

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 31 October 2019

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

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

### *Bills*

#### **LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

##### *Conference*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:01):** I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL EXPANSION**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:02):** I move:

That the 25<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled 'Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department expansion and new mental health short stay unit', be noted.

The Lyell McEwin Hospital is part of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and provides a comprehensive range of specialist and diagnostic treatment services. The committee has heard that the project is critical for the Lyell McEwin Hospital to meet the increased demand for services, which has been generated by the population growth in the northern metropolitan areas of Adelaide and the northern region of South Australia.

Further, the expansion of the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department has been identified as a key infrastructure requirement to support the transformation of the hospital into a tertiary-level facility. The project is expected to involve a combination of internal refurbishment, new building expansion and a car park extension.

In addition to the extension or expansion to the emergency department, this project will include a new mental health short stay unit. This new unit is expected to enable the assessment of the most appropriate care options for mental health related presentations to the hospital's emergency department. The estimated cost for the project is \$58 million and project completion is expected in 2022.

The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project, and the committee has been assured by SA Health officials that the appropriate acquittals for the project have been received. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence that we have considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the proposed public works, the subject of this recommendation.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:04):** I want to thank the Public Works Committee for progressing the plans for many projects and certainly the projects that are impacting the delivery of health services in the north and north-east, which is one of the key priorities that have been raised with me over and over again in my seat.

Good health and positive wellbeing are essential for any thriving community. Everyday life is improved by public health systems and services that support a clean, safe and healthy environment. In order to develop a sustainable health system for the future, we need to reduce the burden of

disease and associated costs to our community by focusing on protecting and promoting health and wellbeing and preventing illness, and this is certainly a focus of our government.

We are committed to delivering better services, which is certainly what people in King have elected me to advocate for within my party and in this place. In King, I have not only community members who need better services from our local Lyell McEwin Hospital but also many staff and volunteers who live in King who have been generous with their feedback and ideas over the last couple of years about how our health system and services must be improved. We are investing millions in health, including making vital upgrades to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Queen Elizabeth, Modbury and Noarlunga hospitals, to ensure our health services are of a standard our community absolutely deserves.

I thank the Public Works Committee for their efforts and the progress they have made to support plans for the \$58 million major redevelopment of the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department and short stay mental health unit. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has said that the proposed plans will almost double the capacity of the emergency department to help cater for projected population growth in the north and increased demand.

The emergency department activity at the Lyell McEwin Hospital has increased significantly over the past decade, from 42,000 to more than 76,000 presentations last financial year, and activity is projected to continue to increase annually. The plan is to develop a three-storey building development north of the existing emergency department, which will alleviate pressure on the emergency department into the future.

The purpose-built eight-bed short stay mental health unit will provide a more suitable care environment for mental health patients requiring a short stay and improve patient flow throughout the emergency department. The highlights include additional capacity for adult treatment spaces in the ED; a new dedicated eight-bed short stay mental health unit; an emergency extended care unit; a new reception, waiting and triage area; expanded dedicated paediatric assessment and treatment spaces; a dedicated ambulance arrival area for patient transfers; additional resuscitation triage capabilities; a new bulk decontamination unit; new quick access and discharge facilities; and workstations and education spaces for staff.

The minister has told us that the former Labor government had not budgeted nor planned for an increase in car parking spaces at Lyell McEwin as part of their redevelopment plans; however, we are certainly investing money in relocating the car parking displaced by the redevelopment. It is a planning requirement to increase car parking as you expand hospitals, not reduce it, yet the Labor government failed to do this.

We have listened to the feedback from patients, staff and volunteers, and we are committing to an extra \$7 million dollar expansion of the five-level, multideck car park at the hospital. Construction of the new car park will begin in coming months to cater for growing demand and to alleviate the loss of around 67 existing car parks from the development. The Marshall Liberal government does not want to cut corners because of Labor's previous poor planning. We have acted responsibly by planning and budgeting for the much-needed extra car parking capacity.

We will now work on finding opportunities to deliver the ED capacity within the project budget, whether that is through construction efficiencies or finding additional money. Northern Adelaide Local Health Network chief executive officer, Maree Geraghty, said that the redevelopment is a major boost for the north. The Lyell McEwin Hospital has continued to grow with the community over the past 60 years, and this expansion will help cater for the future health needs of the growing northern Adelaide population.

The project will be completed in stages in order for the existing emergency department to remain operational. I thank our staff and community in advance for their patience while this project is underway. Construction is scheduled to commence early next year and is forecast to be completed in 2022.

There is further good news this month as well: nurses and other hospital staff in the northern suburbs were pleased to hear that, in addition, they will also have access to an extra 250 spaces in a newly constructed car park opposite the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing said that the state Liberal government will enter into a new lease agreement with

Northwest Healthcare Australian Property Pty Ltd and Perpetual Corporate Trust for dedicated staff car park spaces within a new multideck car park, to be built on Haydown Road.

We are committed to ensuring the community has access to quality health services in a modern hospital setting, and the new car park will support the increase of these future services. Providing a safe environment for our staff, patients and visitors has always been, for us, a very high priority. We have listened to staff concerns and we are working with them to make our hospitals and our surrounds safer.

Due for completion in mid-2020, subject to approvals, the leasing of the 250 new car park spaces will provide better access for staff to the old main entrance of the hospital, which we know is still a well-utilised entrance. The car park will provide secure after-hours access for staff, appropriately lit access and CCTV security camera coverage. I reiterate that this is good news, because the 250 new car parking spaces are in addition to the \$7 million multideck expansion within the hospital grounds for staff, patients, visitors and volunteers.

The 250 spaces obtained through this new lease agreement will address the staff car park spaces lost from the sale of vacant land on Mark Road when the lease agreement concludes. A recent Auditor-General's Report showed that the Marshall Liberal government invested more than \$5 million extra in security services, predominantly in additional security guards, throughout SA Health sites in the past financial year.

The NALHN chief executive officer, Maree Geraghty, said that it is an exciting time for both the local health network as a whole and the staff based at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The northern suburbs has the highest population growth in South Australia, with a quarter of the state's population expected to live there by 2026. The new lease will accommodate the long-term requirements for the northern suburbs and will improve accessibility as demand on the hospital continues to grow.

The existing multideck car park has a capacity of 1,227 spaces and, once the new section is complete, there will be a total of 1,432 car park spaces in the existing multideck, plus the 250 new leased staff car park spaces opposite the hospital from July next year. In addition to increasing car parks, we have also taken steps to increase on-site security and we have held staff information sessions on personal and community safety and situational awareness, led by SAPOL, following violent incidents in recent months across public hospitals.

We are certainly committed to providing a safe working environment for staff and have been reviewing lighting, monitoring and functionality of the CCTV, security patrols and duress alarms on the site. We are also in consultation with the precinct partners, which includes the local council, to look at streetscape upgrades, such as increasing the width of footpaths and trimming trees. NALHN's escort service started last month, which provides a vehicle after hours, driven by a guard, to take staff to their car park, for those who park on roads around the hospital within a prescribed radius. We thank our staff and consumers for their patience during the construction of the car parks and also the hospital's upcoming redevelopment.

The good news is that in the north-east the new government is fixing up Labor's mess at the Lyell McEwin and Modbury Hospital. While Labor downgraded services at Lyell McEwin and Modbury as part of their failed Transforming Health plan, the Marshall Liberal government is investing in world-class infrastructure to deliver better patient care closer to home for the residents in the north and the north-east. Because I live in King and grew up nearby, I absolutely understand the importance of these better services and I am pleased to provide an update on the good news with progress taking place.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:15):** I speak in support of this motion and thank the member for Kavel, Chair of the Public Works Committee, and welcome these works. I think investment in our health system is always a very good thing, and that is why the previous Labor government invested hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, over 16 years, into Lyell McEwin Hospital and actually made it the tertiary hospital it is today. When it comes to actually caring for the north and Gawler areas, we have an excellent track record, bringing that hospital to a higher standard. If I remember correctly, the only thing the last Liberal government did in the north-east was to privatise the hospitals there, and we brought them back under public control.

We talk about safe working environments for staff, etc., and also mention that staff are very happy. Well, it was interesting—I must have been in a different place because this week I think there were members of staff from the Lyell McEwin Hospital rallying outside the hospital, unhappy with this government.

**An honourable member:** They didn't look happy.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** They didn't look very happy at all. Clearly, it is a case of seeing what you want to see and not what is actually happening on the ground. In fact, staff are going to be rallying in my local hospital this week, too, because they are so happy with this government that they are going to take time off and rally against the government about their poor working conditions.

If you actually want staff to be in safe work conditions, an important part is staffing levels—in other words, staff being able to do the work properly and having the time to do the work properly they need to do. Clearly, the nursing staff in our hospital are not happy with that and that is why they are rallying. They also need to be paid a responsible salary to make sure that they are paid for the work they do. According to this government, we care so much for our staff that they actually have to rally and take industrial action to get them to notice, to pay them more money.

This government's commitment to nursing and nursing staff is not that good at all. Rather than the member for King gloss over all the issues—and, as I said, I reaffirm that investment in bricks and mortar is important, and we did that over 16 years—I think we cannot gloss over and ignore the other issues, the other important part of the hospital, which is not just the bricks and mortar but the people who work there.

Unfortunately, I have had quite a few dealings with Lyell McEwin Hospital this year—and this is not a reflection on the staff there, as I think the staff do a wonderful job—because I have a family member who is not well and they have cared for. If the member King thinks that hospital was well staffed and that the staff are well looked after, then she really cannot see what is actually happening there. I can tell you that the staff are overworked. Despite the fact they had poor staffing levels, they did an excellent job.

I can tell you that if you are a patient in the north and you are trying to get some important public health services, you are actually put on a waitlist. You do not get a service really quickly. Unless you go through ED, you are put on a waitlist. To suggest that this will resolve all the health issues in the north and that we have some sort of utopia in the north is just a nonsense. Certainly, the bricks and mortar are welcome, and the things that have been done are welcome, but for this government to suggest that that has resolved our health issues in the north is just a nonsense.

The only way you are going to resolve those issues is to actually put in more money, not giving contracts to private contractors and millions of dollars of contracts to private accountants just to cut costs, and to bring in people who actually do the work—the doctors, the nursing staff and all the ancillary staff. This government is grinding our health system into the ground. We know it from the amount of ramping done, and we know it from the fact that our ambulance services cannot be met. There is such a crisis in ambulance services, and you hear horror stories, that members across the chamber should be ashamed to stand up and say how this government cares about our health services.

With those comments, I support the motion and welcome the decision to spend more on bricks and mortar, but please spend the money where it is very important. In other words, look after staff in terms of conditions and look after the patients we care for. That requires resources, not cutting costs or giving money to the top end of town and your mates at the Property Council.

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (11:19):** I, too, rise to speak on the 25<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee entitled, 'Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department expansion and new mental health short stay unit'. I echo the words of the previous speaker, the member for Light, that we on this side of the house support investment in our public hospitals.

Back in 2017, the previous Labor government committed \$52.5 million in the budget for what is a vitally important and necessary upgrade to this hospital. Although the planning and the bulk of the upgrade and commitment of money towards that upgrade occurred under the previous Labor government, I do admit that the current Minister for Health has left his own mark on this project. He

has reshaped, to use today's polite bureaucratic term, the project which, from my reading of the committee's deliberations, will result in fewer treatment cubicles, and the money that would otherwise have gone to the bricks and mortar expansion of the emergency department itself will instead be put into building car parks.

Aside from that, the funding that was put in place back in 2017 has survived this new Marshall Liberal government, and that is no mean feat, I might add, given that out in the north and north-eastern suburbs we have seen a succession of broken promises. One I can think of in particular that is causing a lot of grief for residents of the north-east at the moment is the much-needed expansion of the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride. There was no mention before the state election that this government was going to do anything other than continue with the bill that the Labor government had basically started, but here we are 20 months on and still there is nothing. I am pleased to see that at least the money towards the expansion of the Lyell McEwin emergency department is still there.

We have heard from both previous speakers that the northern suburbs of Adelaide are one of the fastest, if not the fastest, growing regions in South Australia. The Lyell McEwin Hospital has also grown over the last 15 to 20 years from what was a basic community hospital at the start, which was built in the shadow of what was once the Holden factory, to what is now one of the state's leading tertiary hospitals. The Lyell Mac and the Modbury hospitals, which are not so far apart, work hand in glove across what is referred to as the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network to deliver residents of the north and north-east world-class health care.

The staff, clinicians and volunteers who work in our hospitals, such as the Modbury and Lyell Mac hospitals, deserve world-class facilities. I am sure that is something that everyone in this place can agree on. That is one of the reasons that it is so bitterly disappointing to see that the time frame for this project has so significantly blown out. What was originally a planned completion date of mid-2021 is now mid-2022, so it will not even be in this first term—hopefully only term—of the Marshall Liberal government but will now be outside that four years. It is almost a daily occurrence that we see a story on the TV or an article in the newspaper about the incredible pressures that staff at the Lyell McEwin Hospital face every single day.

A 12-month blowout or a reshaping of an infrastructure project may, for a public servant, just be another bit of paperwork to do, but for those staff who are working in what is already a very cramped, overrun and under-resourced ED for incredibly long shifts every single day, this is heartbreaking. I know because in the last few weeks staff from that hospital have called my office and called me to express their frustration and to impress upon me the pressures under which they are working and how those pressures are affecting patient care and their own lives and their own mental health.

It is not us, nor is it the public servants who make these decisions, who have to work in the emergency department and explain to someone who has been sitting there for hours and hours, waiting to be seen, why there are no treatment cubicles available for them. We do not have to do that; we leave that to the poor staff who are working there every day.

The people who are presenting to an emergency department are often in a state of extreme stress and worried about their own ill health or the health of a loved one. It is a very difficult conversation to have, as a nurse or a doctor, to explain to someone that they are likely to be waiting for hours longer because all the treatment cubicles are full and the hospital does not have the capacity to treat them any sooner.

Earlier this year, we saw photographic evidence of the internal ramping occurring at the Lyell McEwin Hospital—the same internal ramping that this government and this health minister told us is not happening. However, we saw a photo of ambulance staff, with patients lying on gurneys and filling up the corridors inside the Lyell McEwin emergency department. What did the Minister for Health say when he was presented with that photographic evidence of what was happening in his hospitals? This was just a sign of a well-functioning hospital.

At present, I think the emergency department has just over 50 beds, and that is going to increase to just over 70 under these plans. I say 'just over 70' because I think there has been some conjecture regarding the precise number. It seems there is a difference between the submission by

Minister for Health to the State Commission Assessment Panel in April of this year, which had 75 treatment bays, and the evidence given by, I think, the executive director of infrastructure for Health SA, who advised there would be 72 bays. Under questioning from the member for West Torrens, I believe SA Health admitted that they had scaled down the number of bays from 75 to 72.

I think one other peculiar inclusion in this plan is that the money that will be, on my numbers, a net gain of car parking of around nine spaces has actually been delivered. The State Commission Assessment Panel submission notes that 81 current car spaces will be lost to accommodate the expanded ED, and a further 115 spaces will need to be provided just to keep up with the expected demand from the new ED build.

You can put aside all those car parks, in terms of saying that there will be new additional car spaces. That is the number of spaces needed to accommodate the piece of land with existing car parks that will be taken up by the newly expanded ED and the number of car spaces needed on top of that to accommodate the extra people and increased demand that will no doubt occur as a result of the expansion.

In total, 196 spaces are needed to replenish what will be lost and maintain the current levels. Here, we have a plan to build 205—nine extra spaces. I admit that parking at the Lyell McEwin Hospital has long been a problem. We need more car parks and something needs to be done, but you would have thought that if you were going to do something about that issue and build new car spaces you would not do it at the expense of expanding the emergency department.

Who in their right mind would think taking money from an emergency department upgrade to fund what in the end is going to be a net increase of nine car spaces is a big win for the community? I can only imagine what Stephen Wade's message to residents of the north is going to be before the next state election: 'It might be crowded in the emergency department, but have you seen our car park?' or, 'If you are tired of waiting in the emergency department, wait in your car instead.' One other thing I briefly want to mention—

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** You would pay more for the car park.

**Mr BOYER:** Exactly right; the member for Light is correct. Let's not forget that the privilege to use these new car spaces that will be built is going to cost staff and patients a whole lot more. I think the increase at Lyell McEwin and Modbury Hospital in terms of what a staff member would pay over a year of car parking is in the vicinity of an extra \$700.

You have to understand that not all the people or all the staff using those car spaces are what I will call well-paid nurses or doctors or other medical staff. A lot of the people who rely on those car spaces are the people who are getting there early in the morning and late at night to clean the hospital. They are not earning big money. In fact, they are some of the lowest paid workers in this state, and what have we done to them? If they are lucky enough to even find a car park they are going to pay about an extra \$700 a year for the privilege of using it.

I think this is a fantastic window into the priorities of this government. It is incredible to think that we are not going to have this expanded ED until after the next state election, and all I can say is: strap yourselves in—the kind of ramping and overcrowding we have seen under this administration is going to get a whole heap worse.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:30):** May I say that we certainly have benefited today from the remarks made in the house by the member for King. The member for King is a champion for her electorate. She is focused on the needs of her constituents and well recognised in her community as somebody capable of delivering in relation to those needs.

This is a very substantial investment by this government in health services in the north and north-east, and the investment has been made in part because of the advocacy of the member for King. Members will know that she is a champion for her community. She remains in close and direct contact on a regular basis with not just, of course, those of her constituents who closely need health services but also those employees of SA Health who work and live in her community. She has taken on board their feedback and ensured that that feedback has been made available directly to the Minister for Health in the other place, and she certainly should be able to take substantial credit for this very substantial \$58 million investment.

Isn't it the case, Mr Speaker, that those on the other side just really hate good news? They are allergic to it. As soon as there is the merest indication that there is a substantial investment or some good news, what do we get? We suddenly get the immediate knocking, the wrecking, the commitment to undermining a project of substantial merit.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CREGAN:** May I turn to the public value of the proposed project and in so doing address a number of the matters that have been raised by the member for Light and the member for Wright. Of course, in their remarks they neglected to reflect on Transforming Health, the Repat, CALHN and other matters, other atrocities from 16 years. We mention them—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**Mr CREGAN:** Of course, EPAS, the member for Hammond reminds the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the member for Hammond interjecting out of his seat? I hope not.

**Mr CREGAN:** With respect to the public value of the proposed project, specifically it is expected that the Lyell McEwin Hospital ED expansion and the new mental health short stay unit project will deliver an additional 1,900 square metres of emergency clinical floor space. Good news, member for Wright and member for Light: a dedicated ambulance arrival for patient transfers. Good news: additional resuscitation, triage and reception capabilities. Good news—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CREGAN:** —dedicated paediatric assessment and treatment spaces. Good news: increased short stay and quick assessment capabilities. Good news: increased acute and discharge facilities. Good news: refurbishment of existing emergency treatment spaces. Good news: a total of 72 treatment spaces within the ED and a relocated bulk decontamination unit.

There is a new 642-square metre emergency administration accommodation on level 2 above the new ED providing for education and administrative activities; the development of a new eight-bed facility to provide a purpose-built facility on level 3 for mental health patients requiring short stay assessments after presenting to the emergency department; and, of course, a 205-space extension to the existing 1,227 space multideck car park facility to cater for the increase in demand and existing displaced car parks generated as a direct result—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CREGAN:** —of the ED expansion. The redeveloped ED is expected to improve the patient journey by reducing unnecessary patient movement and reducing average length of patient stay in the ED. Other expected benefits to the South Australian community include improved safety and quality of care to patients; providing patients with access to definitive emergency care; a more sustainable ED service, with the release of value through significant productivity improvements, savings and efficiencies; and more equitable access to consistent quality of care.

I said at the outset that this is a substantial investment that has come in part because of the excellent advocacy of the member for King. Her community respects that advocacy; they rely on it. They have elected her to represent them in this place, and she continues to do that well. We are certainly very proud that she is a member of our team, and the minister has made claim that he has benefited directly from her advice in relation to this project.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT ROAD, WEST LAKES BOULEVARD AND  
CHELTENHAM PARADE INTERSECTION UPGRADE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:35):** I move:

That the 26<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled 'Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade intersection upgrade', be noted.

This project will upgrade the existing intersection that joins Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade. All three arterial roads are major commuter routes for the residential areas of the north-western suburbs. The upgrade to this intersection will address existing safety issues and capacity issues that have been identified. The upgrade is also expected to provide better integration with the adjacent Grange railway line crossing to the south-east of the intersection.

The intersection upgrade is expected to include the extension of dual lanes on West Lakes Boulevard in a southbound direction as well as a new northbound through lane from West Lakes Boulevard to the Port Road median. It is also expected that the project will involve road widening on the Port Road and Cheltenham Parade section, upgraded pedestrian crossings and dedicated bicycle lanes on all approaches of the intersection and through the intersection.

It is expected that this project will improve safety for road users at the intersection of Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade as well as improving the efficiency of vehicle movements through this intersection. The estimated cost of the intersection upgrade is \$6 million, with construction expected to be complete in late 2020.

The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project. The committee has been assured by officials from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure that the appropriate agencies have been consulted regarding this project and an acquittal has been received from the Crown Solicitor. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects, as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:38):** I also take the opportunity to speak to the 26<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee regarding the Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade intersection upgrade. As the member for Kavel noted, the primary purpose of this upgrade is to improve the safety at what is quite a busy and complicated intersection. Not only does it incorporate the busy Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade but it is also in quite close proximity to a rail line crossing that comes from West Lakes and crosses over Port Road. Because it is so close, there are also certainly some considerations around that in terms of queueing and making sure that, as traffic comes from the city down Port Road, cars do not bank up and end up queueing over the train line itself because of its proximity.

In terms of some daily traffic numbers, there was a 2016 traffic survey undertaken to look into traffic flows. Along Port Road there were approximately 42,700 vehicles on an average daily volume. Of that, about 3.5 per cent were commercial vehicles along Port Road. That is the Old Port Road section to West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade. Approximately 30,200 cars go past. Again, it is quite similar in terms of make-up, with commercial vehicles making up 3.5 per cent of those.

Along West Lakes Boulevard, from Port Road to Clark Terrace there were traffic volumes of 22,600. The commercial vehicle percentage is around 4.6 per cent. Finally, on Cheltenham Parade, the Port Road to Outer Harbor train line section has approximately 19,800 vehicles go past on a daily basis. Of those, 7.5 per cent are commercial vehicles. As I said, quite a large number of vehicles go through there. Port Road itself is certainly an important link into the metropolitan road network. It intersects with many other DPTI arterial roads but also some local roads that are under the care and control of the City of Charles Sturt as well.

The main design or purpose of the upgrade is to improve greater safety for all users, not only cars but also for the rail intersection and pedestrians. The committee examined the crash history at the intersection between 2013 to 2017. Unfortunately, it included one fatality. In terms of those types of crashes, there are various numbers. Rear-end crashes featured prominently in terms of that damage.



There were 29 total crashes, 12 of those resulting in casualties, principally rear-ends with cars having to stop suddenly. The make-up of the intersection is quite busy. There are narrow areas where cars can queue. The resulting effect is cars have to stop to try to avoid queueing, resulting in rear-end crashes. A lot of drivers, having to turn right, navigate what is a different intersection from most throughout the metropolitan network.

In terms of right-angle crashes, there were seven total crashes, three resulting in casualties. Other types of crashes included hitting fixed objects. There are quite a few Stobie poles around there. There are also trees. I think there is also Crows Corner there, so it might be a bit distracting for some of the Crows' supporters, especially in days gone by on the way back from Footy Park, or AAMI Stadium as it was later called. Other types of crashes involved sideswipes.

Overall, 44 crashes had occurred at this complicated intersection, 17 of those resulting in casualties, so there is a real impetus to upgrade the intersection to try to reduce that number of crashes, especially those resulting in casualties. DPTI advised the committee that the proposed upgrade to this intersection joining Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade will address those safety concerns and also the capacity issues around that. As I mentioned previously, it will provide better integration with the adjacent Grange railway line crossing to the south-east of the intersection.

DPTI is proposing to deliver these works. The key aims are to improve, as I said, the capacity of the intersection, particularly the right-turn movements from West Lakes Boulevard onto Port Road. There is that section in between the traffic going towards Port Adelaide and then the returning traffic back into the city. There is that narrow bridge that spans the normal median area that goes along Port Road and most of the way down, so this is trying to improve that.

It is also looking to improve the capacity of the intersection regarding the left-turn movements from Port Road onto West Lakes Boulevard and, again, to improve the safety of the intersection regarding the left-turn movements from Cheltenham Parade onto Port Road. There has been increased traffic near what is now the Bunnings. Previously, it was a disused warehouse, but Bunnings is now there and so attracts further traffic. We are also looking to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists who use this intersection and, in so doing during this design, minimise impacts on key stakeholders of this intersection.

In terms of what the proposed treatment will be, the proposed works for the intersection will include an extension of dual lanes on West Lakes Boulevard for southbound traffic; a new through lane northbound, from West Lakes Boulevard to the Port Road median, and having the extra lane will stop a lot of the queuing that occurs in that median; new and upgraded pedestrian ramps and footpaths on both sides of the Port Road median; road widening on Port Road, which will in turn provide new dual left-turn lanes westbound into West Lakes Boulevard, which is the section between the Grange railway line and West Lakes Boulevard; and an extension of the dual lane southbound on West Lakes Boulevard.

Additionally, there will be road widening in the central Port Road median to provide two through lanes and a new dedicated right-turn lane from West Lakes Boulevard to Port Road. There will also be road widening on Cheltenham Parade to provide two through lanes and a dedicated left-turn lane from Cheltenham Parade onto Port Road, which will help traffic flows; new and upgraded traffic signals and also road lighting to make it safer at night-time; and dedicated bike lanes on all approaches to the intersection and through the intersection.

It is not only getting new asphalt and treatment to make it smoother for the bicycles that go through at present but it will also incorporate bike lanes, which will assist in trying to make it safer for cyclists who are navigating their way through this intersection. In addition, there will be some kerbs and gutters where the road widening is occurring around the whole intersection itself.

There has been consultation with a number of parties, principally the City of Charles Sturt and also local businesses around the area, including CMI Toyota Cheltenham, National Storage, CastStone, Lofty Building Group, Tradelink, Bunnings, Harvey Norman and Statesman Windows. There are a number of commercial operations around there that need to be advised of these works.

Finally, in the time remaining, I will look at the public value of doing this, and I have talked through the safety improvements. Certainly adopting these solutions will improve not only the safety of road users but also the capacity and efficiency of vehicle movements. I think it was apparent through evidence presented to the committee that having these road widenings will certainly increase efficiency because no longer will traffic have to bank up because one car wants to turn left and has to wait for pedestrians to go past before it can continue on its journey and, in so doing, back traffic up, principally along Cheltenham Parade.

So there are certainly benefits for road users and, as I explained, also for pedestrians and cyclists. I could go into more detail, but the committee examined the evidence and out of that evidence recommends that the proposed public works proceed.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:48):** I rise also to talk about this important road traffic upgrade. This is a project that was provided with budget funding and committed to in the 2017-2018 Mid-Year Budget Review. Money was allocated by the former Labor government for this important project because we realised the importance of this intersection upgrade for people living in the western suburbs.

The member for Morphett is right—this is a bottleneck. In its current configuration, this intersection is a significant road safety risk and it needs upgrading, and that is why money was provided by the former Labor government in the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review. Mr Speaker, you might be aware that that document was handed down nearly two years ago to the day and only now are we seeing this new Liberal government get on with the job of delivering yet another Labor project.

It is clear that this intersection upgrade suffered the same fate as so many other infrastructure projects that were fully funded and provided for by the former Labor government. It is absolutely clear that the member for Schubert, on assuming the role of Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, immediately stopped these projects.

The other projects that were also included in the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review, other road upgrades that were fully funded, were the Golden Grove upgrade for \$20 million in 2017-18. Do you know when that project was due to be completed? By now. That is when it was due to be completed. What the Labor government thought that road upgrade needed was government funding. We did not think it needed a local member who would go back to their old council, capitulate and demand that council provide money for a state road upgrade.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** What kind of local advocacy—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I caution the member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In what regard, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** By accusing a member of capitulating. I am prepared to accept a fair bit of political argy-bargy to a point. I am just going to caution the member.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Your caution is duly noted, sir, and I thank you for it.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** What we thought was that the state government should pay for the upgrade of a state road. What it should not see is a government go to a council and demand \$2 million of funding, threatening the sword of Damocles to hang over the project: that if they did not accede they would withdraw funding from the Golden Grove Road upgrade.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, there is a point of order. One moment.

**Mr PEDERICK:** The Golden Grove intersection has nothing to do with this motion.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order: relevance, member for Hammond?

**Mr PEDERICK:** Relevance.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully to the member for Lee. The member for Lee has the call.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I was saying, that Golden Grove Road upgrade project was funded in the same package of works as the Port Road, Cheltenham Parade, West Lakes Boulevard project. I can understand that the member for Colton is agitated about it: of course, this would be an improvement for the people of the western suburbs, something that he is not familiar with—advocating for his local community. Because that is what Labor governments do: they approve infrastructure for people who live in their communities.

I will tell you another project that was funded as a package in that Mid-Year Budget Review, and that was the Port Dock rail spur. Not only was it fully funded but the contract was awarded. There was a legal agreement between the government and the contractor to deliver that upgrade, which was torn up by the new Liberal government. Why? Because that project had the temerity to be located in a safe Labor seat where those opposite thought that they could not gain political advantage. Well, shame on those opposite.

We see the politics that they play with local communities when it comes to infrastructure funding. Not only are they reluctant to do things to support Labor electorates but they do it to their own members: Golden Grove upgrade, closing the Modbury Service SA centre—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —cancelling the park-and-ride upgrade at Modbury.

*Mr Patterson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** One moment, member for Morphett. Member for Lee, I ask you to come back now to the report.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, it is all part of the same thing, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, please come back to the report. When we start talking about Service SA centres we are drawing a long bow, with respect to the member for Lee. Thank you.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Are we? I will come back to those road infrastructure projects. Not only was the Port Road, Cheltenham Parade, West Lakes Boulevard upgrade part of the same infrastructure package included in that Mid-Year Budget Review, along with the Golden Grove upgrade, which has still not started, the Port Dock rail spur was cancelled by this government, even though it was fully funded and a contract was signed for its delivery. There was no risk to the government, but they cancelled it because it was in a Labor seat.

This project we are talking about, this intersection upgrade, was stalled; it should be complete by now. It was funded at the time by the former Labor government to coincide with the end of the stormwater upgrade works, which were occurring in the middle of Port Road and being conducted by the City of Charles Sturt. That was the other reason it was funded and timed to be funded at that point in time.

You can go and ask the council. They stopped doing any further work at that intersection. They stopped any landscaping work. They stopped any further improvements, like getting rid of that shocking relic of history from that intersection, that sign that says Crows Corner, that brief moment of success from that football team of last millennium. They did not address that. They did not address that because they thought this project was going to be completed.

**The SPEAKER:** Be careful, member for Lee! Be very careful.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Mr Speaker, if you want an example of a germane contribution, then this is it, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** You are provoking the member for Cheltenham.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Even the member for Mawson said, 'Go your hardest!' That is right: this is a rare show of bipartisanship in these fractious days.

That was why this project was timed for that. It should be complete now because constituents in my electorate, constituents who live in the suburbs of Royal Park, Seaton, West Lakes, Tennyson, West Lakes Shore and Semaphore Park know how difficult it is to navigate through this intersection, particularly during morning peak-hour traffic. If you time your run incorrectly in the morning, it can take up to five or six changes of lights to get from West Lakes Boulevard successfully through the intersection to turn right onto Port Road. That is a huge choke on traffic in the western suburbs.

The catchment that I have just informed the house of is thousands and thousands and thousands of households, and at the same time, when this government is attempting to push more and more commuters off train services by denuding the rail service on the Grange train spur, removing security guards so women, schoolchildren and other vulnerable commuters feel less safe in using that train service, what other choice do they have but to be pushed into car transport, further exacerbating the traffic problems that this current intersection configuration provides? I think the house should be aware of the history of this project, that it was deliberately stalled by this government merely because it served to benefit predominantly Labor electorates, just like the Port Dock railway upgrade.

There is one other thing that I might also say, and I think it is important that this is put on the record: a local member of parliament—again, not a member of the government—attempted to attend the community consultation process for this project and was denied entry. Are we to think that this government believes that members of parliament are not members of the community? What a farce! Not only are they a member of the community but they represent the community. Why would you not want them at these community consultation sessions?

Do you think we turned people away from the community consultation sessions on the projects that we successfully delivered, such as the O-Bahn or Torrens to Torrens? Of course not. We welcomed them in because we wanted their feedback. We were happy to hear what they had to say so that we could improve those projects. With the O-Bahn project in particular, I was in receipt of representations from the member for Dunstan, now the Premier, about some of the changes that he wanted made, and, where we could, we made them for the benefit of his constituents.

But that is not the approach of those opposite. They delay projects which happen to suffer the fate of being located in Labor electorates, or they cancel them, and if they do proceed with them belatedly then they stop local MPs from attending community consultation sessions. I say shame on this government for taking that approach to important infrastructure projects that are solely designed to benefit the local communities in which they are located.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:58):** What a thin gruel of rhetoric we have just had: the suggestion that somehow in the western suburbs nothing is being done, but, of course, in 16 years there was an opportunity to resolve this issue and so many others, and was that issue resolved? No, it was not. To impute an improper motive to any member of this place in relation to this project or any other is entirely unacceptable. This committee has been working diligently to bring forward this project and many others.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CREGAN:** We listened carefully and politely to the member while he was making his contribution, wrong as it was, and now is my opportunity to respond, if the member would do me the justice of allowing me to do that, notwithstanding that time is against me. What is incredibly frustrating is that no project has been delayed for political reasons, no evidence is before the committee in relation to that issue on this project, and I refute any suggestion that this committee has acted improperly. It has not. There is no evidence in relation to the matters that the member now wishes to bring before this house.

Motion carried.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

*Bills***MARRIED PERSONS (SEPARATE LEGAL STATUS) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:01):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the separate legal status of married persons and to make related amendments to the Law of Property Act 1936. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:02):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Married Persons (Separate Legal Status) Bill 2019 is part of the reforms that the government is undertaking to ensure that South Australian law is fully compatible with the availability of same-sex marriage. It is complementary to the main bill that undertakes this reform, namely, the Statutes Amendment (Legalisation of Same Sex Marriage Consequential Amendments) Bill 2019.

The Married Persons (Separate Legal Status) Bill 2019 is required due to the numerous outdated provisions that married persons found in the Law of Property Act 1936. The Law of Property Act has many sections that state what married women can do: hold property, for example, or effect a policy of insurance upon her own life. It also has laws about married men; for example, it provides that a man is not liable for torts or debts of his wife. These laws might seem unnecessary and old-fashioned now but at the time they were enacted they were vitally important.

At common law, in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century married women did not have an independent legal identity. They were considered one legal person with their husband and the husband was in control. This doctrine significantly impeded the legal rights of married women. For example, because a married woman had no legal identity, she could not hold property in her own right or have a legal action against her husband. It also operated to make married men legally responsible for their wife's actions.

Statutes like the Law of Property Act and its predecessors used legislation to override these common law rules. As groundbreaking as the laws were at that time, the language used has become outdated and inappropriate to the modern law of marriage, particularly following the legalisation of same-sex marriage. The laws require updating to fit the egalitarian, gender-neutral form of marriage in Australia today.

The Married Persons (Separate Legal Status) Bill 2019 will create a standalone act that expresses in broad, gender-neutral terms that married persons are separate legally and equal to non-married persons as concerns their legal capacity. This ensures that the old common law doctrine of unity of spouses continues to be inapplicable. The bill then repeals the outdated portions of the Law of Property Act. The bill is not intended to alter the law of marriage as currently found in the Law of Property Act; rather, it will consolidate and modernise the provisions in standalone act related to married persons' legal status.

This approach is not unique to South Australia. Two other jurisdictions already have similar Acts. New South Wales has the Married Persons (Equality of Status) Act 1996 (NSW) and the Northern Territory has the Married Persons (Equality of Status) Act 1989 (NT). I therefore commend the bill to members and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Explanation of Clauses*

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Separate legal status of married persons

3—Married person has legal capacity as if not married

This clause provides that married persons have separate legal status to one another in all circumstances.

4—Married person entitled to criminal and civil redress in respect of property

This clause provides that a married person may bring an action against their spouse in relation to the person's property notwithstanding the fact that they are married.

5—Married person has no authority to act as agent for spouse

This clause provides that a married person is not permitted to act as an agent for their spouse, unless another law or agreement provides otherwise.

6—Married person not liable for debts of spouse incurred before marriage

This clause provides that a married person is not liable for a debt of their spouse that was incurred before they entered into their marriage.

7—Housekeeping payments and allowances taken to be joint property

This clause provides that where a married person provides money to their spouse for the purpose of paying joint household expenses, anything purchased with that money, or any money not spent, will be taken to be the joint property of the person and the person's spouse (unless an agreement between the person and their spouse states otherwise).

Part 3—Miscellaneous

8—Regulations

This clause allows the Governor to make regulations in relation to the Act.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Law of Property Act 1936

2—Amendment of section 40—Conveyances by a person to self etc

This clause gender neutralises language in relation to conveying property to oneself jointly with another person.

3—Amendment of section 42—Covenants for title

Section 42(3) prescribes a concept relating to a wife being deemed to convey property on the direction of the husband where both the wife and the husband convey and are expressed to convey as beneficial owners. This clause removes subsection (3).

4—Amendment of section 82—Request by infant or person under disability

Section 82 provides that another person may be authorised to act on behalf of a married woman, infant, person of unsound mind or person with any other disability in certain circumstances, and in effect equates married women with persons with impaired decision making abilities. This clause removes the reference to married women in this section.

5—Repeal of sections 92 to 99

Sections 92 to 99 of the Act specify certain provisions in relation to married women that are no longer required in light of this measure, such as prescribing that, in relation to legal status in respect of property, a married woman is to be treated as though she were not married.

6—Repeal of sections 101 to 107

Sections 101 to 107 of the Act specify certain provisions in relation to married women that are no longer required in light of this measure, such as a married woman having the same civil and criminal redress in relation to property as if she were not married.

7—Amendment of section 108—Interpretation of terms

This clause removes outdated references to married women and otherwise gender neutralises terminology in relation to executors and administrators.

## 8—Repeal of section 109

This section deletes section 109 of the Act, which relates to wills of married women.

## 9—Repeal of section 111

This section deletes section 111 of the Act, which relates to acquisitions and dispositions of trust estates by married women.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF COUNCILS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (12:06):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (12:07):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Local Government (Administration of Councils) Amendment Bill 2019 will amend the Local Government Act 1999 to address three issues relating to the administration of councils under the Act. Firstly, the bill will amend the act to address an issue highlighted by the administration of the District Council of Coober Pedy in relation to the maximum period a council may be under administration.

As members will be aware, on 24 January 2019 His Excellency the Governor, the Honourable Hieu Van Le AC, issued a proclamation declaring the District Council of Coober Pedy to be a defaulting council pursuant to section 273(5) of the act and appointed Mr Timothy Robert Sandford Jackson to be the administrator of the affairs of the council.

This proclamation was made on my recommendation, as the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, on the basis of an extensive report by the South Australian Ombudsman, finalised in July 2018, which demonstrated serious failings and irregularities in the conduct of affairs at the council. The Ombudsman's report was in response to two referrals from the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption pursuant to sections 24(2)(a) and 24(3) of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 in relation to the council.

As members will recall, the Ombudsman was of the view that this was 'one of the most serious examples of maladministration in public administration' that he had observed since the relevant provisions of the ICAC Act were enacted. Subsequently, the Ombudsman's findings were supported by a lengthy examination of the council by the Auditor-General that was released on 4 December 2018. The Auditor-General also identified significant failings and deficiencies in the council's financial management and position.

The District Council of Coober Pedy was the first council to be declared a defaulting council under the act, and the first council in almost 30 years to be declared a defaulting council since the Local Government Act 1934. The last time that a council had been declared a defaulting council and an administrator was appointed was in 1990—the district council of Stirling, under the 1934 act.

The act currently allows for a council to be a defaulting council (under administration) for a maximum period of 12 months. This bill proposes that this maximum period be extended to 24 months following feedback from the administrator currently appointed to the District Council of Coober Pedy that 12 months is an insufficient amount of time to allow for an administrator to address significant council issues, as administrators are only able to utilise one annual budget cycle to implement significant and difficult decisions, such as large rate increases.

Secondly, the bill includes a special provision to extend the maximum period of administration for the District Council of Coober Pedy until the conclusion of the next local

government periodic elections of 2022. This enables an administrator to be in place for the remainder of the current council term should this be considered necessary.

This reflects the very serious nature of the council's failings that resulted in the appointment of the administrator, the council's deep-seated financial issues and also the strong division within the township that the administrator has reported. More time is needed to enable the administrator to address these serious and complex issues. A recent poll undertaken by the administrator has indicated the Coober Pedy community's support for this proposal. However, it is not certain that the council will be in administration until November 2022.

Under the act, a council's period as a defaulting council ceases if the Governor issues a proclamation anytime prior to the expiration of the maximum period that either revokes the proclamation by which the council was declared to be a defaulting council (thus resulting in suspended council members being reinstated), or declares the offices of all members of the defaulting council to be vacant (and elections are held to elect a new council). These provisions are unaffected by the bill.

Finally, the bill includes an amendment to correct an anomaly in the act by clarifying that suspended members of a defaulting council will not be entitled to receive their respective allowances during the period of suspension, that is, while a council is a defaulting council. This is in line with community expectations that suspended council members should not receive allowances while not performing official functions and duties. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of Local Government Act 1999

4—Amendment of section 273—Action on report

This clause inserts new subsection (8a) into section 273 of the principal Act to provide that members of a defaulting council are not entitled to their respective allowances under section 76 during the period of suspension under subsection (8).

The clause also amends section 273(16)(c) to make special provision for the District Council of Coober Pedy, which was declared to be a defaulting council in January 2019, to cease to be a defaulting council on the conclusion of the next periodic elections and to extend when a council ceases to be a defaulting council in other cases from 12 months after it was declared to be a defaulting council to 24 months after the declaration, except where the other circumstances in subsection (16) arise.

5—Transitional provision

This clause is a transitional provision which clarifies that new subsection (8a) in section 273 of the principal Act applies to a member of a defaulting council regardless of whether the council was declared to be a defaulting council before or after the commencement of the relevant provision of this Bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

### **LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 30 October 2019.)

Clause 1.



**The CHAIR:** Despite extensively examining the clauses, we are on clause 1, and I see the member for Kaurana on his feet.

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you very much, Chair. It is my pleasure again to make a contribution in regard to the Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill as it is currently called and particularly raise some concerns about the fact that it is called that and how misleading and deceptive it is to the people of South Australia.

When we were last here—it feels like only hours ago—we were making a number of points in relation to the naming of this bill and the approach that the government has taken against what would seem to be the standards that have been set in accepted practice of naming conventions for bills to name this a miscellaneous bill. I asked the Attorney-General a series of questions—and people can review *Hansard* to see those questions in detail—about how that came about, who was involved, what political decision-making there was and, importantly, whether the decision to name the bill happened at the end of the process rather than at the beginning.

Clearly, the precedent and accepted practice—and I quoted from what some would call the bible of regulation, *Drafting Legislation: Art and Technology of Rules Regulation* by Helen Xanthaki—made it clear that it should happen at the end. The Attorney-General dismissed all the questions to the house. She said, 'Oh, well, have a look at the answers I gave to the member for West Torrens.' I have gone back and checked that, and they do not answer the questions I asked. It is seemingly dismissive of the parliament, which we have come to expect, not to have proper answers to those sorts of questions.

I also mentioned last night that, looking at the works in terms of the standards and practice and some of the academic works that have been published about how we name our legislation and the importance of that, one name comes up again and again, and that is Graeme Orr and his work looking at this matter. I quoted part of his contribution from *Papers on Parliament No. 46* December 2006, where he talked about some of the attempts to politicise the names of legislation. To go on from what I quoted last night, he states:

But to give a picturesque example of how spin-doctoring corrodes valuable distinctions, consider the spate of commonwealth bills with sloganeering titles in recent years. The Workplace Relations (More Jobs, Better Pay) Bill of 1999 adopted the PR title of the Liberals' election policy. The New Tax System Acts spurned the term 'GST'. Not all such perversions are the fault of government, though we may be more forgiving of oxygen-starved private members coming up with beauties such as the Quieter Advertising Happier Homes Bill...and the Migration Amendment (Act of Compassion) Bill 2005...The purpose is to put motherhood slogans into the mouths of the media, and through that, to lull the critical faculties of busy citizens.

This is important because there are two ways in which the legislation titles, in my view, can be corrupted: one is these overspun, over-PR'ed titles that are attempting to sell something to the public just in the title of a bill, and the other is what we have here in the clear example of spinning in a different way: spinning saying, 'There's nothing to see here, very miscellaneous changes being made to this legislation,' when we know that they are very significant, and you just had to go to any of the forums we held on this side to know that. Even the Attorney-General herself noted that a number of people in her electorate have raised concerns with her directly. Clearly, there are concerns about this and it is hardly 'miscellaneous' at all.

I was also drawn to another piece of work by Graeme Orr, this time a joint authored work with his collaborator Joo-Cheong Tham. It was published in *Work and Employment* and entitled, 'The Fair Work Act and other names of shame'. Far be it from me to criticise a Labor legislative bill that was passed in in the federal parliament, but that is the title of his piece. It includes some very interesting discussion about how legislation should be named and some of the ways that, unfortunately, in recent years has not been named appropriately. The co-authors say: 'The title of a piece of legislation should serve a simple, single purpose. It ought provide a descriptive handle.'

That is what we are asking for here. That is what we are asking the government to consider here: a proper description of what the government is seeking to do. I hope that when we get further into this debate we will see some amendments on this measure, and certainly I am considering that as this debate progresses. I think it would be appropriate to have something that meets the standard of Orr and Tham when they say it needs to have a 'simple, single purpose' as a descriptive handle. They go on to say:

Think of the Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), the Ombudsman Act 1976 (Cth) or the various Industrial Relations Acts. 'This is the field I regulate and this is what you call me.'

That is an important statement because this is what the government is seeking to do. It is saying, 'This is a miscellaneous bill. We're just seeking to do miscellaneous work.' We know that that is not the case. We know that this is a significant reform. We know it is the biggest change that this new government—less new now—since their election have sought to make in the parliament. These are the biggest changes that they have sought to do, but they are trying to slip it through as 'miscellaneous'. Orr and Tham go on to say:

Language of course is not always so simple. What forms the *Unfair Contracts Act* to one sub-contractor may, to the powerful corporation who hires that sub-contractor, read as the *Unmaking the Sanctity of Contracts Act*.

Legislative titling is an arcane field, negotiating the boundaries of the legislative and administrative processes of government.

Here we have the legislature, us, raising concerns with what the executive is trying to do here. There is a significant history in terms of this. They go on to say:

In theory, Parliaments can amend the title of a Bill or Regulation. (Short and long titles, the preamble or recital and purpose clause have been described as 'amendable descriptive components': Bennion F, *Statutory Interpretation* (2nd ed. Butterworths, London, 1992) pp 496-506.)—

one of my colleagues might want to look up that in more detail—

But in practice Parliaments no more debate, let alone meddle with, legislative titles than they do the headings to statutory parts and sections.

There they are saying, 'Well, we do have the power to do it, but seldom is it actually done. Seldom does parliament actually get involved in the titles, but we do have the power to do that.' I think that is what we are seeking—to make sure in this debate we appropriately tighten our legislation and act as a parliament, not just as a rubber stamp for the executive in how they do this. Orr and Tham continue:

Naming legislation is thus an act of executive fiat—

nothing sounds more appropriate for the Attorney-General than an 'executive fiat'—

exercised by the Minister who brings the ultimate bill to Cabinet. Yet the tradition was that Ministers, like Parliaments, concerned themselves with the substance of legislation, not its form. At best, there was a Cabinet veto on inappropriate legislative titles, rarely used. Instead, the matter was in the hands of the departmental staff and parliamentary counsel who drafted the flesh of the written law on the skeleton of government policy.

Here we get to the crux of the matter, which is my question to the Attorney-General as to what involvement did ministers, cabinet, ministerial staff members and PR spin doctors have in the drafting of this. I asked a series of questions: was there any discussion with parliamentary counsel about the name, was there any directive that was had with parliamentary counsel and did parliamentary counsel have free rein to determine the title that they thought best in this matter, rather than any input from the government in doing that?

As Orr and Tham make very clear, that is not what should happen. Government should decide on the policy and government should decide on what its policy objectives are, and impartial public servants and impartial parliamentary counsel should get on with the drafting. Ministers should not be worrying themselves about what should be the title of that bill, because we should have appropriate titles that reflect the contents. As was said in Xanthaki's work, that should be done after the legislation is drafted, not before. They go on to say:

As a quick glance at historical British statutes will reveal, the widespread use of the 'short titles' with which we now routinely cite legislation is a relatively recent innovation. It dates to the housekeeping indexes of the UK Short Titles Acts of 1892 and 1896.

We might want to look into that further. Oddly and regrettably, about a decade ago this straightforward Westminster practice became politicised, and we are seeing another example of that happening here today. Slogans, and even puns, started appearing in legislative titles in Australia, producing travesties—

**Mr TEAGUE:** Point of order: standing order 128. Let it not be said in the course of this committee that the point of order was not raised directly in relation to the serial indulgence that has occurred. The member on his feet is perhaps not the worst offender.

**Mr Picton:** Is there a point of order? Have you got a point of order? What is the point of order?

**The CHAIR:** Member for Kaurna, the member for Heysen has identified his point of order: standing order 128. He is speaking to that.

**Mr TEAGUE:** The member who is on his feet perhaps is not the worst offender in this regard, but there is ongoing indulgence in irrelevant and tedious repetition.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** It's happening right now actually from your tedious and unparliamentary point of order.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you, member for Heysen. Thank you, member for Lee. I will consider the point of order. It relates to standing order 128, which is irrelevance or repetition. I agree with the member for Heysen, in that the member for Kaurna has not been the worst offender.

**Mr Picton:** I have not been an offender at all.

**The CHAIR:** In fact, member for Kaurna, you will be pleased to know that I have been listening carefully, particularly in consideration of standing order 128, and I am happy to say that I find that your contribution so far, even though it has been lengthy, with just five minutes to go, has been related back to the short title, with reference to that, all the way through.

**Ms Cook:** I remember the Magna Carta speech.

**The CHAIR:** Hang on, member for Hurtle Vale. I made a ruling on this standing order against a couple of speakers from the opposition last night. I do not feel that the member for Kaurna has breached it to the extent that they did, so, with five minutes to go, please continue.

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you very much, Chair, and I thank you for your ruling on this matter. I have sought to make sure that I am adding to the contribution of this debate appropriately.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** You have. You have.

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you, member for Light. As I was saying, if you look at the work of Orr and Tham, they say:

Slogans, and even puns, started appearing in legislative titles in Australia, producing travesties such as the Roads to Recovery Act 2000 (Cth), a punny title for an electorally significant scheme for the maintenance and improvement of significant roads (see Orr G. 'From Slogans to Puns: Australian Legislative Titling Revisited' (2001) 22 Statute Law Review 160).

So we have seen that over the past couple of decades it has got significantly worse. I think that this is a point at which the parliament should say, 'This is enough. We need to draw a line here and make sure that this doesn't continue in this parliament.' The parliament should make sure that this bill, which clearly we have a significant number of issues with and this is the first of many, is done appropriately in its title to make sure that it represents the contents of the bill. They then go on to say:

What is the ancestry of sloganeering in legislative titling? As mentioned earlier, titles are a relatively recent phenomenon. They became a necessary technology when the statute books started to swell in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as society grew more complicated and modern, reformist government emerged. The older tradition of 'long titles' provided not names for reference and identification, but a prolix description, whose purpose was to circumscribe parliamentary debate on each measure.

The complexity of modern legal administration meant that it was no longer sufficient to refer to legislation by regnal year and chapter number (or today's equivalent of the calendar year and Act number). Prior to the instigation of short titles, only a few foundational pieces of legislation were dubbed with special titles, e.g. in honour of some statesman (Lord Campbell's Act (aka Fatal Accidents Act 1846 (UK))). Occasionally, some fundamental constitutional reform would become lauded with a grand title, like the Magna Carta or the Great Reform Act (the latter being a major step towards universal suffrage).

Clearly, this has a significant history. Given the shortage of time, I am happy to have—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** That hasn't been a consideration to date.

**Mr PICTON:** The Attorney-General can move an extension of my time if she wishes. I will point out a few other things. They raise some particular examples of what has happened in the US.

People might remember the USA PATRIOT Act. That was actually an acronym. People might not know this, but the actual title of that act was the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act 2001. The acronym was the USA PATRIOT Act.

Likewise, it was a piece of legislation where the title was devised to enable the government to sell its message. It was there to say, 'Look at this amazing bill.' In this case, it is to say, 'Don't look at this bill. This bill has significant issues with it.'

**The CHAIR:** Member for Kurna, would you like to remind me and other members of your question to the Attorney.

**Mr PICTON:** Yes, I would like to.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you. With seconds to go.

**Mr PICTON:** Can the Attorney-General definitively state that no political staff—no Treasurer, no minister—suggested titles to parliamentary counsel and that parliamentary counsel determined the title after the bill had been drafted?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I thank the member, in outlining his question, for at least referring to a text of some interest, unlike the member for West Torrens who came in with the wrong set of guidelines, which were applicable in the commonwealth parliament. So I congratulate him on that.

As interesting as it may have been, I repeat, in response to the first and second questions raised by the member for West Torrens at the commencement of this committee, firstly, that the title came from parliamentary counsel with the first draft. I am advised that there was no change or request to that draft through the course of the bill, which goes through various processes to get to the parliament, and that what you have before you in a short title is exactly the same short title that applied at the time of the first presentation from parliamentary counsel.

I was further advised by the head of parliamentary counsel, after we got up last night in committee, with the descriptor of 'miscellaneous', that it is common practice and appropriate for parliamentary counsel, when they have three or four areas of subject matter in a reform in a bill—in this case, the Land Tax Act being reformed—to describe it as 'miscellaneous' so as not to present a position where one area of reform has special prominence above another.

If it were simply the 'land tax (aggregation variation) bill', it would fail to recognise that there is an accommodation of a rate change which, in reading the bill, others may see as more important to them. To ensure that there is no preference given to one part of the reform where there are multiple areas of reform that is the practice. I hope that assists the member in understanding why we rely on the expertise and professional advice that we have from parliamentary counsel and why they serve this parliament so well.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I would like to speak to clause 1 and add to the debate. I will make every endeavour not to repeat anything that has been said to date, but I would like to add some commentary. I will particularly add some commentary to what was started by the member for Kurna because I think he is actually on the right track here in terms of the various issues he has raised. I know there may be some opposite who may think this discussion is vexatious and perhaps unjustified—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: at no time has there been an assertion from anyone on this side of the house that the contribution in relation to this is vexatious.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's right. The member for Heysen—

**The CHAIR:** No, the member for Heysen raised a point of order in relation to one of the standing orders. I made a ruling on that. There have been points of order raised during the debate. At no point was the word 'vexatious' used, so I might ask you to withdraw that suggestion.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: I think it is commonly understood that a meaning of the term 'vexatious' is to frustrate. I do not think it is drawing any form of bow, let alone

a long one, to say that there is a difference between the point of order that the member for Heysen raised in terms of being repetitive and hence providing repeatedly to the house the same information which of course would then have the impact of using up more of the house's time and frustrating the house in doing its business. I do not think that is a stretch.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Lee, I ruled against that point of order that was raised by the member for Heysen, if you recall.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Mr Chairman, perhaps I will clarify the terms in the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Let me finish. I can speak in my defence.

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

**The CHAIR:** Member for Light, take your seat, please. There is a point order.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** It is 137: obstruction. The member for Light has refused to accept the authority of the Chair by complying with your instruction.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** No, I am not going to accept that point of order. That is done. Member for Light, I will ask you to withdraw the word 'vexatious', please, and then you can get on with your 15-minute contribution.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Thank you. I will withdraw the term 'vexatious' and perhaps a more appropriate term would be that some members may believe—I am not accusing them—that perhaps some of this debate may have been unnecessary.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Let me finish. That is my interpretation as I see it. The point I am trying to make—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Members will cease interjecting.

**Mr Pederick:** You want to check your room.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Hammond!

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The point I would make is that rather than it being unnecessary, I think it is very necessary. In fact, last night gave me the opportunity to research this matter about short titles and the importance of short titles when it comes to legislation. There is quite a body of academic work—I am surprised that the member Heysen is not aware of this, but he may be, and he may elaborate soon—on the importance of short titles and the role they play in the political and parliamentary process.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Light, we have all become very well versed in the importance of the short title and we are about to discover more.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** You are absolutely right, sir. I intend to enlighten you and the members of this chamber further. There is one article I read last night that is very relevant to this bit, and I will come to the point about why it is relevant, entitled, 'Are short bill titles a form of deceptive advertising?' That is the nature of this article and it talks about how people who propose short titles in bills can use and misuse them to convey a message. In this case, my argument would be—and I will read from the article:

Short titles may serve useful purposes in that they could facilitate discussion and reference to legislation, but such titles often serve another perhaps less noble purpose...

In this case, I would argue that this short title is designed perhaps for less noble purposes. In other words, it was designed to deceive or hide what is in this bill. The article goes on to say:

Some would argue that unrealistic short titles serve a useful purpose in that they inspire us and provide hope.

But, interestingly, they go on to say whether short titles should be subject to the same rules as in marketing as for people in business where the short title should not be allowed to be misleading and deceptive and should actually be subject to normal commercial laws about misleading the community.

Then I found another article, again in this body of work about short titles. It is quite a well-written area. In fact, Mr Chair, you will be pleased to know one short title matter was actually discussed in the Supreme Court of the United States; that is where the matter went to. It was actually adjudicated upon in the Supreme Court of the United States because words count and are very important, particularly in the law. This article says in its summary:

This past summer saw the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark decision in *United States v. Windsor*, and while the case has generated copious amounts of commentary and scholarship, relatively little attention has been paid to the case's discussion of bill short titles. Central to the case's analysis was a dispute over the role of short titles in inferring legislative purpose, and given this dispute, this Remark will argue that it's time for [Congress to think about a naming authority for short titles because they can be used to mislead.]

The article goes on to say, 'In addition to taking the focus off the substantive nature of legislation, and placing,' which is a very important point. In other words, you can use a short title to deflect attention away from what the bill is about. I will come to an important conclusion at the end of my 15 minutes. The article continues:

Short titles are used as framing and marketing devices and indeed, these few words are now viewed by lawmakers and others as an important aspect of the legislative process.

I would argue that this government in trying to use this very benign short title has tried to hide the impact of this bill from people who are going to be affected by it. The article states:

While the legislative process is inherently complex and competition in Congress remains fierce, at the very least elected officials should not mislead citizens through the titles of legislation.

So the short title of this bill should reflect and talk about the things it does. I agree with the member for Bragg that this bill covers many areas. I do not disagree with her at all. However, to suggest that this bill does not have a very key element and other matters in my view would be wrong. It has a key element. The biggest element of this bill is aggregation. That is a key element. I say 'key element' because that is what the Treasurer and the Premier said. They have both said on a number of occasions they are turning on this particular issue. This is a key element. The fact that the word 'aggregation' is missing from this short title, I think, is misleading. It does have 'other matters'; it certainly does have 'other matters', but we can come to that in a moment.

I read another important article on this matter, titled 'Processes, standards and politics: drafting short titles in the Westminster parliament, Scottish Parliament and US Congress'. It talks about how they do it differently and the importance of short titles to convey the right message. I will not quote extensively from the article for your benefit, Mr Chair. I am sure you can read it at your leisure. The question I would like to ask the Attorney-General is whether she would be prepared to alter the short title of this bill so that it more accurately reflects the intention of the bill.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** As I indicated last night, the answer to that is no. As I have indicated to each of the speakers who have made a contribution to date on this matter, wallowing in their dissatisfaction of a descriptor, to date I have not seen any amendment to that effect. I know there has been 14 days to do it, but you are entitled to put that to the committee for it to be considered.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** In that case, I will take that advice. I move to amend the short title as follows:

Delete 'miscellaneous' and insert in lieu thereof:

Retrospective application of aggregation and other matters

So that the short title will now read:

The Land Tax (Retrospective application of aggregation and other matters) Amendment Bill 2019.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Light, can we have a seconded copy of that? We will circulate that and you can speak to your amendment.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I would like to speak to my amendment. This amendment more accurately reflects both the intention and purpose of this bill. It conveys to the community quite clearly what this bill seeks to do. The biggest element of this bill—and no-one has denied it; not even the people on the other side have denied it—is the aggregation of a number of properties for land tax purposes. That element is also perhaps the most contentious part of this bill. Given those facts, I think that should be in the title of the bill to ensure that the intention and purpose of the bill is conveyed very clearly.

The other matters that the Attorney-General referred to are also covered in the bill title by 'other matters'. If I put every matter in there, it would not be a short title: it would be a book in its own right. With those comments, I seek the support of this chamber for my amendment.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I rise to indicate that the proposed amendment is opposed and I have nothing further to add.

**Mr BROWN:** I would like to speak in favour of the amendment of the member for Light. I, like other members of this place, spent some time following the debate last night and listening to a number of questions from members. I heard a number of views from members about the government's decision to give the bill this particular title.

I note that there was what appeared to be a constant refrain from the government of, 'Well, if you are not happy with the particular title that the bill has been given, then you may go ahead and move an amendment of your own to seek the change the title of the bill.' I am very pleased that the member for Light has done so. I think the member for Light's title of the bill is much more appropriate than what has already been chosen. In coming to my conclusion as to why I thought the member for Light's title of the bill was more appropriate than that which the government had originally drafted, I was reminded of a couple of people who spoke with me during the general policy debate on this particular issue.

One particular story stood out in my mind as being very appropriate in making a decision on what this bill should be called. A person came to my office and said to me, 'I don't know what I am going to do with my personal finances, given that the government is changing this land tax policy. My wife and I have saved over the years and we've worked very hard to put together a very modest portfolio of properties.' In fact, this particular person had, I think, three or four different residential properties. In fact, they rented them to people of very modest means. I think they are very good to their tenants. They are very understanding of people who are often in difficult circumstances and find it difficult to pay rent on a regular basis due to their personal circumstances. This person told me that the changes the government will make, particularly to bring in aggregation in a retrospective fashion, would hit them dramatically.

These people had followed the advice of an accountant at the time that they wished to start their portfolio—very wisely, I must say—and had been told to set up a particular structure. Due to what the government is doing, that structure will now impact them quite dramatically, and with retrospective effect. That is one reason why I think the amendment moved by the member for Light should be supported, and that the parliament should reject the original wording that the government has chosen for this bill.

One of the things this person raised with me that I was quite struck by was that they could not understand why a government that pretends to be in favour of the small investor and small businessperson would do that to someone who had built up a modest portfolio over the years. The government tells us that this bill is all about fixing a 'rort'.

I reject the idea that people who follow the law of the land as it stands and receive proper advice—which is what we always tell people they should do when they are setting up business structures so that they do not have unintended consequences—and set up these structures, only to be told by a government that pretends to be in favour of small business people that they are rorters. I think that sort of behaviour is quite shameful.

I think it is also wrong for the government to seek to hide what they are doing in a piece of legislation by giving it a bland name such as the 'miscellaneous' bill. As the member for Light so eloquently said, a name that actually says what the bill does, so that the piece of legislation says

what it does on the tin, would be much more helpful. That is another reason why I think this particular amendment moved by the member for Light should be supported.

Another reason I think the amendment of the member for Light should be supported is that it is important for general members of the public, particularly those who are seeking to understand the laws that apply in our state so that they can better understand each particular bill the parliament debates and potentially passes.

Often members of the public will look at a list of bills, not just those who are studying or who are students of what the parliament is doing, but even general members of the public will look at a list of bills that we have passed, and find it difficult to understand what each of those bills does. I think having a much more appropriate title would make it much easier for members of the public to understand the business of this parliament and it might even help to bring back a little bit of respect that people seem to have lost in their government.

I know this government, so it is best perhaps to take away some of that respect, but this is a chance for this parliament to take a stand to try to put some of that respect back. I think that those members who are mindful of that will certainly vote in favour of the amendment, moved by my colleague the member for Light, who I know over many years has tried to bring back respect and order in this parliament. He was a very good Chairman of Committees himself at one stage—as are you, Mr Chairman.

I think if members were to cogitate the amendment passed by the member for Light and to consider the proposition put forward by the government, which is that the amendment is not acceptable and that the current obfuscated term 'miscellaneous' is better than that moved by the member for Light, I would be very disappointed if members voted in favour of what the government is saying. But I think all members of this house who properly seek to represent those in their electorates who could be potentially dreadfully affected by this bill the government is moving, would be happy to see a much more appropriate title introduced. I implore all members to support the member for Light's amendment.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I rise to speak in support of the member for Light's amendment. We have spent some time in this place bemoaning the inaccurate nomenclature that has been attached to this bill in the short title in clause 1 through the use of the term 'miscellaneous' rather than a term or terms that more accurately reflect what this bill seeks to do. That has been at the heart of concerns about the bill, not just of many people in this place, but it has also been at the heart of concerns many members of the community have about what the government intends to do by bringing this bill before the house.

Let's be clear. This bill is solely designed to increase land tax revenue to government coffers. Any assertion that this is a tax cut is wrong. There was a tax cut provided by the parliament on the request of the government, but that was last year, and the government is now seeking to claw back the majority of those through the application of these significant changes to aggregation arrangements.

The term that I think deserves some attention in considering this amendment the member for Light has put is 'retrospective' because many people in the community have contacted members of parliament, not just members of the opposition, but those opposite as we are also aware, complaining that the government is seeking to apply a changed land taxation regime to the landholdings which they have held in most instances for many years. They have purchased land, they have invested in land and they have established their personal arrangements and sought to derive their livelihoods around those land interests based on how the land tax act of the day would apply to those land interests.

As I outlined to the house both in my second reading speech and also in my earlier contributions on this clause, for the past generation following the change of government in 2002, there has only been one trajectory for land tax policy in this state, and that has been to provide land tax relief and to provide additional categories of land with exemptions from the land tax regime.

That trajectory now is undermined by this bill where the government seeks to change the aggregation arrangements in a way that will raise more revenue from the community for its coffers.



So, the community feels that, should these aggregation measures pass the parliament, there would effectively be a retrospective application—

**The CHAIR:** Is there a point of order, Attorney?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I just ask that the committee report progress.

**The CHAIR:** Well, it is probably a little early. I will take your suggestion, Attorney, but I will give the member for Lee another couple of minutes.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** A wise ruling, Mr Chairman.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As always.

**The CHAIR:** Continue, member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I was reflecting on the concerns of the community about how they feel these changes to the aggregation arrangements in the land tax bill would punitively apply to the landholdings that many had amassed often over previous decades. The rationale for the government in making these changes has been the constant assertion by the Treasurer that it is fundamentally unfair for people who own 12 properties—and the examples change from the Treasurer—to make use of different ownership structures, including trust structures or company structures, and pay no land tax.

We have consistently asked the government, 'Well, show us the modelling. How many landowners are in that situation?' Of course, we have never seen those details, because (a) I suspect that the modelling does not exist and is a furphy the Treasurer repeatedly claims publicly and (b) I think that it would also come to light that if indeed it was able to be established that there are landholdings in these situations, then it would be a very small number of landowners who would be availing themselves of those arrangements. Of course, we could then have a debate, if the government truly wanted to establish equity in regard to those arrangements, on a very specific bill targeted at that very specific problem, but instead we have a broad-based approach to change the aggregation arrangements to raise more revenue for the government.

The term of this amendment from the member for Light is not just timely, given that we have only just started debating the first clause of this bill, but it also serves as an important reminder of what the bill seeks to do.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you, member for Lee. I have a motion from the Attorney-General that the committee report progress.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Adelaide Festival Corporation—Annual Report 2018-19

Country Arts SA—Annual Report 2018-19

Premier and Cabinet, Department of the—Annual Report 2018-19

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

Training Centre Visitor—Annual Report 2018-19

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Director of Public Prosecutions- Office of the—Annual Report 2018-19

Rules made under the following Acts—

Liquor Licensing—

Liquor Licensing (General Code of Practice) Notice 2019

Liquor Licensing (Late Night Trading Code of Practice) Notice 2019

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—

Child Development Council—Annual Report 2018-19

History Trust of South Australia—Annual Report 2018-19

Leave No One Behind Commissioner for Children and Young People—Report 2019

National Education and Care Services Freedom of Information Commissioner, Privacy

Commissioner and Ombudsman—Annual Report 2018-19

Teachers Registration Board—Annual Report 2018-19

Windmill Theatre Co, Australian Children's Performing Arts Company—

Annual Report 2018-19

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

Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner—Annual Report 2018-19

Health and Wellbeing, Department for—Annual Report 2018-19

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. R. Sanderson)—

Child and Young Person's Visitor—Annual Report 2018-19

Child Protection Systems Royal Commission Progress Report September 2019—

Report 2018-19

Child Protection, Department for—Annual Report 2018-19

Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 Minister's Functions—

Annual Report 2018-19

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. T.J. Whetstone)—

Review of the Operation of the Fisheries Management Act 2007 as of 27 August 2019,

Report on the—Report 2019

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Police, South Australia—Annual Report 2018-19

Witness Protection Act 1996—Annual Report 2018-19

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Recreation, Sport and Racing, Office for—Annual Report 2018-19

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Dog and Cat Management Board—Annual Report 2018-19

Mamungari Park Co-Management Board—Annual Report

National Park Co-Management Board—Ikara-Flinders Ranges—Annual Report 2018-19

National Park Co-Management Board—Lake Gairdner—Annual Report 2018-19

National Park Co-Management Board—Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges—

Annual Report 2018-19

National Park Co-Management Board—Witjira—Annual Report 2018-19

Nguat Nguat Conservation Park Co-Management Board—Annual Report 2018-19

Nullarbor Parks Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2018-19

Response to the Natural Resource Committee Inquiry into Management of Overabundant and Pest Species—Report 2018-19  
Yumbarra Conservation Park Co-Management Board—Annual Report 2018-19

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—  
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Department of—Annual Report 2018-19  
Urban Renewal Authority—Annual Report 2018-19

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:05):** I bring up the 35<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Fleurieu water quality improvement project, Myponga drinking water system.'

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 36<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled SA Schools Public-Private Partnership Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 37<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Mount Gambier Regional Community and Recreation Hub.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 38<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Monarto Safari Park Visitor Centre.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time*

**LAND TAX**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. How does the Premier expect the people of South Australia to support his land tax bill when members of his own party room don't?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: that relates to a bill that is before the house.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to allow the Premier an opportunity, but the point of order has merit. I am going to allow the Premier the opportunity because I think he can answer without contravening standing orders.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08):** Thank you very much, sir. I take this opportunity to just remind this house what is actually before the house at the moment. This is a once in a generation opportunity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** This is a once in a generation opportunity, which should not be lost. And what do we find from those opposite?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** What do we find? Base politics. Hours and hours spent by those opposite talking about the title—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, cease gesticulating.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —of the bill.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** That is what they are talking about opposite. They are not putting the people of South Australia first. They have never put the people of South Australia first—never, ever. Not content with 16 years—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —in government, with a massive handbrake on our economy, now they are trying to apply that same handbrake whilst they are in opposition. We are committed. We are committed to the people of South Australia—a fairer land tax system for South Australia, a lower land tax regime, whilst those opposite want to entrench the highest land tax rate in the nation: 3.7 per cent. They love tax. They are addicted to tax. They want to inflict this high tax regime on every single South Australian.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The people of South Australia threw them out of government and installed a government, and the people of South Australia expect this government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to push ahead with reform, and reform is tough. Reform is tough. Those opposite, whilst they were in government, were content to sweep these tough problems under the carpet because they didn't have the ticker. They didn't have the backbone for tough reform. They are great at throwing hand grenades, but the reality is that what we need in this state is a parliament that can actually put the people of South Australia first, and that is what we have done.

We have a balanced position that is before the parliament at the moment. We are going to be arguing every second that we have for the case for reform to take us off the highest land tax rate in the nation—3.7 per cent, a crippling rate—down to the top marginal rate in South Australia of 2.4 per cent. It's the biggest drop in the history of South Australia: 3.7 down to 2.4, and what are they doing? They are whingeing about it. They are whingeing about it and talking for hours and hours and hours on the title of the bill.

This is a disgrace. Those opposite should hang their heads in shame. They are led by the weakest opposition leader in this state's history, a leader with no backbone whatsoever, a leader who allows his motley crew to thumb their nose at the people of South Australia and talk for hours and hours, hold up this parliament—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and have the officers from the department sitting here until midnight to talk about the title of a bill because they have nothing constructive to offer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They have nothing constructive to offer. They are just blockers. They do not put the people of South Australia first—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and they are not worthy.

**The SPEAKER:** I remind members that there is a bill before the house concerning land tax. The leader can be seated for one moment.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to parliament today the former Governor of South Australia Marjorie Jackson Nelson, AC, CVO, MBE—I believe she is a two-time Olympic gold medallist and seven-time Commonwealth Games gold medallist—and also Margaret Ralston AM, South Australian Journalism Association Hall of Fame member. They are guests of the member for Mawson. Welcome to parliament today.

*Question Time*

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the leader, I have to call a number of members to order: the member for Badcoe and I warn her; the member for West Torrens; the members for Lee, Playford and Reynell; the deputy leader; the member for Morphett; and the member for Mount Gambier.

**LAND TAX**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** My question is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Settle down.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, I'm trying to give your leader a question.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier respect the decision of the member for Davenport to withhold support for his land tax policy?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: that is a reflection on the vote of the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, it can be taken that way. I am going to uphold that point of order. Leader of the Opposition, I am going to give you another question.

**LAND TAX**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** My question is to the Premier. Has Treasury been asked to undertake any further modelling in preparation of yet another land tax policy?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13):** Can I hear the question again?

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is called to order. I would like to hear the question and the answer.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question being to the Premier: has Treasury been asked to undertake any further modelling in preparation of yet another version of his land tax policy?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I said in the house yesterday, and I'm happy to say it again today, we are working towards a resolution of this very important reform bill that is before the parliament in South Australia.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** There are changes a-coming.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** There is change on the horizon.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We are continuing to talk to industry. We are happy to talk to the opposition because we would like to see an improved situation in South Australia. We make no apology for that whatsoever.

#### LAND TAX

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier rule out negotiation regarding his controversial aggregation policy?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: the question being about aggregation policy rather than land tax policy as a whole. Aggregation policy is specifically, as those opposite keep saying, a policy—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I believe there is a clause that does relate to aggregation so, leader, I am going to give you another question and then I am going to move to the member for King—a separate question.

#### LAND TAX

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house what areas of his land tax policy he is willing to negotiate on?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** I refer the honourable member to my previous answer.

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order. The member for King has the call.

#### EXTENDED SUPERVISION LAWS

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:15):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is warned.

**Ms LUETHEN:** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General provide an update to the house on how our extended supervision laws are operating and what work has been done to make our community safer?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:15):** Thank you, Mr Speaker—

**Mr Brown:** Have you asked the Chief Justice?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is warned. Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —and I appreciate the question from the member because it gives me an opportunity to confirm, as I said yesterday, that I have been speaking to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and other relevant agencies, such as the Parole Board, the Department for Correctional Services and my fellow minister, of course, about the potential reform regarding high-risk offenders and their supervision once they complete their sentence.

These are people, I remind the house, who have done their time, completed their sentence, had their punishment and they are let out. Around the country a few years ago, including South Australia under the previous Labor government, legislation was introduced and passed to try to deal with the safety of the community in a circumstance where, first, someone had completed their sentence but was determined by definition as a high-risk offender and, secondly, they would continue to be an appreciable risk to the safety of South Australians, and we supported that from opposition.

Although South Australia's legislation was comprehensively more extensive, and therefore we have had quite a number of cases come before the courts, there had been a concern raised by the Chief Justice—I think late last year on the first occasion—when he raised the question about

whether courts should remain the decision-making body. In other words, he said, 'This is not a jurisdictional issue for us. We determine the facts, we convict, we sentence. It is not our job, which is an administrative matter, to deal with those offenders in those circumstances.'

He also raised the question of whether we should deal with offenders who were determined by his court to be unwilling or incapable of controlling their sexual instincts. These are the Schusters, the Humphrys. We have heard of these cases—and I refer to public cases, of course—where the Supreme Court has been asked to deal with their release on licence as part of that regime.

I think it is fair to say that I expressed the view to the Chief Justice at the time that the question of the latter group was one for which supreme courts around the country have responsibility—they have for decades—and that that should continue. We have continued to negotiate on these matters. He advised me by letter a few months ago that he agreed, actually, in relation to those matters, and that that was an area of jurisdictional responsibility—those very difficult cases where the indeterminate continued incarceration of those persons would remain, then they should be a matter that the Supreme Court kept.

We have made the commitment to him, and we are progressing the question of how we deal with high-risk offenders, and that work will continue.

#### SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENTS

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:19):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with the views expressed by the Chief Justice in a letter to the Budget and Finance Committee published in *The Advertiser* today?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:19):** I thank the member for the question because, again, the matters that were raised in the Budget and Finance Committee, of which there has been a publication of the letter in response to them I think a month ago, the Chief Justice had provided information to the committee on that. He outlined the number of auxiliary judges whom he had arranged or at least asked me as Attorney-General to seek the appointment of over the last few months.

They were provided to the committee in that correspondence. He expressed a concern that, although one of his judges had recently retired in June—a little earlier than expected but, nevertheless, she had retired—and that one was on its way, he felt that it was necessary to populate his court with permanent replacements and set out the reasons why that was important. As I have indicated publicly, it is also important that we consider the appointments in light of legislation which is currently before the parliament in respect of the proposed establishment of an appeal court division of the Supreme Court of South Australia, which would remain, of course, under the responsibility of the Chief Justice.

They are all matters that I have continued to discuss with him. Meanwhile, at his request, to ensure that he is not caught short, there are two things that have happened. One is a continuation of his funding for his judges—a judge at this stage but it will be judges—so that he has the financial support to enable him to continue to provide the services of the Supreme Court to South Australians. Secondly, there are 10 appointments—three retired Supreme Court judges, six District Court judges and two current masters, as they are known in the Supreme Court, as auxiliary judges, just in case he needs any of them. To date, I am advised he has only utilised the services—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** You are criticising the Chief Justice.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** To date—no, this is not a contentious or difficult issue to understand. He has only utilised the services of one of them, but just in case he needs all the others, at his request and without exception, the government has supported the appointment of the auxiliary judges, a number of them with diverse skills, to ensure that the workings of the Supreme Court can continue, because it does important work and it is important that it continues to do that irrespective of whatever structures may be changed by this parliament.

**SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENTS**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:22):** My question is to the Attorney-General. When will the Attorney-General appoint the two vacant positions at the Supreme Court, as has been repeatedly requested by the Chief Justice?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:22):** I appreciate the question. I would have thought the member would remember that the process by which judges are appointed in South Australia—

**Mr Picton:** When will you recommend it?

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —is by a recommendation of the cabinet to the Governor to make that appointment. I have had the pleasure, in the short time I have been the Attorney-General, to appoint four judges, actually, and I have been honoured to be able—

**Mr Picton:** I thought you said it's not you. You said it was the Governor.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —to present at their commission to enable them to undertake—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —their duties to represent people in the District Court—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member Badcoe! Members on my left, please!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —and the Industrial Court, and members, if they read the *Gazette*, would see the repeated reappointments of a number with SACAT. There is one current vacancy at the Supreme Court as a result of the retirement of Justice Vanstone a few months ago, and there is one that is imminent because Justice Hinton, as has been publicly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —identified, has decided to apply to be the new DPP in South Australia. The appointment panel that recommended his appointment has—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: in the course of the Deputy Premier's answer, time seemed to have temporarily stopped.

**The SPEAKER:** I promise you that did not happen. I promise the member for Lee that did not happen. We have corrected it.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Justice Hinton has decided that he wants to apply to be the Director of Public Prosecutions. The panel have put that recommendation and the government has announced that he is the successful candidate. Shortly—in fact, next month—he will be undertaking that responsibility, and we are very proud as a government that he has made this application and that he is going to take up that position.

That will, in due course, leave a vacancy in the Supreme Court. Again, I will be meeting with the Supreme Court Chief Justice—later next week I think is our next appointment; we meet basically every month—and that will be another matter on our agenda, the proposed replacement. But just in case he needs anyone else other than retired Judge Michael David, who is the only one he has used so far, there are a whole lot of other people who are there and ready to fill the breach. As he has requested, they have been appointed just in case he needs them.



**ATTORNEY-GENERAL**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:25):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Why does the Attorney-General keep picking fights with senior judicial officers, the most recent examples being a royal commissioner, the ICAC commissioner and the Chief Justice, and when does her own position become untenable?

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

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for—take your pick—perhaps argument, standing order 97.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Argument and everything else in standing order 97.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to allow the Deputy Premier an opportunity to defend herself and answer the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:25):** I will take that as a comment with which I don't agree.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier has answered. Member for Flinders. I will come back to the member for Kaurna.

**VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:25):** My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house about the latest NCVET report released today and what information it provides about the state of South Australia's skills and training sector prior to March 2018?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:26):** I can answer that question. I thank the member for Flinders for his question. Today, the National Centre for Vocational Education and Research (NCVER) released their publication 'Employers' use and views of the VET system'. The report provides results of a survey undertaken every two years which measures employers' use of and satisfaction with vocational education in Australia. The report released today focuses on results from a national survey relating to employers' experiences from February to June last year, that is 2018. The results highlight just how much work we must do as a government to fix the mess that was left by those opposite. This report is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —a story of Labor's legacy to South Australia. It is no wonder they didn't take a skills policy to the last election—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —because they were hiding from the damage that they did over their last term in office. They tossed in the towel. They gave up on the very people they came to represent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order. Minister, be seated for one moment. The member for Waite is called to order, as is the member for Morphett. The member for West Torrens on a point of order for debate?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, sir. The information the minister is quoting is publicly available, as is the report. My precedent, sir, is a young, up-and-coming member for Hartley in the last parliament.

**The SPEAKER:** I didn't have much else to do in opposition.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** On the point of order, the precedents established by Speaker Atkinson are that reflections on publicly available material are fine.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, it is a valid point of order by both the member for West Torrens and the Minister for Education. The minister would have to provide other information that is not in the public domain. I will listen attentively to ensure that he provides that information, and I'm sure he will. Minister.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** They don't want to hear it, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —because they do not want to be reminded about their record in skills training. The proportion of employers in South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left, please!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —that use the VET system—

*Ms Stinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —fell by 6 per cent in just two years, down to 45.3 per cent. It is the lowest rate in the country. Just 66 per cent of those who use the vocational education system believe that it assists them with the skills that they need for a job. That's Labor's legacy again. The proportion of employers in South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —who provide no training in the VET system increased by 4 per cent.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The same point of order?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, the minister is regurgitating the—

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. I believe the minister might want to provide some facts that are in the public domain and then move on to information that is outside the public domain per the practice. I am going to make sure that that happens, or I will sit the minister down.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The question was to provide the house with the information—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —which is what I am doing. Of course, I am more than happy to answer the question for the member for Flinders. It was a very specific question. It was about providing information to the house.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Of course, that 4 per cent increase in the number of employers that don't use the VET system is the highest level in the country. We have the highest number of employers that don't use the VET system in the country—thank you to those over there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Wright!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Just 18.7 per cent of employers had apprentices and trainees in South Australia under those opposite—the second lowest in the country—all of this over the last two years of the Labor government. Of course, we know what happened: they decimated TAFE, they decimated the private sector, they defunded the private sector, reduced TAFE staff by one-third and failed random ASQA audits. But what's happened since? First of all, we were the only party that took a skills and training policy to the election—not those opposite; they were hiding from their record.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, there is a point of order. Before I hear the point of order, the member for Badcoe, I warn her. She is on two warnings, as is now the member for Lee. Point of order?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It's debate now, sir: talking about the Labor Party and its policies is clearly debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I have always tried to be fair and allow some compare and contrast, which I have done, but I will listen attentively.

**Mr Brown:** Zinger! There's a zinger!

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Playford, you can leave for the remainder of question time under standing order 137A, and that is without debate.

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

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** I can't possibly have been talking about the Labor Party's training policy because they didn't have one. They didn't have one in the lead-up to the election. For the first time in seven years, we have seen some green shoots in apprenticeships and trainees. In the very first full quarter of the commencement of Skilling South Australia we saw an increase in the number of trainees and apprenticeships in South Australia after seven years of decrease from those opposite.

What have we done to take on the challenge? We have rebuilt the skills and training commission, we have introduced industry skills councils, we have expanded the Subsidised Training List from 350 that we inherited to 850 now. We are responding to industry needs so that we can deliver a skilled workforce here in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite is warned for imitating the member for Hammond. Member for Kurna.

### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:32):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by the comments of his health minister when he said in July, 'The QEH has the capacity to deal with cardiac emergencies 24 hours a day, seven days a week'?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:32):** As the members opposite will know, we're taking health very seriously. The Central Adelaide—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The Central Adelaide Local Health Network incorporates both The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. As everybody in this place would

know, the CALHN was a complete and utter shambles when we took that over from the previous government. The Leader of the Opposition knows how much of a mess CALHN was in because he was the minister for health at the time. Of course, none of the problems that existed—

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** Take some responsibility.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —in CALHN relate here to the people of South Australia.

**Mr Malinauskas:** You've been in charge for 18 months now—18 months!

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As the Leader of the Opposition points out, we have been in government for 18 months—19, actually.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Since then, we have put more than a billion dollars back into the health budget in South Australia, back into improving health outcomes in South Australia. We are very proud of those outcomes—

**Mr Picton:** Why don't you answer my question?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kaurana is warned. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We're very proud of the increased money that we have put into the health budget of South Australia, and we will continue to do that because we think the people of South Australia deserve much better outcomes. With regard to the specific question regarding cardiology services, can I say that is an operational issue, and CALHN, as per the arrangement, determine what cardiology services are required across their local health network.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, I remind you that you are on two warnings. If you would like to leave today, you are going about it the right way. Member for Kaurana.

### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:34):** My question is to the Premier. If the Premier is saying that this is merely an operational issue for cardiology services at The QEH, is the Premier not aware that he had an election promise to deliver that?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** One moment, minister. The member for Badcoe, you can leave under 137A for the remainder of question time.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, be quiet! The Minister for Energy, once the noise quietens down, will have the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:35):** We take services at all the hospitals very importantly, from the largest all the way through to the smallest country hospital. The delivery of services in country hospitals and metropolitan hospitals is vitally important. I am advised that cardiology services at The QEH are available, and if I receive any further information to the contrary I will certainly let the house know.

But with regard to suggestions from the opposition in regard to CALHN, I noticed the Leader of the Opposition interjecting previously, saying, 'You have been here 18 months. Take some responsibility.' Things are improving in CALHN. In the last 18 months, things have been improving significantly.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphett is warned. The member for Lee is on two warnings.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Things have been improving significantly over the last 18 months. But as the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has said regularly, this is a big job. We inherited a mess. This is a very big job.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Ramsay!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Things have started to turn around. Things have improved.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Wright is warned. The member for Lee can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** It may have been, but still out of order. Thank you, member for Lee. When he leaves, the minister will have the call.

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Yes, things are improving, very significantly improving, but we have a long way to go. The Premier has said this and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has said this. We are not satisfied with the improvements we have made so far and we will keep working at it and we will keep improving health services across the state, whether it be in CALHN or whether it be in regional South Australia.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Surely not the member for Torrens was interjecting there.

#### **HOME BATTERY SCHEME**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining.

*The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, Premier!

**Mr TEAGUE:** Can the minister update the house on the achievements of the Home Battery Scheme in its first year?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37):** Yes, of course I can. Thank you to my friend and colleague the member for Heysen. The Home Battery Scheme is going very well. The Home Battery Scheme has just under 4,000 households which have had new batteries installed and/or which have—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Nearly 4,000 households have had batteries installed and/or have qualified and signed up for the scheme and are awaiting installation. We always knew that this program would start slowly. We always knew that we had inherited a basket case, essentially, with regard to energy policy in South Australia. We always knew that we would have to do the hard work to implement our policies and particularly with the Home Battery Scheme that we would start off slowly and it would ramp up and accelerate, and that is exactly what is happening.

As evidence for this, let me share with the house that in the last whole week's figures, which I receive from the Department for Energy and Mining, one week at that point in time represented 2 per cent of the total time that the program had been running, but 4.5 per cent of the total batteries

sold had been taken up in that one week. So the program is ramping up; it is accelerating. We are growing, just as we predicted to do, and we will get to the 40,000 batteries at the end of the four years just as we said we would.

Why is that important? Of course, we want the households which invest, the households which receive the up to \$6,000 subsidy and, very importantly, the low interest loan for the purchase of the balance of the cost of the battery and the installation of the solar panels. But as well as that, we want all other South Australians to benefit.

Once we have that many households with batteries participating in the scheme and/or in other mechanisms which are available as well, we will then take pressure off our tightest supply-demand balance times across the state. That will improve the system. That will take pressure off and put downward pressure on wholesale prices. That will then flow through to all other South Australian households as well. We are also growing jobs in the state through this. In Elizabeth and down at—what is that southern suburb?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —Lonsdale, thank you—through AlphaESS and Sonnen, we are growing jobs. We have new companies established in South Australia manufacturing these batteries because of the scheme. They both say that if we didn't have this scheme they would not have set up in South Australia and they would not have created those jobs. I can't imagine why those opposite would not be pleased to see hundreds of jobs in Elizabeth and Lonsdale. This is a good scheme, it is going well, it is on track and it will deliver for South Australia.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** We had in the chamber before the Hon. Andrew Evans MLC from another place. I welcome him to parliament today.

*Question Time*

#### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:40):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, why were there no interventional cardiologists rostered on at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital between 8am and 6pm on Thursday 10 October, which is supposedly a 24/7 service?

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:41):** That is a very specific question. I don't have the answer with me about why—

**Mr Picton:** I didn't ask you; I asked the Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** That is a very specific question. I don't have the information with me to be able to explain exactly who was rostered on or not rostered on at that very specific time on that day, but I would be very happy to take that question on notice, get an answer from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and bring it back for the shadow minister.

#### CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:41):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline whether it is the Premier's signature that appears on an election promise, which says, 'We will ensure The QEH has the capacity to deal with cardiac emergencies 24 hours a day'?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: to quote from a document without leave, and it's against the standing orders to do so.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for the insertion of a statement and he would need leave, perhaps. He might even get leave if he asked for it. Would you like leave?

**Mr PICTON:** I will rephrase the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I will take a rephrased question.

**Mr PICTON:** My question is to the Premier.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I will take a rephrased question, and I remind the member for West Torrens that if he disagrees with the Chair there is a way to go about it.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Yes, there is.

**The SPEAKER:** There is. Member for Kaurna.

**Mr PICTON:** My question is to the Premier. Is it the Premier's signature which appears on an election policy document which states that there will be 24-hour services of cardiology at The QEH?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! You have asked your question.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** No ticker!

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mawson, that is unwarranted and you are warned.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:43):** Without seeing the document, it would not be possible for me to say whether it was the Premier's signature or not.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** But I suspect that it would be very easy for the member opposite to determine whether it was the Premier's signature on that document or not.

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:43):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier regret tweeting in June 2017 that emergency department ramping is the worst in 30 years when it is now five times as bad as it was then?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned and the member for Light is called to order. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:44):** Ramping is a very serious issue, there is no doubt about that. It is a very serious issue. Those opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Who are you looking for?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, I am not looking for anyone.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Those opposite, through Transforming Health, left all South Australians in a dreadful situation in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left, order! The member for Light is warned.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** You won't hear anybody from the opposition use those two words, 'transforming' and 'health', right next to each other ever again. They are ashamed of what they tried to do to Health in South Australia.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We have so many truly outstanding doctors, nurses, health professionals, other people working in the health service throughout—

*The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ramsay is warned.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —metropolitan Adelaide, throughout South Australia, but those opposite—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: a minute in and he has mentioned those opposite four times, so it's debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I have consistently allowed some compare and contrast to a point. I will take on the point of order of the member for West Torrens and intervene if I must. Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The reality is that ramping is a very serious problem. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has made it very clear that we, he, the Department for Health, SAAS and the hospitals involved are working incredibly hard to turn around—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Light, you're on two warnings.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** They are working incredibly hard to resolve the problems that were left to us by the previous government. That is exactly what we are doing. It's exactly what we will continue to do. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing is doing a truly outstanding job in this area, and he will continue to do so, and we will continue to see improvements across our health service under his stewardship.

*The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ramsay is warned for a second and final time. The member for Frome.

#### **NYRSTAR CHEMICAL LEAKS**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:46):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister advise the house if he was aware of the reported dead fish which resulted from the acid spillage at Nyrstar at Port Pirie in January this year. If so, who advised the minister? Who made the minister aware of the incident? Who did the minister advise, and who did he communicate it with?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:46):** I thank the member for Frome for his question. Yes, I was aware that there were two dead trumpeters that were taken away for analysis. Those two trumpeters that were taken away were sent up to the Brisbane forensic science laboratories, and they showed no signs of heavy metal contamination. We have had ongoing monitoring since that time on whether there were any further impacts with that sulphuric acid leak.

What I would say is that the fisheries department and the EPA have worked together dealing with the issues there. As the Minister for Environment and Water said yesterday, he was only notified late in the piece. I was notified straight after the contamination. We took it very seriously. The fisheries inspectors weren't able to assess any damage immediately after the leak due to the weather conditions. But once they were able to get there and assess the situation, they collected the fish. They took them away, they analysed them and they came back without any concern.



We are continuing to monitor the situation as to whether there will be any ongoing concern with the impacts to the environment and particularly to the fish life.

#### **FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:48):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister advise the house how the Marshall government is improving outcomes for vulnerable children and young people by growing family-based care?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:48):** I thank the member for Finniss for his question. For many years under the former Labor government, more foster carers left the system than entered. We have turned this around with a net increase of 50 foster carers in the 2018-19 financial year.

Our foster care agencies have worked hard to promote, advertise, recruit and train new carers. The department has also worked hard scoping families for kinship carers. These two factors working together have led to an increase in the number of children and young people in family-based care to approximately 86 per cent of all placements.

We know that under the Labor government the Productivity Commission's Report on Government Services (RoGS) reported that South Australia had double the national average of children in non-family based care. The Liberal government is working hard to turn this around. We know that for the great majority of children family-based care leads to better outcomes, such as better mental health, better school attendance and education outcomes, employment and life skills.

The 2019 Auditor-General's Annual Report shows that the Department for Child Protection is doing their job and doing it well. In fact, it shows that the average cost of care per child has decreased by 12 per cent, from \$76,470 per child in the 2017-18 year to \$67,130 in the 2018-19 year. One of the many ways we have been able to reduce the average cost per child is through increasing our use of family-based care.

We have improved performance through good management practices such as significant reforms in contracting and procurement, including incentives for not-for-profit organisations for providing growth in family-based care services, which have all contributed to us managing our costs well. This means that more children receive the supports they need and it enables my department to better target their resources. We have increased our front-line staff. We have answered more calls more quickly, we have undertaken more investigations and we have reduced the number of 'closed, no actions'. These are good outcomes.

I would like to say again that foster carer recruitment and retaining our wonderful and selfless carers in the system is one of my main aims, along with thorough scoping of kin. Whilst children continue to come into care and whilst we have children in residential care, I remain committed to continuing to recruit foster carers. We know that stability and permanency are important for good outcomes for our children and that foster care gives young people an opportunity to have a family when they are not able to live with their biological family for whatever reason.

There have also been targeted foster care recruitment strategies, including the development of a foster care recruitment and retention task force and a new foster care recruitment website, [fostercare.sa.gov.au](http://fostercare.sa.gov.au), if you would like to take the quiz to see if you might be suitable to foster. We are pleased with the results and we are delivering more to children and young people in need, but there is more work to be done. We are working hard every day to continue to improve outcomes for our most vulnerable children and young people.

#### **PORT PIRIE FISH DEATHS**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. If the minister was aware of the fish deaths in January, why did he not inform his colleague the Minister for Environment and Water, who appears not to have known?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:52):** I thank the deputy leader for her question. I didn't say that I was made aware of the spill in January.

**KORDAMENTHA**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:52):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

**Ms BEDFORD:** Mama's not happy. My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. What footprint or square metres of floor space does KordaMentha occupy at the new Royal Adelaide site and what services were displaced to accommodate KordaMentha's presence?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:53):** Member for Florey, I will make inquiries and come back with regard to the square metreage, or square feet, as I think you mentioned, for KordaMentha. I will also inquire whether indeed they did displace any other service and, if that is the case, come back to you after consulting the Minister for Health and Wellbeing with an answer.

**KORDAMENTHA**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:53):** Supplementary: perhaps while that's happening you could find out whether there are any administrative tasks, financial or otherwise, currently being undertaken by CALHN staff within and for CALHN also being undertaken by KordaMentha staff?

**The SPEAKER:** It was a question, not a direct. Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:54):** That question was for me, Speaker. Same again: I will make that inquiry for you, member for Florey, and come back to you with an answer.

**PORT PIRIE FISH DEATHS**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:54):** My question is again to the Minister for Primary Industries. Why did the minister not inform the Minister for Environment and Water that there were reported fish deaths next to an industrial site?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:54):** I thank the shadow minister for her question. The EPA were leading the investigation and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left and right, please; I'm trying to listen to this answer.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —where fisheries were involved, we inquired about the fish deaths. There were two fish deaths: two trumpeters. They were sent to Brisbane for analysis. There was no heavy metal contamination with the fish—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —which didn't relate to the deaths of the fish, by the sulphuric acid spill.

**RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall government is continuing to build South Australia through the Gawler rail line electrification?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:55):** I rise to speak about the Gawler line electrification project, a project I know that is dear to the heart of the member for Newland. I thank him for his question and also for his renewed interest in this project. The sense of relief—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —that I have received from the public on this issue has been immense, and that relief—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left, this is grossly disorderly. Please, be quiet.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The preceding cynicism I think stems from the fact that this project was more on again, off again than Rachel and Ross from *Friends*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, be seated for one moment. Member for West Torrens, I am putting you on two warnings, and when the Leader of the Opposition interjects with his hand in front of his mouth, which I used to do as an opposition backbencher, I can still hear him. Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Nobody trusted the former Labor government to deliver this project—no-one—and that is due to the fact that three times this project was restarted—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

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

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order for debate. It's a bit rich to call debate when there are constant interjections—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** I wasn't interjecting, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I didn't say you were—I wouldn't accuse you of things that you haven't done, member for West Torrens—but others were, and I ask that they cease so that I can hear the minister's answer. The minister has the call and I will listen to his answer carefully.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** For those poor long-suffering commuters of the northern suburbs, who for generations have loyally voted for the Labor Party, it took a Liberal government to actually deliver better public transport services for them. All the money is there in the budget from the federal and state governments. This project is going ahead. The service work trench has started and people will be able to see hard hats and high-vis on site delivering this project.

For all those long-suffering commuters of the northern suburbs, can I say thank you for your patience. I also know that these people need us to get on and deliver this project not only because it's going to deliver faster services—because we know that electric trains are able to accelerate and decelerate much more quickly—and not only because we are going to deliver 15 per cent extra capacity by the 12 new and three existing electric trains that are going to be delivered as part of this service. Not only will they get greener services but all those residents who live along that corridor will finally get quieter services.

I think that this is a fantastic outcome and, once again, what happens when a grown-up, mature state and federal government partnership is brought to bear. Sitting down and working with minister Fletcher at that stage, now minister Tudge, to deliver this project—they have been a joy to deal with—we have managed to deliver for the people of the north some \$220 million from the federal government and \$395 million from the state government to deliver this project.

Once completed, we will actually be able to provide a modern service for the people of the north and, I note, especially for the people who live in the member for Light's electorate, people I speak to all the time. The cynicism that they have had on this project has been longstanding, but now they can finally rely on a Marshall Liberal government that is going to get the job done. They are going to get the job done and that is a fantastic outcome.

I look forward to updating the house as this project continues to progress as we deliver this project for those 21,000 people each day, some 60,000 commuters across our network, who are

going to get the benefit from this. They will know that they have a government that is willing to invest in public transport, willing to improve public transport services and willing to take the steps necessary to make sure that we have the best network in the country.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Light, you can leave for the remainder of question time because you have been on two warnings and you continue to interject, thank you; and then the deputy leader will have a question once you leave.

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

*The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Energy and Mining is called to order. The deputy leader has the call.

### PORT PIRIE FISH DEATHS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Who informed, or which agency informed, or how did your department become aware that there were fish deaths next to the smelter in Port Pirie?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:00):** I thank the deputy leader for her very important question—

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Giles is called to order for interjecting out of his seat.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —on this very serious matter as outlined clearly in yesterday's ministerial statement and also in my response to the question from the member for Frome. This is a matter where previously there were not protocols in place for either ministers or members of the community to be notified because the incident which occurred did not meet immediate public health concern. However, I have now asked that the board of the EPA review the protocols and the thresholds in place to ensure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —that this does not happen in the future. While there may not have been an issue of immediate public health concern, there certainly was an environmental issue which had occurred.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader and the Deputy Premier, please!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There were two specific issues here: one to do with a fishery, where PIRSA were the lead agency when dead fish were found, and one dealing with a spill, which was a broader environmental incident, where the EPA took the lead at that point. The protocols were not in place at the EPA level, but I do deem this to be a serious incident which ought to be reviewed to make sure that community, civic leaders and ministers are informed where appropriate.

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is called to order. The member for Kaurna and then the member for Mount Gambier.

### CHUA, DR A.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:01):** My question is to the Premier. What is the Premier's response to the concerns raised with the government by Dr Alvin Chua about his patient who collapsed from a heart attack last Tuesday at Athelstone and had to wait 24 minutes for an ambulance to attend?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: the member has a way to ask a question where he seeks to introduce facts. He continues to refuse to do it. He should seek leave if he wishes to ask a question like that.

**The SPEAKER:** The member has two options: he can either paraphrase within standing orders or ask for leave. I happen to know this man, so I am interested in the answer and the question.

**Mr PICTON:** Excellent. So rephrase; is that what you are saying, Mr Speaker?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If it is within order.

**Mr PICTON:** My question is to the Premier. What is the Premier's response to concerns raised by Alvin Chua about his patient who had to wait 24 minutes for an ambulance?

**The SPEAKER:** I will allow that question. Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:02):** It should be no surprise to the member opposite that public comment or comment in this place about a specific situation like that is not something that would normally be forthcoming at all. Again, I am more than happy to go to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and gather any information that might be appropriate to share but, in terms of a specific comment about a specific patient's circumstances, that would certainly not be right.

I have been able to gather some information to share with the member opposite in response to another question he raised earlier, so I will take this opportunity to share the advice I have received, which is that cardiology services are provided across CALHN, and all decisions are made in the best interests of each patient. A clinically appropriate decision was made on 10 October to treat a patient at the RAH, as the cardiologist on duty was attending to another emergency case. There is a review of rostering going on to ensure the best availability of interventional cardiologists at all times. I can confirm that I am advised that cardiology services are available 24 hours a day at The QEH.

#### REGIONAL HOSPITAL CAR PARKING

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:04):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. More than \$70 million has been spent to provide safe and secure car parking and additional spaces at three metropolitan hospitals. What funds are being allocated to provide improved and additional car parking spaces at regional hospitals, in particular in the seat of Mount Gambier?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:04):** For the member for Mount Gambier, car parking at a hospital is an important issue. It is a challenging issue in metropolitan areas. We have made some significant improvements in that regard. It's complicated for a range of reasons with regard to space, with regard to—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —some people needing long stay car parks, some people needing to have the capacity to park quite close to where they need to go at the hospital. There is a lot of complexity in this. With regard to what the member asks about regional hospitals, and particularly Mount Gambier, the 10 regional hospitals in my electorate don't have car parking challenges in that way, so I just share that as an example—10 hospitals in the electorate of Stuart.

Specifically with regard to hospitals in the electorate of Mount Gambier, I have visited the hospital myself—certainly not in my role as minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing but for other reasons I visited that hospital myself. At that time, there were no apparent challenges with regard to car parking at the hospital, but that certainly might have changed. It might be that the days I was there everything was just okay, or perhaps something has changed since then.

For the member for Mount Gambier, I am more than happy to go to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and find out, I suppose, if it has been deemed that there is a need to change or to upgrade the car parking Mount Gambier and, if so, what the plan to address that issue is.

**MCGOWAN, DR C.**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:06):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, contracted with the Premier, subject to any performance management?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Any minister can answer a question, members on my left.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:07):** The member who asks this question was, for a period before the last election, a minister himself.

**Mr Duluk:** Not a good one.

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

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I know that we have made lot of improvements in the last 18 months, but I suspect that in the former minister's time, as is the case now in the Marshall Liberal government, there were performance agreements for all CEs. I think, if I've got it right, the member asked about performance evaluation or performance—

**Mr Picton:** Management.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —management, thank you. That is certainly part of the program that the Marshall Liberal government has. In fact, we as ministers have, not very long ago, just gone through that process with our CEs. I am sure that my experience as Minister for Energy and Mining is no different from that of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in principle in this area, and that is that we have very clear performance agreements and we have very clear KPIs. We do have performance monitoring and management on a very regular process as well.

While I am not familiar with the specific details of the performance criteria or the KPIs that are set for the CE of the Department for Health and Wellbeing, I am very confident to share with the member opposite that performance management is certainly ongoing.

*Grievance Debate*

**AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:09):** A bit over two years ago, the now Premier grabbed at his phone, took to Twitter and tweeted that ambulance ramping was the worst it had been for 30 years in this state. Of course, any ambulance ramping is unacceptable, but at that time there were about 450 to 500 hours that month when ambulances had been stuck outside hospitals. What is the figure now? It has not gone down: it has gone way up. It is now five times the rate it was when Steven Marshall said that ramping was the worst it had been in 30 years. This is a Premier who got elected on the basis of a promise of better services.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: a breach of standing orders by referring to a member of the parliament by name. It is designed to prevent quarrels.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I believe you mentioned a name. It should be 'the Premier' or 'the member for Dunstan'. Is that what the Minister for Education was saying?

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

**The SPEAKER:** I believe he said 'Premier' and then his name.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** Not with the microphone on.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. You have made your point of order. I will listen to the member for Kaurua carefully.

**Mr PICTON:** The government do not want to hear this, but ramping has doubled since they have been elected. They came to office promising that they were going to fix the health system. They came to office promising better services for the people of South Australia, and what has happened is that the situation has become so much worse since then. It was only last time we were here that we were hearing about some of the difficulties that our ambulance services were facing, and the situation has got even worse since then, two weeks ago.

What we saw this week was that we had significant issues with an ambulance call-out for a patient in the member for Mawson's electorate in McLaren Vale who had difficulty breathing, who could not breathe properly. They had to wait over 20 minutes not only for the ambulance to get to them but just for one to be available to send out to that patient, so that person had to wait over 30 minutes for an ambulance to be sent to them.

We also had another issue that came out this week of a patient who was 90 years old who called 000 due to an emergency. It took an hour for the ambulance to come to them, and then that was only the beginning of the journey because the ambulance then took them to Flinders Medical Centre, which had massive ramping. The member for Hurtle Vale, who used to work there, viewed vision of the ramping and said that in her time working there it had never been as bad as that.

Flinders turned her away. They said, 'We can't deal with you here,' so off she went back in the ambulance over to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but they were ramping there, too, so they put her back in the ambulance and sent her to The QEH. For this patient to receive treatment, they were shuttled around our city for seven hours. This is a 90-year-old person stuck on a stretcher for seven hours. They deserve better. Our elderly citizens of this state deserve better. They expect a public health system that is going to care for them.

What is the government's response to this? It is not to invest in any extra resources; in fact, they are pulling resources out. They closed 60 beds across our health system a couple of weeks ago. They said, 'Demand is going down. We don't need these beds. They are going to be mothballed now. But if demand goes up, we will open them back up.'

**Ms Cook:** They are flexible.

**Mr PICTON:** They will flex them back up. Well, they did not flex them back up when that woman was stuck in the back of an ambulance for seven hours. They did not flex them back up when ambulances were stuck on the ramp and not responding to calls in McLaren Vale this week and they did not flex them back up when we heard from Dr Chua in the north-eastern suburbs that somebody was stuck in Athelstone who had had a heart attack and collapsed. Somebody passing by pulled over their ute and called 000, and that person had to wait 24 minutes for a very urgent ambulance to turn up there. This is not acceptable.

The situation is getting so much worse, and the idea that beds are being reopened is a complete lie. The Premier said here, 'Clinicians will be able to reopen them.' That is clearly a lie. Today, we heard allegations that for 10 hours people in the western suburbs were without proper cardiology care at that hospital, which is not only dangerous for those people but is a massive breach of their election promise to reinstate 24-hour coverage for that hospital. When we asked the Premier about it today, he said, 'It's just an operational issue. Nothing to do with me,' even though his signature is on the election promise that said there would be 24/7 coverage for people in the western suburbs. He denies that. The situation is getting so much worse and lives are at risk every day this continues.

## COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:14):** I rise today to speak about a recent trip by the health minister up to Chaffey. It was great to have him visit the doctors, clinicians and both the Waikerie Health Service and Riverland General Hospital. The minister also came up to make the \$4 million announcement for funding for the new MRI machine at the Riverland General Hospital. It is great news for the Riverland and for country health.

We have a government and a minister prepared to put some effort into regional hospitals, and this MRI machine is an outstanding outcome. The \$4.1 million comprises around \$1.5 million for the MRI machine and, just as importantly, the remainder of the funding is for the housing of the machine and ensuring that we have adequate facilities that will assist patients. I think this is an outstanding achievement.

Currently, patients are undertaking around 3,000 trips to Adelaide. For patients who have to travel long distances, it is about a 600-kilometre round trip, and that represents over six hours in a vehicle. There is hardship in having to undergo these scans, in most cases through health misfortune, and it also takes people away from their workplaces and from their families, and it comes at a great cost. To have this MRI machine at the Riverland General Hospital will be an absolute boon.

It is expected to be operational in 2020, which is great news. As I said, this will reduce a significant amount of stress caused by the travelling and financial impact. This facility is another feather in the cap of Riverland health services, so it is great news. It is a commitment to country health services, so I am very, very proud.

**Mr GEE:** Point of order, sir: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I am proud that the Marshall Liberal government is also delivering additional chemotherapy services in the Riverland after a \$6.9 million commitment from the government. We are increasing the investment to allow higher levels of cancer treatment at the Riverland General Hospital, including the deployment of specialised chemo and oncology staff, and the establishment of a pilot program where a local GP receives training in medical oncology.

Furthermore, the \$3.6 million in annual funding for governing boards, including the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network Governing Board, is allowing decision-making closer to the people who deliver and receive that health care. As I said, I commend the Marshall Liberal government for their commitment to regional health services, particularly in the Riverland in the electorate of Chaffey.

I would also like to thank the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network Chief Executive Officer, Wayne Champion; the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network Governing Board Chair, Dr Peter Joyner; and the Director of Nursing at the Riverland General Hospital, Sally Shannon; and the Berri Barmera HAC Presiding Member, Josie Nelson. They have all played key roles in advocating and facilitating the machine to the Riverland.

I must also acknowledge the wider Riverland community for their support on the petition to attract the MRI, not only the licence but the funding for the machine. It is great to see that the state government and the commonwealth government are working together to bring better services to regional South Australia because we all know #RegionsMatter.

### **MATES IN CONSTRUCTION**

**Mr GEE (Taylor) (15:20):** MATES in Construction was created in response to the high level of suicide in our construction industry. Currently, it is almost 190 deaths per year across Australia, and this represents more than one death by suicide every two days. MATES in Construction is a respected organisation that has delivered awareness training to over 20,000 workers in South Australia and almost 200,000 workers Australia-wide. Its purpose is to make construction workers aware of the nature of suicide and provide practical guidance on how to access help for themselves and how to identify when other workers, their workmates, are experiencing suicidal thoughts and need help.

The organisation has many industry partners and appointed the Hon. Dean Brown AO as its honorary patron in 2017. MATES in Construction's training course, the Life Skills Toolbox, is a three-day training course that is widely seen across the construction industry as being responsible for the prevention of many suicide deaths.

The recent decision by this state government's Construction Industry Training Board to cut \$50,000 from MATES in Construction is a disgrace and may lead to more deaths. It is a further disgrace that this announcement was made on the eve of World Suicide Prevention Day, Tuesday



10 September, and two days before R U OK? Day, Thursday 12 September. Every member knows these are days when everybody is encouraged to check with their mates that they are okay. The construction industry workforce is currently 88 per cent male and, as we know, men are more reluctant to seek help.

An article published in the *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* found evidence that 'young males have poorer suicide prevention literacy than older groups; however there is evidence that they are amenable to belief change, and also report greater endorsement of the belief that the workplace has a role in addressing mental health.' The article continued, 'This suggests receptiveness to workplace suicide prevention intervention and points to opportunities to implement workplace programs to improve suicide prevention literacy among young men.'

The research tells us that governments should be investing in suicide prevention programs as a preventative health program. Preventative health is something that as a society we do not invest in anywhere near enough and this new state government has a poor record. First, it was the funding cuts to Shine SA and other health services that delivered several preventative health programs, and now we have this cut to MATES in Construction.

It is unlikely that construction workers will be able to participate in this important course, or the course will have to be delivered in a different way that would lessen the impact of the training. The hypocrisy of this Liberal government is no surprise. On the one hand, the Premier appointed the Premier's Suicide Advocate, namely, the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place, who I know is very supportive of suicide prevention programs and must have been very disappointed with this decision.

But, on the other hand, the Premier axed the MATES in Construction mental health funding following a site visit to the Riverbank development on R U OK? Day. What a disgrace! I have to tell you that when the Premier went over to the Riverbank construction site, he took a whole heap of people over there during suicide week. The workers over there—I spoke to those workers—were very pleased about the Premier's visit. But when they found out about the cut—and I made sure they all knew about the cut of \$50,000—they were not impressed with this government at all.

This decision continues this hopeless new government's disregard for the health of workers. They tried to repeal the labour hire licensing scheme, which was put in place by the previous government to protect labour hire workers from exploitation. This scheme, which has now come into effect, includes stricter penalties for wrongdoers and a requirement for all labour hire companies to be licensed. This is a very important change to protect workers, but it was almost disregarded by this government simply because their mates, the owners of these labour hire companies, do not like the laws that support workers.

In addition, we all know that our health professionals are working in poor culture by fatigue, bullying, double shifts and understaffing. These workers and all South Australians deserve better.

#### **MINDA DUNES COAST PARK**

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25):** It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak about one of the milestones in my local community at Somerton Park. It was an honour to open the Minda Dunes Coast Park on 20 October; a glorious Sunday it was, too. It was a pleasure to be there with the member for Morphett in our community. This is a shared pathway that quintessentially joins the member for Morphett's electorate and my electorate.

There has been a lot of work done along the path linking Kingston Park in the south and Glenelg in the north, but there was one stretch that was left uncompleted when we came into government. Lo and behold, you would not be surprised, Mr Speaker, that it was the toughest stretch that needed to be done. It was a pleasure working with the member for Morphett in delivering this for our communities. It was a significant project that runs through the Minda Dunes.

As you walk along the foreshore from Glenelg through to Seacliff and/or beyond, you no longer have to go in along Repton Road and King George Avenue and duck your way back in. You can actually go along the boardwalk now that is there in its place. The member for Morphett and I

were there to cut the ribbon and open this boardwalk. As I said, it was a beautiful sunny day and they could not wait for us to cut the ribbon. People were lined up, packed up, ready to go and ready to hit this walk. It has been truly outstanding to see so many people appreciate the great work that has been done.

As I said, the member for Morphett and I were there with the Holdfast Bay mayor, Amanda Wilson, and Minda resident Emma Brougham. It was great to launch this with her. She was so excited. In fact, a lot of people from Minda had come down. One of the most delightful things about this new boardwalk is that it really incorporates the beach and the community into the Minda family, and they are such a great part of our community. That Minda community is such a wonderful part of our local area. To be more ensconced in what they are doing, to be able to help and provide support and to see the wonderful people who live there on a more regular basis is absolutely sensational.

I mentioned that the state government committed \$4.3 million towards this project, that is how important it was, and that was the significant part of delivering this wonderful piece of infrastructure. Of course, the local council put in a million dollars as well. Mr Speaker, I invite you to come down to the coast at any time. The member for Morphett and I would be happy to host you and show you along the new public plaza area that is outside the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club, as well as the boardwalk and shared path uses.

What is more, there is actually an educational zone and a great tribute to the Indigenous heritage of the area. There has also been revegetation, public art, seating and a shade structure, fencing, public amenities and an upgrade to the southern plaza car park. It is a great facility that is right in front of the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club.

Coincidentally, the unveiling of the Minda Dunes Coast Park walk coincided with the opening of the 60<sup>th</sup> season of the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club. It was great to be there with the President of the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club, Warwick Holland, and directors and sponsors. Louise Lawson is part of the fundraising and grants committee there. It was with great pleasure that I was able to hand over \$5,000 to the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club as part of our Active Club Program, which is to go towards the surfboats.

The surfboat crew and the surfboat captain in particular, Michael Whitford, was very happy to learn that this money was coming his way. He is a very good local man, Mr Whitford, and the boats that were there were reconditioned boats. They had come from somewhere else, but they were renamed in honour of some of the club legends. They had to go through a little bit of a process. You write on some coins, you put them in the sea, you wait for the sea to rub the writing off and when the writing is rubbed off you can come back and rename the boats. It is something I did not know before, but you learn things every day when you are down at a local surf club.

The boats were named in honour of Andrew Meaney, a longstanding member of the club. His family and his dad, Lance, are great people in our local community. To have a boat named after Andrew, who is a personal friend of mine, was wonderful to see and thoroughly deserved. A boat was also named after Robert Hood—aka 'Grinder', as he is known. Again, he is a great member of that surf club. He has been there for 51 consecutive years as a member, which is truly outstanding. A boat was named after big Steve Cornish as well, and it was great to see. He is another person who has given so much back to that club; in fact, he was the youngest and longest serving president of the club.

They did the champagne thing. The boats were blessed by the club chaplain, Rev. Barbara Paull-Hunt, and it was great to see her there as part of this celebration as well. The tradition is that they pour the champagne over the stern of the boat and over the names that were emblazoned upon the boats. They have to have a little swig as well, as that is the tradition—if it was not the tradition, they made it the tradition—and it was nice to see.

Again, it is a great part of our community. It is wonderful to be in those celebrations and, as a government, to be putting \$4.3 million towards that contribution. I am very proud of it. I know the member for Morphett is as well, so, too, is the Minister for Environment, who plays a big part in our local community. We thoroughly thank all the surf lifesaving volunteers and all the people in our community who enjoy this wonderful new facility.

### THE LIGHTS COMMUNITY AND SPORTS CENTRE

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:31):** On the weekend, I had the opportunity to participate in an amazing opening of the new The Lights Community and Sports Centre, which was in my electorate of Torrens before the boundary redistribution. It is a fantastic new facility, and it is a project I worked long and hard on for the benefit of the community.

In 2014, when I was elected as the member for Torrens, I had a vision of what I thought we needed in the area, somewhere for the community to gather. With all the new development, it was an opportunity for young people and older people to be able to come together and participate in sport and other community activities. This was a challenging task due to finding an appropriate location, as well as sourcing funding, and working with the former state Labor government, Port Adelaide Enfield council and residents to ensure the best outcome.

The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide recognises the importance of integrated sporting facilities to be able to provide sustainable, safe and inclusive spaces, meeting the needs of our community. With Lightsview continuing to grow and new housing developments in the surrounding suburbs of Hillcrest, Klemzig, Oakden and Gilles Plains, securing this facility was vital to coordinate the provision of services and infrastructure, so discussions began in 2015. Eventually, the former Ross Smith school site (prior to that it was Northfield High School) was granted to the Port Adelaide Enfield council. With further government contribution and a significant contribution from the Port Adelaide Enfield council, the centre was established. So it took that long to plan and to deliver.

This is a great example of the state government and the local government working together to achieve a positive result for our community. The centre is really state of the art. It has amazing facilities, including five multipurpose courts with retractable seating that will seat approximately 1,000 people. It is a welcoming, inclusive indoor community place for all people regardless of age, cultural background, socio-economic status or ability. There are multipurpose spaces for groups, including social clubs, local schools and other educational institutions. There is the Delightful Cafe and Pushing Performance in the commercial spaces.

It has modern, adaptable changing areas, including public and team changing rooms, with separate referee changing rooms; shared use for clients and patients at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre for activities, such as wheelchair sports and exercise classes; adaptable spaces for major events; and competition spaces for sport and other activities. There are viewing platforms and there is also a function space that can cater for up to 250 people.

In addition to all these great features, the City of Port Adelaide Enfield has engaged Play Sight, a technology company that enables live streaming of matches, video on demand, intricate analysis tools, injury analysis, as well as live replay functions, and that will be great for immediate feedback when coaching aspiring athletes. This is the first indoor community and sports centre in Adelaide to install this technology. Other organisations that are involved in The Lights include the North Adelaide Rockets Basketball Club and Inclusive Sport SA, Basketball SA and Volleyball SA, and sports including box fit, tai chi, lacrosse, fencing, badminton, netball, wheelchair sports, roller derby, line dancing, kabaddi and carrom.

The North Adelaide Rockets Basketball Club's home was at Hillcrest Stadium for 48 years. On Sunday I joined them on the Big Red Walk, when more than 500 people walked from Hillcrest Stadium to The Lights to open the stadium to basketball. More than 500 people participated because, of course, The Lights stadium is the new home for the Rockets Basketball Club.

It was great to have vice-president, David Durant, there with his wife, Helene—he is also the coach and he has played a significant role in the club over many years, including overseeing the project from the perspective of the Rockets Basketball Club—, as well as the president of the Rockets Basketball Club, Wayne Schild, and of course Rockets legend and Australian Opals basketball silver medallist, Jo Hill, was there, and her signature on the floor of the main court was unveiled.

### FOSSIL FREE SA

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:36):** As the member for Mount Gambier, I see it as my duty to represent all people within my community, even if they hold differing views from mine. With that in mind, I committed to tabling a letter from Fossil Free South Australia only to find that tabling a letter

is not possible and that the only way to do it is to read it into *Hansard* through a grieve, and that is what I am doing now.

Whilst I did not sign this letter, I want it to be on the record that I do support a long-term move away from fossil fuels. I believe that this will be best achieved with all tiers of government work together. I believe our state needs to continue its transition for more renewable sources of energy that will have less environmental impact, but it needs to be done in a planned and predictable manner that includes base load power to ensure continuity of supply.

This letter is from Fossil Free SA. It is addressed to the Premier, Mr Marshall; the environment minister, David Speirs; and the minister for mines and energy, Dan van Holst Pellekaan. It reads as follows:

We are writing in response to the announcement on May 27 2019 stating that 'Bidding is now open for five new Petroleum Exploration Licences (PELs) in the Cooper Basin in the State's Far North and three new petroleum exploration licences in the Otway Basin in the State's Limestone Coast region'.

Gas and oil companies have until November 29 to apply for these exploration licences.

We are in a global climate emergency and the October 2018 IPCC Special Report has warned that a rapid phase out of fossil fuel use is essential.

Climate impacts are already killing people and destroying ecosystems, and inviting new fossil fuel exploration and extraction will lead to yet more climate damage.

The easiest and least disruptive step towards phasing out fossil fuel use is to stop new fossil fuel exploration and extraction before it starts.

We, the undersigned, ask you to revoke the May 2019 release of oil and gas exploration areas in the Cooper, Eromanga, and Otway Basins and to ban all further fossil fuel exploration and all new fossil fuel extraction projects (those not yet approved) in South Australia.

During the transition to renewable forms of energy, supply of gas for backup electricity generation, industry, and household use is guaranteed by clauses attached to the 2017 PACE grants for recent new gas extraction projects.

Any further new gas extraction in South Australia is likely to mean more gas exports—we don't need it.

South Australia already has over 50 per cent renewable electricity, meaning that all-electric households (even those without solar PV) have much lower carbon emissions than those households that still use gas appliances.

They also have lower energy bills, so the trend away from domestic gas use is likely to continue.

The possibility that new fossil fuel projects might create new jobs is no excuse for allowing new climate-damaging projects.

In 2017-18 renewable energy projects provided 17,740 direct jobs in Australia, with more employment guaranteed as further projects are rolled out.

It is a myth that fossil fuels make anyone except fossil fuel companies rich. Total fossil fuel royalties for South Australia in 2017-18 were only \$86 million, suggesting possible missed revenue of maybe \$10 million/year if new fossil fuel extraction is banned.

We ask you to step up as a climate leader and take at least this first and easiest step in response to the climate emergency by banning new fossil fuel projects in South Australia and revoking the May 2019 release of oil and gas exploration areas.

Youths faithfully,

Fossil Free SA and the co-signers

As I would like to reiterate, I did not sign that letter but, as a member with constituents who have signed it, I saw it as my duty to read it into *Hansard* and pass it on to the three ministers as I said I would.

*Personal Explanation*

### **SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENTS**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:41):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** In question time today, I provided information to the parliament in respect of the auxiliary judges who have undertaken work and indicated there was only one, that is, former judge of the Supreme Court Michael David. In fact, I am informed that a second auxiliary judge has been utilised. I am not sure yet how long it was for, whether it was one application or for a day or whatever, but nevertheless I advise the house that Katrina Bochner, one of the masters that I had indicated had been appointed, has also been utilised.

*Bills*

**SURROGACY BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Schedule 1, page 19, after line 34—Insert:

3A—Amendment of section 15—Donor conception register

- (1) Section 15(1)—delete 'The Minister may' and substitute 'The Minister must'
- (2) Section 15(2)—delete 'If the Minister does keep the donor conception register, the register' and substitute 'The donor conception register'
- (3) Section 15(8)—delete subsection (8) and substitute:
  - (8) This section applies in relation to assisted reproductive treatment whether provided before or after the commencement of this section.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will briefly indicate that we accept the amendment on behalf of the government. Although the model is yet to be identified as to the operation of the register, that will be a matter that will be attended to by the nominated minister who is, of course, the Minister for Health. Accordingly, I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** What is the implication of the amendments?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The amendments are to make it mandatory so that instead of 'The Minister may' it becomes 'The Minister must', as moved by the Hon. Connie Bonaros and, secondly, to substitute a description of the donor conception register after deleting the words 'If the Minister does keep the donor conception register'. That is generally to make it consistent. The third is to delete subsection (8) and substitute:

- (8) This section applies in relation to assisted reproductive treatment whether provided before or after the commencement of this section.

It introduces the obligation of the minister to establish and maintain a donor conception register; and for the member's benefit we are accepting that whilst we are indicating that we are still yet to determine the model.

**The CHAIR:** The member for West Torrens has asked a question on the amendment and the Attorney has answered. Is there any further discussion on that? If not, I will put the question that the motion be agreed to.

Motion carried.

**LEGISLATION (FEES) BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:46):** I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended to enable the adjournment of the house to extend beyond 7pm.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of members is not present, ring the bells.

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:50):** Thank you, sir. The opposition has not been informed by the government why they are seeking this suspension. After the election, the Manager of Government Business made arrangements with the opposition to inform us in advance of sitting times and sitting dates and of these procedural matters. As far as I know, the opposition has not been informed.

**Mr Pederick:** It's on the green.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is on the green, okay. Well, usually this is done by agreement. We are not opposing—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We will not be opposing this measure, sir, but I just want to point out to the—

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** You want to point out something, you just haven't figured out what it is yet.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister for Energy and Minerals, you will come to order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir. Again, regardless of it being on the green, which has brought great merriment to the government, usually these things are done with the agreement of the opposition. It has not been done on this occasion. It is unfortunate, because the opposition is not opposing this measure, but the green is not an advance notice for members to make arrangements in their constituencies and other areas, and it is, quite frankly, unprecedented. The government should inform the opposition 24 hours in advance.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Thank you, member for West Torrens, for that contribution.

Motion carried.

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

That sitting of the house be extended beyond 6pm.

Motion carried.

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

That the time allotted for the remainder of the committee stage on the Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill be 30 minutes and that the time allotted to the third reading be five minutes.

**The CHAIR:** It has been moved; is that seconded?

**Honourable members:** Yes, sir.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no debate on that, member for West Torrens. I am going to put the question. All those in favour say aye; those against say no. The ayes have; it is carried.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I now move—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sorry?

**Mr Brown:** A division was called.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I did not hear that. My apologies, I did not hear that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It seems that nobody heard it, but I am happy to accept it. I was surprised that I did not hear that a division was called for. If somebody did, I am—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, member for Lee! Take a seat, please, Attorney. I am going to re-put the question. I did not hear a division called for but it may well have been.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: I ask the member for Lee to withdraw and apologise.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Once again, I did not hear what the member for Lee said. The Minister for Education has asked that the member for Lee, for whatever he said, withdraw and apologise. It was difficult for me to hear with all the banter going on.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I withdraw and apologise, sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Lee. I am going to re-put the question.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 24  
Noes ..... 21  
Majority ..... 3

#### 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.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried.

*Matter of Privilege***MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:59):** I rise on a matter of privilege. Yesterday, in question time, I asked the Premier, 'Other than the Property Council, can the Premier name another industry group that supports his latest version of his land tax policy?' In response to that question, the Premier answered, 'I am going to allow the opposition all the time they like during the committee stage.' This place—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would like to hear the matter of privilege. The member for Lee is entitled to raise a matter of privilege, just like any other member in this place.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Transport, be quiet! I am trying to listen to this.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. We have just considered a guillotine motion in this place, where the Leader of Government Business moved that the committee stage of the Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill only proceed for a further 30 minutes. There was then a vote on that motion. The government voted in favour of it, the opposition voted against it and a division was called.

Indeed, the record of that division will now show that not only did the government vote in favour of that guillotine motion to limit the amount of time that the parliament will now have to consider the committee stage of the bill to 30 minutes but that the member for Dunstan—the Premier himself, who had previously advised the house that in the future he would provide as much time as the opposition would like in the committee stage of the bill—voted against it.

Sir, your test for a matter of privilege has always been to apply the test previously applied by McGee—that is, whether the efforts of a member in their actions in the house did serve, or would serve, to obstruct or frustrate the business of the house. Clearly, the committee stage of this bill—

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am in the middle of raising a matter of privilege.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, there is a point of order; I will take the point of order. What is the point of order?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you, sir. The member is presenting a matter of privilege. He is entitled to put the information before the house, which he suggests—not to have an argument or debate about it and not to debate the matter, but to put the information—and he has done that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, Attorney-General. I am going to ask members on my left and right to be quiet. If I hear any other interjections, members—I do not care if they are ministers or backbenchers—will be leaving the chamber. I am going to listen to the member for Lee's matter of privilege so that I can try to adjudicate it.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Mr Speaker, just before I continue my matter of privilege, on that point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, I would ask you to stick to the matter of privilege, please, unless it is highly relevant, because I would like to hear it and adjudicate on its merits.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We have had a guillotine motion put by the government, it was opposed by the opposition and there was a division. The division recorded that the Premier himself—the member for Dunstan, the same member as Premier who gave the commitment to the house that in the future he would allow the opposition as much time as it liked in the committee stage of the bill—and his government have voted in exactly the opposite way. He and his government have voted to curtail the amount of time that the opposition has in this committee stage, and—



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond and the Leader of the Opposition, I am going to ask you to leave while I hear the member for Lee. I warned you; I am now acting. I am listening to the member for Lee.

*The honourable members for Croydon and Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** More to the point, at the commencement of the committee stage last night I had raised that I would be seeking to put to the government and on the record a number of queries during the committee stage that came from members of the community and constituents. It was clear to the government, after the Premier had given that commitment in question time, that in the course of the committee stage there was to be information put to the government and queries made of the government for response for the benefit of the opposition and those people the opposition represents. The fact that that commitment from the Premier was given barely 24 hours earlier and has now been broken absolutely impedes the business of this government. As I was saying previously, the test that has always been—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Parliament.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Parliament, sorry. As I was saying previously, the test that you have always applied, sir, is that test of McGee about whether a member's actions impede the business of the house. There can be no clearer example about how the Premier, the member for Dunstan, has said one thing and deliberately and consciously acted the other way.

Not only is he the Leader of the Government who moves that motion but he himself voted to ensure that the commitment he had given to this place was thwarted. That is clearly a matter of privilege which not only needs to be raised but needs to be found and agreed by you, sir, and I now furnish you with the relevant information from *Hansard* yesterday.

**The SPEAKER:** I thank the member for Lee. While the member for Lee is entitled to provide me with that background information, with great humility I say to the member for Lee that, whilst I appreciate any member's ability and availability to raise a matter of privilege, I do not believe that it meets the threshold required. However, obviously, that does not prevent the member for Lee from either dissenting from that ruling or also moving a substantive motion.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left and right, if you want to disagree with my ruling, there is a way to do it. I have pointed out that it is available for you to do that and now is the time to do it in a civil manner. I am making that available. I have taken advice. I do not believe it reaches the threshold; that is my ruling. I am in the house's hands.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I move to establish a privileges committee into the Premier's behaviour.

**The SPEAKER:** No. Because there is not precedence, I am informed that that is not able to be done. However, you could do it by substantive motion.

*Bills*

## **LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

**The CHAIR:** There is a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I ask that the Attorney apologise immediately for her profanity.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I withdraw the reference to the opposition as being idiots, 'look like idiots'.

**The CHAIR:** Attorney, we have not even begun the 30 minutes. I would ask you to withdraw and apologise.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you, and I have done so.

**The CHAIR:** She has withdrawn and apologised.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Say the words, Attorney.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I withdraw and apologise.

**The CHAIR:** Members, we have before us a time-limited debate. There are a couple of things I want to say before we begin, and the first is that we have an amendment to clause 1.

**Ms Hildyard:** Most of us aren't going to get to ask our questions.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Reynell, I am speaking.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** I haven't started the clock yet. I am just explaining where we are up to. We have an amendment to clause 1 before the Chair, which we will need to deal with first up. I am also going to make a short statement in relation to amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3 in the name of the member for Florey. I refer to the amendments put forward by the member for Florey to the Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, schedule 108(2). There are three amendments made by the member.

Amendment No. 1 increases threshold D to \$5 million. By increasing the threshold in the category the amendment, if agreed to, will effectively reduce the tax payable on the land in each category. As this amendment would effectively decrease the amount of tax taken by the government, I rule that it is within the standing orders and can be moved by a private member.

**Ms Bedford:** Really? I was told I had to withdraw it.

**The CHAIR:** Bear with me, member for Florey. Amendment No. 2 deals with funding of public and community housing. While it stipulates an amount to be applied to public and community housing, it does not increase taxation and therefore is in order to be moved by a private member. Amendment No. 3 seeks to increase the amount of tax taken for every \$100 for various categories in the act. This is contrary to standing order 362, which states:

No amendment for the imposition, or for the direct or indirect increase, of a tax, rate, duty or impost may be proposed except by a Minister.

I therefore rule that the member for Florey's amendment No. 3 on the schedule is out of order.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Point of order: so I am not a minister and I am allowed to move amendments Nos 1 and 2; is that correct?

**The CHAIR:** You are allowed to move amendments Nos 1 and 2, yes, but not amendment No. 3. As further information for members, I have before me an amendment that has been tabled by the member for Enfield. Unfortunately, under standing order 114, we are not able to accept that amendment because it needed to be circulated to members at least one hour before the expiration of the allotted time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: my understanding is that the table received that amendment before the ringing of the bells had concluded on the matter of the guillotine. Given that the guillotine had not yet been voted on by the house, surely you can seek advice about whether or not the guillotine was in place when the amendment was received.

**The CHAIR:** You have a point, member for West Torrens. Unfortunately, I am going to stay with standing order 114 and determine that it was not circulated within one hour.

**Mr PICTON:** Point of order: I am reading standing order 114(c), which, as you say, does make reference to amendments that have been tabled an hour before, but that is in relation to the expiration of the time under the guillotine. We are not at the point of the expiration of the time under

the guillotine. There is still the potential that this amendment could be debated within the 30 minutes that has been allocated for the debate.

**The CHAIR:** That is right, member for Kaurana, but we are about to begin debate. We have 30 minutes, and it was tabled at 3.53pm today.

**Mr PICTON:** The clause says it is about the expiration of that time. We are not at that time. We have the ability to debate amendments in this time that has been allocated.

**The CHAIR:** No, but we will be.

**Mr PICTON:** That includes that amendment. There is nothing in the standing orders that limits amendments that have not been provided an hour before from being debated within the allocated time under the guillotine.

**The CHAIR:** My advice is they have to be tabled at least an hour before. We are going to start this debate. You have 30 minutes. There is an amendment to clause 1. The amendment has already been moved by the member for Light.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes .....22

Noes .....24

Majority .....2

#### AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bell, T.S.	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. (teller)	Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.		

#### NOES

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.	Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 2.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Clause 2 of the bill principally deals with the commencement date, which I think is rather important. The reason why the commencement of this bill is important is that it occurs, under the proposition here, during the course of this term of government. Not once before the last state election, which was not 18 or 19 months ago, did we hear the now Premier, the member for Dunstan, ever communicate to the people of South Australia that he had a plan for a substantial retrospective land tax change that would see an aggregation measure introduced that would end up costing thousands upon thousands of South Australians and some small business owners an extraordinary amount of money.

We have heard repeatedly the calls of people who potentially will be subjected to an increase in their land tax in the order of 2,000 per cent—2,000 per cent—and the commencement of this bill occurs smack bang right during the middle of this term of government. Had the member for Dunstan or the Premier had the courage of their convictions, or had the courage of Prime Minister Howard or even former federal leader Bill Shorten, to take this proposition to the election, the date in this bill would be 1 July 2022. As you are well aware, the opposition has sought to amend the commencement of this bill to 1 July 2022 but has been denied the opportunity to produce that amendment.

This house has been denied the opportunity to vote on an amendment because the government is, yet again, guillotining the debate. Not only are we seeing the government guillotining the debate for the people who are the elected representatives of South Australians but we are seeing the government do that on a measure that would give South Australians the opportunity once and for all to determine whether or not a retrospective tax aggregation measure should apply to South Australians in such a punitive way. It is extraordinary.

If 92 per cent of South Australians are better off, if this is a brilliant policy of the member for Dunstan, of the Premier, if this is a lay-down misère, no-brainer piece of reform, why does he not take it to an election? He deprived the people of South Australia of that choice in March last year. Why not provide them with that choice in March 2022? Why not? It must be an absolute political ripsnorter: 92 per cent of people are better off apparently.

I might have a couple of reasons why not. Firstly, on 1 July next year, South Australians will start to become aware of the fact that that 92 per cent figure is a complete misrepresentation of the truth because on 1 July next year, the tax changes that are already *l-a-w*—law—particularly those people who are at the lower end of the land tax regime, will get the benefit and then the 92 per cent figure will come up a cropper.

The second reason why this government is denying debate on providing the people of South Australia with the opportunity to have a say on this measure is that they know the government will not hold. They cannot even get their numbers to stick in the course of this discussion, let alone all the way up to the next election.

Isn't the member for Bragg loving every moment of it? I have not seen the member for Bragg enjoy a debate quite like this one, and one wonders why. It is incredibly unfortunate that not only is this government depriving this parliament of an opportunity to debate an amendment but what they are really doing is depriving the people of South Australia a say on this bill. That is incredibly unfortunate. One would have expected the government to provide people with that choice. They denied it in March last year. They should not be denying it in March 2022, but the people of South Australia will not forget, particularly if this bill passes.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Do you have any questions?

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Absolutely I have a question for the member for Bragg: why you will not take it to an election?

**The CHAIR:** Does the Attorney wish to respond?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will take that as a comment or a rhetorical question. I am happy to answer any questions in relation to the commencement clause.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I have a very clear and specific question for the Deputy Premier, for the Attorney-General. Why did the government not contemplate, during the course of the development of this bill, making the operative date the 1 July 2022?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I do not understand the relevance of the question to the commencement date. Clearly, there are two aspects of the commencement clause. One is to make provision for the transitional provisions of the bill to commence on assent, and that will allow certain notifications to be given in the lead-up to the commencement of the amendments. Of course, if passed, the amendments to the Land Tax Act 1936 will 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. That is the proposition before the Chair, and I am happy to answer any questions in relation to that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

Clause 5.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I indicate that the opposition will be opposing this clause. This clause contains a large swathe of definitions, which will give the capacity for the Land Tax Act to give effect to the punitive increase in land taxes that the retrospective application of these new aggregation measures will enable, and so we will be opposing this clause.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes ..... 24  
Noes ..... 22  
Majority ..... 2

#### 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.	Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bell, T.S.	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.	Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.		

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 6 to 11 passed.

Clause 12.

**The CHAIR:** Attorney, you have an amendment?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I do, but, with respect, the member for Florey also has one to this clause. I will take your guidance as to whether she goes first, but I think she does.

**The CHAIR:** The member for Florey's amendment is consequential on yours being passed.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I have only briefly looked at the member for Florey's amendment. It just refers to the same deletion of subclause (2) but with a deletion of the amount. I am in your hands, Chair.

**The CHAIR:** We might stop the clock.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am advised, Mr Chair, that the member for Florey's motion is really consequential on the one that she now cannot move. That is what I am advised.

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes, absolutely. I am just indicating that is my understanding from the advice I have received that, whilst this is a lawful amendment, it is still an amendment that is consequential upon the delivery of amendment No. 3, which has been disallowed. I will leave it with the member for Florey to put that to you.

**The CHAIR:** We will start the clock. After some discussion, we will ask the Attorney-General to move her amendment .

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

Amendment No 1 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 11, lines 26 to 27 [clause 12(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

- (2) Section 8A(2), table, rows relating to Threshold D and Threshold E—delete these rows and substitute:

Threshold D	\$1,350,000
-------------	-------------

- (2a) Section 8A(3)—delete 'each of the thresholds' and substitute:

thresholds A, B and C

- (2b) Section 8A—after subsection (3) insert:

- (3a) Subject to this section, for each financial year after the 2020-21 financial year, threshold D will be adjusted in accordance with the following table:

Financial year	Threshold D amount
2021-22	\$1,350,000
2022-23	\$1,600,000
2023-24 and each subsequent financial year	\$1,600,000 adjusted in accordance with subsection (3b)

- (3b) Subject to this section, for the 2023-24 financial year and each subsequent financial year (year x), threshold D will be adjusted to take into account increases in the site value of land according to the following formula:

$$\text{Threshold D}_{\text{year } x} = \$1,600,000 \times \text{Index Value}_{\text{year } x}$$

where—

Threshold D <sub>year x</sub>	represents threshold D for the relevant financial year (year x)
Index value <sub>year x</sub>	= Index value <sub>year x-1</sub> × (1 + Avg percentage change in site values <sub>year x</sub> )
	where Index value year x is the Index value for the relevant financial year (year x) and the average percentage change in site values for that financial year is determined under subsection (4), and with the Index value for the 2022-23 financial year being 1.

- (2c) Section 8A(4)—delete 'subsections (2a) and (3)' and substitute:

subsections (2a), (3) and (3b)

- (2d) Section 8A(5)—delete subsection (5) and substitute:

- (5) If, after applying subsection (4) to determine the Index value for a particular financial year (year x) under subsection (3) or (3b), the result would be an Index value for year x that would be less than or equal to an Index value that has applied for—

- (a) if the index value is determined under subsection (3)—the 2020-21 financial year or a subsequent financial year occurring before year x; or

(b) if the index value is determined under subsection (3b)—the 2022-23 financial year or a subsequent financial year occurring before year x, the thresholds for year x will remain unchanged (so as to be equal to the year x-1 amounts).

**The CHAIR:** The member for Florey can move her amendment now.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bedford-1]—

Page 11, lines 26 and 27 [clause 12(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

(2) Section 8A(2), table, rows relating to Threshold D and Threshold E—delete these rows and substitute:

Threshold D	\$5,000.000
-------------	-------------

I am happy to move the amendment standing in my name, which I think is very minor, in fact, and an enhancement of yours, Attorney, in line with the recommendations and representations received by SACOSS. I put it to the members of the house that this is an essential part of the social justice measures of this bill.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I indicate that the government will not be accepting the amendment, as meritorious as it may be, but we will look at it between the houses.

**The CHAIR:** The question before the Chair is that the amendment by the Attorney-General being amended by the member for Florey be agreed to.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Can I seek clarification here.

**The CHAIR:** I am going to stop the clock again.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you; I appreciate that. Can I clarify that what is being put is my amendment with the member for Florey's amendment. Do I have an opportunity to put my motion in the event that this fails? I ask, Mr Chair if I may, that that position not proceed and that you invite the member for Florey to put her amendment separately; if that fails, you proceed to mine, but I do not want mine to be put in with hers and lapse.

**The CHAIR:** The question is, as I indicated before, that the amendment of the member for Florey to the Attorney's amendment be agreed to.

Ms Bedford's amendment negated.

**The CHAIR:** The question now is that the amendment standing in the name of the Attorney-General be agreed to.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman's amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I indicate that this clause, extensive as it is, also provides for much of the application of the retrospective regime and the opposition will be opposing it.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes ..... 24  
Noes ..... 21  
Majority ..... 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cregan, D.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Luethen, P.  
Murray, S.  
Pisoni, D.G.

Chapman, V.A.  
Duluk, S.  
Harvey, R.M. (teller)  
Marshall, S.S.  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Power, C.

Cowdrey, M.J.  
Ellis, F.J.  
Knoll, S.K.  
McBride, N.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Sanderson, R.

## AYES

Speirs, D.J.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Teague, J.B.  
Wingard, C.L.

## NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Close, S.E.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Michaels, A.  
Piccolo, A.  
Szakacs, J.K.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Brown, M.E. (teller)  
Gee, J.P.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Wortley, D.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 14 to 17 passed.

New clause 17A.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [Bedford–1]—

Page 29, after line 20—Insert:

17A—Public and community housing expenditure

- (1) The Treasurer must ensure that, in each financial year, an amount that is not less than the prescribed portion of land tax levied under this Act during the financial year ending on the preceding 30 June is spent by the Government on public and community housing.
- (2) For the purposes of subsection (1), the *prescribed portion of land tax* levied during a financial year is an amount of \$40,000,000 multiplied by the index value for that financial year published by notice in the Gazette under section 8A(6).
- (3) The Treasurer must, on or before 30 September in each year, lay before both Houses of Parliament a report providing details of Government expenditure on public and community housing during the financial year ending on the preceding 30 June.
- (4) A report required under this section may be incorporated into any other report required to be laid before both Houses of Parliament by the Treasurer.

I recommend this amendment to the house, as part of the measures that have been referred to all of us through SACOSS as a way to ameliorate some of the impacts for people in the state in trying to access social housing. If this land tax bill goes ahead, there should be some ability to move some of that money to relieve that pressure.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I indicate on behalf of the government that the proposed amendment is opposed, without in any way questioning the mover's motivation to assist those persons who seek to access public and community housing. Again, we will have further discussions on that matter between the houses.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I have a further question. I ask the Attorney: if there are any unintended consequences through the measures in this bill that do put pressure on rental accommodation, what remedy are you going to be able to assist these people with? We do not know yet what measures your bill is going to actually produce without seeing modelling, so we are a little unsure as to why this is opposed when it is a small measure.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Mr Chairman, I am not entirely sure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! Member for Florey, you are—



**Ms BEDFORD:** Other people do not want to contribute or listen to the debate, but I actually asked the Attorney a question and it is very disrespectful. Mother is not happy.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am not sure how I get to answer questions in relation to this amendment because it is the member for Florey's amendment, but I think her general concern is how the government is going to address the support and funding of future community housing and public housing. Is that the gist of it?

**Ms BEDFORD:** We do not know what unintended consequences there are going to be from your bill. This is a measure that I am trying to put into the bill when none of us know what is going to happen anyway. I just want to know why this has to be discounted completely when there may be unintended consequences.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Notwithstanding the genuine—

**The CHAIR:** Hang on. Everybody is talking at once.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I am asking the questions, in fairness.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, you have the call, member for Florey, if the Attorney can just wait until the member for Florey is finished, please.

**Ms BEDFORD:** That is correct. If we are not having any measures in this bill of this kind and if, as we know, there may be unintended consequences through this bill, I am merely asking whether there is any other measure anywhere to try to ameliorate the unintended consequences of the bill and the impacts on social housing.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Again, I am not entirely sure how I can answer that in the context of this proposal. However, I think I hear the sentiment of the member. To be clear, the bill does not provide any hypothecated amounts for any dedicated purpose from any of the proceeds of any initiative in the bill, other than to identify that where there are proposed refunds or reductions in taxation liability for some taxpayers that that will be to their direct benefit. So if the member is asking whether there is any other part of the bill which incorporates a hypothecated amount of funds to be directed to some other place other than the Department of Treasury and Finance, the answer is no.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Just to be clear—and this is my final question—any revenue raised through this bill and any of its measures just go straight back to general revenue.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think I have made it clear. There are some measures in here which we have described as the 8 per cent who will have an increase in liability in relation to land tax. All land tax under the Land Tax Act—no, I will not go so far as to say the whole act because I do not have the whole act in front of me to refresh my memory on this.

I do not believe there is any hypothecated amount of moneys from the land tax revenue in South Australia which goes to a dedicated fund. I may be wrong on that but it is not part of this bill. Whilst this is a measure, as a package of reforms, some will have a higher land tax liability and many more under our proposal will have a reduced land tax liability. The net money of land tax goes into the Department of Treasury and Finance.

**The CHAIR:** The question before the Chair is that the amendment, which will become new clause 17A standing in the name of the member for Florey, be agreed to.

The committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes..... 3  
Noes ..... 43  
Majority ..... 40

AYES

Bedford, F.E. (teller)

Bell, T.S.

Brock, G.G.

## NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Chapman, V.A.
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Gee, J.P.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Knoll, S.K.
Koutsantonis, A.	Luethen, P.	Malinauskas, P.
Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.	Michaels, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Murray, S.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.
Wortley, D.		

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 18.

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

Amendment No 2 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 29, line 23 to page 30, line 12 [clause 18, inserted Schedule 1]—Delete inserted Schedule 1 and substitute:

Schedule 1—Calculation of land tax (tables)

Note—

For Threshold values see section 8A.

Part 1—Interpretation

1—Interpretation

In this Schedule—

LT (TA) means the land tax payable with respect to land with a taxable value equal to Threshold A;

LT (TB) means the land tax payable with respect to land with a taxable value equal to Threshold B;

LT (TC) means the land tax payable with respect to land with a taxable value equal to Threshold C;

LT (TD) means the land tax payable with respect to land with a taxable value equal to Threshold D.

Part 2—Scales of land tax

2—2020-21 and subsequent years

Land tax for the 2020-21 financial year and for each subsequent financial year is calculated on the basis of the taxable value of the land in accordance with the following table:

Taxable value of land	Amount of tax
Not exceeding Threshold A	Nil
Exceeding Threshold A but not exceeding Threshold B	\$0.50 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold A
Exceeding Threshold B but not exceeding Threshold C	LT (TB) plus \$1.65 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold B
Exceeding Threshold C but not exceeding Threshold D	LT (TC) plus \$2.00 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold C
Exceeding Threshold D	LT (TD) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold D

## Part 3—Scales of land tax for trusts

## 3—2020-21 and subsequent years

Land tax for the 2020-21 financial year and for each subsequent financial year is calculated on the basis of the taxable value of the land in accordance with the following table:

Taxable value of land	Amount of tax
Not exceeding \$25,000	Nil
Exceeding \$25,000 but not exceeding Threshold A	\$125 plus \$0.50 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over \$25,000
Exceeding Threshold A but not exceeding Threshold B	LT (TA) plus \$1.00 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold A
Exceeding Threshold B but not exceeding Threshold C	LT (TB) plus \$2.15 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold B
Exceeding Threshold C but not exceeding Threshold D	LT (TC) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold C
Exceeding Threshold D	LT (TD) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold D

I have outlined the basis for this amendment in the reply. I commend the amendment to the committee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This is the amendment that also includes page 3 of three of the amendments that the deputy filed; is that correct?

**The CHAIR:** Amendment No. 2 on schedule 1, member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, so part 3, page 3. Can the Deputy Premier advise the committee of the number of properties which the scales of land tax for trusts has been estimated to be affected by this measure by the Department of Treasury and Finance?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The number of persons who hold a trust who are affected by this clause are yet to be identified, as a result of this proposal requiring that the trusts that have the benefit of it have to nominate a beneficiary for that; is that what you are asking?

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Properties not persons.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, I do not then, if that is specifically the question.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Deputy Premier's advice is that there is no estimate of the number of properties. Can she advise how much revenue is estimated to be raised via the application of part 3, scales of land tax for trusts, contained within her amendment?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am just looking at page 20 of the PwC report, which is the land tax model methodology review report, and the surcharge on existing declared trusts, which is \$10 million, and the assumption of surcharge for undeclared trusts below threshold is \$7 million. The total is \$17 million.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Notwithstanding PwC's analysis contained in their methodology review, can I ask whether the Deputy Premier could confirm that those estimates have been made by the Department of Treasury and Finance, based on the application of those scales and thresholds, without knowing how many properties will be affected?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The amounts have been calculated as an estimate based on an estimate of the numbers. As I indicated earlier, until we know which of the trusts nominate their person for the benefit, we will not know the answer to that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My question is: how many properties will be impacted by aggregation?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will take that on notice. Just so that I am clear about what we are taking on notice, the question is how many properties will be affected by the aggregation proposal, which in this case is to remove the exemption as such and make that apply to trusts or some trusts. In that regard, I will take that on notice.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 19.

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

Amendment No 3 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 30, after line 12—Insert:

19—Review

- (1) The Treasurer must cause a review of the operation of the amendments to the Land Tax Act 1936 effected by this Act and by the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget Measures) Act 2018 to be conducted by a person independent of the government.
- (2) A report on the review conducted under this section must be prepared and submitted to the Treasurer on or before 31 December 2023.
- (3) The Treasurer must cause a copy of the report submitted under subsection (2) to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

This amendment provides for a review in five years by a person independent of the government, as outlined in proposed section 19(1), reporting to the Treasurer on or before 31 December 2023 and with an obligation for the Treasurer to cause a copy of the report to be submitted and laid before both houses of parliament within six days of receiving the report.

**The CHAIR:** The time for debate has expired.

New clause inserted.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:06):** It is with pleasure that I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Lee has the call, and the time limit on this part of the debate is five minutes.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Five minutes?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, five minutes.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:06):** I think it is 20 under the standing orders, sir, for the third reading contribution. This has not been guillotined. It was only the committee stage which was guillotined.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, it was also the time for the third reading. The member for Lee has the call.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, what a disgraceful abuse of power by this government—that this government would use their numbers to thwart the consideration of what they call the greatest reform of land tax in this state, a hard and difficult reform, they claim, yet they are not willing to have it scrutinised by this house. They are not willing to answer all those issues and concerns that the community has raised with us, that the government were too cowardly to go out and listen to themselves.

The opposition went out and did the hard work. We went and spoke to the people of South Australia about what their concerns were with this retrospective application of aggregation measures, and they came out in droves—nearly a thousand people in three meetings. We had letter and email

and phone call and constituent meeting time and time again, with people in tears and people genuinely worried about the impact of these changes on their livelihoods. We had tax lawyers and we had accountants putting to us questions that they wanted some answers on that the government, when approached by them, had refused to answer. They had refused to answer them.

And here we are in the forum where the people of this state can be represented by members to have their queries attended to, and what does this government do? What does this government do? Try to rush this through the house to minimise the scrutiny. At no point in this debate have we had the government be able to inform South Australians how many pieces of land are going to be impacted by these changes. In fact, we just asked a couple of minutes ago, and they still do not know. They run around claiming how much revenue is going to be raised by these measures without even understanding how many landholdings are going to be affected.

Not only do they not know how many landholdings are going to be affected but they do not know how many ownerships of those landholdings are going to be affected either. They do not know who is impacted and they do not know by how much. When this side of the chamber, the opposition, who are actually willing to engage with people of South Australia on their behalf about this massive tax impost upon them, come to this place to raise legitimate questions on their behalf, the government shuts us down, despite of course the Premier giving this place a commitment that he would do no such thing—no such thing.

We had the remarkable—and in this session of parliament unprecedented—speedy consideration of the matter I raised previously about the Premier. Absolutely remarkable—remarkable—because it is also in that person's interest that this is rushed through, that these concerns of the people of South Australia are swept under the carpet and never addressed because they do not want to have face the reality of these changes. They do not want have to eyeball their constituents who are going to suffer increased bills of thousands of dollars or tens of thousands of dollars. They do not want to know.

They do not want to know what the impact will be on their own constituents and I say: shame on those opposite. Shame on those opposite for turning their backs on the people of South Australia. Shame on those opposite for turning their backs on those people who have done the right thing for their whole lives, who have worked hard and made sacrifices and invested in land to make sure they can provide for their retirements not expecting to be taxed by a Liberal Party after the fact unfairly.

The Liberal Party—this government—do not even have the courage to go and front that community, to go and front those landowners and be honest with them. They will not listen to their grievances and they will not answer their questions, and when we come into this place, the member for Morialta, the Deputy Premier, and even more so the Premier, move to shut down this debate. Shame on all of you. The people of South Australia will remember your betrayal.

The house divided on the third reading:

Ayes ..... 24  
 Noes ..... 21  
 Majority ..... 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Bell, T.S.	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.	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.
---------------	----------------	-----------------

## NOES

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.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

**EVIDENCE (REPORTING ON SEXUAL OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October 2019.)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:16):** I wish to make a few further concluding remarks in relation to this bill. If I have not already, I thank the member for Badcoe, who was the lead speaker on this matter, for her contribution and indication of general support with the qualification that she foreshadowed that the opposition may move an amendment in another place, and I am happy to canvass that further in committee.

Can I also say that we have had the next wave of campaign from *The Advertiser*, and, indeed, to some degree in relation to a current national campaign that it is running, namely, the secrecy or anti-secrecy push—the right to know. It has had various titles over the years, but the most recent one has been very vocal in relation to the issue that this legislation will resolve.

It will not resolve the whole issue of suppression laws in relation to criminal litigation, and there are a number of other aspects that we need to continue to monitor—and no doubt there is room for improvement—but the reduction in the number of suppression orders generally in our courts is encouraging. Importantly, this will be a very clear message that this government is supporting transparency.

I think that Mr Sean Fewster, as our chief court reporter, has been acknowledged in contributions by members. I, too, wish to thank him for his advocacy in this area, but I also wish to acknowledge Meagan Dillon, who has been participatory in her advocacy in this area as well. They bring to light a litany of cases which should have been exposed, and other members have raised these, but I will also indicate a recent circumstance and the consequence of it not being dealt with.

There was a publication on 15 November last year and it related to a senior person in the State Opera of South Australia. I do not need to repeat his name—it has been in the public arena—because the issue of their name is not pertinent for these purposes. What is important is that this person was charged and he pleaded not guilty to two counts of being in an unlawful sexual relationship with a minor. He also denied an indecent assault and an account in relation to sexual intercourse with a person under 18 years.

Obviously, the allegations were very serious. At the time, back in May 2017—that is, under the time of the previous government—there had been an announcement by the Chairman of the State Opera to simply advise that this person had resigned 'for personal reasons'. Almost simultaneously, the person's alumni profile was removed from the distinguished awards section of the website of one of our universities. People knew about this, people were acting on it, and people were making statements about it but the general public were not allowed to know who this person was.

What is more disturbing to me is that, for the 18-month period during which there was an internal South Australia Police inquiry involving senior officers, the identity could not be published because of this automatic statutory suppression regime. Whilst at the time the police spokesperson conceded that it had taken a lot longer than it should have, in relation to that period of continued concealment as a result of this legislation the real question is: how many children were exposed to

this person during that 18 months? How many children may have been vulnerable to some predatory behaviour by this person?

I am not asserting that there were any. I simply make this point: while things are under a secret shield, in cases like this, in this case the person continuing to work with children and young people for that whole 18-month period, how many of them could have been exposed at least to the risk of sexual exploitation or abuse?

This is one of the fundamental reasons for ensuring that once a person is charged they go to the court system and they turn up to court. They have a right to be able to apply, all victims may apply—anyone, for that matter, can apply—for a suppression at that point to protect the interests of a minor, particularly a victim, and the process is from that point, not another 18 months while police or other parties might continue investigations post the charging, post the court hearing until a committal or conviction. That is the current law. That is what we are asking to change, and this is exactly the sort of example that has come forward, where there has been a continued exposure of risk, which is completely unacceptable.

The other aspect is this—and I just reiterate this—it is important to remember, in cases such as this, the reputational damage that can be caused to someone who may be innocent of such an allegation. But what is even more important is that it relates to things such as the cost laws that we have in relation to felonies. People can be charged with murder, they can be acquitted and they are not automatically eligible to line up to say, 'I want my costs back from the state.' The principle that sits behind not giving them that is to ensure that the state or the people of South Australia act without fear that they are prosecuting at that serious level.

There are lower order charges which can result in cost orders being made against the prosecuting body—effectively the state—and they are accepted as being in the category of that being reasonable. But at the high end, we have laws that enable the agencies that represent the people of South Australia, whether they be the police or the DPP and the like, to be able to investigate and prosecute matters without fear that they will have to meet the costs of that.

I commend the bill to the house and I thank all the members who made a contribution to this debate. I have an indication from the member for Badcoe that she has a number of questions. Although I do not have the benefit of excellent advisers that would ordinarily be here, I will assist where I can and take on notice and provide at a subsequent briefing that information to the member.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**Ms STINSON:** For the convenience of the committee, staff and yourself, Mr Acting Chair, I indicate that I have questions on all four clauses. My first question is on clause 1. Labor has been advised of stakeholders who were consulted on this bill. Can the Attorney-General confirm that the list that has been provided is a comprehensive and exhaustive list and advise what form the consultation took?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I may have a list. Just let me check. I have a number of the submissions here but I do not have a list, or I am not familiar with the list that you have been provided with, but I indicate that I will take that matter on notice. If the member has been provided a list at a briefing as to those consulted—

**Ms STINSON:** Not me. I did not go to the briefing.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, sorry. If the shadow attorney-general was provided a list, then I am sure that would be the list to which the bill had been distributed. As to whether other people were consulted, I will take it on notice and check.

**Ms STINSON:** Can the Attorney please advise the position of each stakeholder in regard to the amendment contained within the bill? In those submissions, what submissions might have been

returned? Can the Attorney advise the position of each stakeholder who responded and the nature of their comments and attitude toward the amendments in this bill?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Where appropriate and we are able to disclose submissions that are put, we will endeavour to provide that to the member. Many of these, of course, are already publicly available, such as the Law Society's, for example. In any event, as I cannot give you a comprehensive confirmation of the entire list, I will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** Further, can the Attorney provide a copy of submissions made by stakeholders in relation to this bill?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No. The position is, as the member well knows, that we make available submissions that are not identified as being presented to us on a confidential basis. We also do not as a matter of course provide copies of correspondence from heads of jurisdictions or departments.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

**Ms STINSON:** In relation to clause 2, can the Attorney give some indication as to the period of time along the spectrum, if you like—the time line—from allegation through to charge and then first appearance. Can the Attorney give some detail around when this proposed bill takes effect? I understand that the relevant time that has been indicated here is at the first hearing, the first court appearance date; however, the specific circumstance I am thinking of and trying to elicit some additional detail around is a circumstance where, for example, there are allegations about a person prior to charge. I did speak about this briefly in my earlier statements.

I notice that in the explanation of clauses, dot point 2 under clause 4—and I know we are not on clause 4 yet, but I am referring to it to assist the Attorney—provides that the relevant time would be when a person 'has been, or is about to be, charged with a sexual offence'. Can the Attorney detail what that means in terms of the operation of the proposals in this bill? At what point on that spectrum will these changes have impact, particularly in reference to the circumstance where allegations have been put but no formal charge has been laid as yet?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think it is exactly in the reference at the end of the member's comments on what we are talking about. I think it is pretty obvious—that is, where someone has been charged, and there would be evidence of the charge, and they would be on their way to a court process. If I am correct in understanding that commentary, I think the member's area of concern is targeted at how one defines when someone is about to be charged.

If the member for Badcoe were back in her previous life, she might have become aware that the police had attended a person and taken a report and statement and serious allegations had been made that had come to her attention and, if the person was in the process of being arrested—there might be a house siege or any event that might bring the matter to the attention of the journalist—if there was sufficient evidence to satisfy a court that on the balance of probability the person was about to be charged she would find herself in deep water if she were to tweet that person's details for the purpose of publication. I hope I have given an explanation there.

There would have to be sufficient evidence for the member for Badcoe, in this case, to be prosecuted for a breach of these rules to satisfy a court that on the evidence which was known to her and on which, on the balance of probability, she would have expected him or her to be charged. That is a court determination. That is a matter that obviously would have to be dealt with, but it is reasonable that in consultation with the police and the courts, for example, they do not want a situation where there might be an alert to someone as a result of publication of material that would interfere with their capacity to follow through and conduct the search, arrest, detainment and whatever else leading up to the charge of that person.

It is a little unusual; there is no question about that. It is not as definitive as a charge, but it is one that is important to ensure that there is not a prejudice to the investigation and successful charge, ultimately, of a person of interest. That is why we have sub judice rules. That is why, for example, on this side of the house—there have been a few examples in the past 12 months where I think these have been shamefully abused—we try to respect the fact that when a court is seized of



a matter and they are leading up to the trying of the facts in that case, the last thing they need is people making statements which in some way would be prejudicial to the successful prosecution of someone who is guilty or would let somebody get off when they are guilty in those circumstances.

We need to be very mindful of that. This is consistent with recognising that that critical period between the police conducting their investigation and identifying that have sufficient evidence to charge may be a significant period, but if on the balance of probability the facts surrounding that would be reasonable for the reporter—I am using that example, but it can be anyone in the publication in this sense—they would be captured, and they should be. That is why we have this provision for 'about to be' charged.

**Ms STINSON:** Just to expand on that and maybe seek some further clarity, obviously the expression 'or is about to be', which I understand is in the explanation of clauses, is not defined in any way and, of course, it is not defined in the bill that is put forward, so there is quite a degree of vagary in that. I think the Attorney is saying that a court would have to define that against a particular set of circumstances, so that is one thing I would seek some clarity on.

The second is around what the test is as far as a journalist or another being aware that a charge was imminent. I understand that the Attorney has not been a journalist. From my experience, the police, and the DPP for that matter, do not generally provide a great deal of information to journalists before a charge is to be laid. As she identified, sometimes that can be a matter of hours or days, whereas at other times it can be a matter of months or even years in extreme cases. So there is not necessarily a uniform time period in terms of a journalist even having any reasonable understanding of when a charge might be likely to be made or when a charge is imminent.

I would seek some clarity around whether there is a particular test, for example, whether the prosecution would have to prove that, in some way, the journalist had knowledge of a charge being imminent or whether a journalist would have to be aware that police were investigating. Sometimes journalists do not know if police are investigating certain allegations or not. Often journalists get a 'no comment' from police media on matters.

Does it fall to the journalist in any sort of prosecution for falling foul of this part of the prospective law? Does it fall to the journalist to have to prove that they were not apprised of certain details? Is there an assumption that a journalist should have some degree of understanding about whether a charge is imminent? Who does the responsibility fall to—the prosecution or a defendant journalist—to prove what they did and did not know at certain times in terms of their decision to publish or not? I am talking about prior to charge here. I will leave it at that.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Firstly, that phrase 'about to be charged' or part thereof is not defined in the act or the bill. I am going to make some general statements here. There are many phrases and words that do not have an identified definition for the purposes of the legislation. However, as a general rule, they attract the ordinary meaning of how they are described. By virtue of consideration of matters within the envelope of cases in our common law, courts might develop a level of precedent in relation to how that is interpreted.

But can I say again, and it is very general because it is hard, but I will try to use an example which will hopefully be helpful for members, in general, if there is an alleged breach of a publication prohibition, it is the obligation of the prosecuting party to prove beyond reasonable doubt that that has occurred. The factual determination as to each of the circumstances surrounding that would have to be considered and some of those matters are on the balance of probability.

For example, if a journalist—again, we will use the poor journalist because they are the ones often in the firing line in these situations—receives information from a female person who says to her, 'I have just been here with the police at my house. They have taken away my husband for questioning. They have indicated that they're going to take him down to X police station and that he is going to be charged because he has assaulted me and hit our children,' or whatever the allegation is, it may be that the journalist may say, 'Is that anything to do with an offence relating to "sexual nature" within the definition of what we are talking about here?' They may make that inquiry. They might say, 'Yes, well, there's also going to be a charge of rape of our daughter,' and so on.

There is no direct evidence that the person has been charged, but it may be in that factual situation that the publication within the envelope of that knowledge is sufficient to support a circumstance where the person had not been charged but was going to be as sufficient to breach this, when the journalist then sends the detail in to her editor—or, these days, tweets it or whatever—to publish that information: 'So-and-so is going to be charged this morning with serious sexual offences against his children.'

Hopefully, that gives some light as to what we are talking about here, but it is still up to the prosecution to be satisfied that that person caused the publication to be made and was in a circumstance where they had knowledge of the likelihood of that person being charged. It is designed to be able to capture that period leading up to the charge. However, if anything happened between then and the time the person was charged—that is, he gave an explanation when he got to the police station and he was not charged, and he later went and packed his bags and tried to nick off, the police were alerted to that and then they find that his name is all over the tweet world—the police might be a bit cranky about that. They might say, 'They have interfered with us because they alluded to him, so he went straight to the airport and he has left the state.'

We have to respect the fact that our investigative agencies have a job to do. They know the importance of being able to keep that under wraps, so to speak, to a large degree. However, they need to clearly conduct their investigation in a manner that is going to give them sufficient evidence to be able to have a successful prosecution. As a parliament, I think it is incumbent on us to make sure that we support that process and then, if there is a charge and the person is then brought to court, of course they can put their argument as to suppression in those circumstances. However, it puts the obligation on them rather than the reverse of an automatic suppression.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

**Ms STINSON:** Could the Attorney detail how this act would operate retrospectively, if indeed it operates at all? For example, in the past there have been some offences where the offender has never been named publicly but they are of such public interest that I imagine journalists would try to utilise this change to the law to publish the identity of those people involved in past offences. I am talking about cases that are now complete, where people have been charged, prosecuted and found guilty, or indeed the charges might have been dismissed, prior to this act taking effect. Is this retrospective in any way? Could a journalist publish the identity of a person charged or found guilty of sexual offences due to these changes?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I would not think so. I cannot think of any circumstance where that would apply. I will take that on notice and check if that is the case. Bear in mind that there are a number of historical sexual assault cases in which a person has been convicted and the identity of the accused remains suppressed. It is not actually because of this law. It is because the court have maintained the view that, even post conviction, it is in interests of somebody, usually families.

I think we heard the example from the member for Mount Gambier of the protection of a small community in a regional area that would have the whole stain of this issue. It would be clearly known who the person or family or victims would be, and therefore the suppression has remained on after that time. I think he outlined the angst of one of the victims, or the mother of one of the victims, in not having had that person's name exposed. I will take that on notice. If there is a circumstance in which it would apply to some historic case, I will provide that to the member.

**Ms STINSON:** I do not think this would be the appropriate forum, so I am happy to provide the Attorney with specific instances that I am thinking of in which the statutory suppression—quite separate from the imposition of a suppression order, which is obviously under a different part of the legislation—has prevented publication of the identity of an individual in the past. My question is around whether, because of these changes, that would now be able to be revealed. I am happy to provide some specific examples and seek an answer at a later date between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

**Ms STINSON:** Can the Attorney-General confirm that a victim might not necessarily be informed that the name of an accused may be released under these changes, or prior to the consideration of whether a person's name should be released at the first court hearing date?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** These changes do not affect that issue. These changes relate to the restriction on reporting. As I think I said in the course of the debate, I am advised that the practice of the prosecuting authorities—I know this because we were responsible for the DPP, and frequently the police have a role in the prosecuting aspect post investigation or arrest or detainment, etc.—is that, where there is a known victim, they are informed of the charge. Frequently they are a very key witness or provide evidence which is necessary in medical statements, etc., to support and corroborate the evidence that is going to be used by the prosecuting authorities. So there is quite a reliance frequently on victims or family members of victims.

The general process is that they continue to be kept informed. Certainly, I am advised, the DPP's office get involved. We have a whole witness assistant division to try to facilitate that. As I have also recently reported to the house, the Commissioner for Victims' Rights also has a role, particularly in serious crime, of being a support person and generally giving advice and referrals to someone going through that experience.

As a party, we have made a commitment to try to improve the continuation of advice to a victim unless they opt out, that is, unless they say, 'Look, I got through that experience. He's been prosecuted,' or, 'She's been arrested. I don't want to have anything more to do with it. Take me off the list.' An endeavour is made post police and prosecuting authorities by courts but, more importantly, Corrections if the person is taken into custody under some kind of penalty arrangements. We are trying to make sure that there is an improvement with data so that we can keep victims continuously informed.

However, back in this space in the time that we are talking about, relating to this bill, which is leading up to the charging or the charging up until that first court date, then, yes, it is very important—I agree with the member for Badcoe—and our agencies, to the best of my knowledge, try to do that, but they do not always know all the victims. That is one of the aspects that I have asked the member for Badcoe to look into and perhaps consult with the police.

My understanding is they are not keen to have mandatory imposition of advice to victims and feel that would be an impediment on their capacity to do that, when their responsibility is to catch villains, obviously, and protect people as best they can. As I say, it is an important part of their case to have the support of victims, but they do not wish to be part of a mandatory process. Again, I will leave that matter for the member for Badcoe.

**Ms STINSON:** Did the Attorney think about making the relevant time at the point of charge and, if so, what options were canvassed for having the relevant time earlier than the first court date and what arguments were put forward either for or against that? Why has the Attorney ultimately decided on their first court appearance as the most appropriate time for the statutory suppression to be considered?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is largely on the advice, having read the Brian Martin review and also consulting with the stakeholders to ensure that we had a balance between having a situation that does not transfer to the same regime as all other crime, because there is still a modification in this law by allowing that window of protection pending that first court hearing. It is at that point, usually, that an application can be made to a magistrate—or a superior court, depending on where it is lodged, but usually to a magistrate—to seek the protection of a suppression order. The reason why that has been chosen was based on all the advice we received.

**Ms STINSON:** I wonder if the Attorney can give her thoughts on a matter that she just raised, which is that there is now, or continues to be, a different regime in terms of sexual offences and all other offences. It is generally regarded that murder is the most serious offence, yet under this change it is treated differently.

The protection of the identity of a person who is accused of murder is treated differently and more loosely than a person who is charged with sexual offences. It is the Attorney's interpretation or understanding that the community views sexual offences as more serious than murder and is

therefore the reason for being satisfied with two different regimes in relation to suppression, or are there some other reasons why the Attorney is presumably satisfied to have two different regimes in operation for people who are charged with sexual offences versus every other crime, including murder?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is a subjective assessment as to whether someone thinks child abuse or sexual exploitation is worse than murder. I will not get into that argument. Both are very serious circumstances. However, the situation with the exploitation of a child in a sexual way obviously has very significant reputational damage; that is accepted.

It is fair to say that I think the public have a fairly low regard for someone who kills a child or murders a child, but the reputational damage to the child as a victim of a murder is very different from if they are still alive and have to go to school and be part of a community. I think there is a distinction, but I do not want to cast any view on which is the worst.

I think they are equally bad, just as I think it is a shocking situation if you are a parent of someone who had been murdered or someone who murdered somebody, or that you were the mother or father of someone who had their child sexually assaulted, or whether you were the mother or father of the person who conducted the sexual assault of a child. These are pretty bad, but with a murder I think it is self-evident that the victim has died. The victim is dead and so the reputational damage issue is not so severe.

**Ms STINSON:** For the offender it is, though.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am just saying that the reason often for a suppression order has nothing to do with protecting the person who has been accused, it is the poor innocent child who would have been the victim who would easily be identified as the child of that person, for example, if there was an incest situation, or somebody who worked in a school, or someone who was working with children in another capacity and they were known to be in that area.

All those circumstances lead to victims who are alive and, frankly, have usually gone through some pretty horrific times as it is, so we do not want to make it worse for them. Regarding the idea of having this suppressed up until that court date, the magistrate can make that determination by balancing all those things: reputational damage, capacity to be able to bring other cases forward—that is, letting the public know—public interest arguments and protecting the poor children who may have already been victims.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:58):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Personal Explanation*

**NYRSTAR CHEMICAL LEAKS**

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (17:58):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** In an answer to a question from the member for Port Adelaide today, I said forensic analysis of two trumpeter fish showed no signs of heavy metal contamination. I have reviewed the briefing provided to me on 7 February 2019, which advised that inspections on 5 February indicated that the water quality in the creek was at adequate levels with heavy metal concentrations below environmental trigger values.

The reference to heavy metals was not regarding the fish but the water. The briefing did not contain information regarding the outcome of forensic analysis of the fish. The EPA is leading the investigation into the incident.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Tuesday 12 November 2019 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** 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 Innovation and Skills—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
Aboriginal Programs	Aboriginal Programs support Aboriginal South Australians into employment, through skills training, employer incentives and mentoring. Funding via Skilling South Australia now available resulting in an increase in the number of Indigenous South Australians in training.	596	17	11	3
Adelaide Film Festival	Operational Funding for Adelaide Film Festival.	1,079	1,059	1,084	1,110
Adelaide Gig City	Connect businesses within key Adelaide innovation precincts with extremely fast broadband speeds of 1 gigabit per second and up to 10 gigabits per second available on request.	1,097	1,274	1,140	0
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings. (Funding under the 3-year Strengthening ACE ceasing – Federal Government investing more in Foundation Skills under their \$525 million Skills Package.	3,543	1,064	1,964	1,965
Australian Institute of Machine Learning	Build on research strengths in machine learning. It is the first machine learning institute in Australia.	1,300	1,300	1,325	1,300
Auto Jobs Connect	Connect automotive supply chain workers to employers or jobs.	522	0	0	0
Boosting Business Investment Migration	To facilitate this and assist with achieving 1,000 business migrant nominations.	0	125	250	375
Ceduna Thevenard	DIS contribution to DPTI towards Thevenard Marine Offloading Facility.	125	0	0	0
Centre for Business Growth	The Centre for Business Growth is part of the University of South Australia's business school and delivers programs targeted at executives of South Australian companies between 5 and 200 employees.	698	0	0	0
Commercialisation & Entrepreneurship	Support the University of SA to establish exhibitions and program resources for the operation of SciCEd, develop science, design and innovation program content for young people and adults.	290	750	190	196

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
Country Arts SA	Grant payment to Country Arts SA for operating Hopgood Theatre at Noarlunga. Another funding extension was made by a further, but final, six months, taking it up to 31 December 2019, to allow the Onkaparinga Council more time during this period to develop a funding model to take over this facility.	230	0	0	0
Group Training Organisation (GTO) Support Program	GTO Support Program funding is provided to GTOs in lieu of Payroll Tax Exemption.	2,827	2,084	2,136	2,190
Digital Games Development Program	Fund was established to support South Australia's entrepreneurs and businesses to create high quality digital games. New \$300,000 Games Innovation Fund announced.	150	0	0	0
Disability Sector	A time-limited, once-off grant for activities to support individuals and businesses to build their capability and capacity to meet the demand for services under the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS). NDIS Jobs and Market Fund is available with additional work being undertaken on workforce and training. SA leading reforms.	673	0	32	0
DOMÉ	Paid to DOMÉ (Don't Overlook Mature Experience) DOMÉ provided a business case and funding is aligned.	102	123	0	0
Equal Remuneration Order	Cabinet approved supplementation paid to not for profit organisations to cover CPI increases for community sector workers.	750	785	804	824
Helpmann Academy	Grant for advancing/supporting and promoting visual and performing arts at tertiary level in SA.	412	0	0	0
JamFactory	Operational Funding for JamFactory.	1,040	1,049	1,070	1,100
Job Readiness STEM	Trial to improve the job readiness of VET STEM graduates. Includes \$50,000 contribution from the Commonwealth.	50	0	0	0
Jobs First	Jobs First Employment Projects	1,278	0	0	0
Leigh Creek Motel	Support the operation of the Leigh Creek Motel—Tavern at Leigh Creek. Includes \$115,000 contribution from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.	125	0	0	0
Local Finance Management Scholarships	Scholarship program to provide post-graduate research opportunities in finance and related sectors by investing in research projects exploring new innovations, products or problems in the finance and fintech sectors.	250	250	250	250
Longitudinal Study	Funding for undertaking a Longitudinal Study over 5 years to assess the impact on former automotive workers as a result of the closure of GMH and Toyota.	250	0	0	0

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
Lot Fourteen/FIXE	Subsidies for the Innovation, Incubation, Start Up and Growth Hub to be domiciled at Lot Fourteen site.	2,630	1,522	1,560	1,599
Maritime Skills Centre	Support skills and training requirements of the Air Warfare Destroyer Project workforce.	450	392	0	0
Medical Devices Partnering Program	To assist Flinders University with the continued operation of its Medical Device Partnering Program to undertake research and experimental development and other activities that support the development of innovative medical and assistive technologies with an identified clinical need, sound technical solution and viable market opportunity.	1,000	550	0	0
Metcash Distribution Centre	Assistance with the establishment of a Distribution Centre in Adelaide.	1,000	0	0	0
Minerals Skills Centre	Grant to RESA for the coordination for workforce development opportunities and issues in relation to the resources and engineering sectors.	217	228	234	239
Mobile Blackspot	To improve and extend mobile phone coverage to regional and remote Australian locations in conjunction with the Commonwealth Mobile Black Spot initiative.	956	0	0	0
Music Development Office	Facilitates the development of the South Australia's music industry by supporting both creative and business development. Includes \$850,000 per annum from the Community Development Fund.	2,038	1,728	1,736	1,744
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	To support six South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	7,000	453	3,756	3,784
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury.	912	0	0	0
OJP: Automotive Supplier Diversification Program	Support the diversification of businesses impacted by the closure of the automotive manufacturing industry in South Australia.	1,748	0	0	0
Organisational Development	Contribution to the Office of the Commissioner of Public Sector Employment (OCPSE) relating to the OCPSE Leadership Academy.	30	0	0	0
Our Jobs Plan	Established on the departure General Motors Holden assisting industry diversification and providing support for entrepreneurs.	158	0	0	0



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
Research Commercialisation and Start-up Fund	To support South Australian businesses to collaborate with researchers and universities to solve industrial problems, commercialise new products and services and attract research infrastructure investment into the state, as well as to encourage the establishment and growth of start-ups.	3,427	5,207	6,025	7,913
Retrenched Workers	Assist non-automotive workers exiting a company as a result of retrenchment or company closure by providing funding for career services and training.	357	0	0	0
Rip It Up Initiative	DIS contribution to Whole of Government Electronic forms platform.	32	32	33	33
SA Film Corporation	Operational Funding for SA Film Corporation.	4,762	4,754	4,839	4,932
SA Rapid Commercialisation	Drive commercialisation of technologies that can be acquired or licensed from South Australian research institutions.	600	600	0	0
SA Young Entrepreneur Scheme	To assist young South Australians aged 18-35 years to turn their business concept into a reality or focus on creating a sustainable business model for a newly established business.	120	0	0	0
Science and Research Fund	Dedicated Research and Development funding to support the State's research community to compete successfully on a national and global scale.	3,648	1,925	1,150	100
Screen Production Investment	This fund is used to finance local and international screen production, providing opportunities to broaden the talent base of emerging and established South Australian screen practitioners and position South Australian screen businesses with opportunities to deliver on a local, national and international scale. Includes \$6.0 million contribution from the Economic Business Growth Fund.	8,500	0	0	0
Skilling South Australia	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services. In the first year almost 13,000 new training commencements have been achieved.	34,696	46,418	46,321	46,189
Skills in the Workplace	Skills in the Workplace provides employers with a training subsidy to help them lift the skills of their existing employees at higher qualification levels. Skilling SA now provides	35	0	0	0
Small Business Initiatives	Support for small business to grow capabilities and expand operations.	230	155	175	175

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
Strategic Industry Development Fund	Fund targeting priority sectors, specifically businesses undertaking structural change to sustainable high-value economic activities, with sustainable growth potential, capitalising on national and international opportunities for South Australian products and services, developing global connections and alliances, and investing in new technologies and innovations.	256	0	0	0
TAFE SA Capital	Support provided to the TAFE SA Capital program.	4,975	11,456	13,047	13,375
Tauondi	Paid to Tauondi, a Registered Training Organisation	1,050	2,614	0	0
TechInSA	Contribute to the development of South Australia's high-tech industry.	3,103	877	1,026	0
Thebarton Theatre	To support an upgrade to the air-conditioning units for the auditorium, dressing rooms and foyer at the Thebarton Theatre.	500	0	0	0
Trainee & Apprenticeship Support	Program aimed to support trainees, apprentice and/or employers to maintain or increase participation and provide support for the training sector.	3,911	2,719	2,789	2,858
Training Fund & other VET Support	Subsidies for TAFE and non-government training providers for the provision of VET and associated services. Includes \$969,000 per annum from the Department for Education.	289,323	219,081	211,123	217,661
UNISA Future Industries Institute	The Future Industries Institute builds on the research capabilities in Information Technology, Engineering and the Environment.	3,000	0	0	0
US Ignite	Foster development of next generation applications that provide transformative public benefit using new technologies like software-defined networks.	60	0	0	0
Other – Low value Grants	Various	285	72	69	69

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Innovation and Skills—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
Student Transport Concessions	Program to support Student Transport Concessions. Payable to DPTI.	15,984	14,472	14,834	15,206

The following table details the *new* commitment of grants in 2018-19 for the Department for Innovation and Skills – Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Adelaide Film Festival	Adelaide Film Festival	Operational Funding for Adelaide Film Festival.	3,197,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Aberfoyle Community Centre Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	60,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Alexandrina Connect Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Anglican Community Care Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	121,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Baptist Care (SA) Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	63,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Beach Road Artworks Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	85,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Catherine House Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	55,500
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Catholic Church Endowment Society Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	80,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Centre for Equality Ltd	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	38,970
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Christie Downs Community House Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	49,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	City of Port Adelaide Enfield	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	City of Salisbury	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	80,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Corporation of the City of Marion	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	160,000

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Eastwood Community Centre Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	20,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Elizabeth Community Connections Project Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	49,656
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Employment Options Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Encounter Centre Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Eyre Futures Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	88,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Hackham West Community Centre Inc.	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	33,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Limestone Coast Work Options Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	10,560
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Lutheran Community Care	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	MarionLIFE Community Services Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Mid Murray Support Service Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	28,704
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Midway Road Community House Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Milang and District Community Association Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Morella Community Centre Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	160,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Mount Barker Family House Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Murray Community Incorporated Bridge Centre	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	58,790
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Northern Area Community and Youth Services Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	29,893
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Overseas Chinese Association of SA Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Paralowie Community Incorporated R-12 Centre	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Parks Children's Centre Community Development Group	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	17,900
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Plaza Youth Centre Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	33,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Pooraka Community Incorporated Farm Centre	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	183,893
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Reynella Neighbourhood Centre Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	39,470
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Riverland Division of General Practice Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	49,500
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Southern Yorke Peninsula Community Telecentre Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	18,040
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Strath Neighbourhood Centre Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	12,000

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Adult Community Education (ACE)	The Hut Community Centre Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	100,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	The Junction Community Centre Inc	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	UnitingSA (formerly UnitingCare Wesley) Port Adelaide	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	79,276
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Vietnamese Community in Australia / South Australia Chapter Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	30,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Woodcroft Morphett Value Neighbourhood Centre Incorporated	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	29,930
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Zahra Foundation Australia	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	60,000
Commercialisation & Entrepreneurship	University of South Australia	Support the University of South Australia to establish exhibitions and program resources for the operation of SciCEd, develop science, design and innovation program content for young people and adults.	150,000
Disability Sector	Flinders University	Grant for activities to support individuals and businesses to build their capability and capacity to meet the demand for services under the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS).	56,000
DOMÉ	DOMÉ Association Inc	Paid to DOMÉ (Don't Overlook Mature Experience) to deliver training and employment activities to support mature aged jobseekers.	400,000
JamFactory	JamFactory	Operational Funding for JamFactory.	3,159,000
Longitudinal Study	University of South Australia	Funding for undertaking a Longitudinal Study over 5 years to assess the impact on former automotive workers as a result of the closure of GMH and Toyota.	1,000,000
Lot Fourteen/FIXE	Stone and Chalk Limited	Subsidies for the Innovation, Incubation, Start Up and Growth Hub to be domiciled at Lot Fourteen site.	7,900,000
Medical Devices Partnering Program	Flinders University	To assist Flinders University with the continued operation of its Medical Device Partnering Program to undertake research and experimental development and other activities that support the development of innovative medical and assistive technologies with an identified clinical need, sound technical solution and viable market opportunity.	1,550,000

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	Flinders University	To support six South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	2,102,649
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	MIMP Computer Cable Pty Ltd	To support six South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	1,000,000
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute Limited	To support six South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	2,982,369
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	The University of Adelaide	To support six South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	6,771,000
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	University of South Australia	To support six South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	3,657,107
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Active Fencing and Retaining Pty Ltd	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	75,000
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Adelaide Hydro Fresh	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	25,000
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	All Car & Truck Pty Ltd	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	10,000
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Bryce Sturman Podiatry	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	66,000
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Monastery Coffee Pty Ltd	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	90,000
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Prestige Joinery and Projects Pty Ltd	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	100,000
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	ProActiv People Solutions Pty Ltd	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	97,350
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Ray White Salisbury	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	28,296
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	RMG Industrial	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	14,000
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	Santona Produce	Support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	100,000
SA Film Corporation	South Australian Film Corporation	Operational Funding for SA Film Corporation.	14,355,000

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Science and Research Fund	Department for Energy and Mining	Dedicated Research and Development funding to support the State's research community to compete successfully on a national and global scale.	450,000
Science and Research Fund	Primary Industries and Regions South Australia	Dedicated Research and Development funding to support the State's research community to compete successfully on a national and global scale.	300,000
Skilling Australia	South Adelaide Training and Employment Centre Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	168,351
Skilling Australia	South Australian Council for Educational Research	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	107,930
Skilling Australia	South Australian Industry Group Training Services Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	362,500
Skilling Australia	South Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	169,850
Skilling Australia	South Australian Nursing & Midwifery Federation (SA Branch)	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	61,400
Skilling Australia	South Benairn Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	116,850
Skilling Australia	South Career Employment Group INC	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	695,550
Skilling Australia	South Child Care Services Training Australia Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	16,000
Skilling Australia	South Civil Contractors Federation (SA Branch)	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	165,000
Skilling Australia	South Defence Teaming Centre Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	87,500
Skilling Australia	South Employment Options Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	135,400



Grant program/fund name		Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Skilling Australia	South	Furnishing Industry Association of Australia Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	68,400
Skilling Australia	South	GP Links Wide Bay Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	464,000
Skilling Australia	South	Heather Langton Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	18,750
Skilling Australia	South	Hessel Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	221,470
Skilling Australia	South	Hospitality Industry Training Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	105,000
Skilling Australia	South	Lai Industries Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	87,500
Skilling Australia	South	Logging Investigation & Training Association Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	21,000
Skilling Australia	South	Master Builders Association SA Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	78,450
Skilling Australia	South	Maxima Training Group Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	255,400
Skilling Australia	South	McMahon Services Australia Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	87,888
Skilling Australia	South	MEGT (Australia) Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	196,400
Skilling Australia	South	MRWED	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	72,000
Skilling Australia	South	My Budget Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	22,000

Grant program/fund name		Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Skilling Australia	South	Mynd Shyft Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	5,015
Skilling Australia	South	National Disability Services Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	343,000
Skilling Australia	South	Outside Ideas (SA) Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	80,000
Skilling Australia	South	Plumbing, Electrical, Electronic, Refrigeration, Vocational Education & Training	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	357,000
Skilling Australia	South	PricewaterhouseCoopers Consulting (Australia) Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	1,098,200
Skilling Australia	South	Regional Development Australia Barossa Gawler Light Adelaide Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	57,550
Skilling Australia	South	Regional Development Australia Whyalla & Eyre Peninsula Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	274,020
Skilling Australia	South	Restaurant & Catering Industry Association of Australia Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	84,000
Skilling Australia	South	Resthaven Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	124,800
Skilling Australia	South	SANFL	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	85,000
Skilling Australia	South	SkyCity Adelaide Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	47,200
Skilling Australia	South	The Academy of Interactive Entertainment Limited	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	38,000
Skilling Australia	South	The Fourth Force Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	1,182,940

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Skilling Australia South	The Landscape Association of South Australia Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	126,000
Skilling Australia South	The MTA Group Training Scheme Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	792,200
Skilling Australia South	The Quality Training and Hospitality College Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	186,900
Skilling Australia South	Traineeship and Apprenticeship Placement Services Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	196,000
Skilling Australia South	Transport Training Solutions Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	254,248
Skilling Australia South	VET Development Centre	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	30,900
Skilling Australia South	Workskill Australia Inc.	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	79,750
Skilling Australia South	YourLife Health & Learning Inc	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	350,000
Skilling Australia South	Zancott Recruitment Pty Ltd	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	176,900
Tauondi	Tauondi Aboriginal Corporation	Paid to Tauondi, a Registered Training Organisation funded to assist Aboriginal people with skill development, job preparation and brokerage into jobs.	2,500,000
Training subsidies	Fund Various non-TAFE training providers	Subsidies for TAFE and non-government training providers for the provision of VET and associated services.	37,844,000

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (25 July 2019). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2018-19 in omnibus question 13.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):**

The following table provides a list of attraction and retention allowances paid between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019 for PIRSA.

Attraction /Retention	Allowance—monetary component
Retention	\$22,538.00
Retention	\$18,000.00
Retention	\$10,000.00
Retention	\$39,062.00
Retention	\$7,500.00
Retention	\$20,431.00
Retention	\$10,000.00
Retention	\$15,126.00
Retention	\$22,312.00
Retention	\$16,000.00
Retention	\$15,126.00
Retention	\$32,680.00
Retention	\$29,251.00
Retention	\$21,370.00
Retention	\$7,399.54
Attraction	\$12,000.00
Retention	\$21,370.00
Retention	\$16,000.00
Retention	\$25,394.00
Retention	\$8,800.00
Retention	\$8,000.00
Retention	\$26,855.00
Retention	\$22,740.00
Retention	\$30,000.00
Retention	\$16,500.00

I am advised there were no non-salary benefits paid to public servants or contracts in PIRSA.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):**

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA – Controlled operations:

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
Northern Adelaide Food Park	The Northern Adelaide Food Park initiative was established to create opportunities for businesses to co-locate and enable both new and existing food and beverage processors, manufacturers, food packaging specialists, cold-chain suppliers and logistic and transport companies to expand and grow.	-	1,450	50	-

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
Advanced Food Manufacturing	The program focused on translating new or existing research and technical expertise into practical outcomes for food and beverage producers, to help them create new high value or value added products or processes. Connecting the producers to the technical experts that can help them develop new products and processes and understand the value that can be added through technical innovation, and the associated productivity, and export development potential.	122	120	-	-
SA Wine Industry Development Scheme (SAWIDS)	The purpose of SAWIDS is to develop and support projects that add economic value to the wine industry.	1,544	1,800	1,800	1,800
South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program (SARMS) – Commonwealth funded program	Commonwealth funded competitive grant program to enable the SA River Murray irrigation industry to meet the new policy directions of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and potential challenges faced by future climate change scenarios, and to support the vibrant communities across the Region.	29,045	3,756	-	-
On-Farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme – Commonwealth funded program	Commonwealth funded grant program to provide a one-off 25 per cent rebate up to \$25,000 (GST exclusive) to primary producers in drought affected areas for the costs associated with the purchase and installation of On-Farm water infrastructure.	1,947	1,897	906	-
Regional Growth Fund	Support projects that unlock new economic activity in our regions, creating jobs, growing export opportunities and strengthening regional communities.	11,350	18,650	15,000	15,000
Regional Development Fund	Drive economic growth and productivity by investing in regional infrastructure, creating jobs and new opportunities for regional South Australia.	10,787	3,098	2,759	-
Upper Spencer Gulf & Outback Futures Program	Supporting the region to achieve economic recovery by offering assistance to projects that will contribute to the economic diversification, resilience and capacity building of these communities.	833	175	25	-
Regional Development Australia	The Regional Development Australia Boards (RDA) have been provided with funding certainty through over \$12 million allocated over four years. This funding commitment will allow RDA Boards to continue to provide vital advice and support to drive economic development in each region.	3,516	3,224	3,265	3,307
Economic Sustainability Program	The Economic Sustainability Program is targeted towards key regional economic development projects that facilitate strong, vibrant and sustainable regional industries and communities.	923	35	-	-
Mobile Black Spot Program	This initiative provides \$10 million over three years to address mobile phone black spots across South Australia. Improving mobile phone coverage within the state will contribute to improved productivity, improved safety and enhancing the reputation of the state's key tourist destinations.	2,000	5,000	3,000	-

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
South East Forestry Partnership Program	The South East Forestry Partnerships Program is a merit-based grant program to assist the forest and wood products industry by encouraging further investment in new and existing businesses. Funding was allocated over three phases.	7,532	-	-	-

The following table details the new commitment grants paid in 2018-19 for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA – Controlled Operations:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Advanced Food Manufacturing	Goolwa Pipi Co Pty Ltd	Development of super premium life sashimi grade pipi product for Australian and Asian export markets.	25,000
SA Wine Industry Development Scheme (SAWIDS)	Chalk Hill	Great Wine Capitals bursary exchange program	5,000
	Chapel Hill	Great Wine Capitals bursary exchange program	5,000
	Clare Valley Wine & Grape Association	Funding in support of Wine Australia International Wine Tourism Competitive Grants Program	125,000
	Grow 4	Great Wine Capitals bursary exchange program	5,000
	Langhorne Creek Grape and Wine Incorporated	Managing heat in vineyards project	20,000
	Retallack Viticulture	Great Wine Capitals bursary exchange program	5,000
	The Australian Wine Research Institute	Great Wine Capitals bursary exchange program	5,000
	The University of Adelaide	Assessing the Potential Impact of Smoke from Stubble Burning on Grapes and Wine	60,000
	Vinehealth Australia	Vinehealth Australia Digital Biosecurity Platform	75,000
	Wine Industry Supplies Australia Incorporated	Explorers SA—Wine and Tourism Technology Acceleration Program	80,000
Regional Growth Fund	Spektrum Pty Ltd	Inclusion of an appendix in the APY Sustainable Pastoral Development Plan Review document	8,500
	Innes Experience Pty Ltd	Jacka Brothers Brewery redevelopment	200,000
	Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North	Community Development Officer—Peterborough	240,000
South East Forestry Partnerships Program	Department of Treasury and Finance (for Roundwood Solutions Pty Ltd)	Utilise wood residues to produce biochar and hot air to generate steam to dry posts.	353,738

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):**

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during the 2018-19 in omnibus question 13.