lawyer, or anyone who has a love of the rule of law, would vote to repeal procedural fairness and the rules of evidence.

Then we get to the rules of the Magistrates Court. Why has the other place imposed the rules of the Magistrates Court on these proceedings? I am assuming, without delving into their minds, that they accepted the recommendation of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, which is that, again, if it looks like a court, acts like a court, most people think it is a court, so give it the rules of a court, otherwise you will not have justice, and I think that is probably right.

Why the Magistrates Court rules and not the Supreme Court or any other court rules? I think what they are attempting to do is to establish a set of rules and procedures for public inquiries to ensure that we protect witnesses from undue harm through false accusations. All you have to do is go to the ICAC Twitter site and look at a video of the ICAC commissioner talking about his first day of operations as ICAC commissioner when they went live. The first thing he said was, 'There are a whole heap of complaints that we received that had no place here,' which I take as they had no substance.

We are very lucky to have the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, a former Supreme Court judge and Federal Court judge as our ICAC commissioner, because I think he is a very, very good ICAC commissioner who can tell between what should be investigated and what should not be, but we are deciding legislation that could be in place for 20, 30, 40, 50 years. This parliament cannot predict who will be the next ICAC commissioner. This parliament cannot ensure that we always get the same calibre of the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, or the reviewers, Mr Sulan and his predecessor Mr Duggan, pre-eminent South Australian lawyers and judges—beyond reproach.

But we are not here to make law on the strategy based on hope that we keep on getting these good men or women to serve in these roles: we have to build a system that protects the public from the excesses of executive fear. That is our job. That is why the Crown is not allowed in this place. We are based on the Commons. Our job is to protect the public from the excesses of the Crown and to govern. That is our job.

I have grave concerns about all this, and I am sure that people with far greater legal expertise can make a better argument about this than I could, but I am speaking from the perspective of a layperson in the parliament who has seen firsthand the power that ministers can wield, and they wield it on behalf of the Crown.

We need to make sure that there are safeguards in place for the many who are not as privileged and not as powerful, and who are not able to defend themselves. That is why I think those three principles—procedural fairness, rules of evidence and rules of the Magistrate's Court—should be a no-brainer for all 47 of us. If the ICAC thinks that by operating under those circumstances he cannot undertake an appropriate inquiry, then conduct it in secret.

We are not limiting his ability to investigate maladministration or misconduct. What we are saying is: you are potentially ruining the reputations of innocent people who are going to have false accusations levelled at them—because they may end up being false. Remember, there is no recourse here. If someone accuses you of maladministration or misconduct and it is proven in the end that there was nothing there, all that is left are the images of the accusation. With the

permanency of the internet, those accusations never go away; they follow you to every job interview, to every bank loan, to every aspect of your future life. They cannot be washed away. We are in a digital age.

When I first came to this parliament, the parliamentary library kept detailed cuttings of events from all the papers from all across the country, such as *The Australian*, the *Financial Review*, *The News* and *The Advertiser*. If you wanted a record of what had happened—I can give you a modern-day example of this. I digress, but please forgive me, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Former prime minister John Howard used to be the treasurer under the Fraser government and he earned the moniker Honest John. Honest John was a sarcastic moniker because of the bottom of the harbour scheme. Over time, the Honest John moniker turned into a virtue, because there was no digital memory. He was Honest John. The nickname stayed but the meaning was lost.

In today's world, the accusation and the context remain in perpetuity because of the digital age. That is why the upper house saw fit to put these protections in place: because what is said cannot be unsaid. What is seen cannot be unseen. It cannot be taken away. Once it is out, it is out and there is nothing any of us can do to remedy that—nothing. Once the accusation is made against the powerful or the weak by a person under privilege, it cannot be undone.

The nature of ICAC inquiries is that they will be salacious. They will be sensational. They will be covered. They are newsworthy. Once the accusation is made against a minister, or a public servant, or a police officer, or a firefighter, or a nurse, or a doctor, or a teacher about maladministration and misconduct in public, it cannot be undone. There will always be people, no matter what the final report says, who will believe the accusation. There is nothing that we can do in this place to remedy that—nothing.

There are still people who believe that Lindy Chamberlain killed her baby Azaria. There are people who still believe that to this day. There are people who will not believe the final report. You have to say to yourself, if you are the subject of one of these inquiries in public and you are tested like steel in a furnace, and you come out after all the slings and arrows thrown at you, if it has not destroyed you financially, emotionally or psychologically, when you get out, with the 1,500-page report published by the ICAC, with four printed copies and a copy put online, the exoneration will not be as big as the accusation. So, unless you are prepared to carry the 1,500 page exoneration around with you for the rest of your life, all everyone else will have is the three-line accusation that was on page 1 or 2 or led the news that night ingrained in their brains. That is why the upper house saw fit to put these protections in place.

We oppose the Attorney-General's move to remove those three key pillars completely. We also believe that amendments Nos 8, 9 and 10 curtail the ability of legal practitioners to represent and defend their clients. The effect of the amendments filed by the Attorney-General is to limit the actions of legal practitioners to those approved by an ICAC commissioner. Who says the ICAC commissioner can choose your lawyer? Why? The DPP cannot choose your lawyer. If you are being charged by the DPP or being investigated by the police, they cannot tell you, 'No, you can't have this lawyer.' Who does the Crown think it is to tell members of the parliament that we can check your lawyer?

This parliament should not allow it. This house should absolutely refuse that amendment. I hope there are no lawyers in this house who think it is okay to have a higher authority vet your lawyer. We trust the bar, we trust the associations and we trust our universities to teach and train our lawyers—lawyers who have practice certificates and are legally allowed to operate in this state. You should be able to choose, unfettered, who your legal representation is, not from an approved list by the ICAC commissioner. That is completely unacceptable, and for any member of this house who thinks that is a good idea, I have grave concerns about their grasp of democratic principles. We oppose that.

I want to reinforce that we support the concept of public hearings. We think they are a good idea. Congratulations to the government on pushing forward the public hearings. We are here to help; all we are attempting to do is provide some balance, some fairness and, most importantly, some context. When sitting through the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee for the weeks and months that we were during this inquiry, there were people who gave evidence to us who were no

friends of the opposition: people who hold quite senior roles, I understand, in the Liberal Party. The Bar Association, to the best of my knowledge, has very rarely ever given evidence in a parliamentary inquiry and made recommendations; that is usually left to the Law Society.

To see someone of the calibre of Mr Edwardson QC—someone who I think is well known to members opposite—give his evidence and to hear the eloquence and passion he brought to that evidence and the principled position he argued from, we should hang all our heads in shame if we pass the amendments proposed by the Attorney-General. This is a man at the coalface. This is a man who has defended the guilty and the innocent on the basis of a cab-rank system, on the basis of fairness, on the basis of democratic principles and our judicial system. I think, without putting words into his mouth, what he found was that the bill was going too far.

Let's take a step back and talk a bit about the context of the ICAC altogether. We are seeing this debate now in the commonwealth parliament where the ICAC is being considered. I think it has even passed the Senate now and gone to the House of Representatives for consideration. The ICAC is basically a form of the executive. When I say 'the executive', it is not an independent arm of government. It is not like the courts. The ICAC is not independent.

The ICAC commissioner may be independent in his exercise of authority under the act, but what the ICAC really is, is the executive using legislation to investigate its employees which it defines as public officers. They are pretty remarkable powers, powers no other employer has. Woolworths does not have this power with their employees. I do not think even the police do because in any internal investigation with the police ultimately the rule of law would apply.

These are unique powers conferred upon the ICAC commissioner. I supported those powers being introduced but we put in a very big protection—closed hearings, closed investigations and secrecy provisions—for a couple of reasons. Why the secrecy? Well, the secrecy is there to allow the ICAC to do its job to investigate, sometimes covertly. They have the ability to tap phones and they have the ability to hack in to computers. The ICAC has no power in this parliament or the Legislative Council because of privilege and the ancient rites and customs that we have adopted from the mother parliament, as it should be.

The ICAC has no ability to infringe on privilege and an active example of that is Treasurer Lucas. Treasurer Lucas set an excellent precedent and I applauded him. I understand that the shadow treasurer at the time was given information by a public servant. I understand from media reports that the ICAC asked Mr Lucas to attend the ICAC to inform the ICAC who the individual was. Mr Lucas has been in this parliament since 1982. He understands privilege and he understands the role of a member of parliament and he quite rightly told the ICAC to mind its business and not to infringe on the rights and privileges of parliamentarians into discourse with their constituents. The matter ended there. An excellent precedent.

However, what is happening is that the executive believes that privilege, as a concept, is too broad, too large. Indeed, the ICAC commissioner himself, in the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, was advocating a restriction on privilege. People have died fighting for the rights of privilege. People who have never been afforded the right to privilege have fought and died to maintain it. So when the ICAC commissioner asks that privilege be limited in some matters in this chamber, in committees of this parliament, that should send alarm bells ringing because, if it could happen to the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, what will happen to the next person? Mr Lander is an expert on privilege and the supremacy of parliament. He has written essays and papers on it. He understands it better than almost anyone.

That is my concern with the overreach of the executive. This is not particular to the current Attorney-General or any attorney-general. This is not a Labor/Liberal thing. This is not a member for Bragg/member for Enfield evolution. This is the executive, whoever it is, attempting to increase its power and its reach and it should not be allowed. It should not be allowed. There need to be checks, which is why we are here. I do not know where this legislation will ultimately end. Without wishing to offend anyone, my instincts are that the Attorney-General's amendments in this house will be carried and that we are heading to a deadlock with the other place.

I do not know if the Attorney-General is willing to bend on these. Perhaps a suggestion could be that, in order to begin the first steps towards public hearings, we will leave the current

amendments in place to give the ICAC five or 10 years to bed in the practice, and we will have a review in five or 10 years' time on how the amendments given to us in this bill from the upper house operate in practice. How will procedural fairness, the rules of evidence, the right to a lawyer and the right to appeal a decision to appear before a public inquiry evolve in operation?

Perhaps the best thing for us to do over the next couple of years is take small steps, meaning that we allow the upper house to have its way, as offensive as that is for members of this place given that we always claim supremacy over the other house, although we are equal. Perhaps we should allow these amendments to operate for a while to see how they work. Then, if the Attorney-General could attach an amendment that may lead to a review of these procedures in five or 10 years' time, that is something that the opposition could be convinced about, I think.

But the idea that we would remove these protections and change our votes in the upper house will not occur. The opposition is committed to the rule of law. The opposition is committed to transparency and open hearings, but we are not going to allow the rights of the individual to be trampled. We are not going to allow the coercive power of the state to ruin people's lives—we just will not. One of the clauses in the ICAC Act gives the ICAC commissioner the ability to waive the secrecy requirements for people before it for emotional counselling. The reason is that, for people brought before the ICAC, it can be a life-altering process, especially if they are not of means to defend themselves or if they are not of the capability.

We were talking about public officers. The definition of public officers may be codified but can be expanded. If the ICAC commissioner believes that a contractor is a public officer, then they are, and they have two days to make an appeal to the Supreme Court—two to find a lawyer, write a submission and put it to the Supreme Court to say, 'I'm not a public officer. I'm not part of this tribunal. I'm not employed by the state.' These are the far-reaching implications of this bill passing in its current form if the Attorney-General's amendments are successful.

The opposition is concerned, given some of the answers that we have received from AGD on the briefings. Again, without wishing to offend anyone, there is a little bit of uncertainty within AGD and the Attorney-General's office about the consequence of some of the amendments. In my experience, if there are uncertainties about legislation, it is best for a pause because it is very hard to undo what is done.

Our shadow attorney-general lacks confidence in the briefings he has received about the precedent we are setting. My concern is that, if the amendments of the Attorney-General become law, that is the precedent and we will start seeing these precedents seep to other practices outside administrative tribunals and come into play in the court. That is of great concern.

In my experience, some young whippersnapper will get up here one day as attorney-general and say, 'Well, I'm surprised the opposition are opposed to this legislation. It's an operation in the ICAC Act; it has been for five years, or 10 years, or 20 years.' So what we do today has consequences not just for this bill, not just for people before the ICAC, but for other pieces of legislation, for other matters that will be considered, for other forms of judicial justice.

Given that we do not know who the Attorney-General is going to pick as the next ICAC commissioner, I have grave concerns, given that it will not be Bruce Lander, about the exercise of the power or authority the government bill attempts to give a new ICAC commissioner. It is probably unlikely that the Hon. Bruce Lander QC will conduct one of these inquiries in public, given that time is running out fast, unless he is granted an extension. We are not likely to have him, with all the weight and prestige, age and experience of a man who has lived and breathed the law since university and understands democratic principles and understands the rule of law, conduct himself in a public inquiry. We are going to get someone we do not know. It is the fear of the unknown.

That is the thing about making laws, that when you are in the cabinet generally you stick to your knitting and you stick to the area of your responsibility. I have not been in opposition for 16 years; indeed, I am the only member of the opposition who was in opposition previously. It is important to remember that being in opposition also means asking some of the difficult questions of the executive. Not that the executive wish to undermine democratic principles or judicial rules. It is just that, simply, they are now in a process of government which is all-encompassing and enveloping, and that process

can sometimes get things through the cracks. That is why it is our job to hold things to the light, point out inconsistencies, point out matters that are perhaps best left alone.

However, I have to say that I think the Attorney-General is actually someone who believes passionately in the rule of law. I believe that she does want to see no-one innocently accused and besmirched before and ICAC process. I do not think the Attorney-General believes that if the ICAC is given all these powers without the protections put in place by the upper house anyone will have their reputation damaged. I do not think the Attorney-General is setting out to deliberately create this monster. What I think is happening is inadvertent. We are all people of goodwill. We all take advice.

I have been in a room when the ICAC commissioner, the Hon. Bruce Lander, has advised the cabinet and we have taken that advice, and people have criticised us for taking that advice. So it is very easy to find yourself in a situation where you are acting against principles that you may have held dear because you are a person of goodwill and you actually want to make the system more accountable.

What is the Attorney-General's intent here? I think the intent is: we made an election commitment for open inquiries. Why the open inquiries? I assume because they want to make sure that justice is seen to be done as well as being done. I note that the Supreme Court is not televised. I wonder if the new Court of Appeal will be televised.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Attorney-General says the Supreme Court will be televised, so that is an interesting new development unless I misread what she said. The adversarial system that affords you all the protections is basically done untelevised, but the administrative tribunal that can coerce you to answer questions is publicised.

I believe these administrative tribunals that have coercive powers started at a commonwealth level with the National Crime Authority. I could be wrong about that. There could have been an earlier incarnation of that, but I understand that, to this date, those inquiries are still held in secret and that they overwhelmingly investigate criminal activity. I am not sure if the federal body that is being advocated in the House of Representatives as we speak calls for public or private hearings, but I have seen in practice the appalling outcomes of the ICAC in New South Wales and the damage that it has done to innocent individuals.

I contacted one of these individuals, a firefighter who had been falsely accused in the ICAC, and asked him to give evidence to our Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee about what he went through and what it did to his family. He was so scarred by the outcome of those inquiries that he could not even give written evidence to our inquiry. There is the other case of a very prominent Queen's Counsel in New South Wales who also had her good reputation ruined by the ICAC.

Just remember, in the end, ICACs do not send criminals to gaol: courts do. In the end, ICACs are no different from anti-corruption police or police officers. They are law enforcement. Law enforcement in this state for every other matter operates under principles and we watch them like hawks. In fact, we are so concerned about police overreach that the Police Complaints and Discipline Act is now overseen by the ICAC commissioner because of the awesome powers of the police, but even the general arrest powers that police have have checks and balances. What checks and balances does the ICAC commissioner have, other than the reviewer?

The reviewer, Mr John Sulan QC, who is a former justice of the Supreme Court, and his predecessor, Mr Kevin Duggan, have no permanent staff—none. In fact, both men use their former private secretaries to do their work and they pay for them at their own expense. They have no staff. They rely on the ICAC or the Attorney-General's Department to give them office space, but in terms of staff, they have none. They second ICAC staff, so the OPI is overseen by a reviewer who relies on the OPI to give him or her the information he is reviewing.

Our intelligence agencies have a very different type of review. They review intent. They review process. I have to say that, since I sat on the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, the overwhelming number of complaints we have received about the OPI or the reviewer are not about how they conduct their statutory roles. Hardly anyone complains about that. What they are

complaining about is what they do not do. The reviewer did not check this or the reviewer did not check that. The reviewer, quite rightly, says, 'That is not part of my scope.'

I think—and I say that arrogantly—what the public want out of a reviewer is much like what we have in our national security agencies with an inspectorate. The inspectorate ensures that Australians are not spied on and that listening devices, warrants and court orders are obtained appropriately. Most importantly, they check intent. No-one checks the intent of an ICAC commissioner: 'Why did you call this person? Why this person and not that person?' That is not done. There is no-one second-guessing or asking for review of conduct.

We are lucky we have the Hon. Bruce Lander QC. I sleep soundly at night in the knowledge that he is a man who will not exceed his powers. But I pose this question to you: what if the next person to sit in that chair is no Bruce Lander and they have these extraordinary powers that the Attorney-General wants to give them—not to conduct these inquiries in secret, but in public?

In my experience, conducting a public inquiry is enough to ruin someone, even if you cannot prove maladministration or misconduct. I would hate to think that that is the intent of wanting public inquiries. If the bar is just too high and they were to publish a report after a secret inquiry to find maladministration and misconduct, the way to get them perhaps is just to conduct the inquiry itself. Maybe that is enough to ruin a life, ruin a career and force a resignation. Maybe, in the grand scheme of things, that is justice. Not as we know it.

There are people the DPP prosecutes who get away with it because we cannot prove beyond a reasonable doubt that they are guilty of their offence. They take advantage of the democratic freedoms and the judicial freedoms that we have built over a lifetime. They are equal before the Crown and if you cannot prove it in a court, bad luck. Maybe the ICAC public hearings can get around that. All you have to do is conduct an inquiry—job done. Maybe you just have a gut instinct that they are guilty of something and all you have to do is hold the inquiry and level the accusations.

The person then resigns, is bankrupted through legal expenses, whatever it might be, job done, they are out and it is enough. You do not really need justice then, do you? It is just enough to have the trial or the administrative tribunal hearing in public. That is my concern and the opposition's concern, which is why we beseech the government to think of generations to come, to think of other innocent parties who could be ruined by this process. Without strengthening the reviewer, perhaps there could be some sort of broader role for a reviewer.

I would like to think that we do not need to do all this, and right now we do not. But, as time wears on, like any system, there is mission creep, the scope expands and budgets increase. The budget has increased dramatically for the ICAC—dramatically. I am not sure if people have seen the budget papers recently, but there has been a massive spike in funding for the ICAC even though the ICAC only does maladministration and misconduct inquiries if they are, and there is a certain definition, systemic or severe—I think that is the terminology; I cannot remember what it is—or corruption.

I monitor the ICAC. I am on the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee. I do not know how busy they are, but I do not see that many reports, whereas the Ombudsman is crying out for funds. It was pretty unprecedented to see Wayne Lines (I am not sure if he is a QC or not) make a plea to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee for funding. He is such an honourable man, he made no budget bid because he did not think it would be answered. That is what he claimed to the committee.

I do not blame the Attorney-General for him not having the funding. That is what he told the committee. If the Attorney-General is saying otherwise, that raises a great deal of concern for me because of the evidence that we were given. He made a plea because, with very limited staff, he does an overwhelming amount of cases on maladministration and misconduct inquiries referred to him by the ICAC.

The ICAC does not transfer any resources over for these inquiries, so let's be careful what we are building here. Let's have an eye to the future about what we are building here. What is the purpose? What is the intent of what we are building here? Why are we doing this? Let's always go back to first principles: why are we doing this? Is there a case where we are not getting justice by

having private inquiries? I think not. Okay, the public want public inquiries as does the government—fine. What is wrong with the protections we advocate? I am yet to hear a really good argument.

I am looking forward to the Attorney-General's closing remarks or the remarks from other members of this place who are much more learned than me about why we should not fear the ability of only having two days to appeal to the Supreme Court before being called before an ICAC inquiry or a public hearing, why we should not allow the ICAC commissioner to vet which lawyer we can choose, why we should not have the principles of procedural fairness apply to an inquiry, why we should have nothing to fear from that, why we should have nothing to fear from the rules of evidence applying in public inquiries or why should we not even fear the rules of the Magistrates Court applying to public inquiries.

That becomes the real question. The real question becomes: why are we doing this? Does the outcome that we are going to get give us a better opportunity to catch people who commit maladministration and misconduct? I think not. But I accept that the public have a right to see what is going on when they have their money being spent at such an enormous rate as we are in the ICAC, but that does not mean that the state has the right to destroy people's lives.

The compromise that the Legislative Council is offering this house is: have your public inquiries, the public can see the ICAC commissioner in operation, they can see the public officers being forced to answer questions, or being interrogated or whatever the terminology is, and you can see your money being spent. But the government do not want that. What the government want is what you would see in a private ICAC inquiry in public where witnesses are not afforded the right to silence.

Think about that for a moment. Think about the fact that you are not afforded the right to silence in a public, filmed, televised inquiry that looks like a court proceeding. Think of what that will do to public discourse in this state. Think about the ICAC commissioner giving you a list of approved lawyers that you can choose from. I have to say that I cannot believe that this is even here, let alone that I am the one arguing against it because I would have thought that the processes of both political parties would get the point where we would say this is just too much.

I get that it is politically popular to have public ICAC inquiries but it is also politically short-sighted because of the potential damage it does to individuals, let alone the damage it may do to government ministers. This is another piece of nuance that I will share with the house: the opposition is arguing against its own interests because the truth is that it will not be any of us before a public inquiry: it will probably be a member of the government first.

As I said earlier, His Honour the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, will not be around for much longer and probably will not start a public inquiry if this bill passes in the manner the Attorney-General wants it to pass. He will not have time. He will set the ground rules, build the tribunal with the crest, the elevated chair, the glass, the microphones and Hansard taking notes. He will get all that ready and looking like a courtroom, but he will not actually do it. It will be someone else. The cynic in me, the political operative in me, says, 'Let this pass.' Let's see the Premier in a public inquiry answering questions. That always goes well for political leaders. Let's see the Minister for Industry and Skills or even the Attorney-General in a public inquiry.

The thing about being a political leader is that you have a big target painted on your back and sometimes people make unsubstantiated claims that are believable even though they have no basis in fact or reality. There are people who are arguing with us outside the parliament to let this pass, 'Let this pass. Let the government have its public inquiries.' The broader principle is about making sure that we protect the innocent, not the politicians, because politicians are big enough and ugly enough to look after themselves. Do you want me to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A couple more minutes, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Give me the cue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We need to read a message before 6 o'clock, that is all.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is it an important message?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: They are all important.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is it from the other place? They can wait, sir. They can wait. There are those who are telling us, 'Let the government have its way for political expediency because you may well get a minister.' Remember, there is no statute of limitations. It might be someone on this side, or it might be someone who had a royal commission find that they breached the ministerial code of conduct.

How would that go in a televised display, where a minister is answering questions without a lawyer, without the right to silence, without the ability to go to a court and say, 'I'm being called here unfairly and unreasonably'? Or maybe it is being done in secret so you can ascertain whether or not there should be an inquiry. Or even to go through the entire process of the inquiry and in the end find there is nothing actually there.

Forget ministers—no-one has any sympathy for ministers or parliamentarians, and nor should they. We have awesome responsibilities and awesome powers and we are paid exceptionally well. But think of the ASO2. Think of the contractor. Think of the council employee. Think of the middle manager who is attempting to procure the savings that have been imposed by the cabinet. That middle manager is out there making cuts to services, creating enemies. An aggrieved party then makes a complaint to the ICAC and all of a sudden they need a lawyer, they cannot afford a lawyer, they are being televised live on air and their life is ruined.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Unlike you, who had a QC.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is right. Or like the Attorney-General, who used government stationery to write personal defamation letters, or who was the subject of a police inquiry as to whether or not she broke the law.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: By you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I did not ask the police commissioner; the police commissioner is independent. I do note that currently there is a Renewal SA staffer who has been charged for revealing information about a secret ICAC inquiry—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Being charged?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —whereas the number one law officer in the state gets to walk scot-free. But, anyway, I digress.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is a most outrageous allegation by the member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order, Attorney?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Asserting in relation to my 'walking free', in relation to allegations—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You did walk free.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, look—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I insist that there be an apology and a withdrawal of that statement.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point of order, Attorney. Member for West Torrens, I ask you to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise and withdraw, sir: the Attorney-General was not charged subsequent to her anti-corruption police investigation.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: That is a disgrace.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Why? It is true; you were not charged.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: You are a disgrace, Tom.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, you have withdrawn and apologised—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: —and I thank you for that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are welcome, sir; I am happy to help.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Given that it is two minutes to 6 o'clock—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I seek leave to continue my remarks, sir.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILD-LIKE SEX DOLLS PROHIBITION) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Thursday 12 September 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS**

1049 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Noting that the emergency department dashboard only provides real-time and not collated/historical data, how many patients waited more than 24 hours for a bed in a public hospital emergency department in each month as per below:

- (a) January 2019?
- (b) February 2019?
- (c) March 2019?
- (d) April 2019?
- (e) May 2019?
- (f) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Data on emergency department performance is published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, and reported in real time on the SA Health Emergency Department Dashboard.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

1050 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Noting that the emergency department dashboard only provides real-time and not collated/historical data, how many mental health patients waited more than 24 hours for a bed in a public hospital emergency department in each month as per below:

- (a) March 2019?
- (b) April 2019?
- (c) May 2019?
- (d) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Data on emergency department performance is published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, and reported in real time on the SA Health Emergency Department Dashboard.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

1051 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given that there is no historical information available on the SA Health Dashboard website, what was the longest wait (in hours) recorded for a patient in emergency for a bed for the following months:

- (a) January 2019?
- (b) February 2019?
- (c) March 2019?
- (d) April 2019?
- (e) May 2019?
- (f) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Data on emergency department performance is published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, and reported in real time on the SA Health Emergency Department Dashboard.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

1052 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given that there is no historical information available on the SA Health Dashboard website, what is the number of mental health admissions in metro Adelaide public hospital emergency departments in the following months:

- (a) January 2019?
- (b) February 2019?
- (c) March 2019?

- (d) April 2019?
- (e) May 2019?
- (f) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Data on emergency department performance is published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, and reported in real time on the SA Health Emergency Department Dashboard.

EMERGENCY CODES

1053 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given that no such information is published, how many code black (security incidents) events were called at the RAH for each of the following months:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The data requested is under preparation and will be provided at a later date.

EMERGENCY CODES

1054 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given that no such information is published, how many Code Black (security incidents) events were called at the Flinders Medical Centre for each of the following months:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The data requested is under preparation and will be provided at a later date.

EMERGENCY CODES

1055 Mr PICTON (Kurna) (23 July 2019). Given that no such information is published, how many Code Black (security incidents) events were called at the Lyell McEwin Hospital for each of the following months:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The data requested is under preparation and will be provided at a later date.

EMERGENCY CODES

1056 Mr PICTON (Kurna) (23 July 2019). Given that no such information is published, how many Code Black (security incidents) events were called at the Modbury Hospital for each of the following months:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The data requested is under preparation and will be provided at a later date.

EMERGENCY CODES

1057 Mr PICTON (Kurna) (23 July 2019). Given that no such information is published, how many Code Black (security incidents) events were called at the Noarlunga Hospital for each of the following months:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?

- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The data requested is under preparation and will be provided at a later date.

EMERGENCY CODES

1058 Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (23 July 2019). Given that no such information is published, how many Code Black (security incidents) events were called at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for each of the following months:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The data requested is under preparation and will be provided at a later date.

EMERGENCY CODES

1059 Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (23 July 2019). Given that no such information is published, how many Code Black (security incidents) events were called at the Women's and Children's Hospital for each of the following months:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The data requested is under preparation and will be provided at a later date.

EMERGENCY CODES

1060 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given that no historical information is published on SA Health Dashboards, between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019 on which exact days did the following at some stage reach Code White:

- (a) RAH emergency department?
- (b) Flinders emergency department?
- (c) Lyell McEwin emergency department?
- (d) Modbury Hospital emergency department?
- (e) Noarlunga Hospital emergency department?
- (f) Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department?
- (g) Women's and Children's Hospital emergency department?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

This information is reported daily, in real time, on the SA Health Emergency Department Dashboard.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

1061 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). For each of the following months, how many public elective surgery patients received treatment in a private hospital at the expense of the state government:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?
- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

As part of the government's commitment of \$45 million to reduce overdue lists for elective surgery and colonoscopies a number of contracts have been negotiated with a range of private providers. As of 21 July, there were 615 patients remaining on the overdue list, down 68 per cent from 20 March.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

1062 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). For each of the following months, how much money was spent by the state government to private hospitals for the treatment of public elective surgery patients:

- (a) July 2018?
- (b) August 2018?
- (c) September 2018?
- (d) October 2018?
- (e) November 2018?
- (f) December 2018?
- (g) January 2019?
- (h) February 2019?
- (i) March 2019?

- (j) April 2019?
- (k) May 2019?
- (l) June 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

As part of the government's commitment of \$45 million to reduce overdue lists for elective surgery and colonoscopies a number of contracts have been negotiated with a range of private providers. As of 21 July, there were 615 patients remaining on the overdue list, down 68 per cent from 20 March.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

1063 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare does not publish monthly breakdowns of the total number of elective surgery operations by jurisdiction, how many elective surgery operations on public health patients were performed in public hospitals for each of the following months:

- (a) November 2017?
- (b) December 2017?
- (c) January 2018?
- (d) February 2018?
- (e) March 2018?
- (f) April 2018?
- (g) May 2018?
- (h) June 2018?
- (i) July 2018?
- (j) August 2018?
- (k) September 2018?
- (l) October 2018?
- (m) November 2018?
- (n) December 2018?
- (o) January 2019?
- (p) February 2019?
- (q) March 2019?
- (r) April 2019?
- (s) May 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

As part of the government's commitment of \$45 million to reduce overdue lists for elective surgery and colonoscopies a number of contracts have been negotiated with a range of private providers. As of 21 July, there were 615 patients remaining on the overdue list, down 68 per cent from 20 March.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

1064 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given that no publicly available statements reference the exact amount of flu vaccinations in SA Health storage as at Friday 26 April, what is this number?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to public statements by the minister and health sector management.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

1065 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Notwithstanding the relative frequency of conversations between the minister and the Chief Medical Officer, clinicians and management responsible for influenza vaccinations—on what precise dates were updates or briefings (written or verbal) provided to the minister on flu vaccinations?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The minister speaks frequently with the Chief Medical Officer, clinicians and management responsible for influenza vaccinations.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

1066 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide a breakdown of unfulfilled GP orders -during 2019 how many orders from GPs for flu vaccines were not fulfilled with the full number of vaccines requested?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

1067 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide information as to the details of each individual vaccination order—on what date in 2019 was the first order provided to a GP with less vaccines than was ordered?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

1068 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide information as to the details of each individual vaccination order—on what date in 2019 was the last order provided to a GP with less vaccines than was ordered?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

1069 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23 July 2019). Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide information as to the details of vaccination orders broken down by individual GP practice—what are the postcodes of GP practices where during 2019 less flu doses were provided than were ordered?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

1071 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (31 July 2019). As at 1 July 2019, how many FTEs work for the country health Rural Support Service?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Approximately 208 FTEs worked for the Rural Support Service at 1 July 2019.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

1072 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (31 July 2019). As at 1 July 2019, what is the breakdown by number of staff by job classification for the country health Rural Support Service?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Stream	Staff
Administrative Services	157

Stream	Staff
Manager Administrative Services	6
Registered Nurse/Midwife	27
Allied Health Practitioners	23
Medical Scientists	4
Medical Officers	3
Executive	1
Technical Services	1

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

1073 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (31 July 2019). As at 1 July 2019, what is the breakdown of staff for the country health Rural Support Service by the following office locations:

- (a) Adelaide metropolitan area?
- (b) Nuriootpa?
- (c) Other country locations (please specify)?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Of the approximate 222 Rural Support Service staff, 107 staff are based in regional South Australia while around 115 staff are based in Adelaide.

We expect more staff to move to the regions over time.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

1074 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (31 July 2019). What is the 2019-20 expenditure budget for the country health Rural Support Service?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The 2019-20 expenditure budget for the Rural Support Service is currently in development.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

1075 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (31 July 2019). How many staff of the country health Rural Support Service earn over \$100,000 per annum?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Approximately 111 staff employed in the Rural Support Service earn over \$100,000, which includes base salary, entitlements and superannuation.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

1076 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (1 August 2019). Given the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing do not provide a breakdown of unfulfilled GP orders—during 2019 what was the largest gap between the number of doses ordered by a GP for the flu vaccine and the number of doses provided?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

KAURNA ELECTORATE MINISTERIAL VISIT

1101 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (10 September 2019). Between the dates of 18 March 2018 and 18 July 2019 has the Minister for Environment and Water visited the electorate of Kaurna?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): Since 22 March when the Marshall Liberal government's cabinet was sworn in, seven ministers have personally visited the Kaurna electorate. I can advise that I am one of the seven ministers that has visited.

KAURNA ELECTORATE MINISTERIAL VISIT

1102 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (10 September 2019). On what dates and at what locations has the Minister for Environment and Water visited the electorate of Kaurna from 18 March 2018 to 18 July 2019?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I visited Kaurua on the following occasions:

- 2 June 2019—reopening of the Old Noarlunga Bridge, on the Onkaparinga River
- 21 June 2019—met Friends of Moana group, Friends of Onkaparinga.

BUDGET CARRYOVERS

1320 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11 September 2019). What operating carryovers were approved for the 2019-20 budget, by agency?

1. How much were these carryovers?

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

These questions have been addressed in the response provided to the estimates question on underspend on operating programs (omnibus question 11).

BUDGET CARRYOVERS

1321 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11 September 2019). What investing carryovers were approved for the 2019-20 budget, by agency?

1. How much were these carryovers?

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

These questions have been addressed in the response provided to the estimates question on underspend on investing or capital projects (omnibus question 12).

ADELAIDE CITY DEAL

1340 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11 September 2019). Has a formal agreement been signed between the state and commonwealth governments for the Adelaide City Deal?

- (a) What is the nature of the agreement? Is it a national partnership agreement, or some other form of agreement?
- (b) What are the terms of the agreement?
- (c) Which projects are the subject of the agreement?
- (d) Does the agreement specify how much funding the commonwealth will contribute to each project in the agreement?
- (e) Does the agreement specify how much funding the state will contribute to each project in the agreement?

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

The Adelaide City Deal is an intergovernmental agreement that I signed with the Prime Minister, the Hon. Scott Morrison MP, and the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Sandy Verschoor, on 19 March 2019. The details of the deal are publicly available on the commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities website: <https://citydeals.infrastructure.gov.au/adelaide>

The Adelaide City Deal is currently in an implementation phase. During this phase an implementation plan will be developed, agreed by City Deal partners, and finalised by the end of 2019. A formal project agreement (which is a type of National Partnership Agreement) under the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations will be executed with the commonwealth by the end of 2019. It is intended that, as is the usual practice, once finalised, the project agreement will be made available on the Council on Federal Financial Relations website.

The total commonwealth contribution under the Adelaide City Deal is \$174 million. As set out in the 2019-20 state budget, the commonwealth funding contribution to, or through, the state is as follows:

Projects	Forward Estimates	Total funding
	\$m	\$m
Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery at Lot Fourteen	13	85
International Centre for Tourism, Hospitality and Food Studies at Lot Fourteen	27	30
Innovation Hub at Lot Fourteen	7	20
Indigenous innovation and incubation hub at Lot Fourteen	3	3
Establish a Heysen Gallery at Hahndorf	9	9
Visitor Centre at Carrick Hill House at Springfield	3	3
New trails across southern Adelaide linking major natural and cultural attractions, including improved access and digital wayfinding	2	2

Projects	Forward Estimates	Total funding
Smart City infrastructure across Adelaide City*	3	10
Total	67	162

*This funding will be on-passed to the City of Adelaide who are also contributing \$12.6 million to the Adelaide City Deal to deliver smart technology initiatives in the Adelaide city centre for residents, businesses and visitors

The commonwealth is also providing funding to establish the Space Discovery Centre (\$6 million) and Mission Control (\$6 million) facilities at Lot Fourteen. Although these form part of the City Deal, the funding for these elements will not flow through the state as they will be managed through commonwealth government entities (the Australian Space Agency and Questacon).

The state's contribution to the City Deal includes \$364 million already committed for demolition, site remediation and refurbishment works at Lot Fourteen. In addition, as re-affirmed in the 2019-20 state budget, the state government has committed \$65 million towards the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery (total project cost to be determined) and \$30 million towards the International Centre for Tourism, Hospitality and Food Studies.

PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE

1375 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (1 August 2019). For 2018-19, how many patient separations were for patients utilising private health insurance at each of the following:

- (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital
- (b) The Queen Elizabeth Hospital
- (c) Modbury Hospital
- (d) Lyell McEwin Hospital
- (e) Flinders Medical Centre
- (f) Noarlunga Hospital
- (g) Women's and Children's Hospital
- (h) Country Health hospitals

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to the state budget papers.

PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE

1376 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (1 August 2019). For 2017-18, how many patient separations were for patients utilising private health insurance at each of the following:

- (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital
- (b) The Queen Elizabeth Hospital
- (c) Modbury Hospital
- (d) Lyell McEwin Hospital
- (e) Flinders Medical Centre
- (f) Noarlunga Hospital
- (g) Women's and Children's Hospital
- (h) Country Health hospitals

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The member is referred to the state budget papers.

BAKEWELL, JONATHAN

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 July 2019).

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

Ms Eileen Culleton wrote to me on 8th March 2019. As this matter relates to Correctional Services I referred the matter to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. My understanding is that the minister replied directly to Ms Culleton 11th April 2019.

The Chair of the Parole Board wrote to Ms Culleton on 23rd April. I understand that in this letter the Parole Board made an offer to meet with Ms Culleton in person.

Estimates Replies

ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been provided the following advice:

From 18 March 2018 to 30 June 2018, there were 101 recruitments of self-identified Aboriginal people to a public sector position (the data available to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment does not identify whether these people were new to the public sector or were current employees). No self-identified Aboriginal people were recruited by South Australia Police (SAPOL) during this period.

Aboriginal employment data from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 is currently being compiled by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment for inclusion in the 2018-19 Workforce Information Report. This report will be published in 2019.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

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

There are currently 15 jobs available on the Veterans Employment Program portal.

CONSULTANCY FEES

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

The consultancy fees paid to Mr Wayne Eagleson were allocated from the supplies and services allocation on Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 19.

LOT FOURTEEN

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): The area that the Australian Space Agency is directly occupying is 480 square metres on level 3 in the McEwin Building.

The total gross floor area of level 3 of the McEwin Building is approximately 1,124 square metres.

An adjoining tenancy area for aligned industry and research entities is 242 square metres.

There are shared facilities totalling 161 square metres, and base-building areas (lobby, stairs, building plant etc) of 241 square metres.

PUBLIC SECTOR, ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

The Commissioner for Public Sector Employment does not collect data on the number of public sector roles that are open only to people of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.

AUSTRALIAN SUBMARINE CORPORATION JOBS

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

ASC Pty Ltd employs about 1,350 personnel (employees), including approximately 930 employees at ASC's operations at Osborne Naval Shipyard—North.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

The 55 FTE cap in the budget papers is made up of 42 FTE for Arts and ArtLab, and 13 FTE for corporate overheads.

As at 30 June 2019, the 42 FTE equates to a headcount of 50 people which is inclusive of part-time employees.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS EXPENSES AND STAFFING

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

The 2019-20 Budgeted Employee Expenses for Multicultural Affairs includes \$472,000 (3 FTEs) of corporate overhead expenditure.

Corporate overhead expenditure includes FTE effort relating to finance, procurement, records management, human resources, facilities, communications, project management and ICT services to support the operations of Multicultural Affairs.

As instructed by the Department of Treasury and Finance, corporate expenditure is allocated across agency programs. The allocation across programs for the department's agency statement is based on each program's FTE weighting.

Programs that transfer as a result of machinery of government have corporate expenditure allocated based on actuals transferred with the Program. Allocations in line with the Department of Treasury and Finance model occur in the year following the transfer.

Multicultural Affairs transferred to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet on 1 July 2018, so overhead related employee expenses for the 2018-19 Budget are based on actual overheads transferred to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet from the Department for Human Services for 2018-19.

For 2019-20 overheads are allocated in line with the Department of Treasury and Finance model.

The remaining increase in budgeted expenses allocated to employee expenses from 2018-19 Original budget to 2019-20 budget (\$19,000) is due to indexation.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr BROWN (Playford)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were 17 executive roles abolished within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. During this period there were 4 executive roles created. They were:

Abolished

- Executive Director, Arts South Australia (SAES2)
- Director, Cultural Heritage and Assets (SAES1)
- Director, Arts Industry and Finance (SAES1)
- Director, Modern Workplace (SAES1)
- Executive Director, Machinery of Government (SAES2)
- Deputy Chief Executive, Premier's Policy and Strategy (SAES2)
- Project Director, Europe Strategy (SAES1)
- Executive Director, Government Communications and Engagement (SAES2)
- Director, Program Governance (SAES1)
- Chief ICT & Digital Strategist (SAES1)
- Director, Strategic Projects Advice (SAES1)
- Director, Office of the Economic Development Board (SAES1)
- Director, Justice and Legislative Reform (SAES1)
- Director, Engagement (SAES1)
- Director, Cloud Implementation (SAES1)
- Director, Implementation and International (SAES1)

- Director, Strategic Advice (SAES1)

The total employment cost for these 17 roles was \$3,676,632 (excluding on-costs).

Created

- Director, Multicultural Affairs (SAES1)
- Director, Finance (SAES1)
- Director, ICT Services (SAES1)
- Executive Director, Population Strategy (SAES1)

The total employment cost for these 4 roles was \$767,018 (excluding on-costs).

Infrastructure SA

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were 0 executive roles abolished within Infrastructure SA. During this period there was 1 executive role created. This was:

- Chief Executive, Infrastructure SA (SAES 2)

The total employment cost for this role was \$297,308 (excluding on-costs).

Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were nil executive roles abolished within the Office of the SA Productivity Commission. During this period there were two executive roles created. They were:

- Chief Executive, Office of the SA Productivity Commission (EXEC0F)
- Deputy Chief Executive, Office of the SA Productivity Commission (SAES2)

The total employment cost for these roles was \$324,187.50 (excluding on-costs).

Defence SA

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were 0 executive roles abolished within Defence SA. During this period there were 0 executive roles created.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr BROWN (Playford)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2018-19 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr BROWN (Playford)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet:

- At 30 June 2019, 29.52 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$3.275 million.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2019-20	25.75	\$3.12 million
2020-21	25.75	\$3.18 million
2021-22	25.75	\$3.24 million
2022-23	25.75	\$3.31 million

Infrastructure SA

- At 30 June 2019, 0 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$0.

Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission

- At 30 June 2019, 0 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$0.

Defence SA

- At 30 June 2019, 4.0 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$483,000.
- Costs in 2018-19 higher than subsequent years due to two staff on maternity leave incurring some additional costs and extra temporary resource recruited during the year to alleviate pressure with three major events in rapid succession.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2019-20	3.0	366,000
2020-21	3.0	365,000
2021-22	3.0	372,000
2022-23	3.0	378,000

- As an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr BROWN (Playford)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Assistant Director, Multicultural Affairs	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$8,065

The above allowance paid to the Assistant Director, Multicultural Affairs, ceased to be paid on 26 April 2019.

Infrastructure SA

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Director, Office of the SA Productivity Commission	SAES1	Executive M/V Long term hire	\$4,232.45
Director, Office of the SA Productivity Commission	SAES1	Fuel Costs	\$911.79
Director, Office of the SA Productivity Commission	SAES1	Executive car parking charges	\$765.00

Defence SA

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Administration staff	AS05 04	Attraction	\$13,411.06
Safety Systems Manager	AS07 04	Retention	\$294.84

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr BROWN (Playford)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following, in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Ministerial staff employed as at 5 July was published in the *Government Gazette* on 18 July 2019.

The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2019:

Title	ASO Classification	Non-salary benefits
Correspondence Lead	ASO7	Nil
Cabinet Officer	ASO5	Nil
Senior Administrative Officer	ASO5	Nil
Administrative Officer	ASO4	Nil
Correspondence Officer	ASO3	Nil
Reception/Correspondence Officer*	ASO3	Nil

* Denotes maternity leave

- There are no staff seconded from the department to my office as at 30 June 2019.

TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **Mr BROWN (Playford)** (24 July, 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Four executive level employees were terminated from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019.

The total value of the early termination payment components made was \$568,553.66.

Infrastructure SA

Nil executive level employees have been terminated from Infrastructure SA since 1 July 2018.

Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission

Nil executive level employees have been terminated from the Office of the SA Productivity Commission since 1 July 2018.

Defence SA

Nil executive level employees have been terminated from Defence SA since 1 July 2018.

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT CHANGES

In reply to **Mr BROWN (Playford)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

Machinery of government changes are undertaken on a no budget impact basis, with resources for functions being transferred from one agency to another.

Information on the transfer of resources between departments during 2018-19 as a result of machinery of government changes is published at the agency level in the 2019-20 Agency Statements.

No agency has received additional budget supplementation for machinery of government changes since 1 July 2018.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (29 July 2019): (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised of the following:

The Courts Administration Authority has not created or abolished any executive positions with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more during 2018-19.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (29 July 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised of the following:

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were no executive roles abolished within the Electoral Commission SA. During this period there were no executive roles created.

COMMERCIAL AND ECONOMICS FUNDING

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

I refer to the state budget 2019-20, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, Page 47 which cites a reduction of expenses for DPC of \$22.1 million relating to machinery of government changes. The amount of \$1.079 million (2018-19), including 6.5FTE, was transferred to the Department of Treasury and Finance which relates to the Economics section.

FUNDS SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

For the year ended 30 June 2019, total fund manager fees were \$202.9 million.

FLEET VEHICLES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

As per Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 159, the number of vehicles projected to be purchased during 2018-19 was 2,393.

The estimated result for 2018-19 indicates that 2,457 vehicles would be purchased during 2018-19. The estimated increase of 64 vehicles was based on the number of vehicles that were due for replacement at the time the estimate was made.

The actual result for 2018-19 was that 2,345 vehicles were purchased during 2018-19, 112 less than the estimated result of 2,457 vehicles. The decrease in the number of vehicles purchased was as a result of agencies deciding to hold off on replacing their vehicles while they review potential reductions.

FUNDS SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Funds SA assesses total investment related fees/costs incurred by calculating an indirect cost ratio (ICR). The ICR represents the total investment costs/expenses as a percentage of funds under management and is a standard expense measurement tool used in the funds management and superannuation industry. Types of fees/costs included in Funds SA's ICR include:

- Fund Manager fees, including performance fees
- Fees/costs incurred by underlying funds in which Funds SA is directly or indirectly invested
- Transaction costs
- Corporate expenses
- Custody fees

For the year ended 30 June 2019, the total ICR incurred by Funds SA was 0.88 per cent, or \$8,800 per \$1 million. For the year ended 30 June 2019, total fund manager fees were 0.62 per cent, or \$202.9 million. Across the Funds SA investment options, the range of fees paid directly by Funds SA to investment managers for the year ended 30 June 2019 were as follows:

- Cash, 0.05 per cent
- Capital Defensive, 0.30 per cent
- Conservative, 0.35 per cent
- Moderate, 0.50 per cent
- Balanced, 0.60 per cent
- Growth, 0.66 per cent
- High growth, 0.67 per cent
- Defined benefit strategy, 0.79 per cent

All returns earned by Funds SA investors are reported after the payment of fees.

A summary of funds under management (by manager as at 30 June 2019) is attached.

Fund Manager	Total Funds SA FUM
Macquarie	\$2,397,102,199
Vinva	\$1,813,071,284
AMP	\$1,571,217,725
Investors Mutual	\$1,453,621,655
MFS	\$1,307,358,917
Greencape Capital	\$1,286,115,279
LSV	\$1,232,833,427
Northcape Capital	\$1,195,865,522
Harding Loevner	\$1,168,802,106
Dexus	\$1,153,607,211
Mondrian	\$1,126,366,860
Invesco	\$1,104,073,706
AQR	\$1,000,304,453
BlackRock	\$906,019,711
GMO	\$837,219,355
Bridgewater	\$804,165,261
Colonial First State	\$801,547,013
Ardea	\$795,008,202
Utilities Trust of Australia	\$742,264,767
Vanguard	\$683,285,025
Colchester	\$676,882,992
Columbia	\$666,998,539
Wellington	\$604,082,853
Ethical Partners	\$567,249,411
Investa	\$524,996,591
Brandywine	\$506,315,339
Touchstone	\$496,029,534
GPT	\$405,352,845
Ares	\$399,271,475
Brandywine	\$396,230,169
Internal (cash accounts)	\$394,143,973
LGT	\$393,681,226
Oak Hill	\$388,733,950
Genesis	\$366,410,221
Funds SA (internally managed assets)	\$309,282,099
Global Infrastructure Management, LLC	\$258,533,977
Lord Abbett	\$256,442,375
Bain Capital Partners LLC	\$238,610,540
Putnam	\$215,034,375
Adams Street Partners LLC	\$209,219,802
Ocean Avenue Capital Partners LP	\$207,011,305

Fund Manager	Total Funds SA FUM
Palisade	\$194,080,887
Pantheon Ventures Ltd	\$190,021,279
EQT Funds Management Ltd	\$188,880,259
Cerberus Capital Management, LP	\$181,759,318
Warburg Pincus LLC	\$134,657,109
Siguler Guff & Company LLC	\$109,450,816
Lend Lease	\$107,340,460
Permira Debt Managers Ltd	\$104,686,814
EIG Alternative Investments LLC	\$82,755,691

PLEASE NOTE: the fund managers detailed above cover the top 50 by Funds SA funds under management. Funds SA utilises managers beyond this cohort however, the funds under management of those outside the top 50 is small by comparison.

INSURANCE CLAIMS, AVERAGE DURATION

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The average duration for property claims from SAicorp Insurance Fund 1 is 2.3 years.

The average duration for liability claims from SAicorp Insurance Fund 1 is 4.6 years.

The average duration for medical malpractice claims from SAicorp Insurance Fund 1 is 8.1 years.

The average duration for all claims from SAicorp Insurance Fund 1 is 7.3 years.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Estimated administrative savings from the closure of the Motor Accident Commission over the forward estimates are shown in the below table:

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Saving (\$'000s)	\$1,969	\$2,256	\$2,320	\$2,386

These estimated savings result from a reduction in corporate costs. All funding for road safety activities has been maintained.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

There was no up-front fee received from Berkshire Hathaway.

The transaction involves the outstanding claims liabilities transferring to Berkshire Hathaway's National Indemnity Company, so that all the risks of managing these liabilities were transferred to Berkshire Hathaway.

A reinsurance premium of \$717.7 million was paid to Berkshire Hathaway's reinsurance arm National Indemnity Company (NICO), comprising an initial provisional payment of \$715.2 million calculated in December 2018, and a subsequent \$2.5 million 'True-up' payment made on 10 April 2019. The true-up payment reflects the claims outcomes, management expenses, and other calculations per the terms of the reinsurance deed with BH, which is available online.

MASTER MEDIA PANEL

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The suppliers appointed to the master media panel contract administered by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet are:

- Wavemaker Australia Pty Limited;
- Carat SA Pty Ltd; and
- Reprise Media (a division of Mediabrands Australia Pty Ltd).

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

- The successful tenderer for the across government mainframe services contract was DXC Technology Australia Pty Ltd; and
- The successful tenderer for the across government travel management services contract was QBT Pty Ltd.

The new electricity metering contract has yet to be signed by the parties and therefore it is not appropriate to disclose the name of the successful tenderer at this time. This information will be published on the SA Government Tenders and Contracts Website once the contract is executed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Net debt of each PNFC entity is shown in table 5.6, page 81 of Budget Paper 3.

The amount of debt estimated to be borrowed by PNFC entities from SAFA across the forward estimates is provided in the table below.

Entity	2020 Budget (\$million)	2021 Estimate (\$million)	2022 Estimate (\$million)	2023 Estimate (\$million)
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority	1	7	19	25
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	43	43	43	43
Adelaide Venue Management Corporation	382	382	382	382
SA Water Corporation	7043	7104	7213	7384
Urban Renewal Authority (Renewal SA)	305	243	206	193
West Beach Trust	9	9	9	8
Total PNFC Borrowings	7783	7789	7873	8036

Other than SAFA, HomeStart Finance is the only PFC entity that holds debt.

As at 30 June 2019, HomeStart Finance had debt to SAFA of \$2.04 billion. It is expected that HomeStart debt will be maintained around that level over the forward estimates.'

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

SAFA's outstanding debt is projected to decrease from \$21.4 billion at June 2019 to \$20.0 billion at 30 June 2020.

After 30 June 2020, SAFA's outstanding debt is projected to increase as follows:

- \$21.0 billion at 30 June 2021;
- \$23.4 billion at 30 June 2022; and
- \$26.2 billion at 30 June 2023.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The 2019-20 guarantee fee rate for the Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia is 0.20 per cent per annum.

The 2019-20 guarantee fee rate for Primary Industries and Regions SA is 0.55 per cent per annum.

The 2019-20 guarantee fee rate for the entities listed below is 0.99 per cent per annum:

- Adelaide Cemeteries Authority
- Adelaide Convention Centre
- Adelaide Festival Centre Trust
- Adelaide Venue Management Corporation
- HomeStart Finance
- Renewal SA
- SA Water
- Scope Global
- West Beach Trust

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

\$141.592 million in guarantee fees were received from PNFCs and PFCs in 2018-19.

The guarantee fee received from each PNFC and PFC in 2018-19 is provided in the table below.

Entity	Guarantee Fee Paid
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority	\$21,113.43
Adelaide Convention Centre	\$6,090,037.60
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	\$138,481.36
HomeStart Finance	\$29,730,773.90
Renewal SA	\$14,319,627.80
SA Water	\$91,156,880.11
West Beach Trust	\$136,042.33

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

SAFA's gross funding task for 2019-20 is \$5.2 billion. As the timing and issue of debt by SAFA is subject to market conditions, the number and terms of each issue for 2019-20 is not yet known. However on 1 August 2019, SAFA announced it would be looking to issue up to \$500 million of the August 2024 Select line during the month. Further information on SAFA's 2019-20 funding strategy can be found on SAFA's website at:

https://www.safa.sa.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/96162/SAFA-2019-20-Annual-Funding-Program-.pdf

SUPER SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Super SA is currently undertaking the actuarial evaluation to identify the defined benefit valuation for each of these schemes as part of its annual reporting to parliament.

The table below sets out the number of active members in each of the defined benefit schemes.

Scheme	Number of members
Pension Scheme	559
Lump Sum Scheme	3,172
Parliamentary Scheme PSS1 and PSS2	8
Judges' Scheme	47
Governors' Scheme***	0

***Under the Governor's Pensions Act 1976, the Treasurer may authorise the payment of a pension to a former Governor, at the rate of up to 30 per cent of the former Governor's salary. The current Governor is not an active member of the scheme.'

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The Commissioner for Public Sector Employment (the Commissioner) is available to lead or advise on the recruitment of public sector chief executives.

Where the commissioner leads the recruitment of a public sector chief executive, she determines whether internal resources or an external recruitment agent are used for the recruitment process, depending on the circumstances of the role. Costs associated with an external recruitment agent and advertising are either paid directly by the respective public sector agency, or paid by the commissioner in the first instance and then cost recovered from the respective public sector agency.

In 2018-19, the total cost incurred by the commissioner—and later cost recovered from the respective public sector agency—from using external recruiting agents for chief executive recruitment was \$117,252. This included:

- \$42,533 paid to Stillwell Management Consultants for the Chief Executive, Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure process (includes advertising cost)
- \$46,999 paid to Hender for the Chief Executive, Department for Environment and Water process (includes advertising cost)
- \$26,400 paid to VUCA for the Chief Officer, South Australian Country Fire Service process. A further \$1,320 was paid to Wavemaker, a media agency, for advertising fees for this process.

Additionally, the below chief executive recruitment costs incurred in 2018-19 were directly invoiced to the respective public sector agency:

- \$29,700 for the Chief Executive, Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment process
- \$6,101 for the Chief Officer, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service process.

The total cost of the above chief executive recruitments was \$153,053. This included advertising fees, totalling \$21,970. Other chief executive recruitment processes undertaken in 2018-19 involving the Commissioner were supported internally by her office.

CONVEYANCE DUTY REVENUE

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Over the period from 2020-21 to 2022-23, conveyance duty revenue is forecast to grow by around 7 per cent per annum on a policy neutral basis, reflecting expected growth in the number and price of residential and primary production property transfers.

Approximately half of the forecast conveyance duty revenue growth is due to expected growth in transactions, with the remaining growth in revenue reflecting projected growth in prices.

BUDGET CONTINGENCY PROVISIONS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The general government sector budget holds a contingency provision over the forward estimates to maintain the overall size of the government's investing budget. While agency investing budgets typically decline over the forward estimates as approved projects are scheduled to finish, the contingency provision will rise as the unallocated component of the general government sector budget increases.

Consistent with past practice of previous governments, we do not disclose these general contingency provisions.

TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

- As part of the 2018-19 budget process, the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) was allocated new savings measures of \$12.061 million commencing in 2018-19.
- DTF has achieved its savings targets for 2018-19.
- The following strategies have been implemented to meet the savings targets for 2018-19:
- FTE reductions associated with general efficiencies, organisation restructures and work reprioritisations of business units across the department
- FTE reductions associated with the identification of and the abolition of long-standing vacant positions

- FTE reductions associated with a reduction in ministerial chauffeurs
- Reduction in general goods and services expenditure
- Reduction in SafeWork SA vehicle fleet and associated FBT cost
- Recovery of car parking costs from staff at SafeWork SA and associated FBT cost
- Removal of the ground floor front counter in RevenueSA
- Abolishment of the Young Workers Legal Services Funding Program and WHS Representative Training Subsidies Program of SafeWork SA
- A rationalisation of computer program licenses across the department
- Increased compliance revenue resulting from both industry specific support and the implementation of a taxpayer education strategy.'

PUBLIC SERVICE ENTERPRISE AGREEMENTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The enterprise agreements which are due to nominally expire in the 2019-20 financial year and their expiration dates are:

- Nursing/Midwifery (South Australian Public Sector) Enterprise Agreement 2016 which has a nominal expiry date of 1 September 2019.
- TAFE SA Educational Staff Enterprise Agreement 2016 which has a nominal expiry date of 20 October 2019.
- South Australian Public Sector Wages Parity Enterprise Agreement (Plumbing, Metal and Building Trades Employees) 2016, which has a nominal expiry date of 14 December 2019.
- South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Enterprise Agreement 2017, which has a nominal expiry date of 1 January 2020.
- South Australian Modern Public Sector Enterprise Agreement: Salaried 2017, which has a nominal expiry date of 30 January 2020.
- ForestrySA Enterprise Agreement 2018, which has a nominal expiry date of 22 April 2020.
- South Australian Public Sector Wages Parity Enterprise Agreement: Weekly Paid 2017, which has a nominal expiry date of 30 June 2020.
- Adelaide Festival Centre Performing Arts Centre Enterprise Agreement 2018, which has a nominal expiry date of 30 June 2020.
- Adelaide Festival Centre Professional and Administration Agreement 2018, which has a nominal expiry date of 30 June 2020.
- Rail Commissioner Tram Operations Enterprise Agreement 2018, with a nominal expiry date of 30 June 2020.
- Rail Commissioner Rail Operations Enterprise Agreement 2016, with a nominal expiry date of 30 June 2020.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

As at 24 July 2019, there were 25 vacancies within SafeWork SA. Nine of these related specifically to the creation of a new structure, with the remainder being established roles vacant on an ongoing or term basis due to natural attrition.

SHARED SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The following table highlights the public authorities that used the services provided by Shared Services during 2018-19 and those that did not.

Agency	Payroll Services	Accounts Receivable	Accounts Payable	Financial Services
Aboriginal Lands Trust	N	N	N	
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority	N	N	N	
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	N	N	N	
Adelaide Festival Corporation	N	N	N	
Adelaide Venue Management Corporation	N	N	N	
Art Gallery Board	Y	Y	Y	
Attorney-General's Department	Y	Y	Y	
Auditor-General's Department	Y	N	N	
Australian Children's Performing Arts	N	N	N	
Australian Energy Market Commission	N	N	N	
Carrick Hill Trust	Y	Y	Y	
Construction Industry Training Board	N	N	N	
Commissioner for Children and Young People	Y	N	Y	
Courts Administration Authority	N	N	N	
CTP Insurance Regulator	Y	Y	Y	
Dairy Authority of South Australia	N	N	N	
Defence SA	Y	Y	Y	
Department for Child Protection	Y	Y	Y	
Department for Correctional Services	Y	Y	Y	
Department for Education	Y	Y	Y	
Department for Energy and Mining	Y	Y	Y	
Department for Environment and Water	Y	N	Y	
Department for Innovation and Skills	Y	Y	Y	
Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment	Y	Y	Y	
Department of Human Services	Y	Y	Y	
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Y	Y	Y	
Department of Primary Industries and Regions	Y	Y	Y	
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	Y	Y	Y	
Department of Treasury and Finance	Y	Y	Y	
Distribution Lessor Corporation	N	N	N	
Education & Early Childhood Registration & Standards Board	Y	N	N	
Electoral Commission of South Australia	Y	N	N	
Environment Protection Authority	Y	N	Y	
Essential Services Commission	Y	Y	Y	
Funds SA	Y	N	N	
Generation Lessor Corporate	N	N	N	
Green Industries SA	Y	N	Y	
History Trust of SA	Y	Y	Y	
HomeStart Finance	N	N	N	
Industry Advocate	Y	Y	Y	
Infrastructure South Australia	Y	Y	Y	
Legal Services Commission	N	N	N	
Libraries Board of South Australia	N	N	N	
Lifetime Support Authority	Y	Y	Y	
Local Government Finance Authority	N	N	N	
Lotteries Commission of SA	N	N	N	
Museum Board	Y	Y	Y	
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	Y	Y	Y	
Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment	Y	Y	Y	
Parliament SA	Y	N	N	
Public Trustee	Y	N	N	
Return to Work SA	N	N	N	
SACE Board of SA	Y	N	Y	
SA Country Fire Service	Y	Y	Y	
Small Business Commissioner	Y	Y	Y	
South Australia Police	Y	Y	Y	
South Australian Country Arts Trust	N	N	N	
South Australian Film Corporation	N	N	N	

Agency	Payroll Services	Accounts Receivable	Accounts Payable	Financial Services
South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission	Y	Y	Y	
South Australian Forestry Corporation	N	N	N	
South Australian Government Financing Authority	Y	Y	Y	
South Australian Housing Trust	Y	N	Y	
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service	Y	Y	Y	
South Australian Productivity Commission	Y	Y	Y	
South Australian State Emergency Service	Y	Y	Y	
South Australian Tourism Commission	Y	Y	Y	
South Australian Water Corporation	N	N	N	
State Governor's Establishment	Y	N	Y	
State Opera of South Australia	N	N	N	
State Theatre Company of South Australia	N	N	N	
Study Adelaide	N	N	N	
Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia	N	N	N	
TAFE SA	Y	Y	Y	
Teachers' Registration Board	N	N	N	
TechInSA	N	N	N	
Transmission Lessor Corporation	N	N	N	
Urban Renewal Authority (Renewal SA)	Y	N	N	
West Beach Trust	N	N	N	
SA Health—Country Health SA	Y	Y	Y	
SA Health—Central Adelaide Local Health Network	Y	Y	Y	
SA Health—Department for Health and Wellbeing	Y	Y	Y	
SA Health—Northern Adelaide Local Health Network	Y	Y	Y	
SA Health—SA Ambulance Service	Y	Y	Y	
SA Health—Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	Y	Y	Y	
SA Health—SA Mental Health Commission	Y	Y	Y	
SA Health—Women's and Children's Health Network	Y	Y	Y	

SHARED SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

A charge is only applied for processing a formal employee TVSP request that has been authorised by an appropriate agency representative.

The charges applied for 2018-19 are set out below:

TVSP Request Type	Charges 2018-19
Simple Calculation	\$410
Complex Calculation/Data Cleansing	\$744
Recalculation	\$119

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Budget Paper 4 provides the consultancy budget for each agency.

Expenditures and details on contracts to be awarded cannot be known ahead of procurement being undertaken. As a result, information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total value of contract and nature of services provided, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies at the relevant time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

PNFC and PFC agencies are charged a guarantee fee rate that reflects the general cost differential between an agency borrowing with the benefit of a government guarantee, versus an agency borrowing on a 'standalone' basis.

The guarantee fee rate is calculated using the spread between SAFA's credit rating and an agency's allocated rating band, utilising reference points from the four year term to maturity rating curve within the Standard & Poor's investment grade credit rating bands of BBB, A, and AA.

All PNFC and PFC agencies that borrow from the Treasurer or SAFA are charged the same guarantee fee. For 2019-20, the guarantee fee rate is 0.99 per cent.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The information is available on the SA Tenders and Contacts website.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The unsolicited proposal (UP) Process is governed by the Unsolicited Proposal Framework and Guidelines in place since October 2014. It consists of three steps:

Step 1: Application and investigation step

The initial step allows a proponent to lodge an unsolicited proposal, which enables the committee to form a view as to whether further consideration of the unsolicited proposal is warranted.

Step 2: Exclusive negotiations and business case

This step involves detailed consideration of the feasibility of the proposal.

Step 3: Contract negotiation

The contract negotiation step allows the government and the proponent to negotiate final legal and commercial terms then prepare and execute formal project documentation.

On 31 January 2018, the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) received the Berkshire Hathaway (BH) unsolicited proposal (Proposal). From this date, DTF undertook due diligence activities with the findings provided to the Unsolicited Proposals Committee (UPC). The UPC determined that all five criteria had been met and made a recommendation to Cabinet that the Proposal proceed to step 2. Cabinet approved the progression of the Proposal from step 1 to step 2 on 25 June 2018 with BH notified of approval to Step 2 on 27 June 2018.

During step 2 of the UP Process, I met with executives from National Indemnity Company (Berkshire Hathaway's reinsurance arm) at Old Parliament House on 31 July 2018. The meeting included DTF Executive staff (Chief Executive, Executive Director Commercial and Economics Branch (CEB), and Project Director CEB), as well as members of my Ministerial Staff.

This session signalled the government's commitment to undertake detailed due diligence of a potential transaction proceeding. Consistent with the unsolicited proposal guidelines, no negotiations occurred. Negotiations occurred separately between DTF and BH during step 3 of the unsolicited proposal process.

Cabinet approved the BH unsolicited proposal on 26 November 2018 with the state and BH executing the contractual documents (completion of step 3) on 7 December 2018.

FLEET VEHICLES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The number of private plated vehicles is 1,219. The number of blue plated vehicles is 5,596.

The typical monthly cost per agency is:

Agency	Spend (GST Inc)
Justice (includes SAPOL vehicles)	\$1,935,000
Department for Health and Wellbeing	\$1,372,000
SA Water	\$753,000
Department for Education	\$621,000
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	\$554,000
Department of Human Services	\$518,000

Agency	Spend (GST Inc)
Department for Environment and Water	\$432,000
Department for Child Protection	\$382,000
Department of Treasury and Finance	\$303,000
Department of Primary Industries and Regions	\$256,000
TAFE SA	\$160,000
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	\$145,000
Attorney-General's Department	\$64,000
Department for Energy and Mining	\$55,000
Department for Innovation and Skills	\$35,000
Forestry SA	\$30,000
Environment Protection Authority	\$23,000
Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment	\$15,000
Parliament	\$11,000
South Australian Tourism	\$11,000
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	\$5,000
Grand Total	\$7,680,000

The above costs include the lease rate, fuel and operating costs.

FLEET VEHICLES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The total number of vehicles held by each agency as at 30 June 2019 are:

Split by Agency	Total
Justice (includes SAPOL Vehicles)	1526
Department for Health and Wellbeing	1501
Department for Education	624
Department of Human Services	555
SA Water	527
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	459
Department for Child Protection	392
Department for Environment and Water	363
Department of Treasury and Finance	251
Department of Primary Industries and Regions	193
TAFE SA	149
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	61
Attorney-General's Department	56
Department for Energy and Mining	47
Department for Innovation and Skills	25
Environment Protection Authority	22
Forestry SA	22
Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment	17
Parliament	10
South Australian Tourism	9
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	6
Grand Total	6815

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The standard requirements as set out in the South Australian Industry Participation Policy and associated guidelines are applied in the establishment of across government contracts.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

During 2018-19, SAFA issued \$3.75 billion in long-term fixed rate interest bonds. The terms of each issue are provided in the table below.

Month of Issue	Maturity Date	Coupon per cent	Amount Issued \$billion	Yield per cent
July 2018	24 May 2028	3.0	1.0	3.120
September 2018	22 September 2022	1.5	0.5	2.430
September 2018	20 July 2026	3.0	0.5	2.9525
November 2018	24 May 2028	3.0	1.0	3.205
February 2019	24 May 2030	2.75	0.75	2.885

SAFA also issued \$2.0 billion in short-term discounted securities at various rates with maturities between 1 and 6 months.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The government accepts all recommendations, with the exception of recommendation 1, which is accepted in part, and recommendation 22, in respect of which the government will form its final position after a 3 month trial of body cameras.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

The FTE count at 30 June 2019 will be published in the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment's Workforce Information Report for 2018-19, which will be released later this year.

As previously advised, because the numbers are notional, forward estimates are not included by agency in budget statements across the forward estimates. However each agency statement provides an estimate for the budget year's FTEs for their agency.

The total FTE levels and total employment cost for each year of the forward estimates can be located within Tables 2.9 and 2.6 respectively of the 2019-20 Budget Statement. FTE reductions associated with the savings measures announced in the 2019-20 budget are summarised in Table 2.10 of the 2019-20 Budget Statement, with details of the measures at the agency level provided in the 2019-20 Budget Measures Statement.

The FTE reductions are however notional and based on estimates of how the savings across the forward estimates may be delivered. Chief executives have the flexibility to deliver the savings in the manner that best suits the needs of the business. As a result, the actual level of FTE reductions over the forward estimates may vary. What is important is that agencies manage within their overall budget allocation.

In respect to the question on TVSPs, the government does not have a TVSP target for FTEs. TVSPs are only one means by which an agency might reduce its FTEs. Agencies can deliver FTE reductions and savings by not replacing people who have taken up other employment, retired, or otherwise have separated from the agency. The TVSP budget itself is not set at the agency level. Instead a central budget allocation of \$60 million has been included in 2019-20 as a provision to assist agencies in meeting the cost of TVSPs to the end of December 2019.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Department of Treasury and Finance

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were seven executive roles abolished within the Department of Treasury & Finance. They were:

- Director Performance & Value Analysis, SAES1
- Director, Policy & Governance, SAES1
- Program Director, End User Computing, SAES1
- Director Policy Standards & Governance, SAES1
- Chief Operating & Procurement Officer, SAES2
- Director, Projects and Transformation, SAES1
- Director, Strategic Procurement, SAES1

The total annual employment cost for these seven roles was \$1,105,737 (excluding on-costs). During this period there were seven executive roles created. They were:

- Senior Manager Finance Operations (Lifetime Support Authority), EXEC0A
- Director People & Culture Strategy (Super SA), SAES1
- Director Brand and Member Engagement (Super SA), SAES1
- Director Finance & Business Transformation (Super SA), SAES1
- Director People & Performance, SAES1
- Director Commercial Projects, SAES2
- Executive Director Industrial Relations and Policy, SAES2

The total annual employment cost for these seven roles was \$1,146,013 (excluding on-costs).

Note: Does not include roles created or abolished as a result of staff movements in and out of DTF due to machinery of government changes.

Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were zero executive roles abolished within the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. During this period there were two executive roles created. They were:

- Project Director, Transition (SAES1)
- Chief Human Resources Officer (SAES2)

The total employment cost for these two roles was \$598,258 (excluding on-costs).

Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there was 1 executive role abolished within the CTP Insurance Regulator's Office. During this period there were zero executive roles created. They were:

- Director, Scheme Performance (SAES1)

The total full year employment cost for this position is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised of the following by my departments:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and *non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019:

Department of Treasury and Finance

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Principal Researcher	PO6	Attraction	\$ 3,271
Senior Actuarial Analyst	ASO8	Retention	\$11,022
Director, Payroll Services	SAES1	Retention	\$14,356
Manager Return to Work	MAS3	Retention	\$ 9,533
Principal Mining Engineer	PO3	Retention	\$12,156
Principal Mining Engineer	PO3	Retention	\$12,156
Senior Quantitative Analyst SAFA	ASO8	Attraction	\$47,988
Director, Brand & Member Engagement	SAES1	Access to car park	\$ 4,560
Director, People & Culture Strategy	SAES1	Access to car park	\$ 4,560
Director, Finance & Business Transformation	SAES1	Access to car park	\$ 4,560
Ministerial chauffeurs		Access to a car park and mobile phone	

Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Chief Executive	SAES2	Car Park	\$2,860

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Director, Scheme Operations	SAES1	Car Park	\$2,290
(former) Director, Scheme Performance	SAES1	Car Park	\$2,290

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Ministerial staff employed as at 5 July was published in the *Government Gazette* on 18 July 2019.

The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2019

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
Office Manager	ASO8	Car park
Executive Assistant to the Treasurer	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer*	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer including Cabinet	ASO6	Nil
Parliamentary Officer	ASO4	Nil
Senior Business Support Officer	ASO4	Nil
Correspondence Officer	ASO2	Nil
Correspondence Officer	ASO2	Nil

* Denotes maternity leave

[Note—non-salary benefit could be a description or value (ie car park)]

The following table lists staff seconded from the department to my office as at 30 June 2019.

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
N/A		

[Note—a seconded employee is an employee who is paid for by the department and not the Minister's Office]

TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following by my departments:

Department of Treasury and Finance

Five executive level employees have been terminated from the Department of Treasury and Finance since 1 July 2018.

The total value of the termination payments made was \$797,602.

Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator

1 executive level employees have been terminated from the CTP Insurance Regulator's Office since 1 July 2018.

The total value of the termination payments made was \$72,194.

Details of the separation payments of these former executive employees will not be released as it is considered an unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Department of Treasury and Finance

Since 1 July 2018, the following new executive appointments were made within the Department of Treasury and Finance.

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Executive Director, Industrial Relations and Policy	SAES2

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Director, Finance & Business Transformation (Super SA)	SAES1
Director, Brand & Member Engagement (Super SA)	SAES1
Director, Compliance & Enforcement (SafeWork SA)	SAES1
Director, People and Culture Strategy (Super SA)	SAES1
Director, Services (LSA)	EXECSA
Senior Manager, Finance Operations (LSA)	EXECSA
Director, Corporate (LSA)	EXECOB
Director, Secretariat for Board of Treasurers	SAES1

The total annual employment cost for these executive appointments was \$1,777,778 (excluding on-costs).

Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment

Since 1 July 2018, the following new executive appointments were made within the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Project Director, Transition	SAES1
Chief Human Resources Officer	SAES2

The total employment cost for these executive appointments was \$598,258 (excluding on-costs).

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

As at 30 June 2018 (the latest available data), agencies have reported a total of 16 excess employees to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

The time that each employee has been excess and their salary, as at the date of declaration, are as follows:

- One employee excess for 3 months with \$116,867 annual salary
- One employee excess for 3 months with \$86,633 annual salary
- One employee excess for 7 months with \$101,658 annual salary
- One employee excess for 7 months with \$104,707 annual salary
- One employee excess for 7 months with \$106,507 annual salary
- One employee excess for 8 months with \$99,122 annual salary
- One employee excess for 8 months with \$63,368 annual salary
- One employee excess for 9 months with \$94,543 annual salary
- One employee excess for 9 months with \$88,420 annual salary
- One employee excess for 11 months with \$84,497 annual salary
- One employee excess for 14 months with \$88,097 annual salary
- One employee excess for 18 months with \$93,911 annual salary
- One employee excess for 18 months with \$90,359 annual salary
- One employee excess for 18 months with \$90,359 annual salary
- One employee excess for 18 months with \$82,409 annual salary
- One employee excess for 27 months with \$43,268 annual salary.

Each employing chief executive is responsible for their excess employees including any employment decisions.

Data on excess employees as at 30 June 2019 is currently being compiled by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. The Commissioner will publish this data in 2019 as part of the annual State of the Sector report.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

The following table details (for all agencies) operating carryover expenditure amounts approved by cabinet into 2019-20, and amounts not approved by cabinet as part of the 2019-20 budget.

Table 1—2019-20 Budget Carryover Requests from 2018-19—Operating (\$000s)

Agency	Approved into 2019-20	Approved into Future Years	Not approved
Attorney-General	665	327	—
Child Protection	2,826	-316	2,527
Defence SA	7,822	—	—
Education	845	—	140
Energy and Mining	21,280	10,665	—
Environment and Water	5,409	—	—
Health and Wellbeing	1,408	136	300
Human Services	36	—	715
Innovation and Skills	735	1,032	—
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	7,471	1,177	—
Police	193	385	—
Premier and Cabinet	537	—	1,847
Primary Industries and Regions	3,143	50	—
Total	52,370	13,456	5,529

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The following information is provided on behalf of all Ministers:

The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

The following table details (for all agencies) investing carryover expenditure amounts approved by cabinet into 2019-20, and amounts not approved by cabinet as part of the 2019-20 Budget.

Agency	Approved into 2019-20	Approved into Future Years	Not approved
Attorney-General	9,448	—	—
Child Protection	3,570	—	-
Courts	2,002	-	-
Education	20,863	-7280*	-
Environment and Water	12,840	—	-
Environment Protection Authority	789	-	-
Health and Wellbeing	19,510	14,802	477
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	267,997	53,573	-
Police	639	—	-
Premier and Cabinet	4,326	—	-
Treasury and Finance	3,194	—	—
Total	345,178	61,095	477

* \$7.3 million brought forward from 2022-23 into 2019-20 and is part of the \$20.9 million in that year.

INVESTING EXPENDITURE PROJECTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

The following tables provide the budgeted expenditure across 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 for each individual investing expenditure project in the general government sector and public non-financial corporation sector.

Agency/Title		2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Premier and Cabinet					
Major Project					
Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—AFC Upgrade	1,700	3,600	—	—	
Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—AFC Technical Equipment	2,326	—	—	—	
Arts Storage	1,612	—	—	—	
Womens Memorial Playing Fields	4,000	—	—	—	
Adelaide Superdrome Upgrades	4,100	—	—	—	
Home of Football at State Sports Park	10,000	4,000	—	—	
Annual Program					
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	1,390	882	904	927	
Capital Investment Program—Arts SA	848	743	762	780	
Government Information and Communication Technology Services	6,362	6,625	6,791	6,960	
Annual Program—DPC					
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	1,334	1,183	1,213	1,243	
State Governor's Establishment	128	131	134	137	
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust					
Major Project					
Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Technical Equipment	2,247	—	—	—	
Her Majesty's Theatre Redevelopment	6,666	—	—	—	
Attorney-General					
Major Project					
SA Computer Aided Dispatch System	3,516	—	—	—	
SA Government Radio Network	18,482	—	—	—	
Ombudsman SA office accommodation—fit out	1,200	—	—	—	
GPO Tower—10 Franklin Street—office fit out	26,608	—	—	—	
Liquor Licensing full fee structure	60	—	—	—	
Response Unit for the Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety	150	—	—	—	
Forensic Science SA—CT Scanner	2,050	—	—	—	
Annual Program					
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	655	1,486	1,523	1,561	
State and Public Safety Communications Infrastructure	244	250	256	262	
Courts					
Major Project					
Electronic Court Management System	4,686	3,509	—	—	
Higher Courts Redevelopment	20,585	—	—	—	
Judge View	591	—	—	—	
Annual Program					
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,177	2,249	2,323	2,399	
Electoral Commission					
Annual Program					
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	51	52	148	100	
Public Trustee					
Annual Program					
Hardware	60	550	75	80	
Machines and Equipment	28	46	—	—	
Furniture and Fittings	54	56	57	60	
Software	174	123	154	130	
Child Protection					
Major Project					
Residential Care Facilities	2,252	—	—	—	
Leasehold, ICT Equipment and Furniture	1,318	—	—	—	
Education					
Major Project					
Escalations	5,432	—	—	—	
New Projects					
Sust Schl—Unley High School	9,016	14,507	7,834	1,054	
Sust Schl—Aberfoyle Park High School	1,670	4,991	2,942	203	
Sust Schl—Additional demountable capacity	—	11,897	1,125	—	
Sust Schl—Additional disability capacity	1,560	5,503	3,138	58	
Sust Schl—Adelaide Secondary School of English	800	3,000	1,100	—	
Sust Schl—Aldinga Beach B-7 School	95	800	3,000	1,100	

Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Sust Schl—Ardtornish Primary School	—	—	95	800
Sust Schl—Australian Science & Mathematics Sch	75	670	2,250	—
Sust Schl—Balaklava High School	500	2,700	700	—
Sust Schl—Banksia Park International HS	1,485	4,496	2,872	—
Sust Schl—Belair Primary School	—	—	95	800
Sust Schl—Black Forest Primary School	—	—	95	800
Sust Schl—Blackwood High School	1,067	5,003	2,433	356
Sust Schl—Brighton Primary School	95	800	3,000	1,100
Sust Schl—Ceduna Area School	500	2,700	700	—
Sust Schl—Charles Campbell College	4,794	6,008	—	—
Sust Schl—Christies Beach HS & Sth Voc College	1,300	4,200	2,200	150
Sust Schl—Clare High School	800	3,000	1,100	—
Sust Schl—Craigmore High School	1,488	5,580	4,141	674
Sust Schl—Cummins Area School	500	2,700	700	—
Sust Schl—East Marden Primary School	595	3,000	3,000	900
Sust Schl—Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School	1,034	706	—	—
Sust Schl—Elizabeth North Primary School	—	95	800	3,000
Sust Schl—Elizabeth Vale Primary School	595	3,000	3,000	900
Sust Schl—Findon High School	1,893	5,000	2,900	200
Sust Schl—Fregon Anangu School	5,000	8,300	2,200	100
Sust Schl—Gawler and District College B-12	1,613	4,880	3,049	271
Sust Schl—Glenelg Primary School	—	145	1,100	4,000
Sust Schl—Glenunga International High School	1,812	15,025	12,127	122
Sust Schl—Golden Grove High School	2,140	5,160	4,147	300
Sust Schl—Golden Grove Primary School	—	—	115	1,000
Sust Schl—Grange Primary School	115	1,000	3,600	1,280
Sust Schl—Grant High School	1,082	4,002	1,617	153
Sust Schl—Greenwith Primary School	—	—	95	800
Sust Schl—Hallett Cove School	1,706	5,020	2,874	206
Sust Schl—Hamilton Secondary College	1,500	4,500	2,850	—
Sust Schl—Heathfield High School	1,441	5,633	2,366	234
Sust Schl—Henley High School	2,236	5,501	3,521	565
Sust Schl—Highgate School	95	800	3,000	1,100
Sust Schl—John Pirie Secondary School	1,700	5,000	2,900	200
Sust Schl—Kadina Memorial School	670	2,100	150	—
Sust Schl—Kapunda High School	3,091	5,606	4,666	1,480
Sust Schl—Kingston Community School	500	2,700	700	—
Sust Schl—Le Fevre High School	1,750	190	—	—
Sust Schl—Loxton High School	800	3,000	1,100	—
Sust Schl—Magill School	145	1,100	4,000	1,750
Sust Schl—Mannum Community College	55	1,750	190	—
Sust Schl—Mark Oliphant College (B-12)	1,026	1,504	—	—
Sust Schl—Mawson Lakes School	—	—	115	1,000
Sust Schl—Mitcham Girls High School	785	3,007	1,112	—
Sust Schl—Mitcham Primary School	95	800	3,000	1,100
Sust Schl—Modbury High School	1,100	4,000	1,600	150
Sust Schl—Moonta Area School	500	2,700	700	—
Sust Schl—Mount Barker High School	1,000	3,600	1,160	120
Sust Schl—Mount Barker Primary School	3,000	3,000	900	—
Sust Schl—Mount Compass Area School	603	3,539	2,750	948
Sust Schl—Mount Gambier High School	981	3,609	1,175	122
Sust Schl—Murray Bridge High School	5,700	9,700	4,300	200
Sust Schl—Murray Bridge North School	—	—	95	800
Sust Schl—Naracoorte High School	800	3,000	1,100	—
Sust Schl—Norwood Morialta High School	3,398	12,289	20,099	3,866
Sust Schl—Nuriootpa High School	507	2,917	910	—
Sust Schl—Nuriootpa Primary School	3,000	3,000	900	—
Sust Schl—Ocean View P-12 College	800	3,000	1,100	—
Sust Schl—Para Hills High School	800	3,000	1,100	—
Sust Schl—Parafield Gardens High School	1,700	5,000	2,900	200
Sust Schl—Parafield Gardens R-7 School	115	1,000	3,600	1,280
Sust Schl—Paralowie School	3,968	4,049	3,396	—
Sust Schl—Playford International College	3,313	11,069	838	—
Sust Schl—Plympton International College	670	2,100	150	—

Agency/Title		2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Sust Schl—Port Augusta Secondary School	506	2,916	1,094	—	
Sust Schl—Port Lincoln High School	1,138	5,257	8,016	553	
Sust Schl—Reidy Park Primary School	—	94	800	3,000	
Sust Schl—Renmark High School	800	3,000	1,100	—	
Sust Schl—Reynella East College	1,690	4,997	2,914	201	
Sust Schl—Roma Mitchell Secondary College	542	6,957	7,644	—	
Sust Schl—Roxby Downs Area School	1,100	4,000	1,600	150	
Sust Schl—Salisbury High School	1,663	4,989	2,952	204	
Sust Schl—Seaford Secondary College	1,300	4,200	2,200	150	
Sust Schl—Seaton High School	5,628	8,818	4,809	703	
Sust Schl—Seaview High School	1,821	7,283	2,841	—	
Sust Schl—Settlers Farm Campus R-7	—	—	95	800	
Sust Schl—Springbank Secondary College	1,893	5,000	2,900	200	
Sust Schl—Stradbroke School	145	1,100	4,000	1,750	
Sust Schl—The Heights School	1,670	4,991	2,942	203	
Sust Schl—Trinity Gardens School	115	1,000	3,600	1,280	
Sust Schl—Underdale High School	5,700	9,700	4,300	200	
Sust Schl—Urrbrae Agricultural High School	1,668	4,989	2,945	204	
Sust Schl—Victor Harbor R-7 School	800	3,000	1,100	—	
Sust Schl—Warradale Primary School	595	3,000	2,999	900	
Sust Schl—West Lakes Shore School R-7	—	—	94	800	
Sust Schl—Westbourne Park Primary School	—	—	94	800	
Sust Schl—Willunga High School	1,750	190	—	—	
Sust Schl—Wirreanda Secondary School	2,347	5,484	3,030	—	
Sust Schl—Woodcroft Primary School	—	115	999	2,749	
Sust Schl—Woodend Primary School	—	—	94	800	
Sust Schl—Woodville High School	1,655	4,952	2,973	227	
Voluntary Amalgamations	11,150	—	—	—	
Site Funded Works	1,500	—	—	—	
Children's Centres—Stage 2	500	1,240	—	—	
National Quality Agenda—Compliance	2,300	—	—	—	
SACE Modernisation	1,781	1,460	—	—	
Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics Facilities in Schools (STEM)	6,422	—	—	—	
Whyalla Secondary Education Renewal	17,000	60,000	22,000	—	
Adelaide High School	1,144	9,302	7,502	—	
Brighton Secondary School	936	7,139	5,716	—	
Glossop High School Redevelopment	3,500	10,000	3,462	120	
Annual Program					
School Bus Replacement	1,240	1,271	1,303	1,336	
Major Feasibility Studies	494	506	519	532	
Capital Works Assistance Scheme—Investing	3,004	3,081	3,517	3,605	
Purchase of Land and Property	1,241	1,272	1,304	1,337	
SACE Board	121	124	127	130	
Emergency Repairs—Investing	225	—	—	—	

Agency/Title		2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
TAFE SA					
Major Project					
Purchase of TAFE Sites	619,293	—	—	—	
Annual Program					
Purchase of Plant and Equipment—TAFE SA	1,583	1,714	1,757	1,801	
IT Systems and Infrastructure—TAFE SA	970	1,051	1,077	1,104	
Campus Maintenance	7,101	8,436	8,649	8,866	
Energy and Mining					
Major Project					
Remote Area Energy Supply—Future Sustainability	2,403	—	—	—	
Annual Program					
RAES scheme power generation and distribution equipment	1,873	1,942	1,992	2,042	
Minerals Asset Upgrade and Replacement	191	250	255	262	
Environment and Water					
Major Project					

Agency/Title		2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
South Australian Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure Program (SARFIIP)	57,447	—	—	—	
Monarto Land	293	—	—	—	
Glenthorne National Park	3,200	3,200	1,600	—	
Waterfall Gully Summit Trail	2,030	—	—	—	
Opening Up SAs Reservoirs	4,000	—	—	—	
Water Management Solutions	4,200	800	—	—	
Flows for the Future	1,056	—	—	—	
Great Southern Ocean Walk	228	2,558	2,214	1,000	
Securing the future of our metropolitan coastline	—	—	12,000	12,000	
Park renewal investment	200	938	1,162	1,000	
Annual Program					
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	4,815	5,885	6,008	5,141	
Water Monitoring Equipment	2,030	2,086	2,143	2,196	
Fire Management on Public Land—Enhanced Capabilities	1,057	1,086	1,116	1,144	
South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board	484	496	509	522	
Adelaide & Mt Lofty Ranges NRMB	150	—	—	—	
Environment Protection Authority					
Major Project					
Material flow and levy information system	1,239	100	—	—	
Annual Program					
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	576	623	639	655	
SA Water					
Major Project					
North Lefevre Peninsula Waste Water Diversion	336	—	—	—	
Aldinga Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade Stage 2	69	—	—	—	
Warooka and Point Turton Water Supply Upgrade	12	—	—	—	
Kangaroo Creek Dam Safety	16,229	—	—	—	
Tailem Bend Keith Pipeline Coomandook Tank Additional Storage	26	—	—	—	
Mount Bold Dam Safety	1,296	22,823	23,394	23,978	
Purchase water entitlements to the minister and the River Murray	900	—	—	—	
Mt Barker Development Water Supply Scheme—Stage 1	60	950	950	950	
Murray Bridge Wastewater Treatment Plant Relocation	12,131	105	179	220	
Hahndorf Wastewater Treatment Plant Inlet Screen Upgrade	55	—	—	—	
Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant	12,450	284	485	—	
Orroroo Water Quality Improvement	50	—	—	—	
Hope Valley EL170 Tank Structure Renewal	50	—	—	—	
Myponga Trunk Main	1,452	—	—	—	
Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Upgrade	50	3,717	6,349	7,810	
Bolivar ASR SCADA Controls Upgrade Stage 2	627	—	—	—	
Baroota Dam Safety	2,929	—	—	—	
Bolivar Dissolved Air Floated Filtration Plant Controls Upgrade	1,911	—	—	—	
Northern Connector Project	274	—	—	—	
Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme	49,597	1,000	912	—	
Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant Clarifier Upgrade	5,693	—	—	—	
Zero Cost Energy Future	289,179	52,076	—	—	
Annual Program					
Water Quality Management	12,333	13,432	13,724	14,066	
Environmental Improvement	6,017	18,000	13,464	13,268	
Information Technology	34,404	40,670	34,856	34,856	
Safety	25,832	27,692	28,311	29,020	
Mechanical and Electrical Renewal	21,913	42,666	43,711	44,805	
Pipe Network Renewal	28,462	35,756	36,669	37,587	
Structures	30,884	58,093	59,550	61,039	
Asset Renewal	10,863	10,660	10,921	11,193	
Network Extension	33,248	39,013	39,794	42,983	
Networks Growth	10,002	9,114	9,760	10,004	
Treatment Plant Growth	2,992	3,735	3,727	3,820	
Service Reliability Management	2,694	4,792	4,906	5,028	

Agency/Title		2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Water Resource Sustainability	92	592	607	622	
Major and Minor Plant	5,201	4,767	4,884	5,007	
Health and Wellbeing					
Major Project					
Upgrade to existing Women's and Children's Hospital	23,000	20,100	3,809	—	
Flinders Medical Centre—Neonatal Unit	819	—	—	—	
SA Health Supply Distribution Centre	7,320	—	—	—	
Flinders Medical Centre Redevelopment	100	—	—	—	
Modbury Hospital Redevelopment	6,210	—	—	—	
Lyell McEwin Hospital Redevelopment	71	—	—	—	
Lyell McEwin Hospital Emergency Department Expansion	12,000	26,842	14,500	—	
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment Stage 3	63,158	91,700	85,080	2,052	
SA Pathology consolidation into Frome Rd	14,073	—	—	—	
Country Health SA Sustainment and Compliance	15,960	14,200	14,000	14,000	
Borderline Personality Disorder Centre of Excellence—fit out	—	—	—	—	
Modbury Hospital—Upgrades and Additional Services	31,791	39,668	18,000	—	
SAAS Headquarters Internal Fitout	1,380	—	—	—	
Mount Gambier Renal Dialysis	1,650	—	—	—	
Yorke town Surgical Services	100	—	—	—	
Lighthouse Lodge Kingston—Safety Upgrades	600	—	—	—	
Murray Bridge Emergency Department	4,000	3,250	—	—	
Strathalbyn Aged Care	10,500	2,100	—	—	
Enterprise Cancer Prescribing System	9,512	4,000	5,034	—	
Real Time Monitoring of Prescription Medicine	4,000	—	—	—	
SAAS Volunteer Training Infrastructure	871	—	—	—	
Repatriation Health Precinct Reactivation	26,075	20,000	21,000	2,000	
Mount Barker Hospital Emergency Department	—	—	3,000	5,600	
Citi Centre fit out	—	—	991	—	
Annual Program					
SA Ambulance Service—Medical Equipment Replacement	3,002	3,077	3,154	3,233	
SA Ambulance Service—Vehicle Replacement	9,003	6,399	6,559	6,723	
Hospitals and Health Units—Minor Works	14,058	17,548	16,645	20,736	
Bio-Medical Equipment	17,674	18,166	18,153	21,187	
SA Ambulance Service—Plant and Equipment	948	972	996	1,021	
Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Capital Grants	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	
Volunteer Ambulance Stations	3,160	2,624	2,690	2,757	
Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Other	81	—	—	—	
Human Services					
Major Project					
Riverside Building—Office fitout	5,381	3,458	3,161	—	
Annual Program					
Adelaide Youth Training Centre—Sustainment	522	535	548	562	
Equipment Services	1,249	1,280	1,312	1,345	
South Australian Housing Authority					
Major Project					
Remote Indigenous Housing	17,709	6,982	7,157	7,338	
Playford North Urban Renewal	9,285	8,474	6,737	7,055	
Minor Projects—SAHT	3,391	3,240	3,240	3,240	
Better Neighbourhoods Program	43,516	14,377	15,000	15,000	
Land Development at Sheffield Crescent, Blair Athol	289	—	—	—	
Public Housing Stimulus	1,403	—	—	—	
Economic Stimulus—construction of social housing ⁽¹⁾	13,678	—	—	—	
Morphettville Neighbourhood Renewal Project	6,372	11,759	—	—	
Business Systems Transformation	12,881	9,272	—	—	
Pleasant Avenue Apartments, South Plympton	5,500	3,456	—	—	
Domestic Violence Package—Forty new crisis accommodation rooms	2,000	—	—	—	
Housing Stimulus Package—Preventative maintenance and upgrade	21,118	—	—	—	
Housing Stimulus Package—affordable housing construction	17,139	4,285	—	—	

Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Annual Program				
Public Housing Capital Maintenance	13,550	13,550	13,550	13,550
Aboriginal Housing Capital Program	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
Public Housing Construction and Acquisition	6,241	6,000	6,000	6,000
SAHT Management Capital	2,401	3,350	3,400	3,450
Community Housing Capital Program	2,792	6,000	6,000	6,000
Innovation and Skills				
Annual Program				
Annual Investing Programs	7,389	6,289	6,444	6,604
IT Systems and Infrastructure	940	975	1,001	1,025
Correctional Services				
Major Project				
Adelaide Women's Prison- Additional Prisoner Accommodation—40 beds and Infrastructure Upgrade	3,800	—	—	—
Adelaide Remand Centre—Cell Upgrade	3,200	—	—	—
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,812	3,044	3,120	3,198
Emergency Services—CFS				
Major Project				
Station Upgrades	2,500	—	—	—
Annual Program				
Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—CFS	15,593	15,983	16,383	16,793
Replacement of telecommunications equipment—CFS	1,882	1,929	1,977	2,026
Emergency Services—MFS				
Annual Program				
Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—MFS	6,117	9,551	7,996	8,196
Replacement of telecommunications equipment—MFS	221	227	233	238
Emergency Services—SAFECOM				
Major Project				
Alert SA Replacement	144	147	151	155
New Emergency Services Headquarters	—	—	14,178	—
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	—	—	-500	—
Emergency Services—SES				
Annual Program				
Capital Works, Vehicles, Vessels and Rescue Equipment—SES	4,341	4,443	4,548	4,656
Replacement of telecommunications equipment—SES	427	438	449	460

Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Police				
Major Project				
Hi-tech Crime Fighting Equipment	200	—	—	—
Police Records Management System—Stages 2 to 4	4,153	—	—	—
Crime Tracking App	214	—	—	—
Data Entry Devices	547	—	—	—
Continuous Monitoring of Screening	414	—	—	—
Umuwa Police Station—Multi Agency Facility	1,712	856	—	—
Firearms Control System	3,903	968	—	—
SAPOL Communications Centre Upgrade	—	4,992	4,992	6,490
Expiation Notice Branch System Replacement	579	2,653	2,595	1,898
Fitout for Angas Street HQ	1,000	—	—	—
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment	9,496	10,360	10,621	11,654
Primary Industries and Regions				
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	5,429	5,657	5,534	5,647
Forestry SA	260	—	—	—
Annual Program				
Plant and Equipment, Roadworks	195	—	—	—
Annual Program Forestry SA	65	—	—	—
Tourism				
Annual Program				

Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	649	702	720	738
Adelaide Venue Management Corporation				
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	7,000	7,175	7,354	7,538
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure ⁽¹⁾				
Major Project				
Bus Fleet Replacement Program	18,765	19,234	19,715	20,208
Northern Expressway	400	422	—	—
Upgrading the Sturt Highway	470	—	—	—
Increased Detection of Unregistered/Uninsured Vehicles	1,091	623	639	655
South Road Superway	2,000	5,073	—	—
Adelaide Oval—Redevelopment	900	—	—	—
Public Transport Park'n'Ride Interchanges	900	—	—	—
South Road Upgrade from Torrens Road to River Torrens	4,500	—	—	—
Managed Motorways on the South Eastern Freeway	11,894	919	—	—
Adelaide Hills Priority Program	500	377	—	—
Gawler Line Electrification Project	296,750	93,077	45,000	—
North–South Corridor Darlington Upgrade	96,805	—	—	—
Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Plaza & Integration	5,000	25,000	30,000	10,360
Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Car Park	—	30,000	—	—
Improving critical road infrastructure	1,700	—	—	—
Gawler East Collector Link	4,668	—	—	—
Northern Connector	129,346	—	—	—
Port Stanvac Wharf and Foreshore	6,407	—	—	—
Extension of the Tonsley rail line to the Flinders Medical Centre	89,882	—	—	—
Planning Reform Implementation	7,735	554	—	—
Leigh Creek Capital Program	300	300	400	—
10 New Safety Cameras	849	—	—	—
Oaklands Crossing	35,515	—	—	—
Mitcham Hills Road Corridor	5,000	5,000	3,000	—
Main South Road Duplication from Seaford to Aldinga.	23,000	75,000	164,000	41,000
Golden Grove Road Upgrade	14,800	3,000	—	—
Port Road / West Lakes Boulevard / Cheltenham Parade intersection upgrade	5,598	—	—	—
Main North Road with Tulloch Road intersection upgrade	5,324	—	—	—
North East Road and South Para Left Turn Slip Lane Duplication of Joy Baluch AM Bridge	980	—	—	—
Overpass at Port Wakefield Road	40,000	108,000	49,785	—
Flagstaff Road widening	15,000	66,500	6,500	—
Fix Candy Road and South Road Intersection	—	750	5,630	25,100
Penola Bypass	5,130	—	—	—
Torrens Street and Crozier Road roundabout	14,100	200	—	—
North-South Corridor Regency Road to Pym Street	540	—	—	—
Cape Jervis Breakwater Extension	38,200	141,100	118,800	—
Southern Expressway Throw Screens	1,920	—	—	—
City South Tramline Replacement Project	2,000	—	—	—
Goodwood, Springbank and Daws Roads Intersection Upgrade	11,570	—	—	—
Portrush and Magill Roads Intersection Upgrade	5,000	—	—	—
Fullarton and Cross Roads Intersection Upgrades	2,000	—	—	—
Torrens Road, Ovingham level crossing upgrade	1,000	—	—	—
Main North, Kings and McIntyre Roads intersection upgrade	11,000	—	—	—
Main North Road and Nottage Terrace intersection upgrade	2,000	11,000	—	—
Glen Osmond and Fullarton Roads intersection upgrade	2,000	5,000	12,000	—
Grand Junction, Hampstead and Briens Roads intersection upgrade	1,000	—	—	—
North South Corridor Torrens River to Darlington	2,000	7,000	10,000	—
	30,000	—	—	—

Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Thomas Foods International Facility	7,000	—	—	—
Dublin Saleyards Access	7,000	—	—	—
Naracoorte Roundabouts	8,000	—	—	—
Kroemers Crossing Roundabout	6,000	—	—	—
New Tonsley Railway Station	8,000	—	—	—
Park n Ride Projects	30,371	—	—	—
Annual Program				
Outback Communities Authority	712	1,393	497	502
DPTI Annual Program	138,784	128,068	129,688	130,314
(1) A number of DPTI projects include expenditure currently budgeted in contingencies. As such, expenditure for some projects is larger than the amounts reflected for some projects above.				
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority				
Major Project				
Memorial Gardens—Enfield Memorial Park	220	330	280	-220
Memorial Gardens—Smithfield Memorial Park	135	150	100	-30
Recycled Water/Irrigation Infrastructure	40	170	70	-70
Information Technology	130	140	110	100
Memorial Gardens—Cheltenham Cemetery	150	200	150	-150
Memorial Gardens—West Terrace Cemetery	345	35	185	-35
Cheltenham Mausoleum	200	—	—	—
Enfield Mausoleum Stage 4	800	800	—	—
Multi-Function Community Precinct—Enfield Memorial Park	750	5,888	12,500	5,862
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	359	305	179	-186
South Australian Government Employee Residential Properties				
Annual Program				
Residential Properties	7,011	7,186	7,366	7,550
Urban Renewal Authority				
Major Project				
Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment	3,285	1,646	1,806	814
Annual Program				
Plant and Equipment	194	80	47	81
West Beach Trust				
Major Project				
Roads and Car Parks	800	—	—	—
Replacement of swimming pool and an additional 9 cabins at Adelaide Shores Resort	437	1,313	—	—
Annual Program				
Reserves	100	300	312	320
Corporate Services Office and Works Depot	294	400	416	428
Caravan Park Accommodation and Facility Upgrades	592	800	832	854
Resort Accommodation and Facility Upgrades	614	700	728	747
Golf Course	100	150	156	160
Boat Haven	—	150	156	160
Treasury and Finance				
Major Project				
RevenueSA—Revenue Information Online (RIO) Land Tax system update	2,623	875	—	—
Shared Services—Masterpiece System	—	1,658	—	1,743
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,532	1,639	1,679	1,721
Revenue Information Online system (RIO)	3,479	337	345	354
Lotteries Commission of SA				
Annual Program				
Minor Works—Plant and Equipment	10	10	10	10
Auditor-General				
Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	233	239	245	251

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

The Agency Statements present agency financial information allocated by major areas of activity or 'programs'. The prior year actual, current year estimated result and next year's budget information is presented for these programs.

The preparation of this information is an extensive process and involves the allocation of a range of agency overhead costs. This process is undertaken annually in order to clearly define and allocate the budget for the coming year over the various programs that the agency undertakes. Agency budgets for the forward estimates are based on the next year's budget adjusted for a range of factors including indexation and program and project related parameters.'

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Section 4 of DPC Circular 13—Annual Reporting details the use of the annual report template. The template includes sections for an organisational structure and changes to the agency to be included by each agency.

I refer the member to the annual reports which will be published for each of the agencies I am responsible for.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS TARGET

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

New savings implemented in the 2019-20 budget are presented in table 2.5 of the 2019-20 Budget Statement. The detail of the specific measures, including the estimated FTE impacts, are provided in the 2019-20 Budget Measures Statement.

Previous savings and the detail of the specific measures have been presented in earlier budget papers.

Agencies are responsible for managing efficiency dividends. Chief executives will have the flexibility to deliver the savings in the manner that best suits the needs of the business.

RETURN TO WORK DISPUTES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

ReturnToWorkSA does not keep data on disputes under section 18 of the act.

That information is, however, available from the South Australian Employment Tribunal. The South Australian Employment Tribunal advised the following:

The total number of applications lodged under section 18 of the Return To Work Act to date is 184. 152 applications have been resolved by agreement between the parties or by the applicant withdrawing. 9 decisions have been delivered and 1 preliminary ruling has been delivered. 32 files are currently open.

RETURN TO WORK DISPUTES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Disputes lodged at the South Australian Employment Tribunal regarding ReturnToWorkSA decisions during the 2018/2019 financial year can be broken down as follows:

1. disputes lodged by workers: 1,689 (assuming those lodged by a legal representative do so on behalf of a worker)
2. disputes lodged by employers: 87
3. disputes resolved by consent or other like means: 789
4. disputes resolved by at least a single member of the tribunal: 7
5. of the disputes resolved by at least a single member, the number overturning ReturnToWorkSA's original decision: 6.

RETURN TOWORKSA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

ReturnToWorkSA conducted 47 investigations in 2018-19, involving 29 workers, 17 employers, and one provider. Only one investigation (of an employer) was referred to the Crown for opinion in 2018-19. Other matters which were the subject of ongoing advice and representation by the Crown in 2018-19 had been referred in 2017-18.

RETURNTOWORKSA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 ReturnToWorkSA brought one prosecution against an employer and none were brought against workers or providers. No common law claims for workers have been paid out in 2018-19.

Registered or premium-paying labour hire employers paid approximately \$23 million in initial premiums in 2018-19, which represents 4.4 per cent of premium paid by all employers to date. It should be noted that this amount is not final, as employers have until 15 September 2019 to reconcile their 2018-19 remuneration, which may result in premium adjustments.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 SafeWork SA delivered 224 workshops, presentations and seminars.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 SafeWork SA undertook 15,510 compliance and enforcement activities, which included 3,867 proactive and 11,643 reactive workplace visits.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 SafeWork SA issued one infringement/expiation notice.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 SafeWork SA issued 2,441 improvement notices.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 SafeWork SA issued 703 prohibition notices.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 SafeWork SA entered into two enforceable undertakings.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 the number of potential breaches of the Work Health and Safety Act 2012 (SA) that were investigated and referred to the Crown Solicitor's Office by SafeWork SA was eight.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 SafeWork SA referred seven matters to the Crown Solicitor's Office which resulted in SafeWork SA filing a prosecution.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 there were five matters filed that resulted in a conviction, zero unsuccessful matters, zero not guilty findings and two withdrawals of the application to prosecute that resulted in two enforceable undertakings being accepted.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 there were two matters where SafeWork SA made the decision not to prosecute, but to accept enforceable undertakings.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In 2018-19 the total amount of fines ordered by the courts for breaches of the Work Health and Safety Act 2012 (SA) was \$996,000.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The appeal is about whether the South Australian Employment Tribunal has jurisdiction under section 100 of the Fair Work Act 1994 to adjust the maximum amount of leave loading payable under the Public Service (Recreation Leave Loading) Award. The appeal is not directly concerned with the amount of the adjustment. The adjustment to the maximum amount of leave loading payable is \$30.87.

RETURNTOWORKSA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In relation to Recommendation 3 that ReturnToWorkSA keep records in respect of all disputed claims, comparing the decision with the outcome of the dispute.

ReturnToWorkSA is undertaking a review of its current system for improved data collection in relation to disputes. Data is currently available regarding the final outcome of decisions, that being: 'Confirmed', 'Set aside', 'Varied', 'Set aside and substituted', and 'Discontinued'.

In relation to recommendation 9 that ReturnToWorkSA analyse records of the outcomes of the decisions which are referred to SAET as disputes by injured workers or employers (see recommendation 3) to determine whether they indicate that there is some appropriate change in processes or procedures which should be made to improve initial decisions. ReturnToWorkSA monitors the outcomes of decisions of the SAET and the Supreme Court on an ongoing basis to determine if changes in processes or procedures are required.

In relation to recommendation 11 that ReturnToWorkSA maintain records of the terms on which injured workers return to work, including whether the return to work is to the previous employment position or some other position, whether the return to work is to the same level of hours or some other hours, and whether the return to work is temporary or indefinite/apparently permanent.

ReturnToWorkSA records whether a return to work outcome is with the pre-injury employer or different employer. As at 1 July 2019, ReturnToWorkSA has updated its system to record workers' return to work status to identify if the role is full time, part time or casual and will be used to monitor if workers are returning to work that is comparable to their pre-injury work status.

In relation to recommendation 13 that ReturnToWorkSA maintain records of the return to work rates of the injured workers with a WPI of or greater than 30 per cent, and consider the development of strategies to provide opportunities for such injured workers to return to work in some suitable employment. If a seriously injured worker has a desire to return to work or study in some capacity this is supported and may, for example, include long-term university study to enable the person with a serious work injury to return to suitable employment.

In relation to recommendation 15 that ReturnToWorkSA should identify workers at risk of not returning to work within two years and commence providing ongoing support to those persons via the ReCONNECT program before the cessation of entitlements. ReturnToWorkSA's ReConnect program has a process to identify and make contact with workers that have not returned to work prior to the expiry of entitlements. Referrals commonly occur between 80-90 weeks from date of injury, i.e. before the cessation of income support at 104 weeks.

In relation to recommendation 17 that ReturnToWorkSA continue to conduct its reskilling pilot program, including the consideration of the introduction of financial incentives to support the re-employment of injured workers, and at an appropriate time including consideration of a meeting of all groups properly interested in reskilling injured workers to encourage their return to work. ReturnToWorkSA has evaluated the reskilling pilot program and concluded that the program is an effective intervention strategy that helps injured workers remain at, and return to, work. Subsequently, reskilling was transitioned from its pilot phase into an ongoing program.

In relation to recommendation 18 that ReturnToWorkSA ensure that its reskilling program extends to seriously injured workers, including those who continue to receive income maintenance after the expiry of two years from their injury. The reskilling service is available to assist seriously injured workers.

RETURNTOWORKSA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

ReturnToWorkSA has two managers from the regulation team who are members of the Labour Hire Task Force. They have regularly attended meetings since mid-2018 with the most recent attendance being 11 July 2019.

RETURNTOWORKSA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

In the restructure of SafeWork SA's workforce that occurred in 2018-19, the number of inspector or investigator roles were not reduced.

However, leadership and support functions within those teams have reduced to improve operations, while achieving required budget savings. In addition, service offerings previously available within the Education function have been streamlined or reduced. Consequently, the FTE count in 2017-18 and 2018-19 in terms of functions were as follows:

Function	2017-18	2018-19
Inspectorate	102.0 FTE	91.0 FTE
Investigations	14.0 FTE	13.0 FTE
Education	41.0 FTE	28.0 FTE
Business support	57.0 FTE	44.5 FTE

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The Executive Director, SafeWork SA, Mr Martyn Campbell, attended a meeting of the task force on 29 April 2019.

RETURNTOWORKSA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The total regulated costs paid to workers and employers and/or their representatives for the financial year 2018-19 and the total expenses of ReturnToWorkSA in the same period are currently not finalised. Information will be made publicly available in ReturnToWorkSA's annual report 2018-19 once tabled in parliament.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The maximum entitlement under the Public Service (Recreation Leave) Loading Award affects those employees who currently earn above \$65,527 per annum and affects either directly or indirectly (through flow-on provisions in other industrial awards or enterprise agreements) approximately 40,148 public sector employees.

Those employees who earn less than \$65,527 per annum receive the full maximum entitlement under the award and are therefore not affected by the cap in the award.

RETURN TO WORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

ReturnToWorkSA has no further information on phoenixing, but remains directly involved with the State Government's Labour Hire Taskforce and the Commonwealth Government's Phoenix Taskforce and continues to investigate labour hire employers to ensure they meet their obligations under the Return to Work Act 2014.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (24 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

Incumbents in the following roles accepted a TVSP during 2018-19:

Compliance and Enforcement functions

- 2.0 FTE ASO2 Administration Officer
- 1.0 FTE ASO3 Operational Support Officer
- 1.0 FTE PO5 Chief Officer, Chemical Hazards and Explosive Materials
- 1.0 FTE PO4 Principal Officer (Hazard Leader), Chemical Hazards and Explosive Materials
- 1.0 FTE ASO4 Investigation Support Officer

Workplace Education and Business Services functions

- 0.4 FTE ASO2 Administration Officer
- 2.0 FTE ASO3 Customer Services Officer
- 1.0 FTE PO1 Customer Services Officer
- 1.0 FTE ASO2 Customer Services Coordinator
- 1.0 FTE ASO7 Training and Resource Coordinator
- 2.0 FTE ASO6 Principal Industry Adviser
- 1.0 FTE ASO6 WHS, Fleet and Facilities Coordinator
- 1.0 FTE ASO4 Communications and Education Officer
- 1.0 FTE ASO6 Principal Skills Support Officer
- 2.0 FTE ASO5 WHS Adviser
- 1.0 FTE MAS3 Manager, Workplace Advisory Services
- 1.0 FTE ASO3 Business Systems Support Officer
- 1.0 FTE ASO6 Principal Policy Officer
- 1.0 FTE MAS3 Manager, Corporate Services

In addition, two redeployees from a previous restructure accepted a TVSP, comprising a further 2.0 FTEs.

FAMILY DAY CARE

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): There has been a sustained decline in the number of children using family day care in South Australia over recent years. This is consistent with the national trend and is attributed to a decreased number of family day care educators nationally due to:

- attrition due to the ageing family day care educator workforce
- increased requirements and compliance monitoring associated with the National Quality Framework
- increased availability of long day care
- changes to the family day care eligibility requirements for the new Child Care Subsidy by the Australian government; and
- greater business demands on family day care educators.

The Department for Education does not collect data on the number of children that are cared for at home or in other informal arrangements.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The SACE Board's financial statements and notes to the financial statements provide information on the assets and equity of the agency and are available in the agency's annual report.

The SACE Board produces its annual report and financial statements on a calendar year basis under the SACE Board of South Australia Act 1983, and as a result an updated value of the reserves will not be available until after the end of the current calendar year. The SACE Board has not accessed its reserves since the 2018 annual report was released.

It is not possible to determine whether any revenues from the SACE International Program form part of the reserves of the agency as this revenue is an integral part of the budget and is used in the agency's operations.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Innovation and Skills has advised the following:

Pre-apprenticeships and pre-traineeships are industry driven. The number delivered by TAFE SA will align directly with the demand from industry and will lead to real careers for young South Australians.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Concept designs are progressively being completed and individual scopes will be released publicly in the coming months. The following schools now have completed concept designs:

- Aberfoyle Park High School
- Ceduna Area School
- Le Fevre High School
- Loxton High School
- Mount Barker High School
- Murray Bridge High School
- Paralowie R-12 School
- Salisbury High School.

SCHOOL ZONING

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

A total of 334 year eight students were allocated to Brighton Secondary School in 2019 as part of the Department for Education's year 7 to 8 transition process.

Of the 334 students, a total of 61 were not in zone and not in a specialist program. These students were allocated based on the sibling right rule (58 students) or the Enter for Success program (three students), which aims to improve attendance and retention rates of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students by allowing them to attend the SA government high school of their choice.

These 61 students reside in the following suburbs:

Aberfoyle Park
Aldinga

Aberfoyle Park
Brighton
Camden Park
Coromandel Valley
Dover Gardens
Flagstaff Hill
Glenelg
Glenelg East
Glenelg North
Glengowrie
Hallett Cove
Hawthorndene
Henley Beach South
Huntfield Heights
Kingston Park
Marino
Marion
Mitchell Park
Morphettville
North Plympton
Oaklands Park
Park Holme
Pennington
Plympton
Port Noarlunga
Reynella
Richmond
Seacliff Park
Seacombe Heights
Seaford Meadows
Seaview Downs
Sheidow Park
South Brighton
South Plympton
Trott Park
Warradale

GOLDEN GROVE HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Golden Grove High School's project is in the concept design phase and the scope of works is currently being developed.

SCHOOL ZONING

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The Department for Education no longer routinely produces star charts for selected schools.

PRESCHOOL SERVICES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

A trial of the Ages and Stages Questionnaires (ASQ3) occurred in preschools aligned to the Elizabeth South and Noarlunga Student Support Services offices. Thirty-three preschools returned ASQ3s.

Preschool directors and principals involved in the trial of the ASQ3 were offered an informational session by Student Support Services. Whilst the ASQ3 is designed for educators to use without formal training, this session offered the opportunity to answer queries and discuss the trial objectives. Feedback from two preschools was the timeline for completion was tight, but with further support from their local special educator, they successfully participated in the trial.

Of the total number of ASQ3 questionnaires lodged (90) in northern Adelaide, the psychology team was able to screen children considered to be potential applicants for special options and identify children with developmental concerns such as their speech and language. Feedback from the special educators involved advised the information was invaluable in appropriately programming for a child's success and to support transition planning for children. Preschools advised the questionnaire assisted them to better identify a child's needs.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

All students with disability who have applied to the Inclusive Education Support Program statewide centralised panel for an automatic category 5 (Special Class) or category 8 (Special School/Disability Unit) in terms 1 and 2, 2019 have been allocated these amounts. No students have received reduced support or no support as a result of this application, assessment and moderation process.

From term 3, 2019 the department has changed the application requirements for this cohort of students, as the automatic allocation process was found to not always reflect the personalised teaching and learning needs of a student.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Across the Department for Education there are state transition programs which complement the programs that schools provide to assist senior secondary students with disability to successfully transition from school to post school. These state transition programs include Transition Centres and the Better Pathways Program.

Enrolment numbers of the state transition programs are below:

Program	2017	2018	2019
Transition Centres	199	158	170
Better Pathways Program	129	126	114

Students in these programs maintain their enrolment in a school. Individual secondary schools report in their annual reports the intended destination of their students.

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The position titles of those people who received Targeted Voluntary Separation Packages in the 2018-19 financial year were as follows:

Position title
Administration and Finance Coordinator
Administration Officer
Administration Officer
Administration Officer
Administration Officer
Administration Officer Early Years Learner
Administrative Officer
Administrative Officer
Administrative Officer
Administrative Services Officer
Administrative Services Officer
Administrative Services Officer
Administrative Services Officer
Administrative Services Officer Administration Officer
Analyst Programmer
Analyst Programmer
Apprenticeship Broker
Apprenticeship Broker
Apprenticeship Broker
Apprenticeship Broker
Apprenticeship Broker
Apprenticeship Broker
Apprenticeship Broker
Asset Support Officer
Assistant Review Officer
Audit Project Officer
Booking Coordinator
Business Analyst
Business Improvement Coordinator
Capital Projects Manager
Change Management Unit
Claims Consultant
Claims Officer
Claims Officer
Client Services Officer
Coordinator Central Policy Unit
Coordinator, Bushfire and Emergency Management Projects
Corporate Accommodation Officer
Data Analyst
Employee Services Officer
Engagement Programs Manager
Ethical Conduct Consultant
Ethical Conduct Consultant

Position title
Executive Officer, National Inter-Government Relations
Executive Support Officer
Executive Support Officer
Executive Support Project Officer
Family Day Care Administration Officer
Family Day Care Administration Officer
Family Day Care Coordinator
Family Day Care Coordinator
Family Day Care Coordinator
Financial Support Consultant
FLO Area Manager, Limestone/Murray Bridge/Pt Lincoln
Graduate Officer
Graphic Designer
Graphics Designer
ICT Support Officer
Leadership Development, Aboriginal Education
Leadership Development, Learn Design Assessment and Moderation
Leadership Development, Student Pathways
Management Accountant
Manager OHS&W and Injury Management Compliance
Manager, Business Services Assurance
Manager, Financial Management Improvement
Manager, ICT Business Engagement
Manager, ICT Direct Services
Manager, ICT Infrastructure and Asset Management
Manager, Inter-Government Relations
Manager, Online Communications
Manager, Procurement Services
Manager, Public, Private Partnerships Contract Administration
Manager, Sport Swimming and Aquatics
Manager, Strategic Contracts
Networks Support Officer
Office Coordinator
Office Coordinator
Online Learning Consultant
Operational Services Officer Wiltja—Unplaced
People and Culture Policy Consultant
People and Culture Service Officer
People and Culture Systems Analyst
Policy and Project Officer
Policy Coordinator
Policy Officer
Policy Officer

Position title
Principal Policy Adviser
Program Manager, Teacher Pathways
Program Support Officer
Program Support Officer, Non-Government Schools Secretariat
Project Manager
Project Officer
Project Officer—Subpoena and Record Release Officer
Project Officer, Australian Curriculum and Teaching for Effective Learning Primary Learners
Project Officer, Inter-Government Relations
Project Officer, Learning Improvement Data and evidence
Project Officer, Strategic Policy and Liaison
Project Officer, Teaching for Effective Learning Compass
Project Support Officer
Property Officer
Records Management Officer—Archiving Disposal
Recruitment Centre Manager
Recruitment Employee Services Officer
Recruitment Employee Services Officer
Return to Work Coordinator
Safety Consultant
Senior Adviser, Intervention
Senior Analyst Programmer
Senior Business Continuity and Risk Advisor
Senior Claims Consultant
Senior Claims Consultant
Senior Contracts Officer
Senior Customer Support Officer
Senior Economic Analyst
Senior Manager, Data Quality
Senior Online Communications Adviser
Senior Project Officer
Senior Project Officer
Senior Project Officer
Senior Psychologist
Senior Return to Work Coordinator
Senior Writer
Site Financial Support Consultant
Strategic Policy Adviser
Team Leader, Oracle Systems
Technical Infrastructure Support Analyst
Telephony Support Officer
Testing Officer
Training and Support Coordinator

Position title
Unplaced ASO5
Unplaced ASO6
Unplaced Position

Targeted Voluntary Separation Packages were given to staff from the following areas of the Department for Education:

Early Years and Child Development
Finance and Funding
ICT Services
Infrastructure
Learning Improvement
Office of Chief Operating Officer
Partnerships, Schools and Preschools
People and Culture
Strategic Policy and External Relations
System Performance

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The 2019-20 salaries and goods and services budget transferred to the Department of Human Services (DHS) for child wellbeing practitioners is \$8.474 million. Of the 231.3 FTE transferred to DHS, 134.4 FTE are related to the early childhood program. The 199.8 FTE within the agency statement is the 2017-18 actual, and does not relate to the budget transferred to DHS given the arrangements began 1 July 2019.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The preschool bilingual playgroup program is a state-funded program, funded through the Department for Education's preschool bilingual program. The preschool bilingual program supports participation in preschool for children and families from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds who have limited or no English.

PRESCHOOL OCCASIONAL CARE

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The occasional care cost per child actual result is calculated by dividing the actual expenditure recorded in the department's general ledger for occasional care by the number of actual places in occasional care. For budget purposes, the estimated budget for occasional care is allocated against the estimated number of children, to determine a budget allocation.

Occasional care staffing allocations are provided to preschools through an allocation in applicable preschool's Resource Entitlement Statement (RES).

From a review of actual costs for occasional care the department has identified that occasional care costs have been charged against the general preschool budget line, as opposed to the specific occasional care budget line. After adjusting for these costs, the recalculated cost per child in occasional care is \$1,182. The cost per child in preschool services is reduced from \$10,492 to \$10,417.

Note there is no net financial impact in the reported expenditure for Program 1 Early Childhood Development.

TAFE SA GILLES PLAINS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Renewal SA, on behalf of multiple government departments, is preparing a structure plan for Oakden and Gilles Plains, a site investigation formed part of the preparation.

On 29 May Renewal SA invited community and stakeholder comments on the structure plan and noted that 'the research laboratory and TAFE campus located on Blacks Road are expected to remain in operation for the foreseeable future.' Now that the ownership of the site has transferred to TAFE SA, under my portfolio responsibility, I can confirm that the site will continue to operate as a TAFE SA campus. You may also refer to minister Knoll's response to the Hon Piccolo in Estimates Committee A on Tuesday 30 July 2019, with regards to Renewal SA Structure Plan for Oakden and Gilles Plains.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

At a secondary level, there were 81 vacancies identified in special options and 104 eligible applicants for 2020. These numbers may fluctuate prior to the beginning of the 2020 school year. The primary placement process is currently being conducted and the junior primary placement process will be finalised in the week of 28 October 2019.

Children who have been recommended for a special option but do not receive a place via the special options placement process are provided with the required adjustments and funded supports in the mainstream setting via the Inclusive Education Support Program.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there was one executive role abolished within agencies reporting to me:

- Project Director, Workforce Reform (SAES2)—short term project role.

During the same period there were seven executive roles created:

- Project Director, Workforce Reform, Department for Education (SAES2)—short term project role which commenced 3 September 2018—28 June 2019
- Director, School Implementation Year 7 to High School, Department for Education (SAES1)
- Director, Business Improvement, Department for Education (SAES1)
- Project Director, Department for Education (SAES1)
- Assistant Director, Contracting Services, Department for Education (SAES1)
- Director, Further Education and Pathways, Department for Education (SAES1)
- Executive Director, Quality Teaching and Learning, TAFE SA (SAES2)
- Director, Teaching and Learning, TAFE SA (SAES1).

The total employment cost for the roles created is \$1,489,283.00 TRPV (excluding on-costs).

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:
Department for Education

At 30 June 2019, 17.4 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$2.115 million (excluding on-costs) against an original budget of 29.3 FTEs and an original expenditure budget of \$2.690 million. It should be noted that the unit spent approximately \$0.48 million on contractors in 2018-19 mainly due to staff vacancies.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2019-20	28.3	\$2.766 million
2020-21	28.3	\$2.800 million
2021-22	28.3	\$2.839 million
2022-23	28.3	\$2.873 million

TAFE SA

At 30 June 2019, 18.8 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$2,040,147.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2019-20	18.8	\$2,139,500
2020-21	18.8	\$2,171,590
2021-22	18.8	\$2,204,165
2022-23	18.8	\$2,237,230

SACE Board of South Australia

At 30 June 2019, 5.9 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$691,000 for the financial year;

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2019-20	6.7	\$713,000
2020-21	2.8	\$297,000
2021-22	1.8	\$158,000
2022-23	1.8	\$158,000

Education Standards Board

At 30 June 2019, 0.6 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$51,000.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2019-20	0.6	\$52,085
2020-21	0.6	\$55,286
2021-22	0.6	\$56,668
2022-23	0.6	\$58,085

History Trust of South Australia

At 30 June 2019, 1.6 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$176,000.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2019-20	1.60	\$180,000
2020-21	1.60	\$185,000
2021-22	1.60	\$189,000
2022-23	1.60	\$194,000

As an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website: <https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019:

Department for Education

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Principal	PRNA7	Attraction and Retention	\$12,698.00
Principal	PRNA2	Attraction and Retention	\$26,839.00
Principal	PRNA9	Attraction and Retention	\$16,666.70
Principal	PRNA9	Attraction and Retention	\$16,666.70
Principal	PRNA6	Attraction and Retention	\$21,867.50
Principal	PRNA2	Attraction and Retention	\$8,186.15
Principal	PRNA6	Attraction and Retention	\$10,000.00
Principal	PRNA2	Attraction and Retention	\$10,000.00
Principal	PRNA4	Attraction and Retention	\$5,000.00
Principal	PRNA9	Attraction and Retention	\$8,333.35
Principal	PRNA7	Attraction and Retention	\$6,695.00
Principal	PRNA4	Attraction and Retention	\$13,136.40
Principal	PRNA4	Attraction and Retention	\$6,568.20
Principal	PRNA8	Attraction and Retention	\$22,976.00
Principal	PRNA5	Attraction and Retention	\$13,858.70
Principal	PRNA6	Attraction and Retention	\$6,691.00
Principal	PRNA4_TTC	Attraction and Retention	\$7,214.00
Principal	PRNA5	Attraction and Retention	\$13,857.80
Principal	PRNA8	Attraction and Retention	\$8,010.10
Principal	PRNA2	Attraction and Retention	\$14,033.40
Principal	PRNA3	Attraction and Retention	\$6,693.00
Principal	PRNA5	Attraction and Retention	\$13,857.80
Principal	PRNA3	Attraction and Retention	\$5,000.00
Principal	PRNA9	Attraction and Retention	\$8,333.00
Deputy Principal	DPNB2	Attraction and Retention	\$7,206.00
Manager	AHP05	Attraction and Retention	\$9,050.20
Adviser	ASO06	Attraction and Retention	\$15,962.00
Architect	ASO07	Attraction and Retention	\$5,235.00
Strategist	ASO08	Attraction and Retention	\$6,888.78
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$17,800.00
Psychologist	AHP01	Attraction and Retention	\$12,849.60
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$17,961.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$29,667.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,867.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,867.00
Assistant Director	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$17,800.00

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,867.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$5,933.00
Business Partner	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,867.00
Assistant Director	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$17,800.00
Psychologist	AHP01	Attraction and Retention	\$12,849.60
Analyst	ASO06	Attraction and Retention	\$18,909.00
Manager	ASO08	Attraction and Retention	\$23,072.00
Coordinator	ASO05	Attraction and Retention	\$8,630.00
Consultant	ESB05_PSM	Attraction and Retention	\$9,491.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$17,800.00
Adviser	ASO05	Attraction and Retention	\$5,566.00
Assistant Director	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,867.00
Analyst	ASO06	Attraction and Retention	\$14,451.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$23,733.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,867.00
Consultant	ASO05	Attraction and Retention	\$2,887.00
Assistant	ASO04	Attraction and Retention	\$6,626.00
Business Partner	ASO06	Attraction and Retention	\$9,634.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$23,733.00
Manager	ASO08	Attraction and Retention	\$20,000.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$13,133.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$17,800.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,867.00
Business Partner	ASO06	Attraction and Retention	\$3,806.00
Assistant Director	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$23,733.00
Psychologist	AHP01	Attraction and Retention	\$12,303.80
Analyst	ASO07	Attraction and Retention	\$8,306.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$23,733.00
Manager	MAS03	Attraction and Retention	\$11,687.00
Manager	ASO08	Attraction and Retention	\$17,221.00

A number of positions have access to car parking which may be considered a non-salary benefit. In general, these positions are on-call or include the use of a government vehicle which must be securely parked.

TAFE SA

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Regional Manager Mid North and Far North	MAS3	Retention	\$22,500
Regional Manager Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula	ASO8	Retention	\$15,000
Manager Global Engagement Strategy	MAS3	Retention	\$22,500
Manager Global Engagement Strategy	MAS3	Retention	\$22,500
Senior Consultant Workforce Relations	ASO7	Attraction	\$11,964

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Chief Executive	EXC	Attraction and Retention Car Park	\$20,378 \$1,168
Executive Manager Curriculum and Assessment	EXA	Attraction and Retention Car Park	\$13,868 \$1,168
Applications Architect	ASO8	Attraction and Retention Additional week annual leave	\$22,142 \$2,970
Senior Analyst Programmer	ASO6	Attraction and Retention	\$18,057
Analyst Programmer	ASO5	Attraction and Retention	\$5,849
Executive Manager Information Services	EXA	Car Park	\$1,168
Executive Manager Corporate Services	EXA	Car Park	\$1,168
Manager Curriculum and Assessment	MAS3	Car Park Additional week annual leave	\$1,168 \$2,137
Manager Curriculum and Assessment	MAS3	Car Park Additional week annual leave	\$1,168 \$2,702
Manager Curriculum and Assessment	MAS3	Car Park	\$1,168
Manager Curriculum and Assessment	MAS3	Car Park	\$1,168
Manager Communications	MAS3	Car Park Additional week annual leave	\$1,168 \$2,003
Principal Project Officer	MAS3	Car Park (10 months) Additional week annual leave	\$973 \$2,488
Manager ICT Services	MAS3	Car Park Additional week annual leave	\$1,168 \$5,903
Manager Results and Information Management	MAS3	Car Park Additional week annual leave	\$1,168 \$2,743

History Trust of South Australia

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Education Manager	ASO5	Retention Allowance	\$2,123

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Ministerial staff employed as at 5 July 2019 were published in the *Government Gazette* on 18 July 2019.

The following table lists public sector staff employed in my office as at 30 June 2019

Title	Classification	Non-Salary Benefit
Administration Trainee	TRA12	Nil
Business Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Executive Assistant to the Minister	ASO5	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Office Manager	ASO7	Car park

The member may note that this represents a dramatic reduction from the arrangements in place under the former government. Since 30 June 2019, no staff have been seconded from the department to my office.

TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Since 1 July 2018, one executive level employee has been terminated from TAFE SA. For the same period, no executive level employees have been terminated from the Department for Education, the SACE Board of South Australia, the Education Standards Board or the History Trust of South Australia.

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Since 1 July 2018, the following new executive appointments were made within the Department for Education:

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Project Director, Workforce Reform	SAES2
Director, Further Education and Pathways	SAES1
Assistant Director, Business Improvement	SAES1
Project Director	SAES1
Director, People and Culture	SAES1
Director, Customer and Information Services	SAES1
Director, Aboriginal Education	SAES1

The total employment cost for these executive appointments was \$1,484,596 TRPV (excluding on-costs).

Since 1 July 2018, the following new executive appointments were made within TAFE SA due to natural attrition, termination and retirement.

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Executive Director Quality Teaching and Learning	SAES2
Acting Chief Executive	SAES2
Chief Financial Officer	SAES2
Director Teaching and Learning	SAES1
Director Foundation Skills, Primary Industries, Animal and Laboratory Sciences	SAES1
Director Facilities and Procurement	SAES1
Director Student Experience	SAES1
Director Governance and Research	SAES1
Director Human Resources and Organisational Development	SAES1
Director Finance and Performance	SAES1
Director Information Communication Technology	SAES1

The total employment cost for these executive appointments was \$1,785,900.00 (excluding on-costs).

Since 1 July 2018, the following new executive appointments were made within the SACE Board of South Australia.

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Deputy Chief Executive	EXB

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in Schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Section 4 of DPC Circular 13—Annual Reporting details the use of the annual report template. The template includes sections for an organisational structure and changes to the agency to be included by each agency. I refer the member to the annual reports which will be published for each of the agencies I am responsible for.

CHILD AND FAMILY SUPPORT

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Human Services has advised the following:

The new system is being co-designed with the sector, including government and non-government service providers, peak organisations and practitioners. Families, children and young people with lived experience of the child protection system are being directly involved in and informing this process.

To date, more than 400 people across South Australia have participated in the co-design process, including through eight workshops held across metropolitan Adelaide, Murray Bridge, Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Kadina. There have also been a series of one-on-one interviews undertaken with service users and the government is continuing to engage with young people through a range of channels, including the youth panel informing development of the state's new youth action plan. Further in-depth design workshops will be held with a wide range of stakeholders from across the state in the coming months.

Further questions in relation to the co-design and implementation of the Child and Family Support System should be directed to the Minister for Human Services as lead minister of this work.

CHILD AND FAMILY SUPPORT

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Human Services has advised the following:

The Child and Family Support System has committed to developing a dedicated monitoring and evaluation system. The process of the evaluation and methodology is currently being co-designed with the sector and will include monitoring the performance of the programs and undertaking formal evaluation.

TOGETHER SA

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):

The Department for Education and the (former) Department for Communities and Social Inclusion have previously provided grant funding to Together SA. In June 2018, the Department for Education provided funding of \$50,000 to December 2018. The deliverables were:

- backbone support of Together in the South including advice, facilitating connections and providing access to data
- support of the statewide network of collective impact communities, including opportunities for strategic learning and representing South Australia in a nationwide network for collective impact partners; and
- transitioning out of leadership of Together in the North.

This grant was for short term financial support while Together SA reviewed its ongoing financial sustainability. The Department for Education works with a range of not for profit organisations to deliver programs that support its vision to build a world-class education system in this state. In considering its partnering arrangements, the department aims for the most effective and targeted use of public resources in the interest of education.

GUARDIAN FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The Guardian for Children and Young People (the guardian) is established under the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016 (the act), which is committed to me as the Minister for Education. However, the powers and functions of the act which relate to the Guardian for Children and Young People (Part 3) are delegated to the Minister for Child Protection.

COMMISSIONER FOR ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People's instrument of appointment sets out seven key outcomes for the role, which are:

1. promote the development of operational practices, policies and procedures by state authorities
2. focus on assisting Aboriginal families and communities to keep Aboriginal children safe in culturally appropriate ways
3. consult with Aboriginal children and young people, their families and communities in activities and initiatives arising from the office of the commissioner to maximise engagement and participation
4. gain insight and contribution from experts in relevant fields
5. provide age appropriate and accessible information to Aboriginal children and young people
6. in collaboration with the Commissioner for Children and Young People prepare and publish reports and research finding and make recommendations to ministers, state authorities and other bodies on matters related to the rights, development and wellbeing of Aboriginal children and young people; and

7. work with the Commissioner for Children and Young People to promote the performance of their functions as they relate to Aboriginal children and young people.

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People has not submitted any issues-based reports to me since her appointment.

STRATHMONT POOL

In reply to **Ms WORTLEY (Torrens)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

1. In December 2018, prior to the closure of the Strathmont Centre swimming pool, schools affected by the closure were provided with information regarding 14 swimming pools across metropolitan Adelaide, which offered the Department for Education Water Safety program for students with disabilities. The swimming pools schools could select from included:

- Adelaide State Aquatic Centre
- Clovercrest State Swim swimming pool, Modbury North
- Elizabeth Aquadome Swim Centre
- Golden Grove State Swim swimming pool
- Marion Swim Centre
- Minda Home Swim Centre, Brighton
- Noarlunga Swim Centre
- The Parks Recreation and Sports Centre, Angle Park
- Regency Park Swim Centre
- SA State Aquatics and Leisure Centre Marion
- Surf Education Program, West Beach
- The Aquatic and Recreation Centre (ARC), Campbelltown
- Thebarton Aquatic Centre
- Waterworld Aquatic Centre, Tea Tree Gully.

The school-based decision in relation to selecting the appropriate venue for their students was made to address factors such as cost, travel time and any other requirements, which resulted in the best outcomes for the school and their students. The cost of transporting students to access the water safety program is funded by the school and it would have been a consideration when schools selected the appropriate alternative swimming centre in preparation with the closure of the Strathmont Centre.

In 2019, departmental data indicated that all schools who previously accessed the Strathmont Centre swimming pool have continued their involvement in the Department for Education water safety program at the following swimming pools:

- The Parks Recreation and Sports Centre, Angle Park
- Clovercrest State Swim swimming pool, Modbury North
- Golden Grove State Swim swimming pool
- Elizabeth Aquadome Swim Centre.

All students with disabilities are entitled to access 7.5 hours per term of the Water Safety program and this has not been reduced for students involved in the program since the closure of the Strathmont Centre swimming pool. The schools arrange the scheduling of the lessons directly with the Instructor in Charge of the centre to meet their needs.

As a result of the department's personalised program being available at The Parks Recreation and Sports Centre, the following new schools now access the program:

- Woodville Gardens Primary School
- Kilkenny Primary School
- Trinity Gardens School
- Findon High School.

2. Schools select swimming pool facilities based on suitability for their students' needs. Community pools present significant value in terms of social inclusion and students being able to continue their involvement in aquatic based physical activity as a recreational pursuit with their family and/or friends in the social setting of a community facility.

The number of lanes used in the swimming pool is determined by the number of students in a class, with a minimum of two lanes used and more available if required by the instructor in charge.

The Parks Recreation and Sports Centre has two swimming pools which are larger and deeper than the Strathmont Centre swimming pool. Improved water activities can be offered to students with disabilities as a result. In addition, schools are further attracted to The Parks Recreation and Sports Centre given the extensive improvement to the facilities.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

In the 2018-19 financial year there were 118 investigations. In the 2017-2018 financial year there were 137 investigations, and in the 2016-2017 financial year there were 145 investigations.