

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 16 October 2019****The SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 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.*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	23
Noes	19
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.	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

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	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.		

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 2019.)

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

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 19
Majority 5

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

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	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.		

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:42): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 19
Majority 5

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

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E.
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. (teller)	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.		

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CODE AMENDMENTS) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Second Reading

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:47): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	24
Noes	19
Majority	5

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

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	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.		

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

Motions

HOUSING SA

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (10:52): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the role of the government in ensuring that all South Australians have a roof over their head;

- (b) recognises the valuable role that Housing SA plays in ensuring that South Australians have access to quality public housing and in providing an injection of housing stock into the market to keep a lid on private rent rises;
- (c) condemns the Marshall government for increasing the rent of thousands of South Australians living in Housing SA and non-government housing;
- (d) notes the significant impact that these rent hikes will have on the ability of tenants to pay for everyday expenses like health care, food and bills;
- (e) notes that these rent increases may also be mirrored in the private sector; and
- (f) calls upon the Marshall government to reverse these cruel cuts and stop using Housing SA to raise revenue.

Housing is an economic, social and cultural right. It is recognised universally as a human right, and that is within a number of different instruments. Every South Australian has a right to a secure and affordable home, whatever form that home takes. As part of the United Nations sustainable goals, we can look no further than the achievement of health and wellbeing, the elimination of poverty, the achievement of education for all and the elimination of hunger as points that are central and core within the umbrella of housing. Without housing, how do we achieve all these other goals?

Whether it is public housing through the government, community homes, affordable private rental or affordable houses to buy, the government takes this responsibility very seriously, as does the opposition and as did the opposition in government. We need to ensure that the right home is there for every person, for every family, to suit their needs. Labor has always stood for affordable and public housing for all South Australians. We reasserted this commitment to the essential right at our state convention last weekend.

We moved motions at our state convention that encouraged us to look into a multitude of options around the private market and around partnerships in order to attract investment into the housing market, this housing market that needs to provide homes for so many South Australians. Too many times this government fails to live up to this responsibility, however, to ensure that quality public housing is available for those who need it, and this results in a magnitude of other problems.

Sadly, people easily become homeless if their needs are not met in the public housing system. In fact, we have just seen some questions answered that were left on notice about the number of people evicted from public housing over the past 12 months. There has been a significant increase in this, and the first two months of this financial year are worrying in terms of the number of people who have been evicted from public housing.

If people are evicted from public housing, where do they go? The answers given to us include the private market and private rental. Well, how do they achieve this? It is near impossible for these people to achieve this on their own. What we have seen in the last 18 months as well is a massive reduction in the number of staff available within the public housing system to provide support to people who are in public housing and lack the skills of tenancy. We need to be improving and increasing what we do for these people in order to maintain their presence in a secure and affordable home.

Instead of recognising these problems and making sure that the most vulnerable people are looked after, we are seeing constant threats of eviction causing anxiety amongst this vulnerable community. We have also been told that tenants have been asked to leave the homes they have lived in their whole lives because their homes are not being fully utilised. People do not understand what this means. They are not being given any context to this or any time to prepare for this thought process that means they will need to move on from their family home.

The government is stretching people to the point where they do not have money for food or bills. This has been particularly highlighted this week during Anti-Poverty Week, which is being observed nationally, with 13.2 per cent of Australians living below the poverty line. This is a perpetual problem that we must address and we must deal with, but increasing the rents of very marginalised and often complex people in public housing in small cottage flats and single-bedroom units is not the way to do it. Not only does it put these people at further risk of living in poverty, and it does not just secure their place under the poverty line, but it also increases their risk of homelessness.

We need to remember that these people who live within the single-bedroom walk-up flats—these cottage flats—often have complex medical problems, complex mental health problems or a combination of all those. What these people need is increased supports and input rather than increased rent, because that \$5 or \$10 a week means the difference between their being able to have a hot meal or purchase their medications, or go without and spiral further.

When a government fails the public in one sector, such as housing, there are negative and flow-on consequences into others. When you increase rental prices in public housing, you often see private rentals start to rise as well. The private rental market is simply not affordable for many South Australians. Not only is the private rental market not affordable but it is almost impossible for people in the private rental market to then move through the continuum and attempt to move into their own affordable housing.

What we have is a continuum of housing from homelessness through to home ownership that at every point faces enormous challenges, and what we are seeing is tinkering around and rental increases. These rental increases must be stopped. We have to see investment in order to assure people that we as a society are committed to the ultimate goal of independence, autonomy and affordable housing.

Instead of the government acting like a profiteering landlord and making money from public housing tenants, why do we not see a government lobbying its federal counterparts? We hear often that we have this mature relationship happening; well, use it to have a mature conversation and pull the biggest lever that you have at your hands and raise the rate of Newstart.

Unlike what Senator Anne Ruston is quoted as saying, that income will not go into the pockets of drug dealers, pubs, pokies and all these other mythological exit points for people living on the poverty line: it will go into rent, it will go into paying for children's excursions at school, it will go into buying fresh fruit and vegetables and it will go into looking after yourself and potentially actually being able to invest in self-actualisation and seeking a job.

I do not feel that this government are considering all the impacts of these actions on the community. I believe that they could try to lobby and get that lever pulled to raise the rate, and I believe that many members of this government know in their heart that that is the right thing to do. We cannot fail the community in housing. We have to ensure that every South Australian has the choice of having a roof over their head. It is a crucial human right of every person. Nobody chooses to live on concrete, nobody chooses to live in the damp, cold, wet Parklands and nobody chooses not to have a roof over their head.

We know the importance of affordable housing in helping people live dignified and meaningful lives. We must not let the ideology that rent rises of \$5 a week will change the budget bottom line get in the way of what is providing support and services to people who truly need it, not just in the city of Adelaide but beyond and in the regions. I commend the motion.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Deputy Premier, I welcome today members of the Norwood Combined Probus Club, hosted by the Hon. John Dawkins in another place. Welcome to parliament.

Motions

HOUSING SA

Debate resumed.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:03): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and (f) and substitute in lieu the following paragraphs:

- (c) congratulates the Marshall Liberal government on undertaking the first asset condition inspection program since 2003;
- (d) condemns Labor for running down South Australia's public housing portfolio; and

- (e) thanks all the stakeholders involved in contributing to South Australia's new Housing and Homelessness Strategy.

In doing so, I acknowledge firstly in the motion a recognition of the role of government in ensuring all South Australians have a roof over their head. Security in housing and access to shelter are important aspects for the physical and mental wellbeing of South Australians, but they are also important for their dignity, independence and capacity, and there are a number of ways this has been achieved. However, in recognising the role that is played in relation to public housing, it concerns me that the mover of the motion is so critical of the current government when in fact we have acted to ensure that there is some fulfilment of this aspiration.

I come from the Liberal Party. We are proud of the history of the contribution to public housing in this state. Premier Butler, before World War II, established the South Australian Housing Trust. I see that his grandson went over to the dark side and became the federal member for Port Adelaide. Nevertheless, the initiative of a Liberal premier established the Housing Trust in South Australia, which was built for those who were described in those days as the 'working poor'. He built a system to ensure that the enormous migration program, which subsequently came to South Australia, could be accommodated in housing.

That was the model of the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, and it was a very good one. On this side of the house, we have a good track record of making sure that we make provision. The models have changed; that is true. But please, members of this house, do not come in and start bleating about the sale of Housing Trust (now Housing SA) property when the previous Labor government, in their time, did two things that I suggest are extraordinarily telling of the duplicity of what is put to us in this regard.

At its peak, public housing in South Australia had over 60,000 properties. Under the previous Labor government, thousands of properties were sold off. Indeed, some 7½ thousand properties were sold off, many of them in lucrative locations. When I first came into this parliament, with the elevation of the previous Labor government, they immediately started earmarking properties in Bragg. Why? Because they were more valuable they were immediately sold.

We provided services for those of refugee status—and for the few we have left we continue to provide services—who needed physical isolation and protection. Large families needed to have larger homes. I could recount in some length the support that the people in my electorate gave to the Bakhtiari family while they were here and needing protection and accommodation while their political status was being determined. So, please, do not bleat about that.

In 2011, Labor—not staggering with safety nets—immediately increased Housing Trust rents from 17 per cent to 19 per cent of income for tenants living in bedsits, and from 19 per cent to 21 per cent for those living in one-bedroom cottage flats. It is true that the previous government attempted to grapple with bad tenants in public housing. I think they utterly failed. They had a sort of 'three strikes and you are out' process.

They failed to really work with SACAT to make sure that those who were genuinely good tenants and living in oppressive circumstances via a tenant arrangement or failing to get proper maintenance on the property, were supported. They were also failing to deal with bad tenants who were continually in breach and who caused property damage and disturbance to the community in which they were living. I think they utterly failed in that area.

A responsible and respectful position needs to be maintained on that. I congratulate the Hon. Michelle Lensink on the work that she has done in this area. I also want to say that one of the very first initiatives of the Liberal government was to have the first asset condition inspection program since 2003. How appalling that we used to see, repeatedly, housing that was not ready for sale but done up, ready for tenants, that would just sit idle with no tenants in it. This was an appalling history of underperformance by the previous Labor government.

Sure, there is a new model and there is work around the sale and transition, for example, to organisations such as Anglicare, who can provide wraparound services to people who are in need of care, especially the cohort to which the mover of this motion has referred. But let's not be ridiculous about this. Let's understand that in the development of these new models we need to have some

transfer. This is being done in an orderly, professional and mature manner, in which the best outcomes for people in need of shelter are being provided for.

I also wish to recognise the establishment of the Housing and Homelessness Strategy, which, having had a task force established, produced a report that looked into, via the minister, the development of a 10-year plan, soon to be considered through the announcement process. That is important in targeting the housing needs and aspirations of South Australians and developing more effective and efficient models for the purposes of that implementation: building a housing market that supports housing choice and supply and targets support towards prevention and early intervention.

Congratulations to the minister again on taking this initiative, making sure that we know what we have, doing the audit—and thank goodness for that! It is 15 years late; nevertheless, it still happened, and good on her. She is making it happen and clearly setting out the priorities of the government. New initiatives have also been identified in relation to the supply of housing: \$42.2 million under the housing stimulus package for the construction program, \$21.4 million for the housing construction program to build 90 new homes and \$21.1 million for the preventative maintenance and upgrade programs. We understand what responsibility is in this area and we are actioning it.

The budget also provides to establish an interest-free deposit gap loan of up to \$10,000 through HomeStart to help low income borrowers cover up-front costs of buying a home. I am pleased to see in the media this last week the extra loans that have been taken up by graduates from our universities—excellent. What did the previous government do? They started preparing a plan to look into selling HomeStart. As usual, they were looking for cash for prop-up measures in relation to their own irresponsible public mismanagement of the finances on behalf of South Australia.

Many members are already familiar with the asset condition inspection program. There is the establishment of the new \$6.8 million affordable housing shared equity initiative, called Assist, to help South Australian with low and moderate incomes. Members, we have already established in the first 18 months of the new government a priority for housing. We recognise the importance of this. Shame on the previous government for abandoning their responsibility in this area, so please do not come in here with crocodile tears and be dismissive or rude about the positive initiatives that this government is now employing.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (11:11): Public housing and homelessness is a significant social problem across Australia. This very significant social problem is particularly relevant to me as the member for Adelaide and also the Minister for Child Protection. In my electorate and specifically within the CBD, September figures provided from the Adelaide Zero Project by-name list show that 163 people were identified as sleeping rough at 18 September, compared with 208 in August and greater numbers in July, June and May.

This reduction, while acknowledging the figures can fluctuate, is a step in the right direction thanks to the work of the South Australian Housing Authority and homelessness service providers. The reopening earlier this month of a boarding house in Waymouth Street provides an opportunity for couples and people with pets to seek assistance. Pets and couples, not typically accepted into boarding houses, will be able to sleep safe and access specialised services in this transitional accommodation.

Shockingly, at the time of forming government an asset condition report of housing stock had not been conducted since 2003. Further, the triennial review into the South Australian Housing Trust conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers, tabled last year, demonstrated that assets not sold off had been left neglected, leaving a maintenance backlog bill anticipated to be hundreds of millions of dollars.

In this year's state budget, a \$42.2 million housing stimulus package was announced, comprising a \$21.4 million construction program and a \$21.1 million preventative maintenance and upgrade program. This will make some inroads into addressing the legacy of Labor's blatant disregard for the critical need to maintain housing stock at appropriate levels and in good habitable condition, and to provide residents with dignity and respect.

The establishment of the Housing and Homelessness Taskforce to lead the reform and the development of this government's housing and homelessness strategy, along with the appointment of Ian Cox, who many will know was the driving force behind the Hutt St Centre, who will lead the new Office of Homelessness Sector Integration, are very significant. With this in mind, there is a clear direction to build the necessary framework to meet the 10-year vision that all South Australians have access to appropriate and affordable housing that contributes to social inclusion and economic participation.

Within my local community, I work to support various service providers who focus on supporting those vulnerable South Australians who are facing homelessness. Sadly, of the more than 21,000 people who sought the assistance of the South Australian Specialist Homelessness Services in the 2017-18 year under the former government, almost two-thirds were impacted by domestic violence, drugs and/or alcohol and mental health, or in some cases a combination of all three. These are also the three main contributing factors resulting in children needing to enter the child protection system. The correlation reminds us of how important a whole-of-government approach is to these social issues.

Research also shows that youth who are in foster care and juvenile justice settings are at increased risk of becoming homeless compared with other young people. The national Swinburne study on youth homelessness identified that 63 per cent of Australia's homeless young people were care leavers. The Transitioning from Care report card stated that as many as 40 per cent of young people discharged from statutory care experience homelessness within 12 months of exiting. To combat this, one of the first policies taken to the 2018 election was Stability in Foster Care. I am proud this commitment was met inside our first 100 days, fully budgeted and, since the 1 January 2019, fully implemented so that foster and kinship carer payments have now been extended to the age of 21.

There are clear operational protocols between DCP and Housing SA, ensuring the two agencies work collaboratively in the interests of all young people who are transitioning from care into independent living, as well as providing support by DCP caseworkers and/or Housing SA workers where appropriate. The Department for Child Protection also works with CREATE and Relationships Australia to support those transitioning from care into independent living and can direct care leavers to apply for the Transition to Independent Living Allowance paid through the commonwealth Department of Social Services and grants from the Dame Roma Mitchell Trust.

Another program delivering supports to young people aged up to 21 in Upper Spencer Gulf who are leaving care is the Transition to Adult Life Intensive program. This program involves intensive case management services, peer mentoring and assistance to access education and employment. It is imperative that young people in care who are transitioning to independent living have access to these services to support them on their path to adulthood. These are all key features to equip young people with the life skills necessary to reach their potential and prevent homelessness. I applaud the inroads made by my colleague, minister Lensink in the upper house, in the area of homelessness and commend the motion as amended by the Attorney-General to the house.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:17): I rise today to speak to the amended motion in relation to public housing. I thank the Attorney-General for bringing these amendments to the motion put before the house by the member for Hurtle Vale. The motion, as proposed to be amended, is as follows:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the role of the government in ensuring that all South Australians have a roof over their head;
- (b) recognises the valuable role that Housing SA plays in ensuring that South Australians have access to quality public housing and in providing an injection of housing stock into the market to keep a lid on private rent rises;
- (c) congratulates the Marshall Liberal government on undertaking the first asset condition inspection program since 2003;
- (d) condemns Labor for running down South Australia's public housing portfolio; and

- (e) thanks all the stakeholders involved in contributing to South Australia's new Housing and Homelessness Strategy.

It is a worthy amendment to the motion and one that I support. My support for this amended motion is a reflection of experience in my regional electorate of MacKillop. MacKillop carries a legacy of neglect and poor decision-making by Labor with respect to public and social housing. Public housing forms an important part of the housing continuum. It has an important role in protecting vulnerable tenants against rental stress, providing accommodation for people at risk of homelessness, and can provide a stepping stone people need to secure private rental.

Public housing forms an important component of the housing and rental market. Where public and social housing are unable to meet demand, there are implications for the rental market and difficult and stressful consequences for those, in particular on lower incomes, who are in need of housing. We know that under Labor our public housing system was left to erode. It was variously sold off to prop up the budget of the day and used to raise cash for the trust.

The maintenance budget for public housing was slashed. This has been to the serious detriment of the lives of many tenants of Housing Trust homes and those who are in need of public housing today. This decision-making and lack of action have left a maintenance backlog bill that totals in the hundreds of millions of dollars. I can quote from a meeting where I was informed that the average Housing Trust home has a maintenance bill of \$18,000, but if you compare city and regional areas, city houses had a maintenance backlog of \$16,000 whereas the regions had a backlog of \$26,000, a clear discrepancy between regional and city housing.

Our regional experience today highlights the role that state and, indeed, local and federal governments have in ensuring that South Australians do have a roof over their heads. The townships of Naracoorte and Bordertown are experiencing challenges in relation to housing. There are different drivers for these pressures; however, a key part of the solution lies in roles to be played by local, state and federal governments.

Key housing challenges vary. For example, in Naracoorte one of the housing pressures is the need for social housing for low-income families and individuals. Unfortunately, prospective tenants cannot all be accommodated, with the waiting list for social housing said to be more than 50 applicants in Naracoorte alone. By way of context, the social housing stock we have has been transitioned from Housing SA to Unity Housing, which today is actively seeking solutions to the condition of its housing assets and engaging in partnerships to grow housing stock to meet the needs of tenants.

Labor's decision-making has meant that we are living with a legacy of lower levels of social housing availability and social housing stock that has not been upgraded to ensure cost-effective and efficient operation. We need accessible housing that is fit for the climate and energy efficient. It needs to be affordable. Housing solutions are also needed to accommodate migrant workers who are being attracted to the regions to address worker shortages in meat processing businesses that operate in Naracoorte, Bordertown and surrounding districts.

Finding appropriate and fit-for-purpose housing solutions for migrant workers can also be a challenge. Just one of the challenges faced by migrant workers is that they often come to the region without the ability to pay a bond and provide rental references, and they can have challenges in understanding the rental system and other associated costs. If these factors are not addressed, these workers are significantly disadvantaged in their efforts to find accommodation and, importantly, settle and stay in the region to work and live in the community.

In addition, we find that the configuration of housing stock does not necessarily meet the needs of a range of migrant workers, from individuals through to those with large and very large families. Other complexities faced by the regions include small rental markets, such as those in Bordertown and Keith, which means that finding suitable housing for anyone seeking to move there is challenging.

We have also found that there are barriers to capital investment to grow housing stock in smaller regional communities. There is no social housing available in Bordertown or Keith. To address these issues, ensure adequate social housing and provide opportunities for affordable and

fit-for-purpose housing for all our community requires a strong and collaborative approach by local, state and federal governments.

I am pleased to advise the house that at the electorate level we are working on these challenges. I have been working with the Tatiara council, the Naracoorte Lucindale Council, PIRSA, Regional Development Australia Limestone Coast, Unity Housing, the Australian Migrant Resource Centre and the federal Liberal member for Barker, Tony Pasin, to seek solutions to a range of housing challenges, both social housing and affordable housing, as well as the short and long-term rental challenges for our migrant workers.

The issues we have been experiencing at the electorate level are complex and unique to our area, but they are representative of the level of complexity of housing challenges faced by communities across the state. The Marshall Liberal government has recognised this and is responding to these complex housing challenges by establishing a housing and homelessness task force. Our government has a range of actions underway to support social housing and ensure that people have a roof over their heads.

A key initiative includes the development of a new housing and homelessness strategy, which will be a 10-year plan to implement our vision that all South Australians have access to appropriate and affordable housing that contributes to social inclusion and economic participation. I was pleased that, as part of the development of the strategy, a key consultation workshop was undertaken in Naracoorte earlier this year. This workshop provided an opportunity to bring together a range of stakeholders to examine the issues, drivers and potential options to address matters related to housing and homelessness.

I am informed that the participation and input to the local workshop by the great array of stakeholders who are committed to housing solutions and the welfare of our community was considered, compassionate and forward thinking. We are fortunate that there is a diverse and committed group of people who have been involved in laying the foundations for our statewide strategy. I thank these people and others across the state who have continued to contribute to the development of the strategy. I look forward to the focus that the strategy will bring in addressing the complex issues we face. Strong alliances and partnerships between sectors and governments will be required to support a modern and multiprovider social housing system.

The strategy, coupled with a range of other initiatives, including investment identified in this year's budget, is leading our government's efforts to addressing housing accessibility challenges. Investment includes a commitment of \$21.1 million for a preventative maintenance and upgrade program and funding to establish an interest-free gap loan of up to \$10,000 through HomeStart to help low-income borrowers cover the up-front cost of buying a home. These are just some of the measures our government is initiating for support and access to housing.

Another important measure that is seeking to address the neglect of Labor is the instigation of the housing asset condition inspection program to assess the physical and structural condition of SA Housing Trust properties. The fact that this is a long overdue program which has not been reported on since 2003 should be one of Labor's greatest embarrassments and is yet another blight on Labor's time in government.

If I may, Mr Speaker, with a couple of minutes to go, say that we do have these forums rolling out in my electorate and we do have an affordable housing issue in the area of MacKillop. We have two magnificent, large businesses that employ a lot of people in the processing of livestock, and they are very, very important to our region. However, one of the biggest pitfalls and hurdles they have is finding workers to actually work in these industries.

One of the shortcomings but also one of the most progressive advantages that these two businesses have is that they use migrant workers. They come from all over the world, and they have a lot of issues to deal with, and one of them is housing. It is not necessarily a social housing issue but it is an affordable housing issue. One thing they have to work through is the expectations of what they are doing in our country and what they expect to pay for rent. They expect to pay \$30 or \$40 a week, and to do that they have to share a house with 10 others to pay for a house that costs \$300 to \$400 to rent. There are lots of issues to work through, but it is certainly an issue that is holding back our region, and it needs to be solved.

People having a roof over their head is a basic necessity for security and wellbeing. All South Australians deserve to be part of the delivery of our vision that all South Australians have access to appropriate and affordable housing that contributes to social inclusion and economic participation. I look forward to our government's continued progress on reining back the dire situation in which our public and social housing have been left to flounder under Labor. For the benefit of all South Australians, I commend the amended motion to the house.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:27): Clearly, we will not be supporting the amendments. There are a couple of things to be said about them. Yesterday, a couple of things were said in question time as well, that we all should just be thankful for someone doing something, like a minister doing something in his portfolio. In the other house, the deaf community were completely disrespected by a sledge across the chamber, with a Liberal minister saying that the Labor opposition were either deaf or worse. Well, today, what we have been told is that we have been—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Member, one moment. There is a point of order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Firstly, this is not germane to the motion before us but, most importantly, it is reflecting on the other place. I would ask that the member desist from that.

The SPEAKER: Whilst the member—

Members interjecting:

Ms COOK: What point of order are you talking about? What is going on?

The SPEAKER: If you could just sit down for one moment. Whilst it is true that members should not impute improper motives to any other member, the member did not name any minister. I would caution her about future remarks, and I ask her to come back to the substance of the motion, please.

Ms COOK: In the speech made by the deputy leader, it was alleged that I was dismissive and rude in my comments today in this chamber. I do not believe that I was dismissive and rude at any point; I was merely making a point.

The SPEAKER: Do you mean the Deputy Premier?

Ms COOK: Sorry, yes, the Deputy Premier. I was merely making a point. Yesterday, we were accused and told that we should just be thankful and grateful for things that are done and also that the deaf community being disrespected is all part of the way people are speaking in here. I do not think any of it is useful or germane to any of the debates, quite frankly.

I thank the member for Adelaide for raising the Zero Project numbers. She has chosen to point out that in the last six months the numbers of homeless people in the CBD who were counted have gone down, but they have not gone down to anywhere near the point they were when the Liberal Party came into government. The number that homeless people sit at within the CBD is still around 30 higher than it was in May of 2018. While we see these rises and falls, I do not believe that that has gone the full way, but I thank her for raising that.

The member for Adelaide also raised the point that a property on Waymouth Street has now been opened. That is a great initiative; however, it was ready for use in April, so it has sat empty and ready for use for six months. That is unfortunate, considering we have had this average number of around 200 people in the CBD who sadly have been left without a roof over their head. The date of the availability of that property was provided to me yesterday in an answer from the Deputy Premier: that property was available in April. I am a bit disappointed with that.

I would like to call out again this nonsense about Labor being the only party that would ever sell off public housing to any number. I can tell you that between 1993 and 2002, when the Liberal government was last in power, on average they sold off 3,000 public housing properties per annum—that is 3,000. Rob Lucas was at the helm as Treasurer around this time. That is 3,000 per year on average. Over the period Labor was in government, their average was 500 per year. What have the sales been in the last 18 months? I can tell you that they have not stopped.

So they should not come in here preaching to us about some utopian world where the Liberal government sit on a high horse around sales of public housing properties when they are the real estate agent kings when it comes to selling public housing. They have proven that, and they will continue to prove that as time goes on. It needs to come to a stop.

In terms of the transfer of stock to social housing providers, the brakes have gone on since the Liberals came to government. The housing providers are sitting, waiting for further guidance and support to be able to continue these great projects. We need to work together to get this moving. All people need to be singing from the same songbook when it comes to public housing.

I thank you for your history lesson from the point of view of privilege, but, no, I will not be bleated at either. We do not approve of the amendment.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 24
 Noes 18
 Majority 6

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

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F. (teller)	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.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:38): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the enormous benefits of liberalised global trade to the Australian and South Australian economies;
- (b) commends the Australian government for concluding free trade agreements over the past five years which have substantially contributed to record economic growth, job creation and exports while continuing to pursue an ambitious trade agenda;
- (c) commends the Marshall government for implementing its agenda to increase South Australian exports; and
- (d) notes in particular the efforts of South Australia's farmers and agriculture, food and wine sector to make the most of export opportunities offered by free trade agreements for the benefit of rural communities and the state's economy.

Australia has been a strong trading nation for a very long time. For thousands of years before British settlement, Indigenous Australians have traded goods across the Torres Strait, with their neighbours, to the north of the continent. Indigenous trade across the Torres Strait continues today.

Liberalised trade is essential for the future of this state and the future of our nation. The almost universal outcome for countries which open their economies to global trade is increased economic growth. Australia exemplifies this fact. We have one of the most open economies in the world and have enjoyed 27 years of uninterrupted growth in times when many other Western economies have not. This growth is forecast to exceed the OECD average in the key indicators for the next three years.

Since the 1980s, trade liberalisation has lifted Australia's GDP by 5.4 per cent and increased the average real income of Australian households by more than \$8,400 per year. One in every five Australian jobs involve trade-related activities. Recent national figures are that Australia's two-way trade in goods and services expanded by 8.4 per cent to reach \$798.6 billion in 2017-18. Australian exports in 2017-18 were valued at \$403.2 billion, up almost 8 per cent from the previous year.

Australia's top four trading partners in 2017-18 were China, Japan, the United States and South Korea. They account for almost half of Australia's total two-way trade. It is no coincidence that we have free trade agreements (FTAs) with each of them. Free trade arrangements have been an essential element in Australia's economic success over the years. There is a school of thought in Australia that multilateral agreements are preferable; however, multilateral negotiations in the World Trade Organisation are excruciatingly slow. Free trade agreements with fewer participants offer the best and most expedient means to improve Australia's competitiveness and open up new commercial opportunities.

We have no choice but to commend the Australian government for negotiating these arrangements. Since the Coalition was elected in 2013, the government has successfully pursued an ambitious trade agenda, with free trade agreements as the cornerstone. The FTAs that have been successfully concluded are with China and Japan, and South Korea was soon after.

Australia now has 11 regional and bilateral free trade agreements in force. Another four have been completed but are not yet in force. They are the Indonesia-Australia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement, the Peru-Australia Free Trade Agreement, the Australia-Hong Kong Free Trade Agreement, and the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations. Another seven agreements are currently under negotiation, including with India and the EU.

There is also a strong prospect that we will negotiate a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom. By next year, Australia's free trade agreements may account for up to 80 per cent of our trade. Our own state has benefitted enormously from the Australian government's success in concluding and implementing free trade agreements. Exports create substantial jobs in our economy—greater than 10 per cent of South Australian employment, according to departmental estimates.

For South Australia, based on the \$15.5 billion of merchandise and service exports recorded in 2017, this equated to nearly 80,000 South Australian jobs. Australia's free trade agreements in force cover eight of South Australia's top 10 merchandise export countries for 2018-19 and all top five countries—China, Malaysia, the United States, Japan and Thailand.

The benefits of the free trade agreements for our state's leading agriculture, food and wine sector are impressive. A great example is wine exports to China. Under the China free trade agreement, the tariff for bottled wine steadily reduced to a zero tariff at the beginning of this year. Compare this with major competitors in the EU, South Africa and Argentina, who still face a 14 per cent bottled wine tariff in accessing the Chinese market, and the United States, which, following recent trade tensions, now has a tariff approaching 100 per cent.

South Australia's wine exports to China in 2018-19 were worth approximately \$800 million, up from approximately \$150 million in 2014-15 before any reductions in tariffs flowed from the agreement with China. As a producer of premium wine, South Australia has also increased its national share of wine exports to China from less than 60 per cent in 2014-15 to around 75 per cent in 2018-19.

However, it not just China and wine. One of the key things we have seen since the establishment of the free trade agreement between New Zealand and China back in 2008 is the significant growth of New Zealand's dairy industry in relation to Australia's dairy industry. The

New Zealand industry basically doubled in size, while the Australian industry declined slightly. That competitive advantage they had in going to China was significant; however, with the free trade agreement between China and Australia, that is now starting to reverse and balance up the access.

It is important to note that while free trade agreements have created these opportunities, South Australian farmers and businesses have seized them. To do so requires research, cost, effort, time and considerable risk, in addition to reduced tariffs and better access provided by free trade agreements. The rewards can be great for businesses and farmers, but the benefits flow further to entire communities, regional areas and the state's economy. The Marshall government must be commended for its efforts to boost South Australian exports.

Complementing national activity, the Marshall government is directly supporting local businesses to increase their exports and utilise free trade agreements to their full advantage, with measures including TradeStart advisers educating existing and prospective exporters; overseas representatives in key target markets that have close alignment with markets in Australia, with which Australia has free trade agreements; more targeted inbound and outbound business missions to drive investment opportunities, promote the state's capabilities and facilitate market access; funding the delivery of export capability training to local businesses, such as Business SA's Export Ready Program; and a strengthened South Australia Export Accelerator grant, providing financial assistance for local business growth into international markets.

At a broader level, the government's response to the Joyce review is firmly focused on the role that the nine priority export sectors can play in growing the state's prosperity and exports, because they primarily operate in external-facing markets and there is global growth demand. This also makes these sectors attractive destinations for further investment. This includes a major export sector, food, wine and agribusinesses, energy and mining, international education and tourism. All have significant opportunities to grow further.

There are also emerging sectors based on international technology trends and Australian government commitments to South Australia. These include defence, space, health and medical, and creative and high-tech industries. Lead government agencies are working with each target export sector on sector strategies that have ambitious but achievable growth objectives. The first of the industry strategies was released on 6 August 2019, when the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment and other industry leaders released the South Australian Visitor Economy Sector Plan 2030, which sets an ambitious and bold agenda for tourism. The industry-led and endorsed plan aims to grow the state's visitor economy to \$12.8 billion by 2030 and generate an additional 16,000 jobs.

On 19 August, the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment and industry leaders also announced the International Education 2030 strategy, which sets an ambitious target of achieving a \$3 billion industry and employing 23,500 South Australians by 2030. This strategy was developed with industry and included extensive consultation with international education stakeholders and the Ministerial Advisory Committee for International Education.

Other key exports are working to develop growth targets and will be releasing their strategies over the next 12 months. In coming months, the South Australian government will detail its response to supporting industries to achieve increasing exports as a vital part of the broader goal of achieving 3 per cent average annual growth in gross state product.

The benefits of liberalised trade and, in particular, Australia's free trade agreements are undeniable. The facts speak for themselves: we are much better off with them than without them, yet there is still resistance in the community and among certain commentators. It is a result of the ideological fearmongering, sometimes bordering on outright xenophobia, of many of our political opponents who find it preferable to scare up a few votes rather than support liberalised trade, which not only benefits our nation but lifts countless billions of people across the world out of poverty.

Our population cannot sustain a closed economy as it is simply much too small. In fact, we have the smallest national population of any of the world's top 15 economies. Our prosperity relies on liberalised trade and I am proud to be a member of the Marshall government, which understands this.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:51): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraphs (b) and (c) and substitute in lieu the following:

- (b) commends successive Australian governments for initiating and concluding free trade agreements, which have substantially contributed to record economic growth, job creation and exports, while continuing to pursue an ambitious trade agenda;
- (c) condemns the Marshall Liberal government for its savage cuts to the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment at a time when South Australia's share of national merchandise exports are at 30-year lows; and

While I welcome the thrust of this motion and congratulate the member for Finniss on bringing it here, I think it is disingenuous to think that the negotiation and ratification of free trade agreements could only extend to the previous five years. This nation and this state have a proud tradition of having strong global trading links.

Clearly, an increase in exports leads to a more prosperous economy. However, our national share of merchandise exports, a measure that this government used when it was in opposition, has collapsed under the Marshall Liberal government. South Australia's international trade has plummeted by 20 per cent on the previous month, with our share of national exports now standing at an abysmal 2.58 per cent.

Let's review the last 18 months. In October and November 2018 and January, May, July and August 2019, South Australia had less than 3 per cent of national exports. Let's compare this with the average between 2014 and 2018, which was 4.4 per cent. It is just not good enough. Fewer exports mean fewer jobs here in South Australia, and we already lead the nation in unemployment.

Over the past 18 months, the Marshall Liberal government's approach to the state's trade policy has simply been to constantly review and cut the trade department. We have had 18 months of delay. We have had two machinery of government changes and, while we might have had a substantial review through Joyce, it has delayed our focus. We have had 18 months of delay to get on with it, and now we know the department is cut, cut, cut: \$26.8 million. Staff have been very concerned about their jobs; many have lost their jobs, and these are people with great skills and expertise, and they have gone.

These are real and tangible cuts to initiatives that are designed to help South Australian businesses expand their presence around the world. These cuts are making an impact. These cuts stop us exporting to the world. Labor backed our producers of premium food and wine with a range of measures, including Adelaide's membership of the Great Wine Capitals Global Network; the introduction of the annual \$1.8 million South Australian Wine Industry Development Scheme; annualising the Tasting Australia festival; funding a range of development and export grants, and export grants that were consistent; the development of export training; and not just a commitment to year-on-year funding but a commitment to people that we know that export education is important, to support people who are looking to export and to support people who are already exporting to look at new markets.

I call upon this government to continue its focus on export education and to give commitment not just to year-on-year funding but to multiple year funding for this to continue. It was under Labor that South Australian wine export earnings increased to \$1.56 billion in 2017, the best global market result in 10 years. Labor undertook considerable investment toward developing new technologies for the food industry, but it is also important to remember that our service exports play a valuable role in South Australia's trade performance.

Tourism and international education are two of the biggest exporters that our state has. Unfortunately, tourism is another portfolio that has received significant cuts, with the Marshall Liberal government planning to cut \$23 million from the SATC budget over five years. In the first budget, there was an \$11 million cut. They hoped no-one would see that, but we are seeing the impacts of that now. In the second budget, they said, 'Just find \$12 million in efficiency savings. That won't have an impact,' but it has—a \$23 million cut over five years.

Our tourism marketing budget is now at a five-year low, and we are seeing the impacts of that tourism budget. While we know that tourism and international education are two of our biggest service exporters, we know that Tourism Research Australia says that next financial year there will be zero per cent growth in visitor nights—zero per cent. When we look at international tourists coming

here, we find that they are taking shorter trips and spending less money. We have seen an 11 per cent decline in international visitor nights and a 5 per cent decline in spend. When you make cuts like this, they have an impact. This is why we must continually raise this issue here, to say that \$23 million out of tourism is cutting and biting South Australians.

We also know that there is estimated to be a decline of 1.6 per cent in international tourism visitor nights in the next financial year. I stand here today to talk to this amended motion because it is clear that, when it comes to boosting South Australian exports, the Marshall Liberal government's strategy is to cut.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:59): I rise to support the original motion presented by the member for Finnis, and it is a good motion. The export globalisation, or the liberalisation of exports, is of paramount importance to the state's economy and to the national economy.

We have seen this over a long period of time. History has shown us that we have had over 27 years of uninterrupted growth within the export sector. It also tells us how important it is that one in five Australian jobs is represented within the export area. What we have seen in recent years is the opening up, the globalising, of our export industries, and playing on a world market has been more important not only to the nation's economy but particularly to South Australia's economy. That has been supported by the primary sector, and it has seen a huge windfall—a huge boon—for the South Australian primary sector's economy.

I want to commend a couple of commonwealth government ministers who have performed admirably over a short period of time with the introduction of our free trade agreements. I think the Hon. Andrew Robb has done an outstanding job with his contribution to the Coalition government. The work that he did, particularly with the ChAFTA, with Japan and with the Korean free trade agreements, has seen a huge windfall for our primary producers. The reduction of tariffs, and the continual reduction of tariffs, has created huge opportunity—massive opportunity—for the primary sector.

Steve Ciobo carried on that good work and backed up minister Robb's initiatives, particularly with China. We now see the growing reliability with China. Not only its two-way trade, but the outbound-inbound trade that comes into Australia and, more importantly, that goes out of South Australia, is of paramount importance. We know that that great work continues to be bolstered by the Hon. Simon Birmingham, the current trade minister, with the work he is doing in developing the agreements with Indonesia and with some of the South American countries. And, of course, the Pacific agreement will again continue to bolster what we in South Australia are becoming very much more reliant on.

The agreements are still being negotiated. We know that we are looking to form stronger ties with India. We are looking also to utilise an opportunity with the European Union, as to how we can better use some of the political uncertainty on a global stage at the moment. How does South Australia, how does the nation capitalise on that uncertainty? It is about making sure that we remain a global trader and that we remain globally competitive. That is where governments come into play. That is where this government, the Marshall Liberal government, will continue to work with industry, with our exporters and with those enablers, particularly in opening up our trade offices.

I note that the shadow spokesperson was talking about the terrible trade statistics. It just goes to show you the lack of knowledge and understanding of what South Australia is so reliant on, and that is the primary sector. Over the last three years, we have seen an acute downturn in the grains industry, one of the largest export commodities in South Australia. We have been through drought, so we have seen a considerably reduced grain harvest. Those grain crops are then reflected in the bottom line of our trade. We look at our red meat sector. Again, we are seeing a downturn in the growth of our red meat sector, and our wool sector, due to the drought. That is playing out in the bottom line of our trade stats.

I just want to put that into perspective. If we look across the board, one example is our growing opportunities in the wine industry into China, particularly with the free trade agreements with ChAFTA. Four years ago, the wine industry was travelling along pretty well—there was a \$150 million outbound wine trade into China—but last year, we saw \$800 million of wine headed to China from

South Australia alone. That shows that the free trade agreements are working. The opportunities there, particularly in the red meat sector, continue to grow. They continue to look at our product as a premium, safe, blue-sky product that they are prepared to pay premium money for.

If we look at trade stats, we have to put into balance why our trade stats have slipped away, and that is because we are reliant on the primary sector. We are dealing with drought and issues of water management here in South Australia. We are looking for a continual level of opportunity, optimism and confidence so that people will continue to invest and grow, but the impacts of weather and seasonal challenges continue to get in the way of what we do so well here in South Australia.

Other opportunities into China have been in the horticulture sector. We have seen significant growth out of citrus and almonds, in particular. We rely on those markets that are now paying a premium. They have doubled some of the returns to our primary producers. The doubling of a return to a farmer means that they can invest. They can employ more people, and then they can produce some of the more modern styles and varieties of fruits that the world is calling out for.

Gone are the days when we produced a commodity and hoped that we would get a return for it and that those international markets would buy it. We are now finely tuned, growing, producing, packing and presenting some of the world's best citrus and some of the world's most premium produce, by and large in the nut industry and stone fruit industry. Large sectors in our primary industries are now shining.

If we look right across the board, we have seen a reduction in our grain industry. It was down to about \$1.7 billion in the 2017-18 year, which is reflective of the drought. We are now seeing value-adding within our grain industry. Rather than filling up ships' hulls with a primary product of grain, mostly cereal and some pulses, we are now putting them into packages. We are now value-adding them.

R&D programs have developed some of the world's great malting barley varieties, which are now going to the great brewers all over the world. I note that Southern Cross is a great name in malting barley that has now increased the shelf life of beer from 14 days to 50 days. We know that everyone will drink beer after it has been sitting in a fridge for 50 days, but it does lose its shelf life after only 14 days. That is one of the great attributes of the barley industry here in South Australia.

I want to touch on the red meat sector again. It is about a \$4.3 billion industry. The livestock sector is not only red meat but dairy, hides and wool; they all come under that banner. We continue to ride on the backs of sheep, with wool prices as buoyant as they are. I have spoken about the \$2.15 billion wine industry out of South Australia. Not only do we export 80 per cent of the country's premium wine but we are also the engine room. Particularly in the Riverland, we very proudly produce almost 60 per cent of the state's wine and nearly 30 per cent of the nation's wine.

Going down the list, there is half a billion dollars in the seafood sector and tuna industry. We know that Port Lincoln is the seafood capital of the nation. Wild catch, aquaculture and particularly ranching are some of the great success stories within the sector. I have spoken about the half a billion dollars in dairy, and there is \$1.6 billion in horticulture. Forestry, of course, is one of the great industries in South Australia, with \$2.6 billion in exporting log, making sure we have local supply and making sure we continue to export our paper products. Exports are one of the state's great shining lights. The primary sector is the great supplier of our exporters, and it gives me great pleasure to support this motion.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:09): I rise to support the original motion put to this house by the member for Finnis:

That this house—

- (a) notes the enormous benefits of liberalised global trade to the Australian and South Australian economies;
- (b) commends the Australian government for concluding free trade agreements over the past five years which have substantially contributed to record economic growth, job creation and exports while continuing to pursue an ambitious trade agenda;
- (c) commends the Marshall government for implementing its agenda to increase South Australian exports; and

- (d) notes in particular the efforts of South Australia's farmers and agriculture, food and wine sector to make the most of export opportunities offered by free trade agreements for the benefit of rural communities and the state's economy.

As the member for Finniss quite rightly pointed out, Australia has been a strong trading nation for a very long time, and he touched on the fact that our Indigenous peoples traded for tens of thousands of years across the length and breadth of this country. Liberalised trade is essential to the future of this state and the future of our nation. The almost universal outcome for countries that open their economies to global trade is increased economic growth. Australia exemplifies this fact. We export and we import. It is imperative that we pursue free trade agreements and also free and fair trade.

I sense that across the world, amongst some of the major economies, there is a shift away from this, but in a smaller economy such as ours that relies so heavily on trade it is imperative that we pursue, as I said, free and fair trade. We have one of the most open economies in the world and have enjoyed 27 years of uninterrupted growth in times when many other Western economies have not. Many of those economies, including the United States of America, operate in a protected environment. This growth is forecast to exceed the OECD average in key indicators for the next three years.

Since 1986, trade liberalisation has lifted Australia's GDP by 5.4 per cent, and the benefit to ordinary Australians is an increase in average real income. Australia's top four trading partners in 2017-18 were China, Japan, the United States and South Korea, extraordinarily large economies with which it is important we have good trading relations. They accounted for almost half of Australia's total two-way trade, and it is no coincidence that we have free trade agreements with each of those four countries. Free trade agreements have been an essential element in Australia's economic success over the years.

Since the Coalition was elected in 2013, the federal government has successfully pursued an ambitious trade agenda with free trade agreements as their cornerstones. Free trade agreements were successfully concluded with China, Japan and South Korea soon after and we now have, as a nation, 11 regional and bilateral FTAs in force. Another four have been concluded but not yet enforced, and those are with Indonesia, Peru, Hong Kong and a Pacific agreement on closer economic ties with the nations in the South Pacific. Another seven agreements are currently under negotiation, including with India and the European Union.

There is also a strong prospect that we will negotiate an FTA with the United Kingdom. Of course, there is a bit of water to go under the bridge before that happens, given what is going on in Westminster at the moment. We will have to wait and see the outcome of Brexit, whether they get a deal or no-deal exit, or perhaps even whether they remain. I do not think that that is the intention. Either way, I think there will be trade opportunities for Australia into the UK.

By next year, Australia's free trade agreements may account for up to 80 per cent of our trade and our own state has benefited enormously from the Australian government's efforts in concluding free trade agreements. The benefits for our state include for the agricultural and food and wine sectors and that is impressive. A great example of this is wine exports into China. Under the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement, the tariff for bottled wine is steadily reduced to a zero tariff, so that tariff, that protection, has been removed and it allows us free and open access into the Chinese market.

It is not just about wine, of course; it is about agricultural products in general, it is about mining products, it is about minerals and, as the minister for agriculture said, it is about seafood, which is key in the electorate of Flinders. I know that difficulties have been experienced by some seafood industries gaining access particularly into some Asian markets, but certainly tuna fishing and tuna ranching have been real success stories and the major market by far is China.

It is important to note that, while free trade agreements (FTA) have created these opportunities, it is our farmers, producers, South Australian businesses and miners who have seized on them and the rewards can be great for these businesses and farmers, but the benefits flow further to entire communities in regional areas and to the state's economy as a whole. This state government must be commended for its efforts to boost South Australian exports and we will be the winners for it.

All these sectors still have significant opportunities to grow, including emerging sectors based on international technologies, trends and Australian government commitments to South Australia, as well as defence, space, health, and medical, creative and high-tech industries. They are the potential future exports. As I said, it is not just about agriculture and mining.

We have been exporting and importing from the early decades of this nation. We learnt very early that the real strength of this country is its agricultural exports and within decades of the founding settlers in this country we were exporting what became premium merino wool to the textile mills of the UK, particularly, and Europe, so setting the scene for our agricultural exports and our trading partnerships around the globe.

Soon after that, there was the discovery of gold, first in Victoria and then in New South Wales—but it might have been the other way round. Who am I to know? I am a South Australian—and we discovered copper here as well. In a way, that set the scene for our mining industry. The wealth of Melbourne and Victoria was really built on the back of a gold rush, and in many ways the wealth of this state in the early days was built not on agriculture but rather on copper. Those mining ventures tend to wax and wane. What has sustained the economy through all those decades is the agricultural industry and the mining industry with new discoveries.

As I have spoken about before in parliament, it is really important that we, as a government and as a state, are conscious of the cost of doing business. We need to ensure that if we expect our producers and our exporters to operate in a world market, a global market—a global market of free and fair trade without tariffs—then it is really important that we minimise the cost of doing business here at home because we cannot expect our producers to compete against low-cost producers and low-cost exporters from other nations if our costs are high.

It is really important that we concentrate on the cost of water, the cost of utilities, the cost of power, the cost of finance, the cost of registration of vehicles, the cost of transport, myriad things that go into the cost of doing business—all those things we must feed in and ensure that we create an environment where business can be efficient and done in a way that allows us to be competitive on the world market. I commend the original motion to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:18): I rise to commend the original motion by the member for Finniss:

That this house—

- (a) notes the enormous benefits of liberalised global trade to the Australian and South Australian economies;
- (b) commends the Australian government for concluding free trade agreements over the past five years which have substantially contributed to record economic growth, job creation and exports while continuing to pursue an ambitious trade agenda;
- (c) commends the Marshall government for implementing its agenda to increase South Australian exports; and
- (d) notes in particular the efforts of South Australia's farmers and agriculture, food and wine sector to make the most of export opportunities offered by free trade agreements for the benefit of rural communities and the state's economy.

Agriculture is absolutely the engine room of our economy but, as has been mentioned previously by other speakers, it does sit alongside other productive sectors like the minerals sector. Certainly, from day one, when people landed not just in Australia but also in South Australia, farming, growing crops and raising stock, was taken up dramatically, but a vibrant mining sector also got going. I note that the copper mines around Yorke Peninsula, around Burra—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: Don't forget Kapunda.

Mr PEDERICK: —and Kapunda, as I am reminded, not only kept this state's economy going but, back in the 19th century, kept Australia going with those copper exports. Not so much in those regions, but when you travel further afield and go to places like Arkaroola and see where copper was also mined in those days, you really have to commend the resilience of people, not just the miners but also the pastoralists, the initial station operators who went bush in those early years. They not only survived but thrived in that area. It was a great effort from all.

I know people have been reflecting on growing food, and I will talk more about the wine industry and exports in a moment. We do such a great job of it, and so much of our food and wine is exported. Probably well over 80 per cent of what we produce is exported because we have become so efficient. We have had to be efficient in this great state and country, as we come up against countries that heavily subsidise food production, whether in Europe or the United States.

While I am talking about food production, I want to reflect on something that we are taking action on, and that is trying to gain the ability to grow genetically modified crops here in South Australia. It is a real handbrake not just on our economy but on choice for our producers that we cannot, initially, produce genetically modified canola. I reflect on that because it is a real handbrake on our economy, and the majority of people by far—in the production sector, the innovation sector and certainly the research and development sector in this state—really want to progress and just get on with it.

We hear ridiculous comments that it will upset our clean, green image and that kind of thing. People think if we start producing genetically modified food in this state that basically the sky will fall in, but nothing could be further from the truth. You only have to go to a shopping centre and grocery store to find many, many products that have been produced from genetically modified food. I will pick on soy as an example. It is virtually guaranteed that 99 per cent of soy production is genetically modified. Anyone who wears cotton clothes is wearing genetically modified cotton. Actually, Bt cotton has been such a boost to the environment and the production sector, with farmers and producers not having to use maybe nine, 10 or a dozen lots of insecticide.

I have used a bit of insecticide in my day, and it is pretty strong stuff. Because you are killing little bugs, it is obviously quite toxic, so the less insecticide used the better. I can remember back to the days when we used to spot for the plane spraying DDT. You would have to hold the flags, and occasionally they would switch the tap off a bit late and you would get a little dose of DDT. Anyway, it did not stunt my growth, so I suppose that is something.

Innovation in production does help trade and creates opportunity, but we have been stymied by the previous lack of action, at the government level, so that farmers can have the choice. There is so much more that we can do in looking at ways to produce more varieties that are more drought tolerant. We have seen such dry and droughted years, especially in the last couple of years. We also really need to look at salt tolerant species in cropping and horticultural products to make sure that we can get the most yield out of our country.

It is interesting that people say, 'You can't get any more.' People might have said that 100 years ago about a paddock where they had grown two bags of wheat per acre and been happy. You are probably growing 22 or 32 bags per acre on the same paddock now just with better nutrition, better management and the need to produce more with less. There is so much more we can do. Certainly, the livestock sector is going pretty well at the minute. Wool has been a bit up and down, and I am not sure where it is sitting at the minute. Is it coming back?

An honourable member: About average.

Mr PEDERICK: It is about average at the moment, but it did have a real boom not that many weeks and months ago. I think wool took its place where it should be all the time to make it so much more viable to grow. Stock numbers are down because of dry conditions.

If we look at the lamb trade, those prices are good. If we look at the beef trade as well, things are looking pretty good and prices are really good. We need to have those prices, especially in these times when things are tough in various places. Obviously, not all the state is suffering as badly as some areas at the moment with the dry and drought conditions. It is the same in the country, but in the main there are a lot of dry areas that are really struggling, but as long as people can produce there is real opportunity.

Reflecting on what is happening with wine exports and the free trade agreements, as has been mentioned, so much work has been done with the ChAFTA and other agreements, whether they be with Korea or Japan and other countries, in getting that wine out to the world. The bonus is that we have managed to get tariffs screwed down to zero in China so that we can get more wine into that market.

I want to commend government staff who work in these trade offices and associated entities right across the world. When I went to China several years ago, they looked after us so well. I was an opposition member then, but I must commend the staff who introduced us to people, introduced us to opportunities and showed us what opportunities were taken up with international export.

It is absolutely vital with all our industries and especially our grains, which are mainly export driven, but in the last year or so we have seen a lot of domestic use taken up by more feedlot use, chicken farms, piggeries, etc. Hopefully, this year we will have a bit more grain to go offshore and contribute to this state's economy, because there are plenty of countries out there looking for our great South Australian produce.

There is so much opportunity as we bounce back into the future with stock numbers, whether that be sheep or beef and also the burgeoning goat trade. With those few words, I commend the original motion by the member for Finniss.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:28): I would like to thank all those who have spoken to this motion: the member for Ramsay, the Minister for Agriculture and the members for Flinders and Hammond. I think it is very important to recognise how important the last five years have been in the free trade agreement space and how important the Coalition government federally have been in this space. There are currently 11 agreements operating in Australia with other groups. Of those, four have been concluded in the last six years and another four have been concluded but not implemented at this point in time, as they have not gone through the final approval processes of the Australian government or the foreign governments themselves.

We are looking at bringing it up to a total of 15 agreements in place, and more than half of them have happened in the last five years. I think it is really important to recognise the effort of our Australian government in that period of time. Also, interestingly, when looking back at all those 11 agreements currently in place, eight have been put in place during Coalition governments. Significantly, an important part of the Coalition's philosophy in getting trade access is the free trade agreement process.

When I worked with the dairy industry, I saw great development from within the industry sector. I saw how involved industry gets when free trade agreements are negotiated. There is very much an industry-government relationship that operates when they are developing these arrangements, making sure the government is actually achieving what the industry needs. I really commend the way governments work to make sure the interests of the industry here in Australia are looked after as they go through these free trade agreements.

It is important that we continue down this path and that, as a South Australian government, we allow our agriculture sector and other sectors to take advantage of the free trade agreements that are put in place. I thank all members who have made comments in relation to today's motion. I do not support the amendment to the motion, and I am very delighted to have brought this motion to the house.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

WORLD ROUTES AVIATION CONFERENCE

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:32): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes thousands of delegates from the aviation industry are in Adelaide as part of the World Routes 2019 conference;
- (b) congratulates the previous Labor government on pursuing this opportunity;
- (c) notes the importance of the international and interstate visitors to our economy; and
- (d) calls on the government to commit further funding towards direct flight access and the tourism marketing activity.

I rise today to support this motion, which is about World Routes and support of South Australia's visitor economy. World Routes is a major airline industry conference that attracts thousands of

representatives from airlines, airports and tourism authorities to discuss new air services. It is a global meeting place for them to come together.

In 2016, the Weatherill Labor government made a successful bid for Adelaide to host the first World Routes conference in Australia for 2019. It was a tremendous achievement to attract such a major event to our state, and I would like to acknowledge the former minister for tourism, the member for Mawson, for being a key contributor to making this happen here in Adelaide.

More than 2,000 delegates from 130 different countries came to Adelaide between 21 and 24 September, and I was delighted that, through the support of Adelaide Airport and the South Australian Tourism Commission, I had the opportunity to do a walk-through of the event at the Adelaide Showground. The reason it had to be at the Showground was that it was so big that the Adelaide Convention Centre could not host that space.

It was quite an interesting walk-through, and I have to say that the marketing and the displays were very impressive. Most important to me, I guess, was to see the very strict time lines of the nearly 2,000 delegates. They had clocks absolutely everywhere, and every 15 minutes they would change to a new meeting. It was an interesting and very efficient way of having those meetings.

A number of airlines were represented at this event, and it was incredibly impressive. It was a who's who of the airline industry. The delegates were offered complimentary tours of South Australia and when I met with them at the gala dinner many talked to me about the opportunity to go to McLaren Vale and the Barossa. Some had had the opportunity to go to Monarto zoo and to the Adelaide Oval RoofClimb as well. Unfortunately, as the weather was a bit rough, they could not go out on the KI ferry.

The most important thing about this event is that it not only generated work locally but our local businesses got exposure to global brands. I particularly want to pay attention to the company that was responsible for running the event, for setting up the event—Informa Markets. Informa Markets is a multibillion dollar company with around 150 offices around the world. It organises more than 550 events across a wide range of industries in many different countries.

To have them come and do World Routes in Adelaide exposes them to what we can do in this business convention environment. When we made the successful bid in 2016, we knew that this would be of great benefit and attract global attention to Adelaide, and it certainly did that. Of course, this comes at a time when South Australia could use an extra boost in its international visitor numbers.

International tourists to South Australia are taking shorter trips and spending less money. We know that Tourism Research Australia data has just come out and shows there has been an 11 per cent decline in international visitor nights and a 5 per cent decline in visitor spend. This comes on top of very disappointing news: growth projections from Tourism Research Australia predict a 1.6 per cent decline in international visitor nights to South Australia in 2020-21.

Having World Routes here, having the global aviation spotlight on Adelaide, this was a time for the government of the day to make an announcement to the world's leading aviation companies. In fact, in a doorstep interview in January this year, Premier Steven Marshall told the media that it would be wonderful to have something to announce at the World Routes conference, yet in the end, last month, there was nothing. It is embarrassing that this Marshall Liberal government had no announcement to make to the world's largest aviation conference. This government has not placed any priority on direct flight attraction to Adelaide. In fact, during their time we have seen both Emirates and Singapore Airlines close their offices in Adelaide.

We know that the significant cuts to tourism funding are having an impact: the first budget saw an \$11 million cut and the second budget saw \$12 million in efficiencies over four years—that is \$23 million cut from tourism over five years. We know that this has impacted our international marketing. The Marshall Liberal government has wasted a once in a lifetime opportunity to sell South Australia to the world. It is no wonder that the tourism industry has lost confidence in this government.

We all know in this house and in the industry that international flight attraction is a complex matter. There is no silver bullet, but when you cut funding to tourism marketing it sends a negative

signal to aviation companies. It is an incredibly competitive space. They are making decisions all the time about their ongoing operations in South Australia, Australia and around the world.

A better signal would have been to announce expanded funding for international marketing, but this opportunity was lost. It would be asking too much of this government. The government is short-sighted and does not see the value in turbocharging tourism in South Australia. So far, the most notable campaign that this government has come up with is 'old mate'. The Marshall Liberal government needs to recognise that more tourism will create more jobs. At an unemployment rate of 7.3 per cent, tourism should be the answer but, no, it is a cut to the budget.

I want this government to focus on helping to get new direct flights to Adelaide. We know that we have a great offering from Adelaide Airport. The Airport recently released its latest master plan. The master plan forecasts indicate passenger numbers will jump to \$19.8 million by 2039—that includes 3.3 million international travellers—while airfreight will almost triple, from 58,500 tonnes to 146,000 tonnes.

Since 2014, passenger numbers have increased by one million to 8.5 million in 2018, while the Airport's contribution to gross state product has been boosted by more than \$1 billion Australian to \$2.98 billion, representing 3.1 per cent of the state's economic growth. These are impressive figures not just because they are bringing in money to our economy but also because they create jobs. By 2039, Adelaide Airport would like to be a hub of employment activity for around 56,000 direct and indirect jobs.

Direct flights not only are a critical part of the visitor economy but they make the world more accessible to all South Australians. This will only be possible if this government plays its part by making sure it provides the marketing, the sector support, to get these new flights. It is a job that continues to be more and more difficult, with cuts in subsequent budgets. I dread to think about what we are going to hear in the next budget: more savings, more cuts. What that really means is jobs. It makes a fantastic economic contribution. Cuts are unnecessary and a backward step for our economy.

While we were at this fantastic international World Routes conference, we saw that Adelaide is on the global aviation map. All we have to talk about here are cuts and, unfortunately, we missed out on what was a fantastic opportunity for us to put Adelaide out there for direct flights for more South Australians and for more international tourists to come to South Australia.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:42): I rise to contribute to this motion. I would like to amend the motion. I move:

Delete paragraphs (b) and (d) and substitute in lieu:

- (b) acknowledges the efforts of Tourism Australia and Adelaide Airport Ltd in joining the previous government in securing the World Routes 2019 conference; and
- (d) acknowledges the government's ongoing work in the attraction of new flight routes to South Australia.

South Australia's pitch for the World Routes 2019 conference was a joint initiative in 2015 by the South Australian Tourism Commission, Tourism Australia and Adelaide Airport Ltd. In October 2016, it was announced that Adelaide would host the World Routes 2019 conference, the first time this event has been held in Australasia and only the second time it has been held in the Southern Hemisphere. Major cities such as Las Vegas, London, Rome, Barcelona, Vancouver, Beijing and Guangzhou have previously hosted the conference.

World Routes aims to provide a forum for airlines and airports to meet and negotiate aircraft routes across the world. There were approximately 180 airlines and 300 airports in attendance, with roughly 10,000 meetings, with delegates from both individual city airports and administrative suppliers within the industry. A number of meetings were conducted between aviation partners of Adelaide in the 23,000 square metres of space of the exhibition and the meeting halls. World Routes brought focus to Adelaide and South Australia, as delegates to the conference were also given the opportunity to experience some of South Australia's best tourism operators and experiences.

Some of those included tours of the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale wine regions; a tour of the Adelaide Hills to explore the wine, craft beer and distillery scene of that region; and nature and

wildlife visits to Kangaroo Island, the Monarto zoo, the Adelaide Zoo, Waterfall Gully and Mount Lofty Summit. The Adelaide city experiences include the Segway tour of the Riverbank Precinct, the RoofClimb Adelaide Oval and the World Routes golf day at the Blackwood Golf Club.

Those visiting Adelaide for the first time were effusive in their praise for both the event and for Adelaide as a city and the regions that it is surrounded by. The owners of World Routes, Informa, also expressed their gratitude and pleasure that Adelaide had delivered one of the best World Routes in its 25 years. As at 30 September 2019, South Australia sees 49 international flights per week from nine airlines coming into this great state.

Just on reflection, the shadow spokesperson talks about cuts and the negativity of tourism. What I can say is that last Thursday, as acting tourism minister, I referred to South Australian stats: the tourism visitor economy had hit an all-time record of \$7.6 billion. For every tourism dollar spent here in South Australia—this is one of the shining lights for me—44¢ of that dollar was spent in regional South Australia. That just speaks of the paramount importance of tourism to our economy but also the paramount importance of what regional South Australia is giving our visitation economy coming into this great state. On that, I commend the amended motion.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (12:46): I rise to support the original motion. It is interesting that we have a minister come in here trying to erase the Labor government's role in doing so much for the tourism industry, the visitor economy. I note that we set an \$8 billion target for the visitor economy in South Australia to be reached by next year, and we have set that on a trajectory, and it is great to see the advancements. But, as the money runs out from this new government, unfortunately we are going to see a reversal of our fortunes in the visitor economy. People in the industry know that, and they are very worried about what the Liberal government over the past 18 months has been doing to their wonderful industry.

As the minister points out, 44¢ in every dollar is spent in regional South Australia. That is why it is so important that we get new airlines. The minister outlined the airlines that we have coming in here. Well, in the final five years of our term in government we attracted Emirates here, we attracted Qatar here and also China Southern. Those things did not come about easily. We had to go out and fight for those. We got Air New Zealand to put a Dreamliner on the service between Adelaide and Auckland, and we saw increased flights from Singapore Airlines and Cathay Pacific. We worked hard day in, day out.

The tourism industry is telling me that they are just not getting that same work ethic out of the Liberal government, who want to sit there and ride on the coat-tails of the success they are enjoying, which was the impetus of the work we did as a government. To try to erase our role in the visitor economy is churlish and it is childish. People in the visitor economy know they have a dud minister running the portfolio now, and they lament the fact that they no longer have the Labor Party in office fighting for them.

They had Jay Weatherill in their corner, they had John Rau in their corner, they had Martin Hamilton-Smith in their corner, they had the treasurer of the day, Tom Koutsantonis, in their corner, and I was in there as the tourism minister. We fought as a cabinet to get more and more money into the tourism sector. All we have seen since the Liberals have been elected are cuts. Not to have been able to get another announcement, another player into the international aviation scene in and out of Adelaide, is an absolute, abject failure on behalf of the Liberal government.

I congratulate the member for Ramsay on bringing this motion to the house. I fully support it, and I really implore the Liberal government to start doing the sort of work we did when we were in government. It did not come about by accident that we got World Routes here in Adelaide—the first time it has ever been held in the Southern Hemisphere. This was part of a multiminister attack from the Premier down—and we did everything. We pulled out all stops.

I also want to thank Adelaide Airport, which did a great job, and Rodney Harrex, the CEO of the South Australian Tourism Commission, and his very capable and hardworking manager of international development, Nick Jones. Nick had a really important role and went to routes conference after routes conference around the world, not only to get flights into South Australia but also to make sure that we pushed Adelaide's case for hosting World Routes 2019.

I would also like to pay tribute to John O'Sullivan, the former head of Tourism Australia, because without Tourism Australia's backing we probably would have struggled to get all the money to do it, and it was a great partnership. Again, the South Australian Tourism Commission, while we were in government, worked hard with the national body, Tourism Australia, to do that. I also thank Damien Kitto and Jim Kouts at the Adelaide Convention Bureau for all their hard work in making sure that this was a success that was part of a very big team effort headed up by the former premier of the state, Jay Weatherill, all of cabinet and all the heavy hitters within the visitor economy in South Australia.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:50): I would like to support the amended motion that was put by the Minister for Primary Industries. I just wish sometimes that people would concentrate a bit more on what happens in here. The member for Mawson indicated that we were churlish and childish in not acknowledging what the previous government had done, when the amendment that we want to insert actually reads:

- (b) acknowledges the efforts of Tourism Australia and Adelaide Airport Ltd in joining the previous government in securing the World Routes 2019 Conference; and
- (d) acknowledges the government's ongoing work in the attraction of new flight routes to South Australia.

It is interesting that when we try to give a little bit of bipartisanship in this place we still get sledged. But then I guess we just have to concentrate on what is on the agenda.

The World Routes conference, which was attracted to Adelaide, had thousands of attendees. It is a great conference to have in this state. As we have heard, people travelled all over the state when attending this event, and this conference is to be commended for attracting routes and people into South Australia so that we can get our tourism industry going harder and have more people coming to this great place. People do not realise how good an opportunity they have here in South Australia until either they get here themselves or we have people who promote routes coming here and spreading the news when they get back home.

This conference had been announced back in 2016. As has been indicated, it is the first time that it has been held in the Southern Hemisphere. Las Vegas, London, Rome, Barcelona, Vancouver, Beijing and Guangzhou have previously hosted the conference. It is all about providing a forum for airlines and airports to meet and negotiate aircraft routes across the world. It was heavily attended by approximately 180 airlines and 300 airports. We had delegates from individual city airports and administrative suppliers within the industry, and a number of meetings were conducted between aviation partners of Adelaide in the 23,000 square metres of space in the exhibition and meeting halls.

As I indicated, World Routes brought a focus to Adelaide and South Australia as a whole, as delegates to the conference were also given the opportunity to experience some of South Australia's best tourism operators and experiences. These included tours of the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale regions, and the Adelaide Hills. Throughout these regions, we have great wine, craft beer and distilleries. They also included nature and wildlife visits to Kangaroo Island.

We obviously have our two zoos—Monarto zoo, in my electorate, and Adelaide Zoo. I must say, it is great to see the investment going into Monarto zoo. We have close to \$5 million of state money and a bit over \$10 million of federal money, along with the head of Jayco, Gerry Ryan, putting in something like \$40 million for glamping and caravan park accommodation. That will be a real boon to the area, just to complement other visitor experiences, whether it be giving people the opportunity to explore the great breadth of our river but also to attend race meetings at the racetrack of Murray Bridge Racing Club, which is having its Gold Cup on Friday, or to attend the greyhounds or other events that happen continuously at the motorsport park at Tailem Bend.

We note that people also had the opportunity to visit places like Waterfall Gully and Mount Lofty Summit. Obviously, we have had people who have visited the Riverbank Precinct in Adelaide and have gone to the Adelaide Oval to do the Adelaide Oval RoofClimb, and there was a golf day held at the Blackwood Golf Club.

As has been indicated already in this place, people were full of praise for Adelaide, and not just for the event but for Adelaide as a city. I can say as a country person that Adelaide is one of the easier cities to get around. I am never fully in love with city dwelling when I have to be here for work, but it is what it is and it is an easy city to get around. I think the most comparable city I can put it to in this country is Perth. Once you get to cities of a population of six, seven or eight million, it becomes a bit hectic.

It is noted that the owners of World Routes also expressed their gratitude and pleasure that Adelaide had delivered one of the best World Routes in its 25 years. As at the end of September this year, South Australia sees 49 international flights per week from nine airlines—Air New Zealand, Cathay Pacific, China Southern, Emirates, Jetstar, Malaysia Airlines, Malindo Air, Qatar and Singapore Airlines.

Since April 2019, Malindo Air has commenced four flights per week between Adelaide and Kuala Lumpur via Bali and, in April 2019, when season flight schedules were published, 47 international flights per week operated to Adelaide, equating to 12,331 international seats. That was a 2 per cent increase on April 2018, so it is great to see that success. As has been indicated, this government has been working hard to attract new airlines from a range of international markets, including the United States. This is a strategy that takes time to make sure that people can see the opportunity and viability of these routes, and discussions are progressing.

It is noted that World Routes gave Adelaide exposure to key airline partners and demonstrated that Adelaide is capable of hosting large international business events. This city and this state have benefited from exposure to key airline partners, with a significant local spend from the delegates. It has demonstrated that Adelaide is capable of hosting large-scale international business events. The total estimated economic impact of hosting this event in Adelaide was over \$20 million injected into the state economy, so it was a great event that injected millions into the economy and opened up this city and this state to the world.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:59): I rise in support of my original motion. I thank all those who contributed to the discussion of acknowledging the World Routes 2019 Conference. Obviously, I want to congratulate the previous Labor government on pursuing this opportunity. But I reiterate the disappointment that we did not have more to say when we were on the global stage, and I think this goes to the heart of what the tourism industry is being impacted by now—cuts and more cuts. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Bills

LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Message from Governor

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

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Energy and Mining—Department for Annual Report 2018-19

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:04): I bring up the 27th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr TEAGUE: I bring up the 28th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time***HOSPITAL BEDS**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Why has the Premier closed 60 hospital beds when his health minister said yesterday that hospital ramping is at record levels and has doubled under his government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): The beds remain in the system but, as has occurred under SA Health for a long period of time, and under the previous government, bed numbers in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —operation flex. They tend to increase during peak periods of winter and they tend to reduce at other times.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And we leave that decision up to the clinicians, as we think that this is the best way to go.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call the following members to order: the members for Hurtle Vale, Lee, Kaurana and the member for Elizabeth. The leader.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Why did you not tell South Australians before the election that you were going to close beds if you won government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): As the house would be more than aware, we have been very busy opening beds since coming into government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I make the parliament aware of all the work that we have had to do—

Mr Cregan interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —down on the Repat site. When we came to government, the previous government had sold the site and we had to reverse that sale—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we had to work very hard to increase the number of beds on that site. I think there are currently 50 beds in operation on that site which would not have been in operation if those opposite had won the election. The good news for the people of South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is that those opposite weren't successful at last year's election, and they elected a government to come in and fix up the mess that we inherited—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —from the previous government. We all know who the previous minister for health was. He was absolutely hopeless at his job.

Mr Malinauskas: You doubled ramping.

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: An absolutely hopeless situation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition was the member of a cabinet which decided to close the Repat, putting massive pressure on the southern system in South Australia. However, with regard to flexing of beds, this is something that occurs in hospitals not just in South Australia, not just under this government, but under previous South Australian governments and under virtually every other jurisdiction that I know of.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Wright to order. Leader.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee that he will not close any further beds beyond the 60 that your government closed last week?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I am going to answer that. The reality is that these are the decisions which are made by clinicians. These are not decisions which are made—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left, I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are not made by politicians interfering in the running of the health system. We know where that got people. Transforming Health was a train crash—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we know who was in the driving seat. I know they are scattering around. Nobody wants to ever mention any connection whatsoever with Transforming Health, but what a disaster it was for the people of South Australia. I make this point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —since coming to government this administration has proudly put more than \$1 billion back into the health system in South Australia, and we do that because the people of South Australia deserve more than they had under the previous 16 years of maladministration.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder and then I will come back to those on my left.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Morphett. The member for Elder.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:10): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering the north-south corridor?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:10): I can, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Can I say that—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: One press release at a time!

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned for that outburst. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The north-south corridor is a fantastic project and one that has received bipartisan support from governments of all persuasions over a long period of time. In fact, I remember—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the pronouncements made as far as back as the early 2000s, in the mid-2000s, and certainly when the Premier (then the leader of the opposition), together with then prime minister Tony Abbott, made announcements about this government's commitment—before it even was the government—to the north-south corridor.

This is an important city-shaping project that has remained first and foremost our top infrastructure priority here in South Australia, and on this score the Marshall Liberal government is delivering. Whether that be getting on and completing the three stages in the north-south corridor that were started when we came to government, those being the Torrens to Torrens project, the Darlington project and the Northern Connector—I know that people in my electorate in the north text me every single day asking when that project is going to be opened—or whether it be the fact that we sat down within a few weeks of coming to government to help secure the funding for the Regency Road to Pym Street section of the north-south corridor, some \$340 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —worth of money from state and federal governments to get on and deliver that project, a project that was worked up before we came to office, but there was one pesky little detail that was missing from delivering that project—the money. Normally, when you want to deliver projects that require federal government funding you need to make sure that you have asked the federal government for the funding before you make pronouncements about having it. Can I say that this government has placed its firm focus on the remaining sections of the north-south corridor—the part that the former government put in the too-hard basket—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —leaving a reference design from 2015 on the table that had one—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —missing ingredient that stopped it from being delivered, and that was the money. What we have been able to achieve over the first federal budget, the first state budget, the second federal budget and the second state budget is \$5.4 billion on the table—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to get moving on the remaining sections of the north-south corridor.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What is also interesting is that we are going through a process at the moment, having said before the election that we would take an evidence-based approach to delivering infrastructure in South Australia that meant that we needed to go and do our homework on business case development in order to make sure that we have the best evidence—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in knowing how to deliver this important project. Instead of just taking the former—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —government's design on the table, what we have done is spend money, money that we put aside before the election to look at how we deliver a tunnelling solution here in South Australia, and that is something we are actively exploring at the moment. But for South Australians who have been looking forward to the completion of the north-south corridor—something that has been talked about for a long time—they will know that this Marshall Liberal government is delivering. Four sections are underway or completed at the moment, with the remaining section, the most difficult section, going through an evidence-based rigorous process to make sure that South Australians know that we will deliver the best project, making sure that we don't waste taxpayers' money—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and making sure that we work together with the federal government to secure the funding possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is called to order and his former classmate the member for Lee is warned for a second and final time. Would someone like a question on my left? No, member for Waite, you are not getting this question. Leader.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Was a constituent of the member for Davenport sent home in excruciating pain from Flinders Medical Centre yesterday as a consequence of your policy to close hospital beds?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): Whilst I have no knowledge of the case that the Leader of the Opposition refers to, I do highlight again the massive investment that we have made since coming to government to fix the mess that we inherited from those opposite. I presume the person that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to is in the southern system. We have worked very hard to put 50 beds back into the southern system at the Repat site. It's part of our \$78 million commitment so far to reactivating the Repat site that those opposite closed.

We have also developed and delivered a 12-bed acute medical unit at Noarlunga. You see, sir, we are 110 per cent focused on delivering the very best health system that we possibly can for the people of South Australia.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member Hurtle Vale is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That has resulted so far in a more than \$1 billion additional budget allocation to the health system in South Australia. This has come at a difficult time for us in this state because we have had a massive writedown in the GST distribution to South Australia, but health is so important that we have had to put money in to fix the mess that we inherited. Have we—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale, I remind you that you are on two warnings. If you want to leave the chamber, you are going about it the right way. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I make the point that there is a lot of work to do. Have we solved every single problem? The answer to that is no, but we are working in a logical way through the disaster that we inherited when the previous government decided to concentrate all services in the three major spine hospitals in metropolitan Adelaide—the Flinders Medical Centre, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital—and downgrade the services everywhere else. We are going to be working very hard to build up those services to take that pressure off the spine hospitals. It takes time and it takes money and we are absolutely 100 per cent committed to making sure that that money is available.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned. Leader.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier not viewed the email or the video of Mr Dennis Murphy at 12am, sent at 7.18am this morning, crawling in extraordinary and excruciating pain?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the construction of that question was such that leave should have been sought to include argument or facts because that is what standing orders require in this instance.

The SPEAKER: I understand what the minister is saying. As I have ruled from time to time, if I do rule that out of order, I also do not allow the minister to refute that, so in the interests of that I'm going to allow the question, but I take the point of order. It has merit. Would someone like to answer? Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18): I refer the honourable member to my previous answer. I don't have the details. He hasn't sought leave to introduce the facts to the parliament and without those—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I can't possibly comment.

The SPEAKER: I allowed the question. In that spirit, I ask members on my left to be quiet. Leader.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that Mr Dennis Murphy sent the Premier emails this morning of him in excruciating pain as a result of the Premier's decision to close beds?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19): No, I have not seen those and I'm not sure what email address they were sent to.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT CONTRACTS

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house on the current status of public transport contracts?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:19): I can, indeed, because there has been some conjecture in recent days about the make-up of our public transport system here in South Australia and the status—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —of who provides the services. If I may, we do have a mixture of insourced and outsourced services when it comes to public transport here in South Australia—an arrangement that is evolving and an arrangement that has evolved over the past two decades. There has been, I think, a little bit of misconception potentially in the public sphere about what degree of outsourcing currently exists—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Well, go and apologise and correct the record.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in our public transport system.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee can leave for half an hour for that interjection.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Lee. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The honest truth is that our bus network provides, depending on which figure you choose to use, between 70 and 85 per cent of our public transport services here in South Australia. What is interesting to note is that those contracts are outsourced. In fact, since 2005 until now, the money spent on outsourcing our bus network, which does the lion's share of the heavy lifting of public transport services in South Australia, has been outsourced to the tune of \$2.34 billion worth of contracts since 2005. What is interesting is that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —there have been some comments made in the public sphere by, in this case, the Leader of the Opposition when he said that—

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —it is very, very hard to unscramble the egg—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. There is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: referencing the Leader of the Opposition's comments, sir, is debate.

The SPEAKER: I will allow some reference, but I take the member's point of order and I will consider it. If I have to intervene, I will do so. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: By the way, on the 15th of the fifth:

It's very, very hard to unscramble the egg once you start privatising these sorts of assets...and privatised the bus network, they're back at it again.

Having said that you can't unscramble the egg, there are those who are now putting out policies to try and unscramble the egg, which—

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, it was on the 15th of the fifth.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, be quiet. Member for West Torrens, I am going to allow some compare and contrast. I have allowed some of that. I don't want to anticipate the point of order, but I am going to listen to it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, sir, if you said you have allowed—

The SPEAKER: For debate? Yes, I have allowed it to a point. I think the minister has made his point and I ask him to come back to the substance of the question and relate the answer to the question.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There are those who suggest you can't unscramble the egg. Those people suggested it in May, when there was a discussion about this. It was also said again in early July, that the reason the bus contracts couldn't be brought back into public hands is because you can't unscramble the egg. There were actually two points over 16 years of Labor administration where you could unscramble the egg.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: talking about 16 years of Labor is a debating point.

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The member for West Torrens continues to make this same point of order, which you have ruled is not necessarily accurate, and it is getting to the point where it is just bogus.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order. I don't want to repeat myself, but this is starting to stifle the flow of this answer. I will listen carefully. If I feel the need to intervene, I will. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There is a point when a contract is awarded and over the life of the contract where you can actually unscramble the egg, and that's when the contract finishes. There would have been a point in 2005 where the egg could have been unscrambled. Was it? Did we see insourcing of buses? There was another point where, again, a contract ended—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in 2011, and what happened? Did we see buses insourced in South Australia? The answer is no. In 2015, when there was an awarding of a contract to change who ran—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the bus services due to company change, was there a decision taken at that point to bring buses back in-house in South Australia? The answer is no. This is what

South Australians should look at: the Labor Party's record of outsourcing services in South Australia. More than that, I turn now to trains and trams, for which this government has a proud policy to drive efficiency and better services through an outsourcing model. There was, over the past 16 years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —\$577 million worth of outsourcing happening on our train and tram network, whether that be train maintenance, whether that be security contracts or whether that be cleaning and maintenance of station contracts. The former government outsourced everything it could in public transport, and now being in opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated for one moment.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —it is turning the other cheek.

The SPEAKER: Minister, I do believe the question was about the status of contracts. I respectfully ask you to come back to the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The status of the current contracts here in South Australia shows that over the past 16 years there has been over \$3 billion worth of outsourcing contracts in public transport here in South Australia.

Parliament House Matters

CHAMBER PHOTOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER: I advise members that I have allowed a photographer from one certain media organisation in today for updated pictures, so please remember to smile.

Question Time

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier ensure that an independent investigation into the case of Mr Dennis Murphy is conducted and that the results of this investigation are publicly released?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26): I will certainly be more than happy to ask SA Health to look into this matter and I think that there should be an inquiry into this matter. We don't want to see any of our patients discharged—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, we need to receive details—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of this. I have checked my direct email address and my old email address. There are other sources that they may have gone through and we will check those—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and what procedures are involved. If any discomfort has been caused regarding the discharge of a patient, of course that is regrettable and we apologise, but the reality is that I don't have the details. We will make an investigation.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that anyone else like Mr Dennis Murphy has not been sent home from hospital in excruciating pain as a result of your health cuts closing beds in the South Australian health system?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27): I have just made the point that not only have we opened a large number of beds on the Repat site—

Mr Malinauskas: You have closed more.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is so difficult to argue with people who have no fundamental appreciation of the facts. The reality is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —was the former minister for health in South Australia. He would fully appreciate or he should fully appreciate the concept of flexing the capacity at hospitals. It exists across every health system—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that I know of. It would have existed; maybe he didn't take the time to read the briefings. Ultimately, that decision is a decision that is taken by the clinicians. The decisions that we have taken as government—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the decisions that we have taken as politicians are to provide adequate resources. On that issue, we have had to put more than \$1 billion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —back into the health budget. We have had to reverse the decision to sell off the Repat. We have had to do everything we can to open those psychiatric intensive care beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Those opposite opened a hospital without even making sure that those beds were adequate—they were closed. They were closed and we had to do a whole pile of work to be able to reactivate those beds. We have had to open forensic beds in South Australia and work very hard to open more and more beds in the system that we inherited from the previous government. With regard to flexing of the capacity within the individual hospitals, that is a decision that is made by the clinicians.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Following the Premier telling the house today that beds are reopened when they are needed, why have the 41 beds closed at Flinders and Hampstead late last year not reopened at all during this year's worst ramping on record?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): I have already outlined to the house the different beds that have already been reopened since we came to government. Those

decisions regarding individual hospitals and rehab centres are decisions that clinicians make. We have also worked very hard—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have also worked very hard on a range of other initiatives that will increase the capacity of our hospitals. I speak most specifically of the implementation of the priority care centres in South Australia. I think this is an excellent initiative, where I am now told that the people—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that I am now—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For some reason, those opposite are not interested in trying to give patients the very best service that they can. With the priority care centres that have been established, it gives alternatives for our ambulances to divert away from emergency departments to priority care centres. Can I say this—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Hurtle Vale having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I say this: when we spoke to people who have gone to a priority care centre, they have been extraordinarily satisfied with the service that they have received—prompt service.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It has been welcomed by ambulance officers in South Australia. Of course, it relieves the pressure on our emergency departments, which we have inherited from the previous government. We have also worked very hard on our home hospital pilot. This is again another initiative that we are putting into place—criteria-led discharge, changing the methodology so that patients can be discharged earlier, faster, speedier, so that we can free up beds within our hospitals so that we can—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —make sure that they are available to the people who most need them. We have also been doing work to put geriatricians into the emergency departments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, good results from this, and a much greater use of mobile X-rays. All these things are making a contribution to relieving the pressure on our emergency departments and on our hospital beds in South Australia. There's still plenty more work to do, a massive amount of work to do, but I am absolutely 100 per cent confident, with the additional resources that we are putting in and the different areas of focus that we are achieving—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —within the hospital system, that we are making adequate progress in this area.

CHILDREN IN CARE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister advise the house how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on permanency options for children in care?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned. The minister has the call.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:32): I thank the member for Heysen for his question and note his interest in the wellbeing of all children and young people. Open adoption is a new and exciting shift in policy. It is a deliberate shift from current practice and one where staff will be required to consider open adoption as a genuine option when undertaking permanency planning for each child and young person in care. I accept the fact that open adoption is not for every individual, but it should be considered when it is in the child's or young person's best interests.

Prior to March 2018, this state had been subject to the Labor government for 16 years. For the various agencies and multiple ministers over the time responsible for child protection, they presided over a system that was considered toxic and in utter chaos. At various times, our state's most vulnerable children and young people were living in hotels, motels and caravan parks. Millions of dollars—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Millions of dollars were spent on inquiries to expose the failings and make recommendations for change. These included the Layton report, two Mullighan inquiries, the Debelle inquiry and, most recently, the Nyland royal commission. There were also multiple coronial inquests.

In his recommendation following the inquiries into the tragic death of Chloe Valentine, Mark Johns expressed an opinion that 'adoption should have a place in the alternative placement options in the child protection system'. He went on to express the very firm opinion that 'permanent removal to adoptive parents must have a place in the child protection system and I recommend accordingly'. Despite the number of recommendations from the coronial report of April 2015 being implemented, adoption was not one of them.

During an estimates committee in 2014, I asked the then minister for education and child development, the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, if other person guardianship was designed to lead to possible adoption in the future. The minister's response was no. She went on to say that they were 'not looking at severing the links that children who come under guardianship have with their birth families' and referred to a fiery debate she had engaged in on the topic with the former New South Wales minister for child protection.

Case planning has to be one of the most important aspects in planning for children and young people in care. It is a document which captures both current and future pathways for that child and gives guidance and goals to strive for in the child's life. It should include, for those children and young people who cannot return home, plans for ensuring some stability and permanency in their living arrangements. It is undeniable that stability and permanency are vital for a young person's wellbeing and development and for their health and education outcomes and that they set the grounding for the best opportunity to achieve their dreams in adulthood.

In June 2017, under Labor, only 28.9 per cent of children in care had a case plan. Curiously, that data was not previously given to the productivity committee or to the RoGS. In just 18 months, and under my urging, that figure, to 30 June this year, has grown to 88.9 per cent of children and young people in care having a completed case plan. I ask this place how it can be said that those opposite were doing anything to focus on permanency options for children if they didn't even have a plan.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: asking the house to consider how we could assume something is debate.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order and I am listening carefully to the minister's answer.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Last year, the full first year under the Marshall Liberal government, 46 long-term guardianship orders were made, the highest it has ever been. Adoption will soon be a real option for children in care, along with multiple options designed to meet the varying needs of children and families.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:36): My question is to the Premier.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe, you are warned for a second time. I am trying to listen to your colleague the member for Kaurna. He deserves the respect of this house when asking a question. Member for Kaurna.

Mr PICTON: Thank you very much for your protection, sir. My question is to the Premier. Following the Premier today telling the house, 'We will leave these decisions up to clinicians,' does it mean that clinicians will have the power to order beds to be opened without approval from health bureaucrats?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37): The reality is that these decisions are not made at the ministerial level. They are made by people within SA Health and the clinicians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are made—

Mr Brown: Who's in charge?

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are made by the people who are best in the position to make that decision, and we stand by that.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:37): Supplementary: does that mean that the Premier is withdrawing his previous comment that clinicians will be the ones who will have the power to reopen these beds?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37): I refer the honourable member to my previous answer. Obviously, SA Health seek the input from clinicians here in South Australia. Flexing has occurred for a long period of time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's like it's a revelation to those opposite. They were in for 16 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This guy here was the former health minister. This guy was advising the health minister—and what a mess it was, what an absolute mess! I tell you what happens: SA Health take advice from the people who know. I tell you two people they will not be taking advice from, and that is the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kaurna.

The SPEAKER: I think the Premier has finished his answer. He has finished his answer. Member for Kaurna and then the member for MacKillop.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house exactly who in SA Health will have the power to reopen the beds that he has closed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38): I refer the honourable member to my previous answers on this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Badcoe can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop has the call. I would like to hear the question. The leader will cease gesticulating. The member for MacKillop.

DOG FENCE

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on the progress and delivery of the dog fence?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:39): Yes, I can. I thank the member for MacKillop for his very important question. As one of the state's largest sheep producers, along with his constituency he is very concerned about wild dogs heading south, and we know that there have been a number of wild dog sightings in areas that it was never thought possible that they would travel—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —from the north, and particularly from the northern pastoral country. Initial procurement information for prospective suppliers and contractors has been released for the \$25 million build of the dog fence. It is a 1,600-kilometre piece of infrastructure. It's a generational piece of infrastructure. This government—the Marshall Liberal government—the Morrison Coalition government and industry have come together and realised the importance of the rebuild. It is a 100-year-old piece of infrastructure that a previous government ignored. They left the pastoralists on their own, albeit they did replace some small parts of that fence that are now being pulled down because they were built inadequately.

That leads me on to the next point, that we have a dog fence rebuild committee that have just visited Queensland and they are looking at the exclusion fencing that they have up there. We looked at Barcaldine and Longreach, areas that are now experiencing protection for their sheep industry. Those pastoralists up there are now enjoying the investment of that piece of dog fence or exclusion fencing up there that has changed the lives of the sheep producers and the pastoralists. They now sleep at night, they are now saving money and they no longer have mental health issues that they once had with the loss of large numbers of sheep.

I know that the member for Flinders, with his constituents, is also experiencing large losses. In some cases, 10,000 and 20,000 head of sheep are being lost due to wild dog attacks. What I can say is that the committee, consisting mostly of the local dog fence boards and those chairs, are working with Livestock SA to understand how we will implement and build this piece of infrastructure.

It's not just a fence that is strewn across the state; it is a fence that traverses large and different landscapes across sand dunes, creek crossings, through different parts of the pasture country. It's not just about erecting a fence. It's about clay topping sandhills, it's about building those creek crossings, it's about a significant amount of planning so that we can actually get this piece of infrastructure right so that we can protect a vitally important industry here in South Australia.

It also needs to be understood that the Queensland trip gave the rebuild committee a much greater understanding of how we can put a piece of infrastructure in place now that rarely ever lasts 100 years. Today, we are taking those tenders in place. We are actually putting this fence in place

so that it can last for another 100 years. It is vitally important that it creates jobs. There will be 14 FTEs on the initial rebuild but that will then build to 63 full-time equivalent jobs in that vitally important part of our state's productive farming country.

What I would say is that the report has told us that once the dog fence is built we could save \$120 million to the state's economy. That is massive. This is not an issue that will be fixed overnight. It will take a number of years to build and get it running, but it will be on the back of an already committed trapping and baiting program.

HORROCKS HIGHWAY

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister please update the house on what designs, if any, have been carried out for the construction work for the Horrocks Highway with regard to layout and overpassing lanes? When will these designs be made available to the public? When will the reconstruction commence? What is the estimated completion date?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:43): I do note very much the member for Frome's interest in this. It is something that I know he has passionately been fighting for and something that he fought for, no doubt, whilst he was in cabinet, and something now that the Marshall Liberal government is able to deliver: \$55 million on the table towards fixing the Horrocks Highway. It starts in my electorate, heads through to the member for Frome's, and also has solid impacts for the member for Stuart. This is a very important freight route in South Australia and one that was largely ignored for a long period of time. This \$55 million will go a long way to delivering upgrades along this section of road.

There are already works that have happened outside this \$55 million to improve the road surface, especially at the southern end of the Horrocks Highway, essentially around Roseworthy. South of Roseworthy, there has been quite a bit of resurfacing work and a bit of pavement correction work that's gone along with it. There are a number of projects that are earmarked as part of that \$55 million. As the member highlights in his question, there are a number of elements to the work that need to be undertaken.

There are some intersection upgrades further north, around Gladstone, and there are a number of overtaking lanes that are being looked at for that road. Much of the work that needs to happen is around pavement correction and shoulder sealing—basic work, but basic work that saves lives. We do know that some of the worst sections of that road are below Tarlee, and that's where a lot of this shoulder sealing and pavement correction work will be undertaken.

Can I say that when it comes to sealing shoulders, something as simple as sealing shoulders—something that in today's money costs around \$120,000 to \$130,000 per lane kilometre—can reduce the incidence of serious death and injury by 40 per cent on a road. In fact, there is going to be a massive payoff for a road that too often features in our road crash statistics, and \$55 million on the table—\$44 million from our friends in the federal government and Scott Morrison, a Prime Minister who has injected huge amounts of money into regional South Australia and regional roads.

Can I assure the member that work is actually already underway in relation to the design of this. Again, there are existing maintenance plans for that road in terms of the resealing. In fact, the department already has an existing database of understanding where shoulder sealing needs to be undertaken and the rank order priority of those, so we already do have a very good handle on where shoulder sealing and pavement correction need to be undertaken.

There are a number of other treatments that are happening along other sections of the corridor along this road, including up at Gladstone. In terms of the timing, that is something that we will be announcing as we progress. I can guarantee that the member for Frome is going to find out about when that happens as and when that information is able to be made public.

Can I say to the people of the Clare Valley, the people of the Mid North and the people who travel further north that this government is going to deliver and is delivering for roads in regional South Australia, right across regional South Australia. We now have in the kitty over \$1 billion to help

deliver road infrastructure upgrades in regional South Australia—something unheard of over the course of the history of South Australia.

This is a massive down payment on improving freight productivity, a massive down payment on reducing our regional road toll and a massive down payment on repaying the faith to regional South Australians who have long felt forgotten by their government and who have for far too long delivered in spades to the productivity and the prosperity of this state without getting their dues from their central government.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:47): My question is to the Premier. Premier, is there any clinician at all in South Australia who has the power to reopen the beds that your government has closed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48): I don't think that there's a single person that has authority to do that—a single clinician that you want me to point to this afternoon. These issues are taken by the department, by the people that are put in charge. Lesley Dwyer runs the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. She has been employed since we came to government to fix up the mess that we inherited, and I think we all appreciate just how significant that mess was.

Of course, we didn't find out before the election: we only found out after the election. The full magnitude of the problems on that site were not disclosed to the people of South Australia before the election. On coming to government, it was very, very clear that we were heading towards an annualised cost overrun in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network of more than \$300 million per year—more than \$5 million per day. That's why it was important for us to act swiftly, and we did.

We've appointed a new chief executive for the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. We've put a new board in place for the largest of the LHNs, as we have for all LHNs in South Australia. There's a new governance arrangement, and we have every confidence that we will deliver a much better outcome at a much more affordable price for the people of South Australia.

I emphasise that on coming to government the budget that had been put in place for health in this state was completely and utterly inadequate. To continue with Labor's previous budget for this area would have put the people of South Australia in danger, and that's why we acted swiftly. We put more than \$1 billion back in, but it's not just money; it's also about leadership and governance, and it's also about putting the right systems in place. Those are underway. I'm very confident that they will yield results, and I will certainly not be taking any advice from those opposite.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Was there any clinician at all who recommended to the government the closure of the 60 beds that your government closed last week?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49): I am happy to make inquiries, but the point that I make here is that the flexing of beds is a procedure that has occurred in our hospitals in South Australia for a very long period of time. For those opposite to suggest that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the flexing of beds is something new is just completely and utterly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, order! Leader.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —disingenuous and just shows you how they have absolutely no interest whatsoever in improving the health system in South Australia. The flexing of beds occurs every single year. It occurs in this jurisdiction and it occurs in other jurisdictions around the country. It occurs under this government and it occurred under the previous government but, in addition to that flexing, we have been opening a massive number of beds in South Australia as they are needed.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Will the 60 beds that have closed reopen at hospitals when emergency departments hit Code White?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): Those beds are still in place. The reality is that they haven't been removed from the hospitals. I know those opposite characterise them as being—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —closed or moved from hospitals—they are not; they are there and on stand-by and they will be activated as they are needed.

SCHOOLS WITH INTERNET FIBRE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the delivery of improved internet services to South Australian schools, including in my electorate of Colton?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:51): I am very pleased to have this question from the member for Colton, who I know cares passionately and deeply about the best interest of students not only in schools in his electorate but around South Australia, as I certainly know that all members on this side of the house do. The member for Colton asked about the internet program about which I have provided some information to the house previously. Over the last year, it has been outstanding to see the enhancements to the infrastructure in so many schools across South Australia.

Of course, in the 21st century, having connections through the internet to the world is part of what we expect in the modern curriculum and the pedagogy of being able to deliver effective classroom practice is critical, and also for professional development, not just in the member for Colton's area but, indeed, in regional South Australia that is utterly critical and can save days of teachers being away from schools sometimes.

Across South Australia, since the end of last year, when the Premier and I were able to join the member for Morphett at Glenelg Primary School in announcing our \$80 million partnership with Telstra, 264 schools have been connected through this fibre-optic internet connection, the uncontested delivery of the internet that schools need—131,000 students and 15,000 educators. This is a drastic improvement. I'm pleased to advise the house that the project is 49 per cent complete and was an outstanding start in the last year.

The member for Colton asked about schools in his electorate. I can advise that most recently—a couple of weeks ago now—the St Leonard's Primary School was connected, joining the Fulham Gardens Primary School, the Fulham North Primary School, the Henley High School and the West Beach Primary School, all of which had the infrastructure delivered earlier in the year. The member for Colton would be encouraged to know that Henley Beach Primary School and Kidman Park Primary School will be joining those other schools in the next couple of weeks. They are due for connection in week 3 of term 4.

I can advise the house that also due in coming days are Roseworthy Primary School, Fairview Park Primary School, Northfield Primary School, Ingle Farm Primary School, Morphett Vale East R-7 School, the Mount Baker High School, Hahndorf Primary School, Vale Park Primary School, Hillcrest Primary School, Elizabeth Downs Primary School and the Wallaroo Primary School. I know that the members for Schubert, Newland, Enfield, Florey, Reynell, Kavel, Torrens, Elizabeth and Narungga will all be very pleased, as will their constituents, about those connections happening in their electorate.

As I have been travelling around South Australia over the last year, since we announced this program, whenever we are in a school that has had this connection, with the infrastructure laid in, with fibres connected and the solution switched on, it has been so encouraging to hear the way that teachers, students and school leaders have all talked about the difference that it has made in their school.

It is essential that a school has the capacity if a classroom is using a project that relies on the internet that they can do that, that a teacher can plan a lesson and that the students can prepare their work knowing that, when they all switch on the internet at the same time, it is not going to cause the neighbouring classroom to have their internet drop out, which in many cases was the sort of thing that happened.

Across Australia, every other mainland state had faster internet services than us up until this year, and we are on track that by the middle of next year, by the end of June next year when this program is due for completion, to have gone from the slowest internet in the country to the fastest internet in the country in our schools.

That is not just delivering a great opportunity for improved and enhanced learning in our public schools system. I know that the Catholic system and a number of independent schools have also been in discussion with Telstra, as indeed have other government departments. What we are also going to see, particularly across regional South Australia where sometimes there has not been this cable connection before, are services to those communities that will radically enhance the internet connection for constituents, residents, businesses and other government services right across this state, and I commend this program to the house.

FUEL PRICE MONITORING

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:55): My question is to the Attorney-General. Attorney, I refer to your answer to my question yesterday where you spoke about other territories and states' real-time fuel pricing models, and I ask whether you will consider the WA model, the state you didn't mention, where prices are published on a government department fuel watch website and which are locked in for 24 hours, which leads to savings for customers of up to \$20 a week?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:56): I hadn't mentioned that program yesterday, and I am happy to get the member an update in relation to the operation of that and provide that as soon as practicable.

SA HEALTH

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:56): My question is to the Premier. Has the ICAC commissioner, the Hon. Bruce Lander, requested additional resources from the government to investigate matters of corruption and maladministration at SA Health, and will additional resources be provided?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:56): We provide an annual allocation to the ICAC. I think from memory the allocation this year is of the order of \$15 million. We have been a strong supporter of the introduction of an ICAC here in South Australia, something that was long opposed by the previous government. We are very pleased that they did see fit to ultimately agree to the establishment of an ICAC in South Australia, and as all—

Mr Picton: Has he asked and are you giving money?

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kurna, we have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —members would be more than aware, it is not the government that determines what is investigated by the ICAC: that is a decision for the commissioner. We provide the resources. Not only do we provide an annual allocation of \$15 million, but I think that in the most recent state budget there was a further allocation in the budget of \$14 million, but it is up to the ICAC commissioner to determine the priorities for those areas that he investigates.

SA HEALTH

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:57): Supplementary question: is the Premier telling the house that no additional resources will be provided to the ICAC to investigate the issues of corruption, maladministration and conflict of interest to SA Health that he has raised today?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57): No, the point I was making was very clear. We provide funds to the ICAC. We have provided increased funding to the ICAC, but the determination of what is investigated, and the priority in which it is investigated, is a decision for the commissioner himself.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna and then the member for King.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Coming from you—

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport is called to order.

SA HEALTH

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:58): My question is to the Premier. What concerns did the ICAC commissioner, the Hon. Bruce Lander, raise with the Chief Executive of the Department of Health and Wellbeing, Dr Chris McGowan, and what action did Dr McGowan take following those concerns being raised?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:58): It may not surprise the parliament that I am not privy to personal conversations between the ICAC commissioner and individual chief executives, but it is fair to say—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that the ICAC commissioner raised with me on day one of the government that he had very serious concerns about the health system in South Australia—very serious concerns. Again, I make the point that a decision for the ICAC to investigate something is not a decision of the government. We have provided adequate resources to the ICAC, increased resources to the ICAC, because we believe in it, but the prioritisation is purely something for the ICAC commissioner to do himself.

We have not been sitting idle. We knew that there were massive problems associated with CALHN, and that is why we moved very quickly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to KordaMentha. We weren't going to be sitting around waiting for an inquiry that might take six months, 12 months or 18 months. We needed to take action immediately. CALHN was spending more than \$5 million over budget every single day and, of course, they had been able to uncover all sorts of maladministration—

Mr Malinauskas: But it's clinicians who make the decisions.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —presided over by those opposite when they were in government.

Mr Malinauskas: But it's clinicians who make the decisions.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's a testy subject, sir, for the Leader of the Opposition. He was the minister for health, the guilty party, the person who presided over the fact that huge numbers of activities were never ever billed to the commonwealth.

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Tens and tens of millions of dollars.

Mr PICTON: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. I think the Premier has completed his answer. He has completed his answer, so I'm going to move to the member for King and I will come back to the—

An honourable member: What's the point of order?

The SPEAKER: Was there a point of order?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Yes, there was.

The SPEAKER: Sorry, I will hear the point of order. The point of order is for—

Mr PICTON: Debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Member for King.

RESERVOIRS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. How is the government delivering on its commitment to open up reservoirs in South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:00): It's great to receive this question from the member for King.

Mr Malinauskas: The capitulator.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I know that she is a passionate advocate for this great Marshall Liberal government policy, and what a good policy it is, getting people into the great outdoors—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —enjoying the natural environment, stimulating regional economies and at the same time looking at conservation outcomes as well.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: What a great policy it is. We know that when we came to government we said that we would open up a number of reservoirs across South Australia, looking to maximise these opportunities to get into the natural environment to keep fit, keep healthy and to enjoy the great outdoors. I know the member for King, like many of my colleagues, shares those passions with me.

When we came to office, the previous government had made a very weak attempt at opening a couple of reservoirs. The reservoirs of Bundaleer, Warren and Beetaloo had been slightly opened. In fact, I went along to Beetaloo Reservoir with the member for Stuart a couple of weeks ago, which was one of those reservoirs the previous government had opened. If you wanted to get to that reservoir to enjoy it, to go fishing there and the like, you had to park about 450 metres away and carry your fishing tackle up quite a steep walk—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —with your kids and with your esky. The previous government's policy around reservoirs was what you have when you feel that you need a policy but you don't really want to have a policy. It was a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —very poor man's version of this policy. However, the Marshall Liberal government is going much, much further. We have appointed a task force to manage this project, led out of the Department for Environment and Water, with representation from SA Water and SA Health. We recently had a ForestrySA representative join that committee as well, recognising that often forestry land is close to these reservoirs and that there is an opportunity to join up packages of land for wider recreational opportunity.

It's great that we are now moving towards the further opening of reservoirs. That will include expanded offerings at Warren Reservoir and also Bundaleer Reservoir. Bundaleer is in the Mid North. Warren is just a little outside the member for King's electorate, on the edge of the Barossa.

We are also making the announcement that South Para Reservoir will open. It will really become an adventure-focused reservoir around fishing and around kayaking. There may be opportunity down the track for bushwalking and cycling. South Para Reservoir is a large reservoir with multiple coves and twists and turns. There is lots of opportunity in that landscape to create a real adventure hub up there, and we are looking forward to opening South Para Reservoir in December this year, just a few months away. I know that the member for King, the member for Newland and myself were part of a release of 180,000 fingerlings into that reservoir to ensure that there are sufficient stocks of fish there ready for fishers to enjoy when the gates to that reservoir are opened in the coming months.

Also later this year, we will be seeing shoreline fishing brought in at Myponga Reservoir. We know that since April 2019 we have been able to have access to the reservoir reserve around Myponga. That has been hugely successful. More than 10,000 people have visited that site already. It's stimulating that township on the western Fleurieu Peninsula, bringing it to life and really having an economic uplift there.

This policy is a great policy. There's lots more to come. The opposition are fundamentally opposed to it. In fact, they will close these reservoirs should they form government, and that would be sad for these communities, but we will continue with this policy and I look forward to updating the house on it.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Brave, brave Sir Robin.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, be quiet. The member for Kurna has the call.

KORDAMENTHA

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:05): My question is to the Premier. Why is your government this year giving interstate corporate liquidators KordaMentha over \$20 million, but ICAC only \$14.5 million, and denying the ICAC commissioner's request for additional resources to investigate SA Health corruption and maladministration?

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna, I am going to give you one opportunity to rephrase the back end of that question, which contains characterisation. I will allow you to rephrase; if not, I will sit you down and ask someone else to ask a question.

Mr PICTON: Thank you, sir. My question is to the Premier. Why is the government giving KordaMentha over \$20 million but only giving the ICAC commissioner \$14.5 million?

The SPEAKER: That question is in order. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:05): Of course, the ICAC commissioner and the awarding of a contract to KordaMentha are completely separate exercises. ICAC has a range of statutory obligations, and they are provided with a budget each year and they determine how that budget is spent. I make the point again that the budget going to the ICAC has increased and there was an additional \$14 million put into the budget this very year. With regard to KordaMentha, we acted swiftly to appoint KordaMentha because of the bleed. I think in a previous answer—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I said it was over budget by more than \$5 million a day.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In fact, it was \$5 million per week. The point remains that CALHN was completely and utterly out of whack in terms of its obligations under the budget, so

KordaMentha were awarded a contract which was focused on delivering better outcomes for the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. Two hundred days into that contract, I am pleased to report to the house that they are above their KPI savings target.

They are above that because they have been able to identify a whole pile of hopeless practices presided over by the previous government on that side. One very obvious example was the huge amount of activity occurring at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital that was not being processed and ultimately not being passed through to the commonwealth. Tens and tens and tens of millions of dollars were being—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, be quiet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —missed out on into the system in South Australia because of the hopeless administration of previous governments. On that site, there was a massive blowout in the capital costs for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Education!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Clinicians were not listened to with regard to the design of that hospital. There were a huge number of defects we have had to work systematically through to fix that hospital, including the lack of the psychiatric intensive care unit beds, which only opened this year, despite the first patients coming in several years ago. Every aspect of the previous government's administration in terms of health was absolutely shameful. The people of South Australia know it.

Mr Malinauskas: So why has ramping doubled since you've been in power?

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They can ask as many questions as they like about health in this house because we look forward—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Why has ramping doubled?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to presenting to this house and to the people of South Australia the recovery plan that we put in place. We don't apologise to the people of South Australia for appointing KordaMentha. We had to take urgent, corrective action to fix the mess that we inherited from those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a very significant investment that we have made into the system, but it was necessary to stop the bleed at that hospital and to do everything we could to make sure that we could return that hospital to being the very best it can be for the people of our state.

Grievance Debate

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:09): Today, we heard of the very distressing case of Mr Dennis Murphy, who lives in the southern suburbs and who a couple of days ago had very severe back pain. He called an ambulance, went to the Flinders Medical Centre and, following that, did not receive the care that he should have. He did not receive the appropriate care that he should have in our health system. He was discharged early—discharged home in excruciating pain.

Today, he has circulated an email to the Premier, to the Minister for Health and to others, outlining his concerns about what he says are significant problems within the health system. The video shows him in a very distressing state of extreme pain, being unable to properly get around the house by walking and having to crawl around the house in extreme pain. This should not happen in our health system in South Australia. People should be able to receive the care that they need when they go to major hospitals.

Unfortunately, our hospitals and our public health system are under unprecedented stress at the moment. The doctors and nurses, who are first-class clinicians, are under incredible stress because this government's priority is cuts to Health, cuts to doctors, cuts to nurses and cuts to beds. People will remember this government got elected on the platform of saying they were going to fix Health, they were going to improve services and everything was going to be a nirvana in Health. The actual result has been nothing but the complete opposite of that.

We have seen ambulance ramping in this state at levels that it has never been before—levels that are far exceeding what is happening in other states. In the last month, we had 2,300 hours where ambulances were not out on the road and responding to calls, but were stuck outside emergency departments with patients in the back who could not get inside. That impacts not only those patients in the ambulances but also the next patient who needs that ambulance urgently and who is delayed in getting that ambulance.

That situation is spiralling out of control and this government's response is not to get more doctors and nurses or to open more beds but to actually embark upon a massive program of cuts to doctors, cuts to nurses and cuts to hospital beds. Last year, in November the Premier committed to this parliament that he was not cutting doctors and nurses in the health system. He said, 'We made it very clear in the lead-up to the election that we wouldn't be cutting doctor and nurse numbers going forward.'

Mr Malinauskas: Not true.

Mr PICTON: It's not true, because they are doing exactly the opposite now. They have embarked upon voluntary separations at five of our major hospitals in South Australia. These are now targeting doctors and nurses. They are not targeting bureaucrats: they are targeting those clinicians on the front line we need for services. If those doctors and nurses decide to take a package, as I am sure many of them might do, they are not going to be replaced with somebody else. Those positions will go. They will not be replaced and there will be more pressure on the existing doctors and nurses and, importantly, the patients in our system.

Last Friday, we had another devastating blow from this government when they announced that they are cutting 60 beds across our central hospitals: 32 at the Royal Adelaide, 16 at The QEH and the remainder split across Hampstead and St Margaret's. This follows 40 beds they closed late last year at Hampstead and Flinders Medical Centre. Back then, they said what they are saying now: 'These beds will be opened if they are needed. They will be flexed up when they are needed.' We have had record demand and those 41 beds have never been reopened.

Today, we had the farce of the Premier in here, saying, 'It's all up to clinicians. It's all going to be up to clinicians,' and then, five minutes later, saying, 'Well, it's the department, really. There is probably no clinician I can name who could order these beds open.' We know that the clinicians want these beds open and the clinicians are calling for these beds—in fact, they want more beds—but the government are the ones who are reducing them and KordaMentha, their corporate liquidators, are the ones who are reducing them.

A KordaMentha partner in Melbourne was the one making the calls to industrial groups on Friday, informing them about the closures of these beds. It is KordaMentha who are getting paid \$20 million more than the ICAC, as we have heard today. As we heard yesterday, the Auditor-General has criticised their appointment with nine separate criticisms of the way that they were appointed without a tender process, breaching the state procurement guidelines. This is a government that is obsessed with cuts in our health system, not focusing on the patients who need support. They stand condemned for what they are doing right now.

GOLDEN GROVE ROAD

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:14): I rise to provide an update on our Marshall Liberal government commitment to fix Golden Grove Road. I attended the Tea Tree Gully council meeting last week to urge the City of Tea Tree Gully councillors to focus on the best interests of our local community and provide paths and drainage along Golden Grove Road. I asked these councillors to consider the needs of people with disabilities, residents whose houses are impacted by drainage issues and even the Tea Tree Gully staff, who cannot walk safely from the new service centre to the Garden Grove Cafe without traversing unsafe, unsealed, potholed sides of the road.

I urged the council to support the funding of their own infrastructure, including paths and drainage, as we in King have been waiting for this infrastructure for over 20 years. I reminded the councillors that during my time as a councillor I had many conversations with staff about the dire need for better drainage and paths. I was always told by the staff that when the state government fixes the road 'we will do the paths'.

Upon arrival at council, it was sadly evident that the Labor Party had an agenda to block any council investment in King. We had to walk through Labor Party bullies waving Labor Party posters to enter the council building. Approximately 100 ratepayers attended this meeting witnessing this. It was pleasing to have in attendance the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and the member for Newland. Both are also very keen to see the road upgrade and the council infrastructure delivered. The minister explained how commonplace collaboration is amongst—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: —council and state government across our state and he shared many examples of like projects and took questions from councillors. The minister stated that the government has already committed \$20 million to fix Golden Grove Road.

Councillor Bernie Keane spoke passionately, reminding his peers this was a very important project, that the request was not unusual, and he urged members and colleagues of the council to support this project. Five City of Tea Tree Gully councillors agreed that a collaborative approach to fixing the road was more important than any political pointscore. These councillors agreed with the council staff recommendation to contribute the funds. Frustratingly, six councillors voted against the staff recommendation.

Labor Party members Councillor Brett Rankine, Councillor Peter Field, Councillor Lucas Jones and Councillor Olivia Savvas all used this meeting to deliver partisan speeches and score political points, and it was evident that their political game was more important to them than finding a way to deliver for the ratepayers of the city. Most disgracefully, Councillor Brett Rankine voted against the council recommendation to fund safe paths—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: —and effective drainage for his ratepayers in Golden Grove. I do not know how Councillor Rankine can look residents of Golden Grove in the eye and say that he is representing them, when he is now on the record opposing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: —the delivery of footpaths along Golden Grove Road. This is yet another example of Councillor Rankine not understanding the priorities of King residents. Shockingly, in June 2019 Councillor Rankine moved a motion to increase council rates from the proposed 2.7 per cent to 3.4 per cent. Thank goodness Councillor Rankine's motion to hike up rates for people living in Golden Grove and Greenwith lapsed for want of a seconder. The ratepayers of Golden Grove deserve better representation. Residents tell me they just want the road fixed, they want us to get on with the job, and we will deliver.

Elected members tried to argue that they had been surprised by the state government asking for council to pay for its own infrastructure. This is gobsmacking, given that the mayor has posed for photos with the former government, demonstrating collaboration on this project and was quoted in a local paper back in 2017 saying, 'There will no doubt be some financial impact on [the] council regarding adjacent footpaths, so this announcement gives us time to flesh out the details.' This mayor is the spokesperson for the council.

Who is steering and leading this council's decisions? Is it the Labor Party? It appears that some City of Tea Tree Gully councillors are happy to accept the rate money from Golden Grove ratepayers to balance out their budgets, or as Councillor Jones said, 'spread the love', but they are blocking requests to invest back into Golden Grove. Is this another example of these councillors attempting to take the golden out of Golden Grove? It is time for these opposing councillors to remember whom they are elected to represent and to put the ratepayers first.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: Thank you for the opportunity to provide a status update. We will continue to get on with the job of delivering for King constituents. We will fix Golden Grove Road.

KURDS IN SYRIA

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:19): I rise today to speak of the plight of the Kurdish people. A few days ago, the military of the Republic of Turkey invaded northern Syria. In invading northern Syria, they have destabilised the Middle East. What they are attempting to do is silence a minority. The Turkish military have a history of ethnic cleansing and genocide since the 1920s in Asia Minor, when they ruthlessly attacked civilian Greeks, Greek Pontians, Armenians, Kurds and Assyrians, to the modern day, when they invaded Cyprus in 1974 and began a project of ethnic cleansing of the north. Now we see it again in northern Syria.

The Kurdish people seek nothing but freedom. Indeed, when the West was confronted with the ISIS caliphate, instead of sending our sons and daughters they sent theirs, and they defeated them. With the assistance of the United States and her allies, the caliphate no longer exists. Those fighters were imprisoned—dispersed, weakened and imprisoned. The United States has withdrawn its troops from northern Syria, paving the way for an invasion by Turkish military forces. What has occurred is that those ISIS fighters have now been freed from their prisons. The no-fly zone is no longer enforced. Kurdish civilians are being bombed and murdered.

What do we say to the mother of a Kurdish child whose father or husband or son was fighting in our name, rather than our sons and daughters, while they hold their deceased children in their arms? What do we say to them? What do we say to the Kurds whom we have abandoned? What do we say to any other future ally of the West when we embark upon trying to spread freedom and liberal democracy values? What do we say to them when we ask them to stand by us when they point to the Kurds? This is a human tragedy unfolding before us.

As the United States withdraws, Russian and Iranian influence spreads into Syria. The Assad regime is now moving back into northern Syria with their Iranian and Russian allies. Now that the West has withdrawn from there, we leave these people isolated. It is very difficult for us in the West to understand the intricacies of different politics within the Middle East. When we talk about Asia Minor and its bordering the Middle East, we have Kurds, Assyrians and Greek Pontians, and we have the geopolitical disturbances in Cyprus, and we try to work out whose side we should be on.

But we had a pact. We had an arrangement with the Kurdish freedom fighters, which was that we viewed ISIS and its caliphate as a threat to the West. After a long, drawn-out war in Afghanistan and a long, bloody war in Iraq, the West did not want to deploy troops to another conflict again, so they went there in our name. Yes, they were also fighting for their own homeland, a Kurdish free state. Yes, they had their own self-interest, but we partnered and NATO forces enforced a no-fly zone. We protected the Kurds from Russian and Iranian influence. Indeed, the Kurds tempered the Iranian and Russian influence on the border of the West, which traditionally has been Asia Minor.

Now, of course, we have surrendered that ground. We have surrendered these people to violence and thuggery. I am a student of what occurred in Asia Minor in the 1920s, and the best

accounts we have are from American journalists who were there, witnessing the long, drawn-out retreat of Syrians, Greek Pontians, Kurds and Armenians, who were slaughtered as they were marched out of Asia Minor. This is occurring again. Indeed, the term 'genocide' was initially coined because of Ataturk's actions. It is happening again. We cannot stand for it. We must shine a light.

SHOPPING CENTRES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24): Thank you for the opportunity to contribute a grievance today. Today, I want to talk about shopping centres. The very first shopping centre I remember when I was young in New South Wales is Roselands, which opened in October 1965, shortly before my mother passed away. I remember lining up in the streets around the shopping centre for hours with my family trying to get in to see this new concept of shopping in Australia and how amazed we were to see so many shops around a department store and the array of goods that could be purchased there.

Here in South Australia, I want to make some references following a story in *Boomer* by Jill Pengilly, and I want to pay particular tribute to her and all the work she does in this really amazing column that so many people in my electorate love and read every week. Kmart rose out of GJ Coles in Australia and an American company called SS Kresge. They first opened in Australia in Burwood East in Victoria in April 1969. I remember living off Anzac Highway near Kurralta Park when the Kmart opened there and the same sort of excitement as the days that were there at Roselands in New South Wales. But I particularly want to mention today one of the parts of my new electorate of Florey, which is Ingle Farm and the Kmart in Ingle Farm. I want to read directly from Jill's column:

ATTENTION shoppers, South Australia's first Kmart store opened 50 years ago next month. Premier Steele Hall cut a gold ribbon to open the discount department store at Ingle Farm on October 29, 1969.

Several thousand shoppers poured through the doors once the speeches were over and *The Advertiser* reported that roads around Ingle Farm had been jammed with traffic.

Spread over 9000sq m, the first South Australian Kmart offered 40,000 different items, across 50 departments. The selection ranged from groceries to clothing, shotguns and prams.

Fortunately, I do not think we sell guns there anymore. The article continues:

The Ingle Farm Kmart, with a mall containing 29 stores attached, was part of an expansion of the American brand across Australia.

I digress here: the deli at Ingle Farm was one of the best continental delis in the north-east and I remember going there specifically to get Maggie Beer's Pheasant Farm pâté in the very early days and a wonderful meatloaf they used to sell. A really important part of the shopping centre, indeed, was that deli. The article continues:

Mr Hall said it was an exciting example of competition in retailing.

With the article, there is a fabulous photo of Premier Steele Hall and the Coles deputy chairman in South Australia, Lance Robinson, chatting with a cashier Mrs Tony Lee of Ingle Farm. She is the only woman with five men in the photo—not that that is an important fact, but things have definitely changed now.

Through the good offices of *Boomer*, we have actually found the cashier, who now lives in Greenwith. She is going to be a part of the cake-cutting ceremony at Ingle Farm that we are going to have in a week's time, which I think is actually a really important event because shopping centres, as we all know, become the hub of our communities. People are often at the shopping centre two or three times a week, catching up with their friends, doing their shopping and keeping up with all the ins and outs of the local area.

I know the Ingle Farm Kmart has become central to many people's lives. We have a mall walking group there, who use the safety of the mall to exercise there a couple of times a week. The food court, of course, is a place where people catch up. The Kmart still exists, and the woman who is on the front security entrance there, Christina, has been there for many years I know of, so she knows everybody who walks in and out of that Kmart and is a really important cog in the network there.

Interestingly, our Ingle Farm Shopping Centre has two Coles supermarkets. I have not quite worked out why, but they both exist there and seem to do so happily. As I said, we have a large number of food outlets but an ever-diminishing number of banks and ATMs—of course, that is another story. I am very much looking forward to catching up with people at the Ingle Farm mall at 11 o'clock on Saturday the 26th, which will be a family day. They will be having all sorts of activities.

I would like to pay particular tribute to Sharmila from the marketing department at centre management, which also looks after Hollywood Plaza these days, and also the wonderful Julie on the telephone whenever you ring up. I am hoping Coles will also be able to send a representative and I know that although Steele Hall cannot be there with us he will be sending a message of goodwill.

I would like to pay tribute to not only the retailers who have been in the Ingle Farm Shopping Centre for so many years but also the huge numbers of staff who have gone through Ingle Farm, where a lot of people had their very first jobs and obviously went on to bigger and better things, not only within retail but throughout the wider world. So well done, Kmart and Coles, and congratulations, Ingle Farm Shopping Centre, on your 50th anniversary.

KILBURN FOOTBALL AND CRICKET CLUB

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (15:29): I rise today to speak about one of my local sporting clubs that has faced significant challenges in recent times, and I want to recognise to the hard work put in by its leadership team and its board. I am talking about the Kilburn Football and Cricket Club, which has a long and rich history in the Enfield electorate.

When the suburb of Kilburn was originally formed, it was known as Chicago, and the Chicago football club was formed in 1924. The suburb's name changed to Kilburn and the club followed suit in 1933; however, we still have the Chics football team today. The club was originally based at the Islington railway yard and won its first premiership in 1928. It played at this location with the Kilburn cricket club for some time but was forced to move in 1952. It had a few years in the wilderness before it found its present home at the Blair Athol Reserve, where it has been for the past 62 years.

The football and cricket clubs amalgamated in 1974 to become the entity we know now. The football club has had some success over this period of time. In 2001, it won the Division 1 A-grade premiership, and in lower divisions it has won in 2011, 2012 and 2015. The cricket club has gone really well. In the past year, it has fielded two teams: a two-day and a one-day team. As has been reported in the press, it has faced significant financial challenges, and this came to a head last Tuesday at a City of Port Adelaide Enfield council meeting.

At that meeting, councillors decided to grant the club an extension of 12 months on the lease at the Blair Athol Reserve. I want to thank the City of Port Adelaide Enfield council for working closely with the club to get it into that position. I especially want to acknowledge the hard work put in by the board and its supporters, none more so than club president, Dale Agius, who has worked tirelessly over the past few months to get the club to the position it is in.

I look forward to the club going from strength to strength in the next 12 months, especially as it is so rich in its diversity. Kilburn and Blair Athol have obviously changed tremendously in the past five to 10 years. The cricket team now mostly comprises players from Afghani and Pakistani backgrounds. The club has been enriched by the addition of the Ghan Kilburn City Soccer Club, led quite ably by Rahim Shah Zaidi, and I also want to acknowledge his efforts in helping the club in recent times.

I look forward to the club implementing the plans it put to the council last week, including the future plans to turn the restaurant and function area into a vibrant Afghani cuisine restaurant. The club also plans to invigorate junior football by appointing Andrew Graham as the Junior Football Coordinator. Andrew is going to see an exciting new Auskick program and hopefully have two under-eight boys' and girls' teams next year. Women's football is increasingly popular and I understand the club has plans to commence a women's team in 2020 as well, and I certainly look forward to that.

The diversity of the club is something that we need to hold dear, and I hope the club is successful in that, with those I fondly refer to as the 'old timers' there, such as Phil Martin, Rod Blue

and many others, mixing with the soccer teams and the Pakistani and Afghani cricket players. The football club also has a strong presence of Indigenous players, and they are very proud of that, and they do really well.

I hope that Dale and his team go forward with these plans and make a success of it. I hope that the club goes from strength to strength in the next 12 months, and I certainly hope that I am there with the club to celebrate its centenary in 2024.

FAT FARMERS RURAL HEALTH INITIATIVE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:34): I rise today with great pleasure to talk about Fat Farmers. Of course, this is in reference to the Fat Farmers Rural Health Initiative, which was started several years ago by three farmers from Maitland who could see that they needed to get fit and so thought that they would get together to train and run. Soon, they had inspired 15 other local farmers to join them and the idea spread across farming communities around the state. Nowadays, nearly 200 Fat Farmers or farmers of varying weight meet regularly to get fit in body and mind.

I am pleased to advise that the Fat Farmers group took out the community award category of the Regional Showcase Awards held on Friday night at Maggie Beer's farm, The Farm Eatery, in the Barossa. What a fitting win for the Fat Farmers Rural Health Initiative, recognised for inspiring and encouraging rural communities to improve their health and wellbeing through physical activity. I would like to take this opportunity in this place to congratulate all those involved on their win and to state that it is very well-deserved recognition.

If you talk to one of the founders of Fat Farmers, Ben Wundersitz, he will say that it is not about the kilos that you lose—although that is a great outcome—but that its success lies in what it offers farmers who often work long hours alone and, particularly after you stop playing sport, it offers a social connection that is so needed for everyone's wellbeing. It is a place where farmers can get together in a gym—in the case of Maitland, at the old footy clubrooms—get on the exercise bikes or the rowers or do kilometres of running together, spurred on by each other, or just get there to hang out and talk about what is of interest at that particular time. Fat Farmers are great at recognising that farming is a tough life and that for some it can be isolating, so it has become a great avenue for farmers to exercise together, socialise and connect.

Soon, the Maitland group was running in the City to Bay, and now it regularly features around 150 farmers from Yorke Peninsula and other groups that have popped up around the state. I had the great pleasure of joining the Fat Farmers on the most recent City to Bay as an imposter, wearing one of their shirts and running alongside them. It was a great thrill and privilege for me to be allowed to join them on their run and attend their lunch afterwards to rehydrate the body, as was necessary after what for me was a near marathon. Things are relative, but at six kilometres the half City to Bay I ran seemed like a bloody long way.

It was great to see the Minister for Environment and Water, the Minister for Sport and Recreation and the member for Morphett there. It should be noted that some ran further than others, but just being there mattered more than any distance. It was great to join them and it is a wonderful group. We had over 70 at the most recent City to Bay, and it was a great team and great to meet new people from around the state, develop new connections and just be with like-minded people, enjoying a bit of exercise and getting out there improving health in body and in mind.

I would also like to say that a bonus of the health benefits is that Fat Farmers groups inspire others in the community to get off the couch. Founder Ben Wundersitz said, 'Anything that you can do to improve the health of local communities is a good thing'—and he is so right, in my view, particularly given the alarming reports of the increased incidence of depression and suicide amongst rural men.

Fat Farmers commenced in 2010 as a group of three farmers in Maitland, but it has since grown to become a statewide movement and groups are popping up all over the place around regional South Australia. It is really remarkable that it has grown so significantly, from a small group of farmers in Maitland to what I previously referred to as a statewide movement. It now has two groups on the EP, two or three groups on the YP, a group in Saddleworth, another one in Barossa and Light, another one in Lower North, and new ones—or I understand to be relatively new ones—

at Mallee and Coonalpyn. There are 10 regional areas across South Australia where farmers are getting together and working on their fitness and improving their mindset. It is a wonderful thing to see.

Along with Ben Wundersitz, one of the founders, I would like to congratulate the executive officer, Sally Fisher, and all the team leaders who have done an amazing job getting people organised and taking part in a wonderful organisation. Fat Farmers is doing wonderful things for physical health and wonderful things for mental health, and it is having a significant impact across the state. Congratulations, Fat Farmers, on your recent award on Friday night and on the impact you are having on local regional communities.

Mr GEE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:41): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Land Tax Act 1936. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

With this bill, my government continues to honour its commitment to the people of South Australia—our commitment to lower taxes and other costs. The government has already abolished payroll tax for all small businesses. We have delivered reductions in emergency services levy bills for households and for businesses. We remain committed to capping council rates, to reducing electricity prices and to cutting water bills.

Unlike members opposite, we believe that people who work hard to earn money deserve to be able to spend it without the threat of big government confiscating it ever more on an ongoing basis, so we now introduce our legislation to reduce revenue collected from land tax. This bill is part of a reform package that will reduce the net amount of land tax payable by South Australians by \$70 million over three years. For far too long South Australia has been in the unenviable position of having the nation's highest top marginal rate of land tax. This turns away investment. It stifles economic growth.

For years investors have preferred to place their money in other states because of our 3.7 per cent top tax rate. The government's land tax reform package will release this handbrake on investment attraction. It will boost business and consumer confidence. It will create jobs and put more money back into the pockets of hardworking South Australians.

Through this legislation we will reduce total revenue collected and implement a fairer, more competitive land tax system. The vast majority of mum-and-dad investors and company groups who currently pay land tax will be financially better off. We know that because we have consulted widely about the detail of this reform before proceeding to introduce it. We have listened and developed our land tax package accordingly.

The package we are now proceeding with has three essential elements. The first has already been legislated. This will increase the tax-free threshold, from \$391,000 in 2019-20 to \$450,000 from 1 July 2020.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This measure provides relief to all taxpayers—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —including an estimated 9,300 taxpayers who will no longer pay any land tax at all.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is called to order. The Premier is speaking to the bill.

Mr Brown: No, he's not.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In fact, member for Playford, he is speaking to the bill and he—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Secondly, from 1 July 2020, the top tax rate will be reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent for all total site values above \$1.1 million. The new rate of 2.4 per cent is in line with the average rate for all mainland states. Thirdly, we will change aggregation rules so that they are similar to those already applying in New South Wales and Victoria to ensure that South Australia has a fairer system. This will end the opportunity for investors with multiple properties to establish complex legal structures to avoid paying a single dollar in land tax.

Throughout the debate, opponents of the reforms have comprehensively failed to defend the inequity of the current laws that allow this to happen. It is important to note that the government is not introducing aggregation. Aggregation has existed in South Australian land tax law for as long as land tax has been collected. The simple principle behind the proposed amended aggregation rules is that two investors, who each own \$1 million in property, should be taxed equally, even if one investor has one property and another has multiple properties.

While the government always intended to reduce the total net land tax payable, it was originally estimated that the amended aggregation arrangements would generate an additional \$40 million per year; however, one of the purposes of the extended consultation we undertook was to allow greater investigation and clarity on this estimate. As a result, Treasury has now estimated that, at a top tax rate of 2.4 per cent, aggregation changes will raise an extra \$86 million per annum.

Independent accounting firm PricewaterhouseCoopers has reviewed and supported as reasonable Treasury's methodology for constructing this estimate. When reviewing the methodology used by Treasury, PwC did not identify any alternative ways to use the existing datasets to improve the reasonableness of the estimate. It would clearly be inappropriate and unlawful for the government to disclose the confidential details of individual taxpayers who would be affected by the changes; however, the government has made PwC's report on the review of the methodology available to the public.

Over three years, the land tax cuts that we are implementing equate to a net reduction in revenue of about \$70 million. This is made up of an estimated \$19.4 million of relief to taxpayers in 2020-21, \$24 million in 2021-22, and \$26.3 million in 2022-23. The revised reform package will mean that the overwhelming majority of individuals and company groups will pay less land tax. Estimates show that 92 per cent of all individuals, 47,800 people, will pay less tax under the reforms. In the case of company groups, 75 per cent of them, 7,900 in number—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, I am going to interrupt for a moment. I am going to remind the opposition that the Premier is speaking to the bill. He deserves to be heard with respect and there will be an opportunity to debate the bill in the future, so let's hear what the Premier has to say, members.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may well, but that is all in the future, leader, and I ask that you listen to the Premier's contribution.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens and the minister for agriculture will cease the banter. My apologies, Premier. You have the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In the case of company groups, 75 per cent of them, 7,900 in number, will pay less land tax under the reforms. There are about 52,500 ownerships currently paying land tax in South Australia. Of these, some 22,300 ownerships comprise individuals, companies and trusts that own multiple properties and are already paying tax on aggregated site values. In fact, there are 16,600 individual ownerships or mum-and-dad investors having multiple properties either by themselves or jointly with other individuals.

Let me provide an example. Paradise teacher Lyn De Guglielmo and her husband, Dom, own several investment properties. They currently pay—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: He just told us he can't release individual details, and now he's releasing details.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, I am asking you—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is one which has been in the media.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Premier is speaking to the bill that is before the house.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They currently pay land tax on an aggregated basis. They have worked hard all their lives. They have used property as their form of superannuation for their retirement. Under the existing laws, they have told us that they have felt penalised because they have had to pay excessive land tax. But in response to our reforms they have said, 'Good on you for looking to do something for the ordinary mum-and-dad investor so that they don't have to rely totally on the pension to support themselves in retirement.'

They have said that they will save thousands of dollars on their land tax bill because of the increased tax-free threshold and the reduction in the top rate, from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition and the member for West Torrens are called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is a clear demonstration that it is not just wealthy individuals with significant property holdings who will benefit from the reduction in the top tax rate. Initial consultation about our aggregation proposals occurred over a 15-week period. We then provided a draft bill for further consultation over a further four-week period yielding 193 submissions.

We have consulted broadly on this bill, and it is now in a state that will deliver the objectives that I have outlined today. It is imperative that this bill is passed swiftly to end any ongoing uncertainty for businesses and property investors associated with the pending changes. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses of the legislation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

Some of the transitional provisions will commence on assent to allow certain notifications to be given in the lead-up to commencement of the amendments to the *Land Tax Act 1936*. The amendments to the *Land Tax Act 1936* will however commence on 30 June 2020, immediately after the commencement of amendments to the Land Tax Act that were contained in the *Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget Measures) Act 2018*.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Land Tax Act 1936*

4—Insertion of heading

The *Land Tax Act 1936* is currently not divided into Parts. This clause is the first of a number of amendments contained in the measure that insert headings to divide the Act into Parts and Divisions to better assist the reader in finding content in the Act.

5—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

This clause inserts a number of new definitions for the purposes of the measure.

6—Insertion of headings 7—Insertion of heading

These clauses insert new headings.

8—Insertion of section 5AA

This clause inserts a new section allowing the Commissioner to disregard minor interests in considering the application of the residential land exemptions in section 5.

9—Substitution of section 6

This clause is part of the restructuring of the Act. The current section 6 (which is being relocated to later in the Act to fit the new structure created by the insertion of headings—see new Division 2 inserted by clause 13) is repealed and replaced with what is currently section 11.

10—Insertion of heading 11—Insertion of headings

These clauses insert new headings.

12—Amendment of section 8A—Calculation of land tax

This clause amends section 8A to provide for the application of new rates of land tax specified in the Schedule that is proposed to be inserted by clause 18 of the measure. Section 8A(1) deals with the general land tax rates and (1a) deals with land tax rates for trustees (where the land has a taxable value of more than \$25,000), subject to various exclusions in (1b) and (1c). The new rates will apply from the 2020-21 financial year onwards.

13—Substitution of sections 9 to 13A

This clause contains some measures that are part of the restructuring of the Act as well as substantive changes relating to land tax where there is more than 1 owner of land, land held on trust and grouping of related corporations.

Current sections 9 and 10 are proposed to be repealed because they essentially contain definitional material which is now to be relocated into section 2 of the Act with the other definitions. Similarly, current section 11 is relocated for structural reasons to become section 6.

The current provisions on multiple ownership are repealed and replaced with a new provision as follows:

9—Land tax where more than 1 owner of land

This clause makes provision in relation to land tax where 2 or more persons are the owners of land (whether in the same or in different capacities). Under this provision joint owners are assessed in 2 stages. Firstly, the joint owners are assessed together (and all the joint owners are liable for the land tax together). Secondly, each joint owner is assessed individually on all the lands they own in any capacity that are liable to land tax. To avoid double taxation, an owner may receive a deduction in their individual assessment in accordance with the formula in proposed subsection (8).

New Divisions are also inserted as follows:

Division 2—Land divided by a community or strata plan

10—Assessment of tax against land divided by a community or strata plan

This proposed provision is a relocation of the current section 6.

Division 3—Land held on trust

11—Separate assessment of trust land

This section provides for trust land to be assessed for land tax as if it were the only land owned by the trustee.

12—Land tax for fixed trust if beneficial interests notified to Commissioner

This section allows the trustee of a fixed trust to lodge a notice of the beneficial interests in the land, in which case a beneficiary of the trust is deemed to be the owner of a proportion of the trust land (equivalent to the beneficiary's beneficial interest), and is liable for land tax on that land accordingly. The trustee is still liable for land tax on the whole of the land as if the land were the only land owned by the trustee but this is calculated at the rates applicable to non-trust land. Subsection (5)(b) allows for the application of the principal place of residence exemptions to the land (and if the beneficiaries are exempt from land tax under that paragraph, the trustee will also be exempt because the effect of the residential land exemptions is to render the land exempt from land tax). Subsection (6) provides for deduction from the land tax payable by a beneficiary of an amount (if any) necessary to avoid double taxation

13—Land tax for unit trust scheme if unitholdings notified to Commissioner

This section allows the trustee of a unit trust scheme to lodge a notice of the unitholdings in the scheme, in which case a unitholder in the scheme is deemed to be the owner of a proportion of the scheme land (equivalent to the unitholder's unitholding), and is liable for land tax on that land accordingly. The trustee is still liable for land tax on the whole of the land as if the land were the only land owned by the trustee but this is calculated at the rates applicable to non-trust land. Subsection (5)(b) allows for the application of the principal place of residence exemptions to the land (and if the unitholders are exempt from land tax under that paragraph, the trustee will also be exempt because the effect of the residential land exemptions is to render the land exempt from land tax).

Subsection (6) provides for deduction from the land tax payable by a unitholder of an amount (if any) necessary to avoid double taxation.

13A—Land tax for discretionary trust if beneficiary notified to Commissioner

This section allows the trustee of a discretionary trust to lodge a notice specifying 1 beneficiary of the trust who is to be taken to be the designated beneficiary for the purposes of the section, in which case the designated beneficiary is deemed to be the owner of pre-existing trust land (ie land that was subject to the trust at midnight on the day on which the measure was introduced in the House of Assembly), and is liable for land tax on that land accordingly. The trustee is still liable for land tax, which will be calculated:

- (a) at the non-trust land rates for pre-existing trust land;
- (b) at the trust land rates for subsequent trust land (ie. land that becomes subject to a trust after midnight on the day on which the measure was introduced in the House of Assembly); and
- (c) in accordance with a formula set out in subsection (9) where land subject to the trust consists of both pre-existing trust land and subsequent trust land.

Subsection (9)(b) allows for the application of the principal place of residence exemptions to the land (and if the designated beneficiary is exempt from land tax under that paragraph, the trustee will also be exempt because the effect of the residential land exemptions is to render the land exempt from land tax).

13B—Land tax for beneficiary/trustees

This section makes provision in respect of someone who is both a nominated beneficiary under section 12 or 13 and a trustee and provides for deduction from the land tax payable by the beneficiary/trustee of an amount (if any) necessary to avoid double taxation.

13C—Land tax for excluded trusts and public unit trust schemes

This section provides for the payment of land tax at the general rates on various categories of trusts that are exempt from the trustee rates applicable under section 8A(1a).

Division 4—Miscellaneous trust land provisions**13D—Requirements for trustees to notify Commissioner**

This section sets out various notification requirements for trustees. A failure to notify, as required by the section, that results in a reduced tax assessment (or no tax assessment) will constitute a tax default by the person for the purposes of the *Taxation Administration Act 1996* in accordance with section 19 of the *Land Tax Act 1936* (as amended by the measure).

Division 5—Land held on implied, constructive or resulting trust**13E—Land held on implied, constructive or resulting trust**

The other provisions relating to trusts do not apply in relation to an implied, constructive or resulting trust but this proposed provision provides that the owner of land as trustee of an implied, constructive or resulting trust is liable for land tax on the land at the general (non-trust land) rates.

13F—Trustee's right to reimbursement under implied, constructive or resulting trust

A trustee of an implied, constructive or resulting trust is entitled to recoup the amount of any land tax paid by the trustee from trust property.

Division 6—Grouping of related corporations

13G—What are related corporations?

This section defines what constitutes a 'related corporation'.

13H—What is a controlling interest in a corporation?

This section defines when a person has, or persons have together, a controlling interest in a corporation.

13I—Further provisions for determining whether corporations are related corporations

This section sets out a list of further matters that go to the question of whether corporations are related corporations.

13J—Grouping of related corporations

Related corporations that own land are jointly assessed for land tax as if the land were owned by a single corporation and are jointly and severally liable for the tax so assessed. The section also sets out particular circumstances in which a corporation may apply to the Commissioner for an exemption from this grouping.

14—Insertion of heading

15—Insertion of heading

These clauses insert new headings.

16—Amendment of section 19—Time for payment of tax

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 19.

17—Insertion of heading

This clause inserts a new heading.

18—Insertion of Schedule 1

This clause inserts a new Schedule setting out land tax rates for the 2020-21 financial year and subsequent financial years.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions etc

The Schedule contains transitional provisions.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

SUPREME COURT (COURT OF APPEAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:52): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Supreme Court 1935 and to make related amendments to various other acts. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is with great pleasure that I rise today to introduce the Supreme Court (Court of Appeal) Amendment Bill 2019. This bill will establish a permanent court of appeal in South Australia, as a division of the Supreme Court. The benefits that a court of appeal will deliver for South Australia is a more effective and efficient means of disposing the appellate work of the Supreme Court.

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court includes hearing first instance civil cases and serious criminal matters, including trials for offences such as murder and treason. In its appellate jurisdiction, the Supreme Court reviews and determines errors which may have occurred in other courts of the state and interprets and expounds the law for the guidance of other courts. Under the current

arrangements, the judges of the Supreme Court work on a rotational basis in the Full Court to hear civil appeals and in the Court of Criminal Appeal to hear criminal appeals. They also sit as a single judge when hearing and determining first instance civil and criminal matters.

The functions of an appellate and a trial judge are significantly different. The trial function involves hearing evidence, making findings of fact and making rulings on evidence. The appellate function involves a much greater element of theory, principle and conceptualisation of the law. It is not my intention for this bill to be seen as a reflection on the work of the current serving judges of the Supreme Court.

Pursuing this reform simply recognises that the appellate work involves functions and skills different from those performed in trial work and is therefore better performed in a separate court of permanent members than in a court of changing membership. By appointing judges to a court of appeal on a permanent and ongoing basis, the development of specialist appellate expertise will be fostered, leading to greater efficiency in our justice system and higher quality judgements.

South Australia remains one of the only jurisdictions yet to establish a dedicated court of appeal. When considering this reform, the government has looked to the advantages that have been borne out in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia following the successful establishment of courts of appeal in those jurisdictions.

In particular, in Western Australia a high-level committee was established in 2001 to consider the desirability and feasibility of establishing a court of appeal there. The Court of Appeal committee's final report concluded that the longstanding courts of appeal in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland were successful, working effectively and efficiently and were superior to a full court comprising several judges of a supreme court sitting on appeals in rotation, as is currently the case in this state.

The committee found that courts of appeal raised standards generally in the courts and the legal profession, improved the quality and consistency of appellate judgements, increased the speedy delivery of such judgements and involved shorter hearings. The committee's report also found that the principled development of the law was facilitated and that the Court of Appeal had developed a status and authority not previously enjoyed by full courts. For these reasons, the report concluded that the establishment of a court of appeal in Western Australia would advance the administration of justice in that state.

I consider these to be powerful arguments for the establishment of a court of appeal here in South Australia. This bill has broadly been modelled on the legislation establishing Western Australia's Court of Appeal and has the following major features:

1. The Court of Appeal will be established as a division of the Supreme Court, with a separate general division for the matters that are not heard by the Court of Appeal.
2. This is consistent with the court structure in New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland, whose courts of appeal are integrated with their supreme courts.
3. The Chief Justice will remain the principal judicial officer of the Supreme Court, including of the Court of Appeal.
4. The Court of Appeal will be comprised of the Chief Justice, the president and the judges of the Supreme Court who have been appointed to the Court of Appeal.
5. The president of the Court of Appeal will be responsible to the Chief Justice for the administration of the Court of Appeal.
6. The jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal will be the existing jurisdiction of the Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia and of the Court of Criminal Appeal.
7. To hear matters, the Court of Appeal will be constituted by at least three judicial officers.
8. The general division will be comprised of the Chief Justice and the judges of the Supreme Court who are not appointed to the Court of Appeal.

9. The jurisdiction of the general division will be the current jurisdiction of the single judges of the court. It will also include current jurisdiction of the land and valuation division of the Supreme Court, which is to be abolished and subsumed within the general division.

10. To hear matters, the general division will be constituted by a single judge.

11. The Chief Justice and president will jointly be able to authorise a judge of the Court of Appeal to temporarily sit in the general division and authorise a judge of the general division to temporarily sit in the Court of Appeal.

12. The bill also makes a number of consequential and transitional amendments to legislation to reflect the new court structure.

As Attorney-General, I am extremely proud to introduce the bill into the parliament, which represents a major advance on the administration of justice in South Australia. At the heart of this reform are the goals of efficient service of the public and principled application and development of the law. The bill, in establishing a court of appeal in South Australia, will deliver both.

At this point, the South Australian bar agrees and its members have welcomed the establishment of a court of appeal and the introduction of the bill into the parliament. They agree that there will be benefits in developing appellant expertise and have highlighted that this should lead to increased quality and efficiency in appellant decision-making. It is members of the bar who frequently appear in and have a specialist working knowledge of our higher courts. Theirs is therefore an important endorsement of what they have described as a most welcome legislative development.

One of this government's key justice priorities is to modernise our courts and to meet not only our needs but those well into the future. Attorneys-general should strive to improve the justice system and lead important reforms. I am pleased to say that the establishment of a court of appeal will improve this state's justice system and it is an important reform that will serve the people of South Australia well into the years to come. I therefore commend the bill to members for their favourable consideration. I table a copy of the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I welcome to the gallery members of the Adelaide Hills branch of Amnesty International, who are guests of the members for Kavel and Heysen. Welcome to parliament today.

Bills

CROWN LAND MANAGEMENT (SECTION 78B LEASES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (16:02): I move that I have leave to introduce the Crown Land Management (Section 78B Leases) Amendment Bill and an act to amend the Crown Land Management Act 2009.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am getting some advice, minister. You need to read it as it is on the *Notice Paper*. It should be the long title of the bill. Do you have that there?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I thought that is what I read, the Crown Land Management (Section 78B) Leases Amendment Bill 2019.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the short title. We need the long title.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: if the minister is not ready, should we move on to the next item of business?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is ready. He has been furnished with the long title.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Obtained leave to introduce a bill for an act to amend the Crown Land Management Act 2009. Member for Kaurna, I do not need your help in any way. You were a minister for six months.

Mr PICTON: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order, minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: He was minister for six months. I do not need his guidance in any way, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, could you take a seat. There is a point of order. Member for Kaurna.

Mr PICTON: Clearly, this minister cannot do his job. Clearly, he has capitulated for this state and he should not reflect upon members like that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for Kaurna, you are out of order. The problem here is that I think there was an interjection and the minister responded to that interjection. I ask that interjections cease. The minister is on track now and he has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I did not reflect on members. I provided a statement of fact about the duration, but the member for Kaurna—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take your point of order. Minister, I would ask you stay on your contribution please.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (16:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I am pleased to introduce a bill to amend the Crown Land Management Act 2009. The bill marks an important step towards delivering the government's election commitment to create new opportunities to retain shacks on Crown land, providing greater certainty of tenure for lessees, bringing shacks up to contemporary standards and strengthening links between rangers, Friends of Parks volunteer groups and lessees to enhance the care of our coastal and riverine environments.

Shacks have been part of South Australian life for more than 100 years, providing rest and relaxation for families and friends and a boost to regional economies. For generations, South Australian families have committed to caring for holiday shacks and, in doing so, have contributed to the wider environmental wellbeing of our beaches and rivers, provided healthy lifestyle opportunities and assisted our tourism sector. Due to a clause in the transitional provisions of the Crown Land Management Act 2009, family shacks on Crown land that were subject to life tenure leases were unable to be converted to another tenure, resulting in many shacks falling into disrepair or reverting to the Crown upon the death of the last family member named in that lease.

In April 2018, one of my first acts as Minister for Environment and Water was to announce a moratorium on the automatic demolition of shacks upon the death of the last person named in the lease. I also placed all pending revaluations of shack sites on hold until a new policy framework was developed and implemented to provide certainty of tenure and revaluations going forward. Since this time, we have undertaken a comprehensive review of the regulatory and policy landscape for shacks on Crown land and in national parks.

I have considered the policy application for national parks at the same time as reviewing the legislative impediments and policy considerations for the shacks on Crown land to ensure consistency. We have also undertaken targeted consultation with shack associations, local government, regulatory agencies and bodies and some traditional owners.

I would like to thank everyone who has contributed through their feedback to express their views on shack management in South Australia. Shack lessees and other stakeholders were invited to complete an online survey and review a discussion paper, entitled 'Retaining shacks for vibrant holiday communities', and the draft amendment bill, which were available for public consultation from 14 June to 26 July 2019.

The government also undertook information sessions across the state with shack lessees and local government about the content of the discussion paper. The sessions were attended by 115 shack lessees, and over 250 survey responses were received from the community and from stakeholders. The review and consultation process identified the requirements and standards that would need to be met to retain a shack, as well as the respective role of lessees, government agencies and local councils. It also confirmed that some amendments are required to legislation, including the Crown Land Management Act 2009 and park management plans for national parks.

As part of this process, and in my time as opposition shadow minister, I have personally sat down with a number of shack owners from across the state. I heard the concerns firsthand, listened to what was important to shack owners and noted the complexity of the matters that needed to be addressed to provide an appropriate way forward in assessing shack sites. These conversations have shaped and informed the amendment bill.

The amendment bill removes clause 14 in the transitional provisions of the Crown Land Management Act 2009 that prevents life tenure leases being converted to another tenure. Proposed amendment to clause 9 relates to life tenure leases for holiday accommodation purposes, shack leases on Crown land that were issued under section 78B of the Crown Lands Act 1929. In 2010, the Crown Land Management 2009 replaced the Crown Lands Act 1929. The current act does not allow a holder of a section 78B shack lease to apply for a new longer-term lease or to purchase the land due to the effect of clause 14 of schedule 1 to the Crown Land Management Act 2009.

Upon passage of this bill, the government will be able to lawfully convert the section 78B leases to another tenure through a new application process, enabling the holder of a section 78B shack lease to apply for a new longer term lease or to purchase the land. An application will be determined by the minister and a critical consideration will be the demonstration by the shack lessee that they can meet contemporary safety, amenity and environmental standards.

The bill also addresses an ongoing issue by creating a provision to allow for the minister to require the removal or to remove unauthorised fixtures from Crown land. It is important to note that the amendments to the Crown Land Management Act 2009 will not undermine the objects and principles of the act which, as minister, I will continue to be bound by; rather, it will provide an opportunity for holders of a section 78B shack lease to apply for a longer tenure and create a clear mechanism to manage the removal of unauthorised fixtures on Crown land.

These reforms will ensure that shacks are retained long term to support regional communities and so that many South Australian families can continue to enjoy these special places for generations to come. The reforms will also ensure that shack communities will remain as an integral part of the regional economy, supporting local South Australian businesses and the tourism sector. I commend the bill to members and I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Crown Land Management Act 2009

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *section 78B lease* to mean a lease granted under section 78B of the repealed *Crown Lands Act 1929* that has been continued as a lease under the current Act in accordance with Schedule 1 clause 13.

5—Amendment of section 24—Minister may dispose of Crown land to which Division applies

This clause amends section 24 to empower the Minister to dispose of Crown land following the surrender of a section 78B lease of the land. The disposal may be by way of transfer or grant of the fee simple in the land.

6—Amendment of section 25—Disposal by transfer or grant of fee simple

This clause amends section 25 so that the disposal of Crown land following surrender of a section 78B lease of the land is not required to be by public auction, public tender or some other open competitive process determined by the Minister.

7—Amendment of section 37A—Consent process for surrender of certain leases

This clause amends section 37A to require the Minister's consent to the surrender of a section 78B lease if the lessee seeks to surrender it on condition that the land is disposed of by transfer or grant of the fee simple to the lessee or a person nominated by the lessee, or on condition that a new lease of the land is granted to the lessee or a person nominated by the lessee.

8—Insertion of section 74A

This clause inserts a new section.

74A—Removal and disposal of unauthorised fixtures on Crown land

Proposed section 74A empowers the Minister to cause any building, structure or other fixture erected on Crown land without lawful authority or excuse to be removed and disposed of in such manner as the Minister thinks fit. Any costs incurred in doing so may be recovered by the Minister as a debt from the person who erected the fixture. If the unauthorised fixture is on Crown land under the care, control and management of a Crown agency or person other than the Minister, the Minister may only act with the consent of the agency or person. For the purposes of this section, it will be presumed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that an unauthorised fixture on Crown land was erected by the person in occupation of the land at the time it was erected.

9—Amendment of Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

This clause repeals a transitional provision that prevents a section 78B lease of Crown land being surrendered on the condition that an interest in the land be granted to the lessee or any other person.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

I indicate that the government will accept the bill as amended by the Legislative Council. The effect of this is to prescribe the allocation of certain funds from interest accruing on legal practitioners' trust accounts. Those who have been following the debate would understand the background of this. The issue of funding to be available for legal services in South Australia should be placed on the record. The Legal Services Commission is a provider of legal services and is funded primarily from significant grants from both the federal and state government and also receives some allocation from the Fidelity Fund. The community legal centres in South Australia are also the beneficiaries of some allocation.

The immediate matter of concern is to ensure that any effect of the terms of this amendment is not adverse in respect of national agreements on legal assistance funding and moneys available for community legal centres. As a government, we will of course follow up those matters. That said, the matter has been clearly aired in the Legislative Council. There is effectively a desire for the Law Foundation of South Australia Inc. to be a continuing and prescribed beneficiary of the whole of the 10 per cent of available discretionary funds. As Attorney-General, I note the same and do not have anything further to add.

Mr PICTON: I rise to indicate that the opposition supports the Legal Practitioners (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2019, importantly, as amended by the Legislative Council. The original bill introduced by the Attorney-General made amendments to the formula that governs the allocation of the interest to curing on solicitor trust accounts. The practical effect of the amendment will be to reduce the amount paid to the Law Foundation of South Australia made under

section 57A(2)(c) from 10 per cent of the funds to only 5 per cent, with an option to reduce it to zero at the Attorney-General's discretion, as the bill was originally constructed.

The Greens and SA-Best moved amendments in the other place to ensure that 10 per cent of the funds must be directed to the Law Foundation and 50 per cent of that funding must be applied to the provision of legal services to the community. Therefore, we are very happy to support these changes. This is something that we raised in the debate when it was previously in this chamber.

The Law Foundation distributes grants to organisations that provide direct legal services to the community. Unfortunately, there was a lot of overcomplication of the simple amendments. I think this probably could have been worked out beforehand. I hope that the government will support these amendments so that we can ensure that appropriate funding goes to the important work of the organisations that are supported through the foundation. I hope that continues into the future. Therefore, we support the amendment that has been moved by the Legislative Council.

Motion carried.

LAND ACQUISITION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 15 October 2019.)

Clause 8.

Mr PICTON: Chair, it is my duty to draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms STINSON: This is the clause that talks about 14 days being substituted with 21 days for SACAT to make considerations. My question to the Attorney is around the reason for that. I wonder whether part of the reason is the resourcing of SACAT. I am certainly aware that they have a large jurisdiction now, an ever-growing jurisdiction with not necessarily all the resources they may want. Is part of the reason for going from 14 days to 21 days a matter of resourcing and then being able to respond or having the resources to be able to respond in that time?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that I am aware of. It has not been in the submission or in the many meetings that I had with Justice Hughes, the head of SACAT. Indeed, the transfer of extra jurisdictional work to her and the amalgamation of the two cohorts of work under guardianship law and under tenancy law onto one site have all triggered, I suppose, an inquiry by me as to whether they are adequately covered. That has not resulted in any request for further funding. This is entirely a matter that is a response to the inquiry on the bill seeking an extension of time to be able to deliver the decision.

At the moment, it is done by the minister, who has the review role, and he or she has to make that provision within 14 days. That is the previous law. The previous attorney-general amended that to give it to SACAT. SACAT have not actually heard any cases. They do not have millions of these or thousands of these and they have not actually done anything yet, but they are saying, 'We might need a bit more time.'

It is the same process: a single person has to make the decision whether there is an objection that is reviewed or not. So, other than giving us a request for that, we have not interrogated the basis of that to them. We accept their advice that they would like to have some flexibility in this time frame, but we have also matched it against the need of the claimant, the person who is sitting there waiting to have a decision made, whether an application for compulsory acquisition should proceed or not. The final determination of that, of course, if it does proceed, may end up in the Supreme Court and that may require a lot longer process. Hopefully, with the other new initiatives that we are introducing in this bill, that will not be the case.

Ms STINSON: The Attorney detailed there that she had looked at the resources of SACAT after the guardianship and tenancy jurisdictions had gone over to SACAT.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: When they amalgamated.

Ms STINSON: Yes. When this work goes to SACAT in a meaningful way, when it actually starts hearing cases, one would expect that it would be quite sporadic and that as developments are being proposed—for example, the South Road upgrade—then that would be a time when you would see some increase in land acquisitions going on and subsequent cases going to SACAT. Is there any assessment that the Attorney has done or plans to do to ensure that the court is resourced when it does have an influx of these cases coming through, or are you confident that its existing resources will continue to be adequate, even when a large project like the South Road expansion is undertaken?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Whilst the member is focused on the South Road development, I think it is fair to say—

Ms Stinson: As an example.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that these things are going on all the time. It does not mean that we end up with thousands of acquisition disputes in South Australia. We end up with 10 to 15 applications in the Supreme Court a year. That should give you some indication. However, what we are talking about here is much more occasional, if I can describe it as that; that is, a notice has been issued and there is an objection which the recipient has the right to respond to and which is in very specific areas as outlined in the act already—set things such as whether there is a right to do that, whether there should be a boundary change, or whether there should be other land brought into account.

It is not the really difficult area, I suppose, of after having dealt with that matter then dealing with the significant issue about, 'Well, if you're going to take my house, what am I going to get for it and what compensatory benefit do I have, what time frame do I have to leave and what can I take with me?' and all the things that go with a compulsory acquisition issue in a substantive way. Nevertheless, in relation to this role, which is as a review role of that initial notice challenge, the judge is aware of this. She has been through all the different iterations of transfer of jurisdiction.

I think there were three of them before we came into government and another lot that was coming across, I think, in the early part of last year, or this year it may have been, in which I again asked the judge, 'I know these may be small in number but other jurisdictions are still being transferred. There is a group of them that are due in the early part of our government. Is that adequate, especially as you have just moved to amalgamate your premises from the ABC building out at Collinswood into a premises here in Adelaide?' Those things can cause some disruption, especially when you are being asked to do extra work. I understand that. The judge understands that, and she has not asked for any other money.

Ms STINSON: Is the Attorney confident that the resources that SACAT currently has are adequate to cater for land acquisition matters that it may need to consider in future?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, I am, and I am sure that Her Honour will let me know if it is not.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just quickly, given that this is the same deletion as 'and in the same way', is it the same reason that you gave last night for the removal of this section as well?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is correct.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just to be clear, is the Attorney telling us that this has somehow been a case where clients have changed lawyers and that, unless the same previous lawyer was informed, this starts the process all over again? I was a bit confused last night about how 'and in the same way' could be used legally by anyone to attempt to use that as a legal tactic against the agency or the authority when attempting to negotiate with the authority on land acquisition.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that it is more an administrative matter to give the flexibility to ensure that the notice gets to the right person at the right place. That is what it is for.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could the minister give me a brief explanation of the purpose of this amendment—and I do mean brief—as opposed to what it meant last night? I am interested in a very brief explanation in her own words of the merits of this amendment.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I assume the member is asking for more than what is already a brief explanation in the explanation of clauses, so I would refer the member to my second reading contribution where I am reminded that there is an example given of how this works. The example I gave was:

...if there is a landlord with three tenants the authority knows about and one tenant who is for some reason unknown to the authority, the authority issues NOIs—

that is notice of intention to acquire—

to the landlord and the three known tenants. Three months pass and the authority discovers the fourth tenant and issues their NOI. The authority wants to issue the NOAs as three months have passed since the first NOIs were issued but it cannot because it has to wait until three months has passed since the last NOI was given to that fourth tenant.

The amendment means that the landlord and the first three tenants can be issued with their NOAs without waiting for the three-month period from the last NOI.

The fourth still gets their three-months notice and the authority can move forward on acquiring the other interests. You have the summary and an example.

Ms STINSON: Clause 10 talks about the amendment of section 16. Section 16 of the Land Acquisition Act states that, subject to this act, the authority may publish a notice of acquisition in the *Gazette*. Could the Attorney elaborate on 'may' and whether that is something that in reality and practice does happen each time and that there is a publication in the *Gazette* each time and shed some light on why the term 'may' is in there if it is the case that it is required for a notice to be published in the *Gazette*.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that on each occasion it is published in the *Gazette*.

Ms STINSON: Is there some reason why the terminology 'may' is used rather than 'must' in that particular clause and there is no seeking to change that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is no reason that I am aware of. It is drafting practice.

Ms STINSON: To clarify, it is the Attorney's understanding that there would be a notice of acquisition in the *Gazette* each and every time?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is what I said.

Clause passed.

Clause 11.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Negotiation, compensation and other payments: are 'other payments' not compensation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Compensation represents obviously either the agreed or ultimately determined fund provided to be some recompense for the loss. Other payments are not compensation and that is why they are not included in that. They are the new regime we are having, which allows for up-front fees, usually professional fees, to be provided for and made, which are separate to the compensation usually if you get valuations or assessments, legal advice and the like.

Clause passed.

Clause 12.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This clause seeks to amend 22B in the parent act, which provides:

Subject to this Act, a person is entitled to compensation for the acquisition of land under this Act if—

(a) the person's interest in land is divested or diminished by the acquisition; or

- (b) the enjoyment of the person's interest in land is adversely affected by the acquisition.

The bill inserts:

- (1) Section 22 B—delete 'is entitled to compensation for the acquisition of' and insert:

who has an alienable interest in land is entitled to compensation for the acquisition of the

I would like to hear the Attorney-General give me a definition of alienable and what the legal definition of that is for this section. Without giving the committee my concerns in full, because I will get some advice between the houses, I think—and I stand to be corrected by the Attorney—this means that if land is not currently enjoyed, that is, land beneath you, and the government is taking it away, you are not entitled to compensation.

I do not know if that is the correct reason for this, but I would be interested to hear the Attorney's definition. My only concern—and I flag this up-front—is if it is describing land you currently are not enjoying that is at surface, does it mean that somehow now, if the state can make a case that you have not enjoyed the value of land at surface, therefore it is not compensable either because the land we are alienating from you is beneath the ground? I am not sure that this is right; I am just checking.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In simple terms, I will try to make this as clear as I can. The whole of this section attempts with this amendment to distinguish between alienable interest and native title interest. I will just deal with native title interest. The member for West Torrens and I, more than likely I am assuming, would not have a native title interest in relation to a piece of property. Unless we were of Indigenous background that had continuing occupation, that would not be available to us. It is a discrete benefit available to certain persons.

Alienable interest relates to the right to own, lease, occupy through a transferable interest—in other words, something that is usually an ownership, such as estate in fee simple and that type of thing, that is, the registered proprietor of the property or a leasehold beneficiary who is able to transfer that as a right to another occupant. Unless you or I had Indigenous blood, we would not be able to transfer what we might have in a native title interest, but you can sale, give away or bequeath an alienable interest in the land, so it is distinguishable, firstly, from native title—it is something you cannot just sell to each other—and, secondly, it distinguishes between someone who might just be staying the night as an occupier. They have no transferable interest they can onsell or gift to somebody else.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Currently, I could sell my rights beneath my land to the state to build a tunnel because the state has no right of access or power to acquire it, hence the bill. If this is only for things at surface, I am relaxed. If this is something to do with below surface, that is the point I am trying to get at. Does alienable in any way reference or assist the government, or is it an attempt to make clearer the type of acquisition that it is? If it is at surface, it is transactable, whereas below surface it is not.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This section has nothing to do with whether the interest is above ground, below ground or on top of the structure. It has nothing to do with this section. This section is distinguishing a transferable interest or a non-transferable interest, as distinct from the native title aspect, which is further in the clause.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay. I assumed that this section in the parent act—the 1969 act, division 2, section 22B—entitled people to be compensated for above-ground loss of land, not just of business but homes and principal places of residence. If you are saying it is not—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just saying you have to have an alienable interest. It is nothing to do with whether it is above ground or below ground. It may be that it turns out that when we identify the bore issue, for example, there may be an alienable interest that is below ground. We are yet to get advice on that, but this is irrespective of where it is. If you have an alienable interest, which is an interest in that land which is essentially transferrable to someone else—something you can sell, give or bequeath to someone else—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You can currently do that now.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, I understand that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Then why the amendment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Because we are clarifying the difference between alienable land as distinct from someone who might just be visiting the property, who is a squatter or someone who has come to stay overnight and who does not have an alienable interest. You have to have an alienable interest to be able to line up for compensation. That is usually an owner or someone who has a document of right of occupancy via a lease, residential tenancy agreement or the like.

Clause passed.

Clause 13.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is about the negotiation of inserting an obligation on claimants to negotiate in good faith in relation to the compensation payable for the acquisition of the land under the act. It has a series of amendments. One deals with native title. The other, clause 13(3), wants to insert:

- (7) The Authority must, at the request of the claimant and in accordance with any requirements set out in the regulations, convene a conference (a valuers conference) between land valuers who have made a valuation of the subject land (and the Authority may convene such a conference at any other time the Authority considers appropriate).

My concern about that is it gives the power to the authority but not the claimant or the landowner to call a valuers conference. I would just like to understand why the landowner cannot call a valuers conference if they disagree with the valuation, unless it is set out somewhere else I have not read yet in another part of the act. That is point 1 I want to make.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point 2.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is clause 13(3) and new subsection (7).

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, the good faith. Again, from my understanding yesterday, you claimed that was a recommendation of the committee. My concern is that by the state imposing this obligation on others, are there other examples in acts where the government imposes on an individual party that it is in litigation with—that is, that the state is in litigation with, not between two independent parties—good faith requirements on them?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We will check whether there are any, but this is rather unusual because of course we are dealing with a very significant power imbalance. I do recall raising it in a debate we had here in the house in relation to Mr Ian Nightingale's powers. He is a statutory officer and he has all sorts of powers to require documents to be produced.

I raised the very question at the time when the former government introduced legislation giving him these powers: how do you deal with that in a circumstance where the party might be in litigation with the government, with the state? He did not seem to be too bothered by that. He took the view that he should be able to look at these documents anyway.

It all related to whether he could make an inquiry whether, when a certain procurement had been granted on a certain expectation—namely, head office in Adelaide, local employment, all those things—they got the benefit of a weighting in a procurement process in which they might be successful. He would have a monitoring role in relation to that and he could do all sorts of things in relation to that. It did not seem to be of any concern to him that the party might be in litigation or in court already with the government. He thought he should still have that.

Fortunately, we are not dealing with that bill. What we are dealing with here is a situation where, firstly, the authority already has an obligation of good faith; that is, they have to negotiate. This first issue that you raised with the amendment requires that both the authority and the claimant must negotiate in good faith. Really, that is putting them both on a similar obligation. That is the first issue.

The second issue you raised on this clause was: how is it that the authority can require a valuers conference to be convened and not the complainant? If the member rereads new subsection (7), he will see that the authority must, at the request of the claimant and in accordance

with any requirements, etc., in the regulations, convene a conference. Here is the scenario: if the claimant wants a valuers conference, the authority is obliged under this proposed clause to convene it. So, indeed, the claimant does have the right to call one, but he or she does not have to do the work. The authority is going to be obliged to do that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you for clearing that up because I was concerned with the way it was worded further down the clause, where it states 'and the Authority may convene such a conference at any other time the Authority considers appropriate'. I thought perhaps there was some way for the authority to argue that they might not think there is one. Of course, given that the first part of the clause allows that, I am glad that has been cleared up. Over the page, it states:

- (9) Subject to this Act and the regulations, a valuers conference is to be conducted in accordance with procedures determined by the Authority.

The authority is forced to call a valuers conference, but it decides the process, rather than an external defined process that you can point to, and the process will be conducted following the same procedure as some other open process that everyone knows. The way I read this, the regulations will define how the authority conducts the conference. The landowner may wish to have a conference where they can supply information, but my concern is the regulations may not allow the landowner to bring more information into the conference or discover new information later and convene another conference.

I just want an assurance from the Attorney that, if new information comes to light, there will be nothing in the regulations that limits the ability of a claimant to have more than one conference and that the regulations governing the way conferences are conducted are standard in the way that other conferences are conducted in an arbitration or conciliation where there is an open procedure in place, people can see it is transparent and there is no difference from one conference to another. That is, two neighbours get the same procedure and the same conference where valuations are determined. New subsection (10) of the same clause goes on to provide:

The regulations may make further provision in relation to a valuers conference (including, to avoid doubt, requiring a report of the valuers conference to be prepared and provided to the Authority and the claimant).

So the authority decides the rules of the conference based on regulations that the minister makes. The authority can then prepare a report to be provided to both. I am not sure whether the claimant can get a report of what they feel was the process, or something to give contrary information or to contradict or to rebut the authority's report, and still make that available to the authority for consideration on the value in the conference.

I am just trying to make sure that this is an open process. I am sure that the Attorney has attempted to do the same. I just want to make sure (1) that the processes they are choosing are open, transparent and normal, that is, consistent with other processes, and (2) that for any reports that are commissioned by the conference to the authority and the claimant, the claimant can also commission their own reports and provide them to the conference and the authority.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: With respect, I think that the member is misunderstanding that the purpose of these conferences is some kind of mediation of the parties. It is not: it is the conference of the experts. In a lot of civil matters now, it is common practice that the court, the tribunal or the determining authority can prescribe if there is going to be a dispute about value. In motor vehicle accidents, for example, there will be a dispute about the extent of the injury and, in that case, you have experts in either land value or medical disability.

A lot of tribunals—I use that term in a broad sense—now prescribe that, whilst each party can have their own expert come along in the course of the determining process, there is a common process where there has to be a settlement conference of the experts—an experts conference. That is what we are talking about here: the valuers. So, in this case, it is the valuer who has been nominated by the landowner and perhaps the claimant, and DPTI have their valuer as well. They are obliged to meet and confer, and then a joint statement is prepared for the purposes of the ongoing determination of the matter. So it is an expert conference, as distinct from a parties conference.

This is not an uncommon process. What is more prescriptive here is the obligation on the authority to set the date and time to facilitate this to occur—in other words, to make an office available for the people to meet in at a time that is presumably within business hours. They also have a role

in ensuring that a summary is prepared of the resolution of the valuers conference. There may be none, depending on whatever the ultimate determination is.

Commonly—and I hope this gives some reassurance—once there has been a meeting of the valuers and each has listened to the basis upon which the others have issued their opinion (in this case, on the value of the property or leasehold interest or whatever is going to be compensated), they can see the weaknesses of each other's position or add in other information, such as, 'Yes, if I take into account that other aspect and this other sale that has occurred in a similar location, then I agree that my valuation could go up a bit.' They may reach a range, if not an amount, of what is a reasonable resolution of the expert valuation.

The theory with these things is that, if that can occur, frequently it provides a good basis upon which the parties can then confer and reach agreement or, alternatively, submit that for the purposes of a determination ultimately by the court. It is not an uncommon practice. There is probably a bit more prescription here about what the authority is obliged to do because these are not equal parties. The act already recognises the important feature of there being an imbalance here and so there are clearly many more obligations on the authority to do things than on the claimant.

Clause passed.

Clause 14.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In this amendment, section 23A is being amended with (1a)(a):

- (a) if the Authority considers that the amount of compensation is unable to be determined at time the notice of acquisition is given, in which case the Authority must, as soon as is reasonably practicable after the amount of compensation is able to be determined, make an offer in accordance with subsection (1);

Why is there no time frame given on the authority to make a determination of a value? Given that you are giving SACAT 21 days to make a determination, why not give the authority a time frame to make a valuation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is not just a decision based on a time frame imposed for a decision based on the documents before them. This is a process that considers values, including something like a business of which the business proprietor is then obliged to pull together financial material—presumably, if I use this scenario—of what their sales have been each week to identify a profit stream to then be able to assess value, and then of course use that as some base to seek compensation for presumably loss of the business, or interruption at the very least. That is why it is a different matter. This is not just a time frame to say, 'We need a decision on this.' This is a capacity to be able to get this material together.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is my exact point. If there is no time frame and there is an announcement of activity, and properties are being acquired and demolished around the business, turnover drops, there is interruption and sales figures are decreased. There is no requirement here to say acquisition valuation is done the day before the announcement, or any other inconvenience around the business—this is my exact point. It is good enough for SACAT to have to make a decision within 21 days about this matter, but the authority is giving itself as much time as it thinks is practicable to go away and work out a valuation.

All I am saying is that it seems to me that if it is good enough for the goose, it is good enough for the gander. Let's require the authority to make a decision quicker. I am not saying it has to be 21 days but why not at least say within three months. Again, whatever time it takes a proprietor of a business or a landowner to collect the information, I assume the process would not start until the authority gets it. Once the authority has all the information it needs, the clock should start ticking; otherwise all the authority has to do to lower the payments the government has to pay is just wait until the inconvenience drives these businesses' turnover into the ground.

I can give you some very good examples. There are a number of businesses on the north-south corridor that saw their turnovers dive dramatically during the acquisition and demolition of properties as they were still negotiating, properties like crash repair shops, bottle shops, other businesses on the north-south corridor. I just would have thought that there could be a time line once

all the relevant information has been given. No doubt, there are requirements when people have property, given they are being required to act in good faith. There are other requirements in the act, I understand, for them to provide information to the authority to determine all this, but there is no requirement on the authority to do it quickly.

I am not trying to be difficult. I just think that between the houses we are going to have to contemplate whether or not we move amendments in the other place about whether we give the authority some time frames as to how quickly it should calculate values. This is so that they can get on with dispute resolution and so that we do not see businesses devalued because of the inconvenience they are suffering due to roadworks.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: One of the reasons we are doing this is to ensure that the rules are set so that decisions can be made before they start the infrastructure project. In these circumstances, it is usually in the interest of the authority to move this along pretty quickly. After all, they are the ones who have served the notice on the person to say, 'We want to take your property. These are the good public interest reasons why we're doing it. You are going to be in the way and we're starting the process.'

We presume the conduct that is being regulated by the current act and amended under this bill is that time is of the essence for them and they are indeed keen to progress it. What we are trying to do is make sure that there are adequate situations, especially in circumstances where there might be an operating business on a premises where it is not just a simple case of bringing somebody in and comparing sales, saying, 'Your house has this amenity or this level of decoration and it is worth this or that.' We are talking about assessment auditing of financial information, which may or may not be in a computer spreadsheet.

We are trying to ensure that we protect the interests of the claimant, not the authority. The imposition on the authority is when they have this and they do make an offer. The process here is really part of the protection against the claimant being bulldozed along with this.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am sorry, and I do not mean to quarrel with the Attorney on this, but I disagree with her. As a transport and infrastructure minister, as a local MP and as treasurer, I have seen the time it takes to acquire properties, demolish them and begin works. There have been business evaluations that have taken too long and we have seen their turnovers dive, and then the assessments are made late and the value of the business is lowered.

I do think I can flag that between the houses the opposition will probably want to see this done in a timely way after all the information that has been provided to the authority. I would like some advice from the government between the houses on what they think is a workable time frame for an authority to get back to the business on what they think the value is. I do not want to be difficult about this.

I do not want to make this something that makes the act unworkable, because we want this act to work, but I think businesses deserve some form of certainty from the government that they are given a value in a timely fashion. I do not mind whether the government say it is three months, four months or six months, but I would like the government to come back to the opposition with a number, between the houses, which they think is workable and in which the authority must get back to these businesses with a value.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to disagree with the member for West Torrens, but when you are considering these amendments you are proposing, perhaps you will bear in mind that this clause has nothing to do with their providing a value. The obligation here is that the authority put in an offer. When you do consider this—and I am sure you are clearly going to—I just ask you to read the full provision. This has nothing to do with the authority producing a valuation to give to them.

This is about them having an obligation, when they have the information, to put an offer to them. It has nothing to do with a valuation. As long as we are clear about that. You go away and have a look at it and I will wait and see what you propose.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you for your assistance.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

The CHAIR: Are there any questions on clause 15?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are now.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Absolutely, sir, thank you very much for your considerations. Once you have received your offer in a reasonably practical time that the authority can decide whatever it is, the claimant must respond in accordance with the regulations, and no doubt it will be in writing. The person must indicate whether the person accepts or rejects the offer. I am wondering whether there is a time frame in which the person must accept or reject the offer and respond to the authority.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member will see that the prescribed period means six months from the date of the offer of compensation.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Great, we have a time frame.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, it is right at the end. If you read the whole clause, you will see it there under subclause (8).

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I just wanted to hear you say it.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Do you want me to read the whole section for you just in case?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, what I think is not clear is that it is proposed—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to tell you that it is different. We are setting up a schedule which gives some timely and fair progression and a process by which there can be some attempt to resolve a settlement fair to the complainant but also consistent with the authority wanting to get on with its piece of infrastructure.

We start with the presumption that the authority actually want to get the property. They are the ones keen to get going and so forth. There is an obligation in part of this model that talks about money being paid into the Supreme Court, and it has to be in and out within 24 months. There are some obligations further down the track in this bill on that, and I am advised that they are the next bit. There are reversion things that apply to the 24 months, so there is a timeliness in that regard.

If you think ultimately that six months is not long enough for the complainant, then obviously you can come back with some amendments. If you think that there is a situation where there are examples of the authority not putting an offer in a timely manner, we would be very happy to hear it. What we are hearing to date is that that is not the problem in these cases. There are clearly major disputes on what the asset is, what its value is and what the emotional stress is in the relocation of the complainant.

They are the three areas that we most commonly hear about, not that the authority is in some way failing in its responsibility to put an offer in a timely manner. As I say, you are going to consider that between the houses, and no doubt you will put your case in the other place if you feel that there is some example of that. To date, we have not heard it but, if that is something you understand, as you say, in your experience as a minister, then we would be happy to hear it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I just find it gobsmacking that the authority, in formulating the offer of compensation, is given no time frame because we assume that they are in a hurry to get on with this and that therefore they will act quickly and expeditiously to work all this out, but the claimant is given a time frame within which to respond to the offer. I would have thought that any fair-minded person would think, given the state is using the power of the parliament to take away someone's land that is not for sale to build its infrastructure and putting a requirement on them to respond within six months, then asking the government to make its offer of compensation within a

certain period is also not onerous. For the life of me, I do not understand why there is any quarrel on this matter at all in the parliament.

As I said, if it is good enough for the goose it is good enough for the gander. If it is good enough for the claimant to have to respond to an offer within a time frame, why not make the government make the offer within a time frame once notice has been given? It makes complete sense. Again, who are we to question the wisdom of the Attorney-General, in awe as I am in her shadow of brightness and intelligence, because I dare not even gaze at her lest I be burnt.

All I was asking for was some assistance from the government about what would be a reasonable time frame that would work with the authority so that we could get this done in a way that does not impact the authority's ability to get on with the job but also provides some procedural fairness to both parties. One party has a time frame to respond with; the other can take its time as it sees fit. That does not seem fair to me.

The Attorney's argument is: well, there are no examples of the authority not doing it. I have not been the transport minister for six years. I do not know whether there are complaints. I am not sure whether these complaints are even FOI-able. I am not sure whether there are even records kept of all this. I do not know.

All I am saying is that I am seeing two clauses: one putting a time frame on someone to respond to an offer of compensation and the other giving as much time as needed to make the offer. I would have thought that it would be pretty common sense and routine to put the same time frame on both parties, but apparently not. I will get advice on that between the houses, and if the Attorney will not give me any assistance about what an appropriate time frame might be we will have to make one up ourselves.

The CHAIR: Attorney, do you wish to respond?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No.

Ms STINSON: I wonder whether the Attorney could explain. I am just looking at new section 23AC, which goes through some rules around how interest is accrued. I wonder whether the Attorney might just explain the effect of those clauses in terms of the accrual of interest, particularly in the situation where the authority's money is being held? Does the claimant receive that interest in the event of extended negotiations, and are there any caveats on that in terms of the behaviour of the parties as to whether interest is accrued and is paid out?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As the member may be aware, when money is paid into court, it is paid into the Suitors' Fund and it accrues interest. That is the normal situation. This provision provides that, if there is no resolution of the matter at the end of the 24 months, the money that was paid into it by DPTI, for example, would be paid back to it with the interest and there would be no further interest accruing on it. Does that make that clear? There is a time frame of that money sitting in there in the fund.

Ms STINSON: I am wondering about the situation where money is paid out, for example, after 24 months. Say that DPTI, for example, has put money into this holding account, there is then a protracted period of negotiations and then money is paid to a landowner. What is the situation with interest in that circumstance? Is interest accrued, and is it paid to the landowner who has been waiting for the money that is then determined to be theirs?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There still has to be a resolution ultimately of the claim. Usually what occurs in relation to these matters is that if the claim is assessed at \$20,000 and interest is payable on it from the date of the claim as determined, ultimately if the court makes the decision and not any other agreement, then they will get their interest as part of their settlement.

Ms STINSON: So not from the date when the money goes in but from the date when the court makes a decision?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No. The money that is going into this fund is really just to hold it there and be ready to pay out. It is usually consistent with the offer that is being made. It is sitting there and it is ready to go. Sometimes there is a dispute about certain aspects of a case and money is held in there for longer in the Suitors' Fund for other civil litigation. Here, though, we have a very

prescriptive program of what each party has to do to be able to get through that process, hopefully, quicker and more cheaply, but in the meantime, while the money is sitting in the fund, it accrues interest. If the case is not resolved at the end of that time, it can go back to DPTI—I think we have used as the example—and no interest will continue to accrue on that.

Ms STINSON: Just so I am clear, does the interest accrue from the moment that the money is put into the holding account or is the interest only accrued from the point of a court decision about that money going to a claimant? Would you like me to repeat that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No. To clarify, in the course of what is occurring, the money is paid into this fund. If the claimant says, 'I want that \$20,000. I'm still claiming \$100,000, but I'm taking that now,' they can do that. That is my understanding of this position. They do not have to let it go back at the end of 24 months. They can agree, as part of the process, to take it presumably as part settlement of whatever they are seeking.

Ms STINSON: While I find that helpful, I am not sure the Attorney heard my last question, so, if it is okay, I might just repeat it. My question was about the point at which interest starts accruing. Does the interest start accruing from the time when DPTI, for example, puts that money into the holding fund or is there some later point, for example, the court making a decision as to who that money goes to, when the interest starts accruing?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As I said before, the interest accrues from the time it goes into the fund. That relates to that money in that fund. That does not interfere with the capacity of the Supreme Court to make an order at some subsequent date that may well include interest in a different form or different part of what they determine, so we are not interfering with them. We are just making provision that, when money is put into a fund, it continues to get interest from the time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Why is this amendment even necessary, given the government is imposing a condition of good faith negotiating on both parties? Why would the government deem it necessary to withdraw funds out of the Supreme Court if there is no resolution? It could be because the court is taking its time in considering this and asking for more information. If both parties are acting in good faith, why are you doing this?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is a provision that is being included at the request of the Chief Justice. Some people apparently utilise the fund like their own personal bank account. The case is resolved. The money is left in the Suitors' Fund and it continues to accrue interest. It is not disclosable, apparently, when somebody might be applying for some other benefit, for example. I am assuming by this that it is not something that shows up in the usual transparency of bank records when various agencies, like the tax department, go through and look at these things.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Or means tested.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Means testing comes separately, but in the sense of the other authorities that get access to this information it could just be parked in the Suitors' Fund and left there. Obviously, the Chief Justice sees that as completely inconsistent with the purpose of this fund and therefore has requested that there be this time limit put on it. From memory, I think there is a power to vary that time or at least the terms. There is an ability to vary only for compensation, I beg your pardon.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If that is the case, and the issue is not that it is being withdrawn for a tactical purpose to try to gain a settlement process because both parties are acting in good faith, and it was simply because people are using it as a tax-avoidance measure, why not just say that once the matter is resolved moneys must be paid within 14 days? Why this measure?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think I started this whole section on the basis that we have a Suitors' Fund and, in normal civil cases, it is used for the purposes of offers that are made and security of costs for lawyers—all these sorts of things. I am not sure that the use of the Suitors' Fund is perhaps the best way to deal with money that is being offered in these acquisition cases. It seems as though the Supreme Court put up with that, if I can put it in as generous a way as that, but they do not see this as really being what its principal purpose is. They agree to have it; they just want to make a limit on the time to do it because they do not want it to be abused. So we have taken advice—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How can it be abused if it is taken in good faith?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Because people do not always do the right thing.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: But there is a legal requirement on them to do the right thing.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I understand that, but we do not have a law which simply says, 'You do the right thing. You act in good faith.' We do not have anything else.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: So it is a tactic then?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, it is a request by the Chief Justice for the utilisation of the fund for these purposes. Whilst there may not be a suit at large at this point—because remember we are in the pre-stage where we are trying to resolve these matters without litigation—he is saying, 'You can use the fund, but I am asking you to ensure that we don't perpetuate this problem of people utilising it for a reason that they should not.'

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Just pay it once it is resolved.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just putting to you that this is his indication about what he has sought. He has been provided with the bill as part of the consultation process, and I think you have seen that. He has put his view, we have listened to it, and hence we have this amendment.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

Ms STINSON: This clause talks about a settlement conference. Can the Attorney clarify who pays for such a settlement conference and, for that matter, the valuers conference, which I realise is in clause 13, which we have passed. Who is the party who looks after the costs of these conferences?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I believe it is the authority in both cases.

Ms STINSON: Do they pay for just an initial conference? Is a settlement conference determined as one meeting and one conference, or could it be a series of conferences? Again, would the authority pay for a series of conferences? I can imagine that parties may go to a conference, particularly landowners who may not be satisfied with the outcome of a conference. What I am trying to figure out is whether there are avenues for those conferences to continue, or is there simply provision for a conference and the result at the end of a single conference is binding on the parties?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: A settlement conference can be more than one meeting, but let us remember that the process here is that, if an agreement is reached at that conference, that becomes the binding agreement of the terms of the settlement. If it has not—for example, there is something that one party wants to get some extra advice on, there has been a new issue raised at a conference—then they may well say, 'We will convene tomorrow morning or next week,' or whatever. The settlement conference process is one that is not prescriptive to the extent that the parties cannot continue to meet, and I am sure there would be circumstances—there certainly are in other jurisdictions—where settlement conferences are more than one.

Ms STINSON: And DPTI covers the whole cost?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct. They would not agree to have a settlement conference if they were not prepared to pay for it. Do you see what I mean?

Ms STINSON: Yes, okay.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A member of the settlement conference can be a member of the authority. On the second page, subsection (5) provides:

(5) A person who, without reasonable excuse, refuses or fails to comply with a direction of the conference coordinator under this section is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

That is at page 10 of the amendment. Does this mean that the authority is being bound by directions of the conference coordinator? If they are found guilty, who bears the liability of the \$2,500 penalty?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The person who fails without reasonable cause or excuse to comply with the direction of the conference. I am assuming that to be a party.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: But if it is the authority, who pays that fine?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The authority. Authorities are departments of the state—you would remember this as a minister, I am sure—and are responsible. They can sue and be sued, etc. Do I need to go through all that again? Do I make that assumption?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Do you want to be here all night?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That person, whether it is a person representing DPTI or the claimant, if they do not do what they are asked to do under direction, could be subject to that fine.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: So the state would pay the fine.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That depends, as you might recall. Let me give you a little refresher: let us assume the transport officer has been required to produce certain documents and turns up and refuses to do so. It turns out that that behaviour is in breach of his obligation to the department head or the chief executive—or maybe the employer, in that circumstance and that relationship—and he may be committing a criminal offence in not doing that. If he or she is not and there is some breach of code of conduct, there may be some disciplinary action.

From the conference coordinator's point of view, a fine is issued on making those findings that yes, they had been directed; yes, they knew what their obligation was; yes, they had failed to do it or did not have a reasonable excuse and that is the consequence. It will be up to the department then, usually, to make a decision about whether their employee was acting within the terms of their obligation as an employee, whether they were outside of that or whether there was some misconduct or, indeed, any criminal behaviour.

I cannot say to you who would pay it until that aspect is defined, but if the employee who has turned up to this conference, who has disobeyed a direction and maintains to his employer that he was acting in the ordinary course of his duties and was not acting illegally or in breach of his obligations in his employment, then no doubt he would have a position to put if that was accepted by the department, and the department would pay. I suspect there would be some questions asked by the head of the department or the minister in charge if they found that a member of the authority was disobeying an obligation or direction of the conference coordinator.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Which section of the amendment bill empowers the conference coordinator to issue fines?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised—and I am not sure if this is entirely correct—leaving aside whether it is a criminal offence or whether it is a summary offence, it is a prosecutable offence and that would be reported, presumably—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You said the coordinator would issue the fine.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The coordinator would issue the direction. If it is a breach of the direction of the coordinator and there is no reasonable excuse, then the process in that scenario is likely to be that the claimant and/or the lawyer for the complainant would make the report to the police to say, 'This person has not complied. I want a summons issued against this person.'

That person, who in your scenario is an employee of the Department of Transport, would then go back to his employer and say, 'I thought I was acting in the ordinary course of my duties,' or not, 'I don't want to pay this,' or, alternatively, 'Yes, I have taken this on the chin. I was in error. I have been fined.' In those circumstances, we would see whether the employee pays or the department pays.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In your previous answer, you said the conference coordinator issues the fine. Now you are telling me that participants in the conference need to make a complaint to the police about a breach. So it is not the coordinator who issues the fines, as you told the committee not 30 seconds ago. It is indeed, I assume, a court that issues the fines. That is not what you told us. I have not finished yet.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, you may not have, but I am going to indicate to the committee, because I do take offence at that tone, that if in any way I have indicated that the coordinator is the prosecuting authority and the determining body of that, I apologise for that. What I have consistently said is that the conference coordinator has powers to issue directions and, if his or her directions are not complied with, there is a potential penalty here for that person, whether they are from the authority or the claimant, to suffer that offence being found and a fine to apply. That goes through the normal process. I would assume it to be under a summary jurisdiction process, in which case it would be a Magistrates Court matter, but I may be wrong in that regard. It may actually apply to someone else.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will tell my constituents that if the authority does not comply with the conference coordinator to call 000. This has now become absurd. All I was interested to know was if the authority does not comply with what the conference coordinator asks it to do, is the state liable for the penalty? The Attorney has said, 'Only if the representative of the authority has acted outside the brief of the authority after a claim.'

There is an ambiguity about how that claim is made by a participant of the conference because the authority has the minister setting the regulations about how the conference is conducted, the government select the conference coordinator and the authority provides information to the conference. If a claimant feels or suspects that the conference coordinator's instructions to the authority have not been fulfilled, their outlet for complaint is the police, according to the Attorney-General.

I do not think that is satisfactory and I do not think that is what is actually envisaged. If it is not envisaged, it is not clear here. I ask the Attorney, between the houses, to provide the opposition with a written brief about what happens if the authority does not comply with its own conference rulings about what the conference wants the authority to do. In terms of the penalty, I accept the Attorney's argument that if the representative of the authority has acted outside the scope of what the authority wanted it to do, then that person would be liable.

I am assuming that if he took any action, it would be against the state rather than the individual and it would be the minister, I assume, or whoever is responsible. I cannot see anywhere in the amendment bill which jurisdiction this penalty applies to, where you go, how you make the complaint or what the process is for making a complaint if the orders are not followed. Can only the conference coordinator find a breach?

What if a conference coordinator does not believe that there is a breach but a claimant does? Are they allowed to go somewhere? I want a briefing between the houses to understand exactly how this works so that no-one is unduly given any disadvantage.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to provide the detail about which court deals with this matter for the purposes of the issuing of the breach summons and about who makes the decision. I would add one further piece of information, which I hope makes this clear: the appointed conference coordinator is an independent person. The directions that he or she gives in respect of attending this conference which is set out in the process can be either to a member of the authority or to the claimant, so it is not one-sided in that sense.

If the conference coordinator is unhappy with the failure of somebody to comply with that direction, he or she may report that matter themselves and take it through the process, the detail of which we will get hold of. I would not think that there would be any reason that any other party could not report that, but in those circumstances I would be surprised if any action were taken, unless it were corroborated by a supporting statement of the conference coordinator, who would be able to confirm whether his or her direction had been breached.

In any event, we are happy to get that further information, but I want to make clear that this is a process of setting up a conference arrangement with an independent coordinator and that the parties have to comply with certain directions. In this matter, I would hazard a guess that it relates to the production of documentary evidence or information to support assertions made by each of them. Obviously, there must be full disclosure of that material at the conference to make it, hopefully, an effective resolution.

Clause passed.

Clause 17.

Ms STINSON: My question on this clause continues from my earlier line of questioning around who pays for settlement conferences. This clause says that a claimant must apply to the authority to convene a settlement conference. I am inquiring about a circumstance in which a settlement conference is held but the claimant is unhappy with the result of the settlement conference. Would that bring the settlement conference to an end, or does the claimant have a right to insist upon another settlement conference in order to get a result they may want?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, I suppose it is a question of what they are both there for. This is a process that is designed to say to the parties, 'You are going to have to go through a mandatory conference process before we are going to let you litigate in court, for all the reasons we have espoused historically.' I think I pointed out during the course of the second reading, or at least during the reply, that the courts are now looking at rules of court that may introduce the obligation of mandatory conferencing even in other civil jurisdictions. However, at this stage, people can go to the state civil courts and can issue proceedings.

Having gone into court, they might be referred to mediation or a conference of some kind before the court will agree to list it further and things of that nature. But this is a pre-issue process which is being imposed and which, as I say, is not uncommon in contemporary litigation matters. Here we are saying that, before referring a matter to court, a claimant must apply to an authority to convene a settlement conference and take part in that conference.

There is nothing in there that obliges them to settle. The obligation is to give notice and the authority has to pay for it all so they have to actually set the time and place and so on. Remember, they are keen to have a conference because they want to resolve it; nevertheless, this is to make sure that the claimant is not bearing the expense of the venue for that to take place. He or she will come along to the conference on their own or with a legal representative and they will take part in it. If there is no resolution, then really this is the trigger that then enables them to be able to progress on to litigation.

Ms STINSON: To clarify, obviously, there is no cost for the claimant associated with a settlement conference but there is a cost associated for a claimant with a court process. I can see a situation in which a claimant would probably prefer to resolve through a conference process but also a point at which DPTI may say, 'No, this is it. We are going to court now. We are not continuing to essentially fund a conference process.' I think you have answered my question in your earlier answer to a large degree but I am—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can I just clarify something?

Ms STINSON: Yes.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think the member is under the misunderstanding that the law in this area does not continue to fund the claimant—it does, including legal expenses. We have a couple of jurisdictions: estate disputes, for example. There are certain circumstances where there is quite a generous approach given to either the up-front and/or provision of legal representation for parties to enable them to assist in the resolution of matters.

What the government is saying—and this is supported in consultation with the courts—is, 'In these cases, we want there to be a process and to support a process where they are obliged to come and confer and bring all their documents and discuss their expert valuers, and they have to meet and have a genuine attempt at this. Then, if a fair crack at that fails, they can come through the litigation process.'

I think it is fair to say that to date, whilst the member for West Torrens has raised some weaknesses in delays on these matters, there is a genuine attempt on the authority because they want to acquire the property and there is sometimes perhaps understandable but nevertheless not justifiable resistance on behalf of the claimant, who frankly does not want to lose their house at all or leave at any time, or no amount of money will be enough to buy their property because it is their castle, it is their home, and they are really paralysed into any kind of capacity to even really participate in it. We have quite an extreme at that end.

This whole process is designed to say, 'We are going to give you up-front costs. We are going to put you through this process. If you cannot resolve it there, you can still go to court, but you really have to demonstrate good faith along the way in complying with this structure and give it a good go.'

Ms STINSON: I understand the Attorney to be saying that a landowner would have their legal expenses paid at either a conference stage or at a subsequent court process, so therefore there would be no incentive for someone to continue with a settlement conference because that would be equally covered in any subsequent court process.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Ms STINSON: Great. Thank you very much.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is exactly why it has been mandatory.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 15, after line 4 [clause 21, inserted Part 4A]—Insert:

26DA—Application of Part to native title

- (1) The provisions of this Part do not apply to an acquisition of underground land in which native title exists.
- (2) To avoid doubt, an acquisition of native title in underground land may only proceed in accordance with Part 4 Division 1.

This amendment is necessary to address some issues with the bill as it relates to native title. The bill as originally drafted provided that, for underground acquisitions, native title rights were not discharged in new section 26F(2)(c) but also that no compensation was payable in relation to interest acquired in underground land in section 26F(5). These provisions are inconsistent with each other, as well as having a potential conflict with the commonwealth Native Title Act 1993.

The commonwealth legislation provides that native title rights cannot be extinguished without compensation, and therefore new section 26F(5) of the bill as drafted was inconsistent with the Native Title Act, putting it at risk of legal challenge. This amendment provides that the new part 4A, inserted by the government's bill dealing with underground acquisitions, does not apply when an authority is acquiring native title rights in underground land.

This means that the other provision of the Land Acquisition Act that already provides for acquisitions of land in which native title exists will apply, and if it is found that native title exists in an underground part of the land compensation will be paid as per the Land Acquisition Act. In practice, I am advised, it is very unlikely that this situation will ever arise, as native title has been held to be extinguished in almost the whole of the Adelaide metropolitan area and surrounding regions.

Generally speaking, tunnels are only feasible in built-up urban areas where the cost is outweighed by the avoidance of huge disruption and vast numbers of acquisitions that would otherwise occur. Therefore, the chances of underground acquisitions intersecting with an area of native title are extremely small. Nevertheless, it is important to account for all possibilities, so this amendment clarifies the situation in respect of the intersection of native title and underground acquisitions.

My recollection is that this amendment came as a result of advice that we had received from the Crown Solicitor's Office and parliamentary counsel, who have really erred on our being covered, as I have indicated, in the unlikely circumstance there would be a challenge.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For the same reasons that I have just indicated, I move:

Amendment No 2 [AG-1]—

Page 15, line 19 [clause 21, inserted section 26F(2)(b)]—Delete '(except native title)'

Amendment No 3 [AG-1]—

Page 16, lines 1 to 7 [clause 21, inserted section 26F(6)]—Delete subsection (6)

Amendments carried.

Ms STINSON: Just to clarify, I have quite a few questions on clause 21 but not in relation to these three amendments.

The CHAIR: That is no problem. The amendments have been agreed to but we are yet to pass the clause, so you have the call.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much. I am interested in why, when we are talking about the acquisition of underground land, there does not appear to be any particular depth of land specified. Does the Attorney have any particular objections to specifying a depth at which this right for the government to acquire underground land is applied, especially without compensation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: 'Underground' is not defined in the act or in this bill. There is no specificity in relation to underground being at a certain depth, and I would expect the technological advancements are going to be the key to what is proposed to be introduced in some infrastructure—i.e., a tunnel—in the future.

I am advised that the tunnel, for example, that the previous government built under Hackney Road into the Parklands was at a certain depth, and the ones that are going to be considered to be investigated for the purposes of looking at the north-south corridor intersection issues would be much lower. I do not know the detail of how low they are going to be.

From my own history of South Australia, I remember that we have had issues with underground water. I think the Minister for Transport has also raised questions regarding soil and clay, etc., which relate to some reasons for why we have not traversed underground. We do have some tunnels in the city, and the most recent one I have referred to. We have underground water. We have had issues historically with the establishment of the West Terrace Cemetery, for example, when in the early days of the colony coffins were found out in Gulf St Vincent. We have some very interesting terrain under the plains of Adelaide and we obviously need to rely on our engineers and experts in relation to what they might be able to construct—tunnels or otherwise.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Coffins floated from West Terrace Cemetery.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, and they ended up out in the sea. Read a bit of history. I just make the point that that traverses exactly the zone that we are talking about in that north-south corridor, so I expect that we are going to need all the geniuses and expertise in relation to how and where such underground terrain is going to be navigated for the purposes of infrastructure: water tables, and obviously weaknesses in the soil and the like are all things to be considered.

We know what is accessible—and we are talking several kilometres down into the core that are accessible in current mining capacity in regard to drilling and so on—but otherwise I will have to leave the member to ponder her own geology knowledge. The closer you get to the centre of the Earth, I understand that it gets pretty damn hot. There may be someone from future generations who will be able to create structures that will survive that, but that is a long way in. At the moment, we have quite a bit of dirt to play with, but there are some features which may or may not be very helpful for us when it comes to putting infrastructure through it. Again, that will be a matter for the engineers and the experts.

Ms STINSON: So that we are all on the same page, I had the privilege of a brief briefing from one of the Attorney's advisers before this bill was discussed yesterday. In that meeting, I asked similar questions and was told that the advice from DPTI to the Attorney's adviser was that the highest depth where work would need to be conducted would be around 18 metres to 20 metres below the surface and that that was the area they were looking at if not building on then agitating in order to build tunnels.

Obviously, I accept that this bill is not just for the specific purpose of tunnels. It may be for much broader purposes and for other government purposes than simply building a tunnel. Of course, the one along South Road is quite specific.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: On that, can I just clarify something. If you are referring to the South Road development for that purpose, yes, my understanding is that the proposed area of access would be between 18 metres and 24 metres below the surface. Obviously, for other projects, who knows?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not by statute? By engineering choice?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Absolutely. That is what I am saying. At present, on this project, that is the parameter that is being looked at, as I understand it, but in relation to future infrastructure, whether it is as high or low as that, that changes depending on where we are at. Obviously, the member for West Torrens particularly would have more information than I do on what parameters were looked at for the purposes of the undergrounding into the East Parklands. Whether that is 18 metres down or more, I do not know, but my understanding is that it is not that far down. The capacity and engineering expertise, I suppose, is one of the features that will change in the future, subject to whatever other natural impediments are down there.

Ms STINSON: I hope the Chair will take this as a continuation of my second question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Ms STINSON: Excellent. Taking onboard that there is this 18-metre to 24-metre guideline, if you like, that we are looking at specifically for the issue of tunnels for South Road, are there other purposes that the Attorney is aware of for which the government might seek to acquire land under a person's property? If so, could the Attorney give any indication of the depths that are required for those purposes? I realise that she might want to take this on notice between the houses.

The issue that I am getting at is that, because there is no definition of underground in the bill, it would mean that, conceivably—and I know this is taking it to the extreme—the government could compulsorily acquire land a metre below a person's property and not have to provide any compensation. I think that is quite a different scenario from talking about land 18 metres down, as it would be difficult for most people to mount an argument that that is usable land or land that they intended to make some profit from or make some use from.

Obviously, a piece of land that is a metre or a few metres below the surface might conflict with either an existing cellar or something like that, or indeed reduce the value of their land. For example, in my electorate a great many apartment blocks are being built along Anzac Highway at the moment. Many of them now have underground car parks that are being built. It would obviously reduce the value of a person's land if they were not able to sell it to a developer who might want to build an underground car park if the government had already compulsorily acquired a section of that land.

My broad question is: why is there not a specific depth that has been identified to protect a landholder from that situation, or indeed a specific depth that is identified where compensation might not be provided at a deep level but at a level where land may be viable for a person to profit from or utilise so that compensation might be provided in that circumstance? Is the Attorney aware of any other uses that the land might be used for and the depths that might be required in order for the government to build at that depth, and can she provide any more information about the issue of compensation for land that might possibly be of value to landholders?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not aware of any infrastructure projects of the kind that we are talking about here. However, I think it is important perhaps that I place on the record that the Land Acquisition Act is to apply not just to infrastructure that is going to be built by DPTI. It can be a railway line that may need a tunnel to go through something or it could be SA Water, which puts plumbing a lot of the time underground and under houses and across people's property at a metre's depth or less.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just saying that we have that situation where, from time to time, they will either have to acquire a piece of land to do something—for example SA Water, especially if it is large plumbing, to service a pumping station, for example, or put a lien over that property for the purposes of continuing to have access to it for maintenance, etc.

This is an acquisition process that is to occur when the state wants to take over somebody's land and it is to include a feature where, if we need to dig underground or under your property for the purposes of a piece of infrastructure, we will not be paying compensation. I am sure that my adviser will correct me if I am wrong, but if work was undertaken under someone's property and it was established that it caused the collapse of their back shed or their porch, or the house for that matter, then that would be a different civil action.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That is a common law right.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Exactly.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30.

The CHAIR: The Attorney was part way through answering the member for Badcoe's second question on clause 21. Are you happy to take up where you left off?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No.

The CHAIR: You have finished, okay. Member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: Has the Attorney received any advice about the impact on the surface of land caused by construction beneath the land—for example, at what depth sound, vibration or any other impact might be felt on land or might create potential damage on land? I understand that is not necessarily something that would be known by the Attorney-General's Department, and I am happy for it to be taken on notice to DPTI, which I understand does have such information.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: To deal with the advice that is being sought, I think the member has been informed, where there has been tunnelling dealt with interstate, what the parameters have been that have resulted in accepting that there is an entitlement or claim as a result of tunnelling interstate, that will be provided, as I have indicated, when we receive that advice.

In respect of the matter generally, as I have previously said but I will just confirm, should there be a disturbance or loss or damage arising out of an established claim, that the interruption had caused some breach, i.e. cracking in your house or a whole house collapse—it could be any range of things—this legislation and the compensation proposals around it do not interfere with the usual civil right to sue for damage caused as a result of another. This is not in any way attempting to interfere with that.

How deep you have to go to be relieved of that obligation and those sorts of things are, I imagine, more technical than legal. At the end of the day, if you can establish on the balance of probability that you are owed a duty of care and obviously have damage caused arising out of the conduct of another or misconduct of another, then of course you line up with a liability for civil claim like everyone else.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is very nice of the government not to extinguish common law rights to sue the state for doing damage to one's home.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I am saying it is very nice of you not to extinguish them. My question to the Attorney is: what is the safe distance you can tunnel under a home without disturbing it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have answered that in the previous answer, so I refer to my previous answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The answer you gave the committee was that, if there was damage done, there is a common law right for the owner of the property to take civil action in a court; that is, they would have to go out and make the case against the state. The question that the member for Badcoe and I are seeking to have answered here is: if you are going to tunnel underneath our

constituents' homes, what is the safe, acceptable level where there is engineering certainty that there will be no visible or reportable risk to property or value? If the government does not know that, how can we be assured that 18 to 25 metres is the safe distance?

If the response from the government is, 'You have a common law right to sue if something goes wrong,' I am not sure that is acceptable because therefore the burden of proof would be on the landowner rather than on the state to accept liability. The state would obviously defend itself because it would not deliberately drill a tunnel that has caused any damage. The state would believe that it has done nothing wrong and that the subsidence or any other damage that has been done is from another cause.

I know that I am taking leaps and bounds here, but if we are assuming that the state has drilled to build a tunnel at a certain depth the state has made assessments that, in an engineering term, that is safe. If that proves not to be the case, the onus is not on the state to say, 'We made an error. There is damage to your house and we are going to pay you or compensate you.' The onus is on the owner of the land.

The question that I think the member for Badcoe and I want to flesh out here is: at what point does the state say to landowners, 'Listen, there will be no impact on your home at this depth'? If the state will not tell us that, should the parliament perhaps contemplate putting in a floor or ceiling, depending on your terminology, about how deep or how close you can get to the foundations of a property? What impact would that have on building the north-south corridor or any other project, for example?

As the member for Badcoe said, there are unique and diverse types of properties along the north-south corridor. Some properties have very limited footings because they are turn of the last century villas, cottages or bungalows that had very shallow footings and foundations. There are other buildings that are brand new and state-of-the-art with underground car parking—for example, the RAA building on the corner of Richmond Road and South Road—and that have very deep foundations and probably could withstand more disturbance. Is there going to be a minimum depth that DPTI have or a minimum requirement of how close they get? Should there be a cap imposed by statute about how close you can get before you begin to compensate?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: 'Underground' is not defined and is not identified for the purposes of introducing a level below the surface at which liability might be imposed. There is no impediment by virtue of a depth-qualifying feature of any civil claim. Whether it is one metre or a hundred metres may depend on the technology that is going to be applied, the nature of the infrastructure and the like.

As I said before, there is no attempt being made in this legislation or by the government to interfere with that. All that is being proposed here is that, for the purposes of providing acquisition of underground area, there is no proposed compensation to be paid for the acquisition for that purpose. The civil liability is still there, and I expect that is going to change depending on the nature of the infrastructure.

If I could think of one other example in the time I have been in parliament, it is a massive underground pipeline which was put under the South Eastern Freeway on the city side of the tollgate facility and which went underground through Burnside and through into what I assume to be the Netherby area. It went underground under the freeway, under some houses and then came up for the purposes of the north-east extension and connection of all the reservoirs, which was quite a massive piece of infrastructure.

I have not seen any cracks on the roads or in houses or anything else since, but from memory that was not 18 metres deep. It was actually fairly close to the surface of the carriageway. I imagine those sorts of factors are going to be taken into account in the question of any risk of damage or collapse on the surface of any improvements. As I say, this is not in any way attempting to circumvent or undermine (pardon the pun) the right of someone to take civil proceedings in the event that some act or failure to act on behalf of the state in building its infrastructure causes damage or loss.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Without wishing to labour the point to the Attorney, consortia bidding to build large pieces of infrastructure will always attempt to maximise profits and minimise costs. The shallower the tunnel, the cheaper it is. It is simple. The deeper the tunnel, the

more expensive it will be. If you have to go down to a depth of 25 metres rather than 18 metres, it is more expensive, as there is more tunnelling. If you have to go even deeper, it is more expensive.

The way these design and construct contracts work is the bidders put in the cheapest possible bid to lower the cost to the taxpayer and what they do then is attempt to minimise their construction costs and go in a straight line, because straight lines are cheaper. Underpasses, overpasses, change in grade, change in costs, excavation costs, removal of debris, more concrete, all cost more money.

If the state refuses to put a statutory cap on how deep a tunnel can be under your home, the consortium building the tunnels, knowing that the state is the one ultimately liable for the risk, will choose the cheapest option. Often, at the time, with the information available, the cheapest option is as close to the surface as possible, which may at that time show no risk. Of course, over time there is risk and then people in those homes have to undertake civil action—let alone the reputational damage to that suburb, which would be very hard to extinguish because, once it becomes ingrained in people's psyche that there is a risk, obviously it will have a devaluing impact.

I suppose the statement that I am making, and the comment I am giving the Attorney, is that perhaps it would be prudent for the state to think about a minimum distance that it thinks is acceptable between the foundation of a property and the tunnel to give residents some feeling that the state has set some parameters. We set levels of noise, we set levels of particulate pollution, we set levels of pollution in water, we set levels for all sorts of things when it comes to the exposure people can sustain, but with this legislation the state is setting no minimum level.

Instead, the state is saying, 'If your house does subside or there is damage, you have a civil right to make a common law claim against the state or the consortium.' The bill does not say that the state will not defend that, it does not say that the state will not fight you, it just says that you have a common law right to take them on. That is fine, but I just wonder whether the state has considered and if the Attorney has been advised at any stage throughout this process whether there should be a minimum gap between a property and a tunnel. If we are leaving it entirely to the engineers and the consortium, I can assure the house it will be the cheapest option.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will take that comment on and make sure that the Minister for Transport is alerted to the view of the member for West Torrens in relation to the rapacious conduct of people wanting to build these things. I think it somewhat sadly reflects on the responsibility of agencies such as the department and indeed the government to ensure that safe infrastructure is built in our state. I do not necessarily agree with the view of the member for West Torrens, but I will be happy to pass it on.

I think, though, what I am trying to be clear about is that, in a statute which is outside the terms of this, setting a limit as to what is a safe level at which you may or may not interfere with some improvement above the ground may well be prescriptive and variable depending on the infrastructure, the substratum soil you are dealing with and any other interference with that property. I do not share that view, but I am happy for the Minister for Transport to be alerted to the gratuitous opinion of the member for West Torrens.

Mr BOYER: In relation to 26F—Acquisition of underground land, is any notification given to a landowner, or anyone with an interest in land, prior to the publication of a notice of acquisition of that land in the *Gazette*?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I invite the member to view the new section 26F(4), whereby:

The Authority must, as soon as is reasonably practicable after a notice of acquisition of underground land is published, give notice of that fact to the person who was the owner of the relevant land immediately before the land was acquired.

Ms STINSON: So they do not know before it is gazetted?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct. That is before the acquisition.

Mr BOYER: In relation to the same new section, 26F, regarding the residual interest in the land, can the Attorney provide some examples of such residual interests and how they might actually be modified?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: A residual interest, for example, could be at the end of a life interest in a property. Is that what you are talking about?

Mr BOYER: Yes.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For example, if the owner of the property is divided on the basis that a person has a life interest—it be under a bequest of a will, for example—and they are able to live there for their life and then some other party has a residual interest when the life of that occupant is concluded. That is not an uncommon situation where you have a residual interest. I think the question then is: how is that accommodated? Do you mean does notice have to be given to the owner of the residual interest? Is that what you are saying?

Ms STINSON: We are referring to 26F(2)(c), where it talks about a residual interest and then how the interest is modified.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think the question was: what is an example of a residual interest?

Ms STINSON: Yes, some examples of that scenario.

Mr BOYER: And how might it be modified. What might count as a modification as per 26F?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I see. The interest to be modified to the extent required by the acquisition, if the acquisition is to take the property and it is no longer available for the residual interest? Is that what you are talking about?

Mr BOYER: Yes.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that sometimes the acquisition can be of the life interest, for example, and they are moved on and so forth. It may be that the residual interest in the property is kept separate. I would imagine that would be a circumstance where that would apply. In a circumstance where the property can be resumed for the purposes of use, then the person who has the residual interest may well take that up. It may be modified; it may be that they only get it upon the completion of certain infrastructure builds, for example, but they get it back later. That is an example that I can think of. I hope that clarifies it.

Mr BOYER: I refer to 26F again. I assume, Attorney, that there could be costs associated with the modification of a residual interest? If so, who is responsible, or who will pay those associated costs with the modification of a residual interest?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In general terms that would be met by the authority—DPTI or whoever the party is that is dealing with it—because they are the claimant as well. They are coming along to say, 'I want to get the interest at the end, once you have utilised the property for whatever purpose you need, for example, and retain some residual interest.' It might be modified, as I say, not subject to the life interest of the person who has been bought out but someone else, but at a different time. Again, that person who has an interest in the property, has an inalienable interest—we discussed this earlier in the committee—because you can onsell a residual interest. It is a transferable right and a saleable right. So, yes, they are a potential claimant in this exercise and while they are negotiating their entitlement they, too, get that benefit.

We are using DPTI as a common feature here as they are frequently the party. They have a responsibility to provide and support the financial basis upon which the claimant has a chance to be able to get independent legal advice, representation, valuations, assessments, etc., and the support structures that go with the model that is being proposed. So, yes, they have quite a significant role.

Ms MICHAELS: I have a question for the Attorney regarding section 26F(4). The way I understand it is that the authority publishes the notice and under subsection (2) that then vests the interest automatically in the authority. The owner does not find out about it until as reasonably soon after as possible, so they have lost their ownership interest before they know about it; is that correct?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, although the member suggests that they have an interest; the fact is that we are talking about underground land, which we say they do not have and they do not have any right to compensation for. However, they are given notice through this process about what is happening around them—in this case, under them.

Ms MICHAELS: I have a follow-up question for the Attorney. What then is the purpose of subsection (2) and the concept of vesting an interest that the authority does not otherwise have? Clearly, the owner must have an interest in their land and the underground land below it.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not entirely sure that I understand the question. This is a modification of the notification procedure. Again, let us look at a residential property: they are sitting there and they get a notice which says that something has been gazetted. They have not seen that. They get the notice which says, 'DPTI has a right to put a tunnel underneath your property,' essentially. That is correct, and the purpose of having this is to make sure that they are notified of that.

Ms MICHAELS: The concept of a property interest vesting in another entity that did not have it prior under subsection (2), in your opinion who owned that interest up until the point of the notice being published? Was it not the landowner?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is why we have an acquisition process that makes it clear as to the underground land being underneath the plot of land that is owned and to make it abundantly clear that, as a government, we are treating that as land that sits underneath the registered proprietor, who has the estate in fees simple, etc., of the plot of land above. Whilst they own it—this is why it has been put in here as 'underground'—and there is the need to acquire the underground land (not the plot above in this instance, although in some cases they will need to take both), in this instance if they want to take the house and the plot on the top, they have to go through one process. If they just want to dig a tunnel underneath it and not disturb the person on the top and do not require any access to or acquisition of that land, then they go through this more simplified process, which is the gazettal process with a notice ultimately to the landowner to say, 'We are letting you know that there is going to be a tunnel underneath you.'

Clause as amended passed.

Remaining clause (22) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (19:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (19:56): The opposition understands what the government is attempting to do and we are broadly supportive. We will consult between the houses and speak to the parties that were not consulted—the Property Council, Business SA and other interested bodies.

Our concerns remain as we have articulated today. We seek government assistance between the houses to help us with some of the problems that we have articulated. We do not wish to be difficult. We hope the agency can allay some of our concerns and fears. If they can offer us any support between the houses it would make the process a lot easier and give the government the outcome it is looking for; otherwise, the opposition will be left to its own devices with the crossbenchers to legislate without the informed knowledge of Crown law and the agencies who are actually building the infrastructure. So we seek the government's assurances and assistance on this matter to try to get a good outcome for the people of South Australia.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (19:57): I wish to thank all those who have made a contribution to the debate and assisted in relation to the committee matters. I will follow up to ensure that we provide the court process in relation to any prosecution for failing to comply with a direction of a coordinated conference.

Furthermore, there are some matters that have been raised by the member for Badcoe and that information will be sought. It has been referred to during the debate, so I will not repeat it, but we will do that. Of course, as always, in the event that there are further matters that have not been brought to our attention that require some further consideration, we would be happy to receive any proposals from the opposition in that regard.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERIES BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 September 2019.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (19:58): I rise to speak on the Lotteries Bill. I indicate that I am the lead speaker, if not the only speaker, for the opposition on the Lotteries Bill. As the Attorney has made clear to the chamber, this is one of a package of three bills to reform the administration of gambling activities in South Australia, by and large, to consolidate those functions under the regulation of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, rather than the Independent Gambling Authority, as some of those regulatory functions were split between those two bodies. It is certainly the case that the Lotteries Bill is the least contentious and most straightforward of the package of three bills that the government has brought to the parliament. Nonetheless, the changes that the Lotteries Bill suggests are important and they will have an impact on the community.

Lotteries, of course, are not just those large headline events which are available to the whole community, where perhaps people may have the chance of winning quite significant sums of money, if not other types of property, but their various different forms are used by all manner and all size of organisations, including community and sporting clubs, as an essential fundraising tool to maintain their activities in the community. Changes that are presented to us in this bill will have some effect on how they are expected to manage those fundraising activities.

By and large, other than the transfer of the regulatory functions to be consolidated within the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, there is some greater discretion for the commissioner to exercise or choose not to exercise regulatory requirements over particular types of lotteries. My understanding, from the information that has been provided to me, is that not only does it provide a necessary level of rigour for the larger sized lotteries that the community would expect but it also provides a corresponding discretion for those smaller fundraising type activities that I have previously referred to.

I also notice from the provisions of the bill that there is essentially a simple and stratified penalty regime proposed by the government, where many offences under the act, of course depending on how serious those offences are deemed, can be expiated, which I am sure, for minor, most usually unintentional breaches of the act, makes sense, whereas for more serious offences more significant penalties apply. That certainly makes sense to the opposition.

There are some quite simple and understandable changes in terms of the requirements that the bill places on people who are conducting lotteries and the requirements on them to provide information and advice to the commissioner when it comes to the running of those fundraising activities. It places the obligation on the organisers of those events to ensure that the commissioner is kept up to date, for example, with changes of details of conditions or terms, and so on. There is also a regulatory-making power within the bill. Given the scope of the fundraising activities, which are covered by this bill, it makes sense that there is some discretion for the commissioner and for the government of the day to be able to regulate different provisions when it comes to lotteries.

It is perhaps timely that this bill is now coming to the house. Certainly, the government and the Deputy Premier have made some necessary reference to the work examining the regulation of gambling activities in South Australia, which was commenced under the former Labor government, and now the current Deputy Premier, as opposed to the former deputy premier, is carrying forward with some of those recommendations.

The review, of course, that we refer to is the Anderson review. The main thrust of that review, at least on my reading, is the recommendation to change who regulates these activities in the community, not just for the type of gambling that most people would immediately think about, whether it is casino-related gambling, table gaming or gaming machine, or gaming machines in hotels and pubs, but also this other form of gambling.

It is also timely not just because the government is choosing to continue on with this reform program of gambling regulation but also because when it comes to lotteries out in the community, particularly major house and land lotteries, they have had a bit of a mixed history in recent weeks. We have seen some new ones start for the first time and we have seen some longstanding ones fail to reach an adequate level of subscription in order to be successful and taken through to completion.

I think it is perhaps worth pausing for a moment to reflect on the changing nature of the use of these fundraising tools to try to assist both charitable organisations and community and sporting groups to raise money. Certainly, my overall conception of lotteries was what we were all exposed to at about 8.30 on a Saturday night after *Hey Hey It's Saturday* had finished. That same old familiar music would start—*I Want to Break Free* by Queen—as the SA Lotteries and those three faceless, mostly men, public servants, who were never really named or identified, from the gaming commissioner, would have to sit uncomfortably in the TV studio and somehow—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Hammond okay?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —supervise the conduct of the lottery, which I always found interesting, because they would be sitting at least 20 feet away from the spinning orb of balls from which successful numbers were ultimately selected. Of course, as people gnashed their teeth, as they frantically went through their easy-pick numbers and tried to circle what those successful balls were, there was a pause. I think Scott McBain was the person who provided the voice-over; in between voice-overs for ads like Jaffers Furniture and Transformers, this was the other main gig that I remember him for. But we show our age, don't we, Minister for Education?

Anyway, things have moved on, and I think having a clearer set of regulations, a hopefully more simplified regime, for people to adhere to when they are conducting these lotteries is a good thing. I hope that it encourages more people to undertake these fundraising activities, let alone more people to participate in these fundraising activities, because these sorts of fundraising activities do fund an enormous amount of activity, both for charitable organisations, which can flow into things like medical research, and for keeping our sporting and community clubs going in local communities. With those brief remarks, I conclude my remarks on this bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (20:08): I thank the member for Lee for his contribution to this debate and his indication of the opposition's support for the bill. I would be happy to follow up any other queries that he might have in committee. There being an indication of none, I would move to the bill being read a second time.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (20:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LEGISLATION (FEES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 September 2019.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (20:10): I rise to speak on the Legislation (Fees) Bill. On behalf of the opposition, I indicate that I am the lead speaker. As far as I am advised, this is a relatively simple and straightforward bill, which seeks to resolve a significant amount of red tape, which is required to be waded through by the government internally in providing for the annual incremental increase to a plethora of fees and charges which are levied on all manner of activities within the community each year. It is a significant undertaking for government.

You only need to look at the budget papers to realise that the levying of these fees and charges, as well as the sale of goods and services, tends to raise about \$2.5 billion a year for the

government, although of course that figure has noticeably increased this current financial year with the very significant increase to fees and charges in particular areas as the government continues its assault on household budgets and the costs of conducting small business here in South Australia.

But, in terms of the provisions of the bill, it is my understanding that moving from the current regime, where Treasury eagerly awaits the latest CPI data here in Adelaide and balances that against what they anticipate to be the annual indexation rate for public sector wages, to come up with a blended indexation amount for government fees and charges, the higher the better, of course, for Treasury, as that means they get to raise more revenue, but that certainly has not been the case in recent years. Once that figure is set, then of course the directive goes out to agencies to apply that to fees and charges, although of course in some instances there are necessary rounding provisions for ease of payment and receipt of those fees and charges.

Then the bulk of the work is left not just with Treasury and Finance for the coordination of all these efforts across the agencies but principally parliamentary counsel, which has the responsibility for drafting what is required to be, under the standing act that we have at the moment, the fee notices, which then make their way back up through the process to cabinet, to the Governor, and to be laid before both houses of parliament in here.

I am advised by the Attorney's office that this currently constitutes approximately half parliamentary counsel's annual task, which seems to be an extraordinary amount. I am surprised by that, not just because it has only been 18 months for us now in opposition and frantically asking parliamentary counsel to draft all manner of well-intentioned bills and amendments but also because of the work that the crossbench in both chambers tends to put parliamentary counsel to.

However, as I intimated before, there are many, many fees and charges—hundreds and hundreds of them—and it is a large amount of work for parliamentary counsel. Under the terms of this bill it enables the government to change that arrangement so that, after what I understand still to be a cabinet-mandated average indexation rate, for want of a better term, it will be the job of agencies rather than parliamentary counsel to go about drafting these fee notices, thereby alleviating this significant burden on parliamentary counsel.

The public should not notice too much difference in this, but, from the explanation that we have been provided, perhaps parliamentary counsel will, and that might be welcome for them. Hopefully, that does not lead to a reduction in parliamentary counsel staffing or resources, given the diminution of their workload in this regard. Otherwise, the opposition is more than happy to support this measure.

The only caveat that the opposition had about this bill is making sure that these fee notices were still laid before both houses of parliament and were disallowable instruments. My understanding, from the briefing that has been provided to me, is that clause 5 of the bill, in particular clause 5(4), still retains the requirement under the Subordinate Legislation Act for these fee notices to be laid before both houses of parliament and hence become disallowable instruments. In that way, while these taxes, fees and charges are able to be indexed by the government of the day, there is still the necessary parliamentary scrutiny and, if need be, control over the extent to which they have been increased.

We have seen very substantial increases in fees and charges, as I mentioned, and it is perhaps timely that the Minister for Environment and Water is here. We have had a 40 per cent increase in the solid waste levy, to be paid by residents from across South Australia, for a capital infrastructure project in a marginal Liberal seat, Colton, which—

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It benefits my seat, I'm told. Well, if you speak to the residents, for example—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have to say there might be a snapper ban, but it is still easy to throw a hook and a line out and to get it instantly caught in this state. You only need to bait the Minister for Environment and Water, and instantly there is a strike, and you are able to haul it in at your leisure.

But I must say that the benefit to my residents—well, let's look at the benefit to my residents. Let's look at the increase of hundreds of truck movements through the western suburbs as being a benefit. Is it? Well, that is not the contention of the residents of Tennyson, Semaphore Park, West Lakes Shore, West Lakes and Grange, depending on whether trucks stay on Military Road or head up West Lakes Boulevard.

Indeed, even in the former part of my electorate, on the southern part of Lefevre Peninsula, there is of course contention that now the government is proposing not just to run these hundreds of truck movements up one single, solitary side street between the Esplanade and Military Road in Semaphore; now that plan is apparently to be extended to three different streets. I look forward to making sure that we have the required heavy vehicle access notices consulted on and appropriately published before these truck movements begin to occur in the western suburbs.

Nonetheless, the minister has made the decision that the good burghers of Streaky Bay, Mount Gambier, Penola, Roxby Downs and Port Augusta all should be paying a higher level of tax on their solid waste so that this one, single, solitary capital project in a Liberal-held marginal metropolitan seat can be delivered.

I find that surprising for another reason, and that is that we heard that, despite the claims from the Minister for Transport that, despite all appearances, he has a mature relationship with the federal government, he has somehow secured billions of dollars of additional infrastructure funding. Yet, indeed, we can say that the vastly more mature Treasurer of South Australia—I mean that in years—had to go to Canberra last week to ask Josh Frydenberg not to spend money on capital infrastructure in the next 10 years but to spend it in the next three years here in South Australia to try to stimulate the local economy.

Perhaps the increase in the solid waste levy and the new sand carting regime which is being imposed on the residents of the western suburbs will in fact will be one infrastructure project that will be delivered by this government in the next three years to the exclusion of all others. It is unfortunately an infrastructure project in the western suburbs because there are not any other infrastructure projects in the western suburbs.

Of course, there was meant to be an extension of the Outer Harbor rail line to Port Adelaide, which was not only contracted and signed with a contractor on a fixed price contract, and not only had millions of dollars spent on it, but it was subsequently cancelled, and as compensation the Minister for Transport gave that company who had signed that contract to deliver that rail spur into Port Adelaide the exclusive access to the contract for the new tram stop at the intersection of Halifax Street, Sturt Street and King William Street. We look forward to the Auditor-General's next report on that procurement process. However, I digress.

As to fees and charges, of course we have had other significant fees and charges increase. These were put to the community by the Treasurer as being a government crackdown on speeding motorists. There were very significant increases in the levels of speeding fines to be levied by the government in the future, and this would send a clear message and deter speeding behaviour by South Australian motorists.

It raises quite a lot of money. It raises over \$20 million, but you only have to access the publicly available expiation data from the government websites to work out that the real revenue raised is not actually through the speeding fines. Of that \$20 million, over \$18 million is projected to be raised not through speeding fines but through the massive increase in the corporate fee, from \$300 to \$1,500.

If you want to know who pays the corporate fee, there is a common misrepresentation made that the corporate fee is paid by nefarious businesses who want to hide the identity of drivers who have been caught using business fleet vehicles because, if those drivers were actually nominated and named, they would lose demerit points. Instead, there is some sort of arrangement between the

driver and the small business that they choose to pay the corporate fee rather than nominate the driver and that driver suffer demerit points.

The reality of the situation is that there are many small to medium-sized businesses in South Australia that run fleet vehicles. Many of these businesses started out as sole trading enterprises and, through the hard work, determination and nous of those operators, those businesses have managed to grow. They might be delivery businesses. They might be tradie businesses where perhaps more than one plumber or electrician or so on is engaged and they are provided with a van to attend to jobs and so on.

It is those businesses that have grown to the extent where they have a fleet of vehicles—more than one vehicle registered in the business name of the company—that perhaps does not have the sophisticated fleet monitoring and vehicle tracking software that a larger delivery business like Toll or Linfox might have on its vehicle, which, when presented with a fine for the company for a speeding offence at a particular time on a particular road, can look at the vehicle information it has on its database and nominate the exact service and driver and hence ensure that that driver is held to account. That is not the situation with the vast majority of these people.

If you are wondering how many times this is going to happen, my understanding is that in the last financial year 12,000 offences were expiated with the attachment of this corporate fee. That is remarkable. There are cases, of course, where the corporate fee should be increased, and indeed the former Labor government did increase the corporate fee and did increase the corporate fee for speeding offences but on one particular problematic stretch of road, and that was the descent in the last parts of the South Eastern Freeway, where we had seen separate fatal accidents within a short period as well as two very significant near-miss incidents.

It comprised part of a comprehensive response to the Coroner's recommendations, which also included changing the infrastructure of the South Eastern Freeway; better line marking; better signage; clearing vegetation; making a public campaign more broadly available, indeed nationally available, about the use of safety ramps; and changing the name of arrester beds to safety ramps, which we were told was important as well. But that is not what this government is doing. This government is ramping up this corporate fee really to raise funds for the budget with no demonstrable road safety benefits.

Of course, we know that this is not the only effort by the government in pursuing road safety efficiencies that benefit the budget, because of course they wound up the Motor Accident Commission, which had the sole responsibility for promulgating road safety messages to the community. Not only have we had confirmation that since 1 December 2018 there has been no proactive public messaging from the Motor Accident Commission but it has also been over that period that we have had a dramatic escalation in our road toll.

We only need look in the Auditor-General's Report, which was tabled on Tuesday, to see that \$670 million of additional taxes, fees and charges are being raised this year by the government. We are happy to support this bill. It does alleviate a burden of red tape from the government. It does free up parliamentary counsel so that the opposition and the crossbench can continue to concoct and have drafted all sorts of worthwhile amendments to government legislation, let alone draft our own bills, and the opposition is happy to lend its support to it.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (20:27): Again I find myself thanking the member for Lee for his contribution to this debate and his indication of support from the opposition for the passage of this bill.

To confirm, yes, parliamentary counsel will be relieved of a considerable amount of work. They have been the principal promoters of the reform in this area and not just so that the extraordinary amount of work done is not so burdensome. I think they undertake their work very diligently, but where there is a process that can be developed, in this case to have a notice procedure but with the protection, as set out in the new section 5, of ensuring that subordinate legislation obligations remain with the notice—namely, the obligation to table before both houses of parliament—that means that we protect the interests of the parliament in being able to review this matter just as we would have if they had remained under the regulatory regime. That is an important

protection and, indeed, I do not think the government would have even considered presenting such an option.

I am not sure who introduced it, but I am aware of a process in the Department for Environment, where they have a rather novel way of issuing directives to the public other than by regulation. We can have legislation, we then have regulations and sometimes we have rules that might apply to courts, but in the Department for Environment they have this peculiar practice where they can publish a policy—on cleanliness of air and things of that nature. I found out only a few years ago that, having published this policy, it then has the effect of a regulation and you can be prosecuted under it. It is quite bizarre. Nevertheless, that is a power they have.

The poor, hapless person, who might not be trained in understanding all the Department for Environment rules and regulations, might read this policy, thinking, 'Well, this is interesting. This is something that's important for people to learn about and perhaps not just comply with but abide by,' only to find that in fact that any breaches of this type of policy can bring you into significant trouble.

What is important is that the public need to know that when we make laws in here they can be amended by this forum and, if ministers make regulations or any other process under them as an operation of government, similarly there needs to be a review process. That has been maintained and secured. I thank parliamentary counsel for bringing this matter to our attention. I think it will make sure that they are available to all members of parliament to undertake their other important work in the preparation of legislation. I thank the member for Lee for supporting the same. I commend the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (20:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TREATMENT (REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 20:32 the house adjourned until Thursday 17 October 2019 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***GRANT PROGRAMS**

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 have been advised:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Education:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$M's	2019-20 Budget \$M's	2020-21 Budget \$M's	2021-22 Budget \$M's
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Grants are provided to non-government organisations to assist in improving the educational opportunities, learning outcomes and personal development of children with disability.	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.0
Multicultural Grants	Grants are in support of innovative school based projects that provide opportunities for students to engage in and reflect upon linguistic and cultural diversity.	Top of Form 2.2Bottom of Form	2.2	2.1	2.0
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Grants to assist organisations where the activities and objectives of those organisations are consistent with the responsibilities of the Minister's portfolio.	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9

The following table details the commitment for grants in 2018-19 for the Department of Education:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose	Value \$
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Autism Association of SA Inc	To assist in improving the educational opportunities, learning outcomes and personal development of children with disability.	\$3,027,218.00
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Cora Barclay Centre Inc	As above	\$94,484.00
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Down Syndrome SA Inc	As above	\$73,383.50
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	ORANA Australia	As above	\$44,767.00
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Guide Dogs Association Of SA & NT Inc	As above	\$328,294.00
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Inclusive Directions	As above	\$149,578.50
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	The Benevolent Society	As above	\$46,798.00
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Novita Children's Services	As above	\$496,263.00
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Port Augusta City Council	As above	\$70,000.00
Children & Students with Disability Program Grant	Townsend House Inc	As above	\$383,214.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose	Value \$
Multicultural Grants	ADEL BANGLADESHI CULTURAL CLUB	Grants are provided to ethnic and community language schools to deliver language and cultural programs to South Australian school-aged students outside school hours.	\$6,062.00
Multicultural Grants	ADEL JAPANESE COMM SCHOOL	As above	\$29,014.00
Multicultural Grants	ADELAIDE LITHUANIAN SOCY INC	As above	\$3,917.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose	Value \$
Multicultural Grants	ADELAIDE NEPALESE SOC AUS INC	As above	\$6,764.00
Multicultural Grants	ADELAIDE PROGRESSIVE JEWISH	As above	\$4,346.00
Multicultural Grants	ADELAIDE RUSSIAN ETHNIC SCHL	As above	\$29,224.00
Multicultural Grants	ADELAIDE TAMIL ASSOC INC	As above	\$12,816.00
Multicultural Grants	AFGHAN ETHNIC SCHOOL	As above	\$3,774.00
Multicultural Grants	AFGHAN UNITED ASSOC OF SA INC	As above	\$35,155.00
Multicultural Grants	AFGHAN WOMEN'S FED OF SA INC	As above	\$9,612.00
Multicultural Grants	AFRICAN MUSLIM INFORMATION	As above	\$18,827.00
Multicultural Grants	AL SALAM ARABIC SCHOOL INC	As above	\$34,726.00
Multicultural Grants	ALLIANCE FRANCAISE D'ADELAIDE	As above	\$30,236.00
Multicultural Grants	ASSOC OF UKRAINIANS IN SA INC	As above	\$10,818.00
Multicultural Grants	AUSTRALIAN ISLAMIC SOCIAL	As above	\$15,308.00
Multicultural Grants	AUSTRALIAN UNITARIAN DRUZE	As above	\$16,812.00
Multicultural Grants	BANGLA SCHOOL	As above	\$4,489.00
Multicultural Grants	BANGLADESH CLUB AUSTRALIA INC	As above	\$7,608.00
Multicultural Grants	BANGLADESH PUJA & CULT SCY SA	As above	\$3,488.00
Multicultural Grants	BHUTANESE AUSTRALIAN ASSN	As above	\$26,700.00
Multicultural Grants	BOSNIAKS' ASSOCIATION OF SA	As above	\$3,631.00
Multicultural Grants	BRAZILIAN ETHNIC SCHL OF SA	As above	\$4,060.00
Multicultural Grants	BURUNDI INTAMBA GASIMBO ASSOC	As above	\$24,800.00
Multicultural Grants	CEYLON TAMIL ASSOC OF SA INC	As above	\$8,010.00
Multicultural Grants	CHINESE ASSOC OF SA INC	As above	\$23,407.00
Multicultural Grants	CHINESE CULTURE & EDUC CTR SA	As above	\$6,408.00
Multicultural Grants	CHINESE SCHOOL OF SA INC	As above	\$32,218.00
Multicultural Grants	CHINESE WELFARE SERVICES OF SA	As above	\$29,637.00
Multicultural Grants	CROATIAN SPORTS CENTRE SA INC	As above	\$2,630.00
Multicultural Grants	DINKA BOR ETHNIC SCHL OF SA	As above	\$4,060.00
Multicultural Grants	EGYPTIAN COPTIC SCHOOL	As above	\$24,030.00
Multicultural Grants	ERITREAN MUSLIM COMMUNITY	As above	\$5,633.00
Multicultural Grants	FILIPINO ETHNIC SCHL SA (SAL)	As above	\$3,917.00
Multicultural Grants	FREE SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH	As above	\$2,916.00
Multicultural Grants	GABRIELA MISTRAL SPANISH SCHL	As above	\$5,061.00
Multicultural Grants	GREEK ORTH COMM OF BERRI SA	As above	\$4,060.00
Multicultural Grants	GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE	As above	\$7,654.00
Multicultural Grants	GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE OF	As above	\$6,062.00
Multicultural Grants	GREEK ORTHODOX COM & PARISH OF	As above	\$25,810.00
Multicultural Grants	GREEK ORTHODOX COMM OF THE	As above	\$38,950.00
Multicultural Grants	GREEK ORTHODOX COMMUNITY INC	As above	\$59,646.00
Multicultural Grants	GREEK ORTHODOX PARISH—COMM	As above	\$11,570.00
Multicultural Grants	GRK ORTHODOX COM&PARISH/ST.GEO	As above	\$22,517.00
Multicultural Grants	GURU NANAK SOCY OF AUST	As above	\$7,476.00
Multicultural Grants	HUNGARIAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL ADL	As above	\$2,886.00
Multicultural Grants	IGBO CULTURAL SCHOOL OF SA	As above	\$4,775.00
Multicultural Grants	IMAM ALI MOSQUE AND ISLAMIC	As above	\$44,767.00
Multicultural Grants	ISLAMIC INFORMATION CTR OF SA	As above	\$30,794.00
Multicultural Grants	ISLAMIC SOCIETY OF SA	As above	\$28,124.00
Multicultural Grants	LAC-VIET VIETNAMESE SCHOOL	As above	\$6,764.00
Multicultural Grants	LATVIAN SCHOOL OF ADELAIDE INC	As above	\$6,586.00
Multicultural Grants	LET'S TALK TOGETHER ASSOC INC	As above	\$45,973.00
Multicultural Grants	MUTHAMIL PALLI-SOUTH	As above	\$12,434.00
Multicultural Grants	MYANMAR ETHNIC SCHOOL OF SA	As above	\$3,488.00
Multicultural Grants	NEW ERA PERS LANG & CUL SCHL	As above	\$8,366.00
Multicultural Grants	OVERSEAS CHINESE ASSOCIATION	As above	\$103,086.00
Multicultural Grants	POLISH LANGUAGE SCHOOL TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO INC	As above	\$4,346
Multicultural Grants	POLISH LANGUAGE SCHOOL 'ADAM MICKIEWICZ' INC	As above	\$4,060
Multicultural Grants	PORTUGUESE ETHNIC SCHOOL	As above	\$2,630.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose	Value \$
Multicultural Grants	REMARK GRK ORTH A/NOON SCHL	As above	\$3,774.00
Multicultural Grants	ROMANIAN COMMUNITY OF SA INC	As above	\$2,916.00
Multicultural Grants	RUSSIAN MOLOKAN SCHOOL INC	As above	\$12,994.00
Multicultural Grants	SA BANGLADESHI COMMUNITY	As above	\$12,460.00
Multicultural Grants	SARBAT KHALSA PUNJABI SCHOOL	As above	\$17,978.00
Multicultural Grants	SCHOOL FOR THE GERMAN LANGUAGE	As above	\$35,956.00
Multicultural Grants	SCHOOL OF RUSSIAN LANGUAGE INC	As above	\$3,774.00
Multicultural Grants	SCHOOL OF ST NICHOLAS PARISH	As above	\$4,918.00
Multicultural Grants	SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH&SCHOOL	As above	\$12,816.00
Multicultural Grants	SIKH SERVICES AUSTRALIA	As above	\$7,120.00
Multicultural Grants	SIKH SOCIETY OF SA INC	As above	\$7,476.00
Multicultural Grants	SINHALA BUDDHIST SCHOOL	As above	\$37,972.00
Multicultural Grants	SLAVIC BAPTIST CHURCH SA	As above	\$5,903.00
Multicultural Grants	SOMALI ETHNIC SCHOOL OF SA	As above	\$15,868.00
Multicultural Grants	SPANISH CLUB OF SA INC	As above	\$2,487.00
Multicultural Grants	ST DIMITRIOS GREEK ORTHODOX	As above	\$8,633.00
Multicultural Grants	ST MARY'S VIETNAMESE SCHOOL	As above	\$14,676.00
Multicultural Grants	SUDANESE ETHNIC SCHL OF SA INC	As above	\$9,256.00
Multicultural Grants	SUKULU NA BARI ASSOC INC	As above	\$5,919.00
Multicultural Grants	TATAR—BASHKURT ETHNIC SCHOOL	As above	\$3,059.00
Multicultural Grants	TELUGU ASSOCIATION OF SA INC	As above	\$8,188.00
Multicultural Grants	THE ARABIC LANGUAGE SCHOOL	As above	\$20,982.00
Multicultural Grants	THE BANTU ETHNIC COMM OF SA	As above	\$26,394.00
Multicultural Grants	THE BULGARIAN EDU & FRIENDLY	As above	\$3,917.00
Multicultural Grants	THE CROATIAN CLUB ADEL INC	As above	\$9,078.00
Multicultural Grants	THE ERITREAN ISLAMIC SOCY IN	As above	\$4,632.00
Multicultural Grants	THE ISLAMIC OUTREACH ASSOCIAT	As above	\$4,973.00
Multicultural Grants	THE JIVAN SHILP SCHOOL OF	As above	\$15,638.00
Multicultural Grants	THE KOREAN PURE PRESBYTERIAN	As above	\$12,282.00
Multicultural Grants	THE UNITED VIETNAMESE BUDDHIST	As above	\$14,418.00
Multicultural Grants	THE VIETNAMESE CATHOLIC	As above	\$165,188.00
Multicultural Grants	TURKISTAN ETHNIC SCHOOL	As above	\$18,156.00
Multicultural Grants	VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY IN AUST	As above	\$59,630.00
Multicultural Grants	VISHVA HINDU PARISHAD OF	As above	\$4,346.00
Multicultural Grants	XINGGUANG CHINESE SCHOOL INC	As above	\$8,544.00
Multicultural Grants	ETHNIC SCHOOLS ASSOC OF SA INC	Grant in support of the provision of administrative and educational services, and systems development and operational grant management functions for the benefit of the Ethnic Schools Association of SA. Part of the grants were provided to support ethnic and community language schools providing SACE subjects to students	\$461,000.00
Multicultural Grants	AUSTRALIA DAY COUNCIL OF SA	This grant is for the administration of the Award for Leadership in languages and cultures 2019	\$6,000.00
Multicultural Grants	ETHNIC SCHOOLS ASSOC OF SA INC	This grant is to strengthen and investigate the uptake of secondary pathways in languages through the delivery of the ECLS program.	\$79,000.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose	Value \$
Ministers Discretionary Fund	SPELD SA	This grant is in support of the SPELD program, which provides an information service and engages and manages professionals to help people with specific learning difficulties.	\$135,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Government Schools	This grant is in support of parent groups to increase participation in their child's school community.	\$83,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Marine Discovery Centre (Star of the Sea School)	To support the Marine Discovery Centre so that it can continue to provide learning programs for all children in South Australia at an economic cost.	\$30,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Federation of Catholic School Parent Communities	Grant in support of services that strengthen parent, family and community engagement.	\$30,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA	Grant to support the Science Alive Career Day.	\$25,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Association of Independent Schools of SA (AISSA)	This grant is in support of parent groups to increase participation in their child's school community.	\$25,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Australian Migrant Resource Centre SA	Grant in support of the Australian Migrant Resource Centre to support Refugee Week and poster award exhibition.	\$8,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Adelaide Holocaust Museum and Steiner Education Centre	Grant in support of developing and piloting a Holocaust Education Program for Secondary learners.	\$50,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Children's Week Association of South Australia Inc	Grant in support of the Children's Week Program of events.	\$26,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	The University of Adelaide	Supporting the Adelaide Open Music Academy community engagement project (Children's University).	\$100,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Tea Tree Gully Toy Library	Grant funds enable the Tea Tree Gully Toy Library continued sustainability of its loan services, ongoing provision of an environment particularly for families from vulnerable and isolated communities and improvements to the quality of services it provides.	\$25,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Australian Children's Television Foundation (ACTF)	To support ongoing operational costs of the foundation.	\$25,250.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Pelvic Pain Foundation of Australia	To support the development and delivery of the Periods, Endometriosis and Pain Program (PEPP TALK) for secondary school students.	\$70,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Restless Dance Theatre	To deliver a training program to advanced dancers with disability	\$12,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	SA Museum	Grant in support of the SA Museum Dedicated Learning Space.	\$50,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Association of Independent Schools of South Australia	In support of the Allied Health Specialist Support Services Program.	\$150,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Sammy D Foundation	Grant funds are in support of the Bullying and Violence Prevention School Program.	\$235,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	Grant in support of the Adelaide Festival Centre's program centRED school education program.	\$52,275.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Second Chances	In support of one on one reading tuition for the special needs of primary aged children of prisoners.	\$13,000.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose	Value \$
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Mid Murray Council	Grant to support the council to conduct a Mannum Play Space Feasibility Study during 2019.	\$5,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	The University of Adelaide	In support of the Open Music Academy	\$45,900.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Power Community Ltd	Funding to assist the program costs for contributing to the provision of services and resources to strengthen family engagement.	\$75,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	South Australian Association of School Parent Clubs (SAASPC)	To support and facilitate the participation of families in schools and preschools and in the engagement of children's learning.	\$75,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Adelaide Crows Children's Foundation	This grant is to help to assist the delivery of the 'Growing with Gratitude Program'	\$ 150,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Australian Council for Health Physical Education & Recreation SA Branch Inc (ACHPER)	Grant to support Physical Education week 2019 program	\$20,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	United Way South Australia Inc	This grant is to support the United We Read pilot program which will provide over 2,000 pre-school children, living in the disadvantaged areas of Playford LGA with an early intervention reading program to better prepare children with language, cognition and with the skills to start school, ready to read, learn and succeed.	\$55,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	South Australian Association of State School Organisations Inc	Grant provided to support, inform and represent state school governing councils and parental involvement in the education of their children	\$70,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Mathematical Association of SA	Grant in support of the Remote and Rural Schools Mathematics Program which will promote the importance of mathematics to teachers, students and education professionals within remote and regional areas within South Australia	\$50,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	South Australian Ice Sports Federation Inc	Grant in support of the Ice Factor Program which targets youth who are at risk, experiencing disadvantage and who would otherwise not have access to team sport.	\$61,200.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Isolated Children's Parents Assoc	Grant in support of ICPA programs that provide advice, support and information to its members.	\$10,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Carly Ryan Foundation	Grant funds to deliver Project Connect to SA Schools. These sessions provide both online safety and healthy relationships education to school students in Years 8 to 12 to empower and equip them with the right tools and support in their online journey.	\$220,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	SciWorld Inc	Grant in support of the SciWorld outreach services to remote and disadvantaged schools that are least likely to be able to adequately fund science incursion experiences for their students.	\$50,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Virtual War Memorial	Grant in support of the virtual war memorial portal, a resource for the students of South Australia.	\$80,000.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose	Value \$
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Encounter Youth Inc	Grant in support of program costs that cover effective, preventative, alcohol and other drug education for South Australian Secondary Students.	\$335,000.00
Ministers Discretionary Fund	Federation of Catholic Parent Organisations	Grant in support of the operational costs in providing support, training and development to Catholic school parent communities	\$22,000

The following table details the commitment of grants for the Department of Education:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Commitment	2020-21 Commitment	2021-22 Commitment
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Association of Independent Schools of SA (AISSA)	Grant to support the Allied Health Specialist Support Services Program	\$25,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Australian Children's Television Foundation	Grant to support operating costs	\$25,250	\$25,881	\$26,528
Minister's Discretionary Grant	The Carly Ryan Foundation Inc	To support the delivery of the program to the SA Community to improve safety and awareness of issues associated with online safety and preventions of online crime.	\$220,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Co-Opera Inc.	Grant to support the Music Education Workshops project	\$97,386	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Department of Human Services MoAA for Second Chances SA Inc	To support the PK Family Care program.	\$57,500	\$57,500	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Encounter Youth	Grant to support education about alcohols and drugs to secondary students	\$330,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	History Trust of South Australia	Grant to support the History Trust's Digitisation Project	\$100,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Isolated Children's Parent's Assoc of SA	Grant to support the Association with the provision of advice to families living in rural and remote areas.	\$10,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Marine Discovery Centre	To support the Marine Discovery Centre to continue to provide learning programs for all children in South Australia at an economical cost.	\$30,000	\$30,000	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Mathematical Association of South Australia Inc.	To support the Remote and Rural Schools Mathematics Program	\$51,250	-	-

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Commitment	2020-21 Commitment	2021-22 Commitment
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Federation of Catholic School Parents Communities	This funding is to administer and manage Parent Initiatives in Education (PIE) Grants to Catholic schools to assist with innovative school projects designed to increase and support Parent Initiatives in Education.	\$30,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Innovation First International (AU) Pty Ltd	Funding to support the Vex National Competition event	\$15,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of SA	Funding to support Science Alive Careers Day	\$15,000	\$15,000	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Sammy D Foundation	To support the delivery of programs with a focus on evidence based bullying and violence prevention in primary and secondary schools, and prevention of alcohol and other drug fuelled violence in secondary schools.	\$235,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	South Australian Aboriginal Secondary Training Academy	To support the running costs of a soccer academy for Aboriginal and Torrens Strait Islander high school students.	\$50,000	\$50,000	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	South Australian Ice Sports Federation Inc (SAISF)	To support the ICE factor program	\$62,730	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Specific Learning Difficulties Association of SA (SPELD)	To support the SPELD program	\$138,375	\$141,834	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Tea Tree Gully Toy Library	To support operations of the Toy Library	\$25,000	\$25,000	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	The Smith Family	To support the delivery of early years literacy and numeracy programs	\$120,000	\$120,000	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	University of Adelaide	To support the Children's University Australia	\$100,000	-	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	University of Adelaide	To support the Open Music Academy project	\$46,900	\$47,900	-
Minister's Discretionary Grant	Virtual War Memorial Ltd.	To support the development of a learning portal for schools	\$82,000	\$84,050	-
Totals			\$1,866,391	\$597,165	\$26,528

In response to this question and omnibus question 14, the following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for TAFE SA—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
StudyAdelaide*	Contribute to a sustainable level of funding for StudyAdelaide to promote Adelaide as Australia's premier learning city and in partnership with institutions, grow South Australia's international student numbers.	75	75	75	75

*This agreement was signed on 12 October 2018.

The grant funding is only to support the functions of StudyAdelaide and is not for distribution to further beneficiaries.

There are no new grant commitments in 2018-19 for TAFE SA.

In response to this question and omnibus question 14, the following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Education Standards Board—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Education Standards Board	Operational funding (No grant funding agreement)	5.32	5.39	4.93	4.44

The Department for Education is currently in the process of finalising its annual financial statements in liaison with Shared Services SA and Auditor-General's Department. The audit process is continuing and statements have not yet been finalised. Until this process is completed and the general ledger balances are essentially confirmed, the information is unable to be provided.

GRANT PROGRAMS

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 have been advised:

Please refer to my response to question 13 in response to this question.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth)** (30 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment): In response to omnibus questions 13 and 14 I have been advised:

Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated Result \$'000	2019-20 Budget \$'000	2020-21 Estimate \$'000	2021-22 Estimate \$'000
Billion Dollar Benefit	To support the Adelaide Convention Bureau to increase convention related tourism to the state.	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250
Bob Such Memorial Scholarship	Financial assistance to assist young South Australians to undertake university study.	4	—	—	—
Business SA Export Ready Program	To support Business SA in providing an export ready training program to South Australian businesses.	180	—	—	—
Convention Bid Fund	To support the attraction of conventions to South Australia.	2,509	2,359	4,544	4,153

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated Result \$'000	2019-20 Budget \$'000	2020-21 Estimate \$'000	2021-22 Estimate \$'000
Destination Adelaide	To support the development and growth of the state's international education market.	419	—	—	—
Destination Adelaide— Intersective	Provision of a two-year work-based pilot program for international students.	92	—	—	—
Economic Investment Fund	The EIF was available for investment projects to deliver significant strategic and economic benefits for the state, where there was a case for public support of a private project, and when competing with other jurisdictions (national and international) to attract investment.	3,975	2,328	393	—
Emerging Technologies Interest Group	To support the facilitation of emerging technology interest groups to connect interested businesses, technology providers and researchers to develop shared knowledge and practices.	225	—	—	—
Food SA	To support Food SA to deliver programs to grow food and beverage manufacturing businesses in South Australia.	—	1,000	1,000	1,000
French Strategy— Matthew Flinders Internship	To support French students undertaking internships in South Australian universities.	60	—	—	—
Health Industries Fund	The HIF was available to attract international and interstate companies in the life sciences sector to commence or expand operations in South Australia.	700	—	—	—
International Research Co-op Shandong	To support universities with the establishment of China-Australia joint laboratories.	550	400	100	—
Our Jobs Plan— Northern Economic Plan	To assist jobs growth in northern Adelaide.	228	—	—	—
Our Jobs Plan— Supplier Diversification	To assist businesses to diversify from the automotive supply chain.	1,519	—	—	—
Our Jobs Plan— Workers in Transition	To assist re-skilling and re-employing of people following the cessation of vehicle and component manufacturing in Adelaide.	97	—	—	—
SA Brittany Research Collaboration	To support cooperative relationships between academic and research institutions in Brittany and South Australia.	105	—	—	—
SA Export Accelerator Program (formerly Export Partnership Program)	Provides funding to eligible South Australian companies to pursue international market development opportunities.	1,286	782	802	823
SA Landing Pad	To attract international and interstate early-stage and established companies with transformational and high-growth potential and job creation across priority industries.	—	1,000	1,000	1,000
Sir Eric Neal Scholarship	Financial assistance to regional and rural undergraduate students undertaking engineering.	4	—	—	—

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated Result \$'000	2019-20 Budget \$'000	2020-21 Estimate \$'000	2021-22 Estimate \$'000
StudyAdelaide	To support StudyAdelaide to increase the number of international students in South Australia.	2,503	2,500	2,500	2,500
Terry Roberts Memorial Scholarship	Financial assistance to Aboriginal students undertaking undergraduate studies at a South Australian university.	2	—	—	—

Excludes amounts paid to other SA government agencies for on-passing to grant recipients and amounts which are commercial-in-confidence.

The following table details the new commitment of grants in 2018-19 for the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value (\$'000)
Convention Bid Fund	Adelaide Convention Bureau	Funding to secure a convention.	38
Business SA Export Program	Business SA	2018 Export Awards	35
Business SA Export Program	Business SA	2018 International Trade Expo and Conference	20
Business SA Export Program	Business SA	Delivery of the Export Ready Program	65
French Strategy—Matthew Flinders Internship	Flinders University of SA	Awarding of an internship	20
French Strategy—Matthew Flinders Internship	University of South Australia	Awarding of an internship	20
French Strategy—Matthew Flinders Internship	The University of Adelaide	Awarding of an internship	20
International Research Co-op Shandong	SA Health & Medical Research Institute Ltd	Establishment and operation of the SAHMRI and SFMU/SAMS Joint Laboratory	150
International Research Co-op Shandong	University of South Australia	Establishment of a China-Australia joint laboratory for Advanced Lasers and Sensors	300
SA Brittany Research Collaboration	The University of Adelaide	Brittany Research Collaboration Grant	35
SA Brittany Research Collaboration	University of South Australia	Brittany Research Collaboration Grant	35
SA Brittany Research Collaboration	Flinders University	Brittany Research Collaboration Grant	35
StudyAdelaide	StudyAdelaide	Activities to support the State Government's Destination Adelaide plan	10,000

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value (\$'000)
SA Export Accelerator Program	1847 Winery (SA) Pty Ltd 57 Films Pty Ltd Alliance Wine Australia Pty Ltd Artisans of Barossa Australia Swan Vintage Pty Ltd Avinet Pty Ltd Bascomb Family Trust Bettertaste Organics Pty Ltd Biosensis ty Ltd Brayfield Park Pty Ltd Bull & Bull Pty Ltd Byrne Vineyards Pty Ltd Chalk Hill Wines Pty Ltd Charlesworth Nuts Pty Ltd CNC Porting Australia Pty Ltd Connexion Systems Pty Ltd DNA Security Solutions Elderton Wines Pty Ltd Ennio Pty Ltd Eyre Peninsula Seafoods Pty Ltd Geoff Hardy Wines Hastwell & Lightfoot Vineyards Healthy Heart Produce Pty Ltd Krix Loudspeakers Pty Ltd Lanacoona Operation Trust Madrane Pty Ltd Massena Vineyards Pty Ltd McLaren Vale Cheesemakers Pty Ltd Mighty Kingdom Services Pty Ltd Momentum Food and Wine Pty Ltd Mori Seafood Pty Ltd Never Never Distilling Norseld Pty Ltd Oasis Systems Pty Ltd Op2ma Pty Ltd Pangkarra Pty Ltd Paulett Wines Penley Estate Pty Ltd Portia Valley Wines Pty Ltd Pouch Australia Pty Ltd Raidis Estate Coonawarra Sentek Pty Ltd Seppeltsfield Road Distillers St Peters Investment (SA) Pty Ltd Tcpinpoint Pty Ltd Turkey Flat Vineyards Pty Ltd U Pull It Pty Ltd WD Wines Pty Ltd Wilderness Escape Outdoor Yelland & Papps Zephyr Quest Pty Ltd Unico Zelo (Ochre Nation Pty Ltd)	Funding to pursue international market development opportunities	1,148

South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC)

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates (a-f):

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Budget	2020-21 **Estimate \$00	2021-22 **Estimate \$00	2022-23 **Estimate \$00
Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$514 998	\$527 868	-	-	-

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Budget	2020-21 **Estimate \$00	2021-22 **Estimate \$00	2022-23 **Estimate \$00
Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund (RCCM)	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with the Agreement.	\$220,000	\$220,000	-	-	-
Convention Bid Fund*		-\$130,909	-	-	-	-

*The Convention Bid Fund bid fund was transferred to the Department of Trade, Tourism and Investment on 1 April 2019. The actuals listed are for grants paid (including refunds) pre transfer and do not include costs associated with hosting the 2019 World Routes. The reason this is negative is due to a refund received for the Australian Geoscience Convention (AGC) 2018 event from the Adelaide Convention Centre.

**It is not possible to forecast future costs across the forward estimates, because budgets are set annually based on operational requirements linked to the strategic plans developed and approved at board level. Therefore, the forward estimates are subject to decisions regarding internal strategic allocation of resources. Any estimate beyond 2019-20 will be unreliable.

The following table details the commitment of grants already made: (g)

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$	Subject to grant agreement under TI I5
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Adelaide Hills Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Tourism Barossa	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Regional Development Australia Whyalla & Eyre Peninsula Inc.	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Fleurieu Peninsula Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Flinders Ranges and Outback SA Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Tourism Kangaroo Island	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Limestone Coast Local Government Authority	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Regional Development Australia Murraylands & Riverland South Australia	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Destination Riverland	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$	Subject to grant agreement under TI I5
2019 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Yorke Peninsula Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$46,818	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Adelaide Hills Tourism	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$	Subject to grant agreement under TI I5
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Tourism Barossa	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Regional Development Australia Whyalla & Eyre Peninsula Inc.	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Fleurieu Peninsula Tourism Marketing Committee Inc.	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Flinders Ranges Outback SA Tourism	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Tourism Kangaroo Island	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$	Subject to grant agreement under TI 15
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Limestone Coast Local Government Association	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Destination Riverland	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Regional Development Australia Murraylands & Riverland	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Yorke Peninsula Tourism	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2019 Convention Bid Fund	Adelaide Convention Bureau	Flight Centre Senior Leaders Convention	\$10,000	Y
2019 Convention Bid Fund	Adelaide Convention Bureau	Instalments 1 and 2 for the International Conference of Computing in High Energy Physics (CHEP) 2019	\$30,000	Y
2019 Convention Bid Fund	Adelaide Convention Centre	Refund for the Australian Geoscience Convention (AGC) 2018	-\$190,909	Y—Refund
2019 Convention Bid Fund	Australian Tourism Export Council	Beyond the Barrel National Wine Tourism Conference 2019.	\$20,000	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Adelaide Hills Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Tourism Barossa	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Regional Development Australia Whyalla & Eyre Peninsula Inc.	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Fleurieu Peninsula Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$	Subject to grant agreement under TI I5
2019 Regional Consumer Cooperative Marketing Fund	Limestone Coast Local Government Association	To raise the tourism profile of South Australia and increase visitation to South Australia by delivery of the Cooperative Marketing Campaign as defined in accordance with this Agreement.	\$20,000	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Flinders Ranges and Outback SA Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Tourism Kangaroo Island	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Limestone Coast Local Government Authority	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Regional Development Australia Murraylands & Riverland South Australia	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Destination Riverland	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y
2020 Regional Tourism Organisation Funding	Yorke Peninsula Tourism	Local Contact Officer Services to support Regional Tourism Initiatives	\$47,988	Y

Adelaide Venue Management Corporation (AVMC)

The Adelaide Venue Management Corporation is not responsible for administering grant programs.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth)** (30 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment): I have been advised:

Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2018-19 in question 13.

South Australian Tourism Commission

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2018-19 in question 13. Below is a list of all ad hoc grants paid that fall outside of these programs:

Beneficiary/Recipient	Amount paid	Purpose	Payment Date	Date contract executed
Adelaide Convention Bureau	\$815,265	Annual grant funding to support operations	Paid across 4 instalments	6/07/2016
The Congregation of the Sisters of St Joseph of the Sacred Heart	\$250,000	Funding towards the redevelopment of the Mary Mackillop Museum.	18/06/2019	4/06/2019
Adelaide Convention Bureau	\$104,280	Support of Destination SA	13/09/2018	25/02/2016
Adelaide Convention Bureau	\$57,354	Support of the Asia is the future program	13/09/2018	21/06/2016
The Bend Motorsport Park P/L	\$100,000	Funding to support a Tourism Liaison Officer	09/05/2019	16/03/2018
City of Port Lincoln	\$26,000	Grant to assist the cruise ship meet and greet program.	21/05/2019	6/11/2017
Tourism Industry Council South Australia	\$15,000	Funding towards the TICSA Conference	Paid across 2 instalments	2/05/2018

Beneficiary/Recipient	Amount paid	Purpose	Payment Date	Date contract executed
Tourism Industry Council South Australia	\$50,000	Funding towards the service excellence program.	20/09/2018	19/09/2017
Flinders Ports	\$783,931	Port Adelaide Passenger Terminal Upgrade	08/07/2018	10/10/2017
Tourism Industry Council South Australia	\$180,000	South Australian Tourism Awards Funding	Paid across 2 instalments	05/05/2016
The Bend Motorsport Park P/L	\$1,000,000	Funding towards the FIM Asia Road Racing Championships	18/12/2018	16/03/2018
City of Victor Harbor	\$5,000	Support towards the development of a strategic plan and business case for cruise ship infrastructure in Victor Harbor.	09/05/2019	1/11/2018
Copper Coast Council	\$10,000	Funding towards hosting the 2019 South Australian Visitor Information Centre Conference	08/01/2019	28/11/2018
Tourism Industry Council South Australia	\$19 350	Funding towards the Visitor Information Centre accreditation audit	08/01/2019	14/12/2018
E-Suede Pty Ltd	\$9,091	Funding to support the Sightseeing Pass project	13/06/2019	10/10/2018
Touring Treasures	\$8,000	Funding to support attendance at the Pure Life Experiences Travel Show	20/11/2018	02/07/2018
AOT Group	\$20,000	Funding to support hosting a familiarisation of 15-20 key staff to South Australia	9/11/2018	28/08/2018
The Tailor	\$5,000	Support funding to conduct a 6 day South Australia VIP agent famil	26/04/2019	25/02/2019

Adelaide Venue Management Corporation (AVMC)

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2018-19 in question 13. The AVMC not responsible for administering grant programs.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (25 September 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

In reply to: Hon A. Koutsantonis MP (25 September, 2019):

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): In response to omnibus questions 14 and 15 I have been advised:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Energy and Mining—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Carbon Capture	Carbon Capture and Storage/Seals and Unconventional Resources	50	50	-	-
Oil and Gas Strategy	To facilitate the establishment of the Gas Industry Social and Environmental Research Alliance (GISERA) Program in the South East of South Australia	333	333	-	-
Future Fuels	To address future fuel technologies, systems and markets, social acceptance, public safety and security of supply	115	205	100	-
SA State Chair of Petroleum Geology	Contribute to meeting the cost incurred by the University in employing a Chair of Petroleum Geology	205	210	215	221
Lithospheric Architecture	Magentotelluric data will be processed and modelled to provide information on the lithospheric architecture of the Australian continent.	15	-	-	-

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
APY Officer	A grant for the salary and associated costs of employing an APY Minerals and Petroleum Tenement Officer	162	-	-	-
Australian Research Council Linkage	ARC Linkage Project enabling 3D Scholastic Geological Modelling	10	10	10	-
Mine engineering skill development	To address issues facing the minerals, resources and heavy engineering sectors by developing and facilitating the delivery of projects to increase the availability and productivity of the workforce, identifying gaps in, and issues with, the skills of the resources industry workforce and develop solutions.	180	408	233	239
MinEx CRC Exploration	New technologies for improving the efficiency and productivity of mineral exploration drilling, and for the acquisition of geochemical and geophysical data while drilling and incorporation of that data into automated, constantly-updating 3D models.	2,250	350	350	300
Centre for Ore Deposit and Earth Sciences	Collaborative research project with CODES examining the mineral geochemistry of pyrite and the relationship/impact on mineral exploration	30	30	-	-
AusLAMP	Australian Lithospheric Architecture Magnetotelluric Project (AusLAMP): Thermodynamics inversion for mineral systems	150	50	-	-
Potash Processing	To provide funding for the development of an Intelligent Control (IC) system for PotashCorp. The system will optimise the process and avoid costly acid reactor shutdowns that sometimes occur due to unstable chemical reactions.	10	-	-	-
Renewable Technology Fund	To support further integration of the next generation renewable technologies (including batteries, pumped hydro, hydrogen, biomass and solar thermal) and demand management technologies. To accelerate the deployment of these technologies, to provide system security measures that are comparable to traditional thermal generators.	13,577	22,688	3,145	661

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Home Battery Scheme	State Government subsidies to help pay for the installation of home battery systems. The subsidy is available to all South Australians households, and calculated on the kilowatt-hour capacity of the battery purchased. Energy Concession Holders are eligible for a higher subsidy, ensuring low-income households are supported to access the Scheme.	7,070	25,000	37,500	30,500
Grid Scale Storage Fund	To support development of new energy storage technologies to back up renewables and enhance reliability of South Australia's electricity system.	-	13,900	22,500	13,600
Energy Productivity Program	Grant to help large energy using businesses in South Australia manage their electricity costs and contribute energy supply benefits to the state	7,939	3,427	-	-

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
National Hydrogen Roadmap	Contribution to the National Hydrogen Roadmap	20	-	-	-
Bird Lake	To assist the Port Augusta Council to undertake rehabilitation works	255	2,136	-	-
Australian National Electricity Market Modelling	To assist with the development of a web-based open source grid integration and optimisation modelling tool for the Australian National Electricity Market.	28	-	-	-
Electric Vehicle Adoption Program Everergi	To undertake activities in South Australia under the Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA) program to boost electric vehicle adoption.	14	-	-	-
Electric Vehicle Solar Garage	To design, construct and operate an Electric Vehicle Solar Garage within the Tonsley precinct.	15	-	-	-
myCar	To procure a base for the operations of myCar at the Tonsley Innovation Precinct, and to assist the establishment of a new public transport service based on electric vehicles.	34	17	-	-
Bioenergy Connect	To administer the Bioenergy Connect Fund supporting provision of bioenergy expertise to potential proponents interested in investigating bioenergy as an energy source.	25	-	-	-

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Energy and Mining—Administered:

NIL

The following table details the new commitment of grants in 2018-19 for the Department for Energy and Mining—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Lithospheric Architecture	University of Adelaide	Magnetotelluric data will be processed and modelled to provide information on the lithospheric architecture of the Australian continent.	15,000
MinEx CRC Exploration	MinEx CRC	New technologies for improving the efficiency and productivity of mineral exploration drilling, and for the acquisition of geochemical and geophysical data while drilling and incorporation of that data into automated, constantly-updating 3D models.	5,150,000
Centre for Ore Deposit and Earth Sciences	University of Tasmania	Collaborative research project with CODES examining the mineral geochemistry of pyrite and the relationship/impact on mineral exploration	60,000
AusLAMP	University of New South Wales	Australian Lithospheric Architecture Magnetotelluric Project (AusLAMP): Thermodynamics inversion for mineral systems	200,000
Electric Vehicle Adoption Program	Everergi	To undertake activities in South Australia under the Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA) program to boost electric vehicle adoption.	15,000

INVESTING EXPENDITURE PROJECTS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (25 September 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised that for the Department for Energy and Mining:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2018-19 in question 14.