

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 5 December 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.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (11:01): Before I call Mr Clerk, I would like to make a statement with regard to the matter of privilege involving the Premier in relation to the ICAC SA Health report. I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens in the house on 4 December. However, before addressing that matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to this house and its members.

Privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters than can be addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion. I have referred to the test of McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand* as a good benchmark. Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes the house in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such house in the discharge of his or her duty, which has a tendency to directly or indirectly produce such a result may be treated as contempt and therefore be considered a matter of privilege even though there is no precedent of the offence.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for West Torrens in relation to the answers provided to the house by the Premier on 3 and 4 December concerning his responses to questions on the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption report into SA Health. More specifically, the Leader of the Opposition asked the following question to the Premier in the house on 3 December:

My question is to the Premier. Now that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has delivered his report on SA Health, will the Premier now provide him with the resources that he has requested to conduct a full investigation into the state's largest public sector agency?

The Premier replied:

Yes, the Leader of the Opposition is right. This is the largest public sector agency, and we thank the commissioner for the report, which he delivered to the government last week, which has now been tabled in parliament and available for all to read. I myself am about two-thirds of the way through this report...

The member for West Torrens in raising this matter of privilege stated the following to the house:

Today in question time in his previous answer, the Premier told the parliament that the government had ample time to read the report and that the intergovernment task force was released after the report had been considered.

The member for West Torrens alleges that the Premier has deliberately and intentionally misled the house as his answer to the question asked by the leader on 3 December is inconsistent with this answer to a question on 4 December.

The member for West Torrens has subsequently provided me with an email wherein he articulates his complaint more thoroughly by identifying the inconsistency between that part of the Premier's first answer, where the Premier said, 'I myself am about two-thirds of the way through this report,' and the Premier's second answer on 4 December, which the member for West Torrens quotes in his email as follows:

We had ample time to read the report. It was only around 60 pages, plus appendices. I read the report and formed the opinion that the best way to inform the government to take action on the contents of the report was to establish an interagency task force...

The inconsistency, as I read the member for West Torrens' complaint, is that on one hand the Premier is stating that he had read 'about two-thirds' of the report, while on the other, the Premier says, 'We had ample time to read the report.' The inconsistency is that, in the opinion of the member for West Torrens, the two statements do not reconcile.

Having examined the additional information provided to me by the member for West Torrens, together with the relevant *Hansard* from 3 and 4 December, I do not see enough of an inconsistency between the two statements to establish a prima facie case of privilege. While the Premier's first answer refers to his own progress in reading the report, his subsequent answer, where he says, 'We had ample time to read the report,' can readily be understood to be a more inclusive description of a collective reading of the report, rather than relating to each and every individual who may comprise the collective.

Further, the Premier's subsequent response that 'I read the report' does not of itself indicate the extent to which the Premier had read the report. As such, it cannot be said that it is that inconsistent with his earlier answer. Therefore, on the evidence available to me, it is not clear that a prima facie case has been made out that would amount, or be intended or likely to amount, to an improper interference that would generally be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties.

Therefore, in the Chair's opinion, this is not a matter of privilege for the reason I set out above. In the Chair's view, the matter could not genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties. Therefore, I decline to give the matter the precedence that would allow the member to immediately pursue the matter; however, my opinion, as always, does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:06): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable me to move for the establishment of a privileges committee forthwith.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, please ring the bells.

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

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority being present, I accept the motion. Member for West Torrens, do you wish to speak?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:09): Yes, sir, I do. Sir, I note that in your ruling you did not say there was a prima facie case that the Premier misled the parliament. I believe the chronology of what occurred over the last two days shows that the Premier deliberately and intentionally attempted to interfere with the deliberations of this house.

Sir, you tabled the ICAC report given to you on 29 November at your first opportunity at the commencement of parliament on Tuesday 3 December. That day, 45 minutes later, the government held a press conference where the minister awkwardly marched out of the Royal Adelaide Hospital with senior health executives, without Dr McGowan, and announced a response or a task force to contemplate the ICAC report you, sir, had tabled. Later on in that question time, the Premier was asked a question, to which he responded:

Yes, the Leader of the Opposition is right. This is the largest public sector agency, and we thank the commissioner for the report, which was delivered to the government last week, which has now been tabled in parliament and available for all to read.

This is the important part is:

I myself am about two-thirds of the way through this report.

The following day, in response to questions from the Leader of the Opposition about the government's response and its handling of this matter, the Premier told the parliament this:

We had ample time to read the report. It was only about 60 pages, plus appendices. I read the report and formed the opinion that the best way to inform the government to take action on the contents of the report was to establish the interagency task force—

The parliament was told on Tuesday by press release at 11.45 that an interagency response had been established, but a few hours later the Premier told the parliament he had not even read the report. The next day he tells the parliament, 'Before I announce the interagency report, I have read the report.' No, he did not.

An honourable member: They both can't be true.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They both can't be true. The parliament has been misled. We need to have a privileges committee to call the Premier before the bar and ask him questions, to call the officers in this agency to find out who knew what when, because both statements cannot stand, let alone the learned legal opinion of the Attorney-General, who handed out the report and told everyone they could not read it, and then afterwards said, 'Actually, you could read it, so I'm sorry I told you you couldn't read it.' So, yes, we will leave that legal opinion to one side.

Mr Brown: Just put that to one side.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Put that to one side. What we have here is the parliament being told two completely different things about the same topic. That is a clear definition, and McGee speaks very clearly of impeding the operation of the house. The operation of the house in good order is that the parliament is given accurate information. We cannot conduct ourselves as an opposition if the information we are given is inaccurate.

If we are told that an inquiry was established on the basis of an ICAC report, we should be able to believe that, but we cannot believe it when the Premier and the health minister told both chambers, almost at the same time, that they had not read it. Then we are told the next day that 'we had ample time'.

Sir, on the justification you gave—and this is in no way a reflection on your ruling; you are entitled to make the ruling and the opposition makes no reflection on that whatsoever—you claimed 'we' meant the government as a collective. Well, the Premier and the health minister had not read the report, and if the Premier and the health minister are not running the health agency and the government, who is?

There is the idea that we can somehow have the Premier say on Tuesday that he had not read the report and on Wednesday say, 'No, no, no. I read the report; it's not very long. I had ample time at 11.45 to announce it.' We had the health minister on the radio saying that it went to cabinet and the Premier telling us here that it was not a cabinet deliberation.

Mr Malinauskas: It's a farce.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a farce and a shambles. The only way to sort this out is to have an inquiry. The parliament cannot be misled. I know some members opposite do not like the Premier being humiliated in this way—

Dr Close: Some do.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Some might. I noticed a very interesting photograph this morning of two very senior, prominent right-wing MPs standing behind the Premier, looking at him in a certain way. It was not affection, I can say. I have seen that look. I have to say, I had to abstain from looking at him any longer. I had to abstain from looking any longer.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Trust me, I take all your instructions very seriously, and the Premier should, too. Back to the matter at hand, the opposition is asking the parliament to suspend standing orders so that we can move a motion to establish a privileges committee. I understand that members opposite do not want to debate a privileges committee. They may not want to support it, but let's let the house decide it.

Let's have the suspension, let's move the privileges committee, let's have the debate because we cannot have the Premier in two days telling us two different things about the same topic.

It just cannot work—you cannot have the good functioning of parliament. What occurs next, because the opposition has the *Hansard* of both days, with the two answers to the same question that contradict each other, is that it creates bad order in the house. It creates interjections. It creates—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is entitled to be heard, and the government will have a speaker shortly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Settle, member for Heysen.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Given the Premier did not read the report and announced the committee, announced an inquiry, and given his health minister did not do it, I think a prima facie case exists that this parliament was misled—and misled deliberately. The reason we were misled deliberately was to try to inhibit the opposition's inquiries into the conduct of the government, which is what question time is for.

We believe it fulfils the test that McGee sets. We believe it fulfils the test that the parliament demands; that is, all answers given to this place must be honest and truthful. If they are not, there are consequences no matter who you are. Whether you are a witness to a committee, whether you are the Premier or a lowly backbencher, whoever you are this parliament is supreme, and nothing and no-one should come here and ever mislead this parliament.

The Premier has to answer for his inaccurate statements. He does not even have the courtesy to come into the parliament and make a correction so that there is no misunderstanding. The arrogance is growing by the day: the contempt for the procedures of this parliament, the contempt for the procedures and the committees of this parliament. We are now having public servants mislead parliamentary inquiries. We are having public servants now making up excuses or not even turning up to parliamentary inquiries.

The House of Assembly has higher standards. The House of Assembly will not let anyone mislead it. We cannot have the Premier tell us all on one day that he had not read the report, and the next day that he had, before he ordered an inquiry into SA Health. It is clear from his own words that none of that is true. It is important that we ask the Premier questions.

It is important that we empower the Serjeant-at-Arms to go through and check the Premier's diary, to check when he was given the report and to ask the questions that we need to get the information. We need to call for documents to go through this forensically because the Premier cannot mislead the people's house. The people's house, elected every four years, elects the government. It is a solemn duty that we have in this parliament, and we cannot have our leaders in this chamber mislead the people of this state. It cannot be allowed to occur.

I ask members opposite: at least let us have the debate. At least let us move the motion. Agree to the suspension and let the parliament debate this matter so that we can argue whether or not we should have a privileges committee into the conduct of a Premier who lied to the parliament.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:19): The member for West Torrens has sought to suspend standing orders, as is his right, to move a motion to establish a privileges committee, and he has laid out the case as best he can as to why that should take place. I am unconvinced, and I imagine that the government members who stand with me are utterly unconvinced, by what he has said.

The failure of the Leader of Opposition Business to successfully lay out a case as to how the Premier allegedly has misled the parliament is why this house should not suspend standing orders to give precedence to a privileges committee and why no case has been made for the establishment of a privileges committee. To say that somebody had read two-thirds of a report on one day and the next day had read the report is actually not inconsistent. To form a view that a task force should be established—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —to announce that a task force should be established, to complete reading a report and to confirm one's view that a task force should be established, to then write to the task force members or to establish the task force formally is a chain of events that is entirely logical, especially when as soon as this government came to office we were presented with information that, indeed, was apparent to many people for a number of years—that there were problems in SA Health.

The Leader of the Opposition, having been the minister, admittedly, as he said yesterday, for only five months, and therefore not responsible for them, should have been aware of the problems in SA Health and should have established a task force then; but he did not, despite five months as minister for health and either not knowing the problems in the health system or not being interested.

The shadow minister for health, as an adviser in the minister for health's office—I think he was even chief of staff in a former minister for health's office during the period when a number of things raised in the ICAC commissioner's report were raised—should have known that many of these issues were at stake and yet did nothing, and yet sat on his hands, and yet supported Transforming Health—two words that no-one opposite has the courage to even say in the same sentence anymore.

The problems in the health system have been significant, and we were advised of that for some time. There was a report being prepared. There was a very strong level of confidence that a task force or something of that nature would be relevant and would be useful to help us inform the government's full response to the ICAC report, and that is logical—announcing and having it clear that this is logical, it having been likely even before the report came in. Announcing that that would be the case, completing the reading of the report (60-something pages read through a day; not over several weeks as other reports have been read by other ministers, but over the course of a day) and be confirmed in a view, was clearly the right course of events and exactly the appropriate thing to do. It is exactly what the Premier has done.

This government has acted in accordance with logic, and this government has been open and transparent with the house releasing it on Tuesday so that all could read it. I would encourage those opposite to read those 60 pages because there is a lot of information about what was happening in SA Health and the health system over the course of the time when the Leader of the Opposition was the minister for health and when the member for Kaurana, the shadow minister for health, was a senior political officer in the health minister's office.

It would make chilling reading for some of those on the opposite benches who express their confidence in their leader, who express their confidence in the shadow minister for health—the architects of so many of the failures in South Australia's health system. They are the people who closed the Repat, the people who left Noarlunga Hospital without overnight care. It took this government, this Minister for Health, this Premier, this member for Davenport, this member for Waite and our other southern suburbs members to announce that it was being restored this morning because we actually care about improving the health system.

While those opposite are focused on their sideshow, on their stunts, on their suspensions of standing orders and their hopeless positioning of themselves in relation to health, they cling on to the fact that there was an ICAC report. They ignore the fact that most of the detail is actually critical of their time in office, and they focus on the fig leaf covering their shame, for their horrific atrocities on the South Australian health system. There is no case that has successfully been made for a privileges committee to be laid and there is no case that has been successfully made as to why standing orders should be suspended. We have other business to get on with—let's get on with it.

An honourable member: Fig leaves covering their shame.

The SPEAKER: Yes, we heard the comment about the fig leaf, minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I already did.

Motion negatived.

Parliamentary Committees

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND
COMPENSATION: ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19**

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:25): I move:

That the second report of the committee, entitled 2018-19 Annual Report, be noted.

This is important business that we are now speaking about. I rise to speak on the second report of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, entitled 2018-19 Annual Report.

I should say from the outset that this report will provide an overview of the activities that have been undertaken by the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation (the committee), activities that occurred between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, and also provide a brief update on the committee's ongoing activities in the latter half of 2019.

In accordance with its legislative obligations, the committee continued to monitor existing relevant South Australian legislation, as well as monitoring the recommendations from and the implications associated with several externally conducted inquiries and reviews. Specifically, the committee reviewed the reports associated with the evaluation of SafeWork SA conducted by the South Australian Independent Commissioner against Corruption, the ICAC commissioner, who is quite topical at the moment.

There was also the independent review into the workplace culture within the ACT public health services and additionally the Your Voice Survey undertaken by the South Australian Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. Another investigation undertaken by the ICAC commissioner was the Public Integrity Survey. A lot of the findings in that survey led to his further investigations, which are now quite topical.

A lot of work has been done looking into activities in the Public Service in general. Some of the reading in that survey regarding SA Health and the findings of the ICAC commissioner which led to his further investigation were quite interesting, as was his most recent report into the governance in SA Health. We can touch on that a bit later in my contribution. The committee also looked into the South Australian Coroner's inquest into the death of Mr Castillo-Riffo on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital construction site.

In October 2018, the committee undertook an inquiry into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services. This inquiry has been the major focus of the committee's activities during that report period. I will touch on some of the reasons behind that. The ICAC commissioner has been investigating attitudes in the Public Service, along with Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. Over many years, one of the issues that has been highlighted through those reports has been bullying.

It has been found that bullying is occurring across all parts of the Public Sector at unacceptable levels, but SA Health was more prone to bullying and fatigue. That was certainly one of the prompts for our committee, which does have oversight of these key workplace health and safety concerns. Bullying has been going on for years, and we heard evidence that it has been reported for years, but there has been no action.

The committee, very early on in the Marshall Liberal government's time in government—in October—to supplement the work that the health minister was doing in SA Health, resolved to look into bullying and fatigue in the South Australian health system in general, not just the public health system. We wanted to look at what was going on in private health as well because there is that crossover with some of the medical professions working in public and/or private hospitals.

I just want to touch on the definitions used by this inquiry, which were based on those that Safe Work Australia has come up with. Workplace bullying is defined as repeated and unreasonable behaviour directed towards a worker or group of workers that creates a risk to health and safety. Fatigue is defined in a work context as mental and/or physical exhaustion which reduces your ability to perform your work safely and effectively.

In terms of the inquiry's terms of reference, I think it is worth highlighting what we were looking at. Some of the terms of reference were the factors contributing to workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services, the impact of workplace fatigue and bullying on the health and wellbeing of healthcare professionals, the impact of workplace fatigue and bullying on the quality, safety and effective health services and measures to improve the management and monitoring of workplace fatigue and bullying. There are other recommendations, but that gives a bit of the flavour of the key investigations we looked into.

The inquiry received written submissions up to 31 May 2019. During that time, it received more than 60 written submissions, along with more than 20 supplementary submissions, which took the form of responses to a short questionnaire following up on their written submissions. From the launch of this inquiry, the committee has been keen to ensure that it consults as broadly as possible. As part of this consultation process, the committee developed a survey which included a range of questions relating to the experience of individuals with both workplace fatigue and/or bullying. The survey was open from 3 April 2019 to 31 May 2019.

In order to ensure that the information relating to this survey could be collected from as many stakeholders as possible, the committee asked a range of relevant agencies and organisations to assist in notifying their members about this survey. These ranged from SA Health, the College for Emergency Medicine, SASMOA, the Health Services Union and the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation. They certainly assisted with the distribution of the survey, and I acknowledge that and thank them for assisting us in getting a fuller understanding the state of play in SA Health. As I said, we greatly appreciate the assistance that the committee received in this regard.

I should note that all responses to these surveys were anonymous and confidential. A total of 2,299 valid responses were received. Of those responses, a high-level overview of the survey results was made available on the committee's web page. The survey itself was a voluntary, self-selecting survey, so was more likely to attract respondents who had been affected either by workplace fatigue and/or bullying. This should be taken into account when interpreting the results.

In terms of some of the overall trends and rates of bullying and fatigue, they were found to be reasonably consistent across all the constituent parts of SA Health. The committee did hear evidence that it seemed to be centred around CALHN more so than others but, in fact, the survey found it to be quite consistent across all local health networks and the Ambulance Service, as well. This is also consistent with the findings conducted by the ICAC commissioner's survey and the public sector workforce, as well.

If I could also touch on a few more of the themes, not only did we have some standard, quantitative responses but we also had qualitative responses that allowed for free-form explanations of some of the responses by survey respondents. Some of the themes that were identified around that survey that were quite prominent were around workplace culture and the complaints resolution process around bullying, especially in terms of a dissatisfaction with how the complaints around bullying and fatigue were resolved.

Before going into more detail, I will touch on some of the submissions. In terms of using surveys as a tool to engage with stakeholders as part of an inquiry process, they have been used in other Australian jurisdictions, but they have not been used previously here in South Australia. The committee sees them as a really effective tool and an important part of running the inquiry to help engage with as many stakeholders as possible. We certainly encourage other South Australian parliamentary committees to consider using this mechanism into the future.

During the reporting period, the committee met on a total of 16 occasions and heard from 20 witnesses, who were all in connection with the inquiry on workplace fatigue and bullying. Of those 20 witnesses the committee heard from, two were individuals whose submissions focused on instances of fatigue and/or bullying they had previously experienced or witnessed. The remaining witnesses were individuals appearing as representatives of nine separate organisations. These stakeholder organisations certainly provided valuable information about the impact of fatigue and bullying, as well as information about potential ways in which these matters could be addressed into the future.

Given the scope and the complexity of the inquiry, the committee is taking care to ensure that it consults widely and fully understands the key issues. It has been quite a substantive inquiry. As I said, it has been going for all of 2019 and the last part of 2018. When we started the inquiry and looked into it in depth, we realised from the early stages that a final report was not likely to be finalised for at least 12 months. At the time of tabling the report here in the parliament, the committee is aiming to complete its information collection by November (we are hearing our last witnesses tomorrow), and then from that hopefully come up with some draft recommendations. That is why we are still meeting in December.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PATTERSON: That's right—it is one of the last times we will meet. Another key aspect of this inquiry was to make some site visits to some of the primary tertiary hospitals in South Australia. The committee resolved to visit the Flinders Medical Centre, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the South Australian Ambulance Service headquarters at Parkside and also the Lyell McEwin Hospital to look at a range of initiatives they are undertaking, and I will touch on those briefly.

We went to the Flinders Medical Centre because the committee received a number of submissions and heard from a number of witnesses regarding the importance of rostering with respect to the management of fatigue, and this was really important. The member for Davenport and I went to the Flinders Medical Centre and found really interesting some of the initiatives they are taking and saw the stresses the emergency department is under.

So funding for the upgrading of the emergency department, adding an extra 30 beds, was a really welcome announcement this morning from the health minister. This will be really vital in providing an upgraded emergency system in the south and will be welcomed by the member for Davenport, who has been pushing strongly for it. He has seen the stresses the department is under, and the staff who took us on the tour of the Flinders Medical Centre will certainly see it as welcome announcement, too.

The member for Davenport and I then went to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where we were met by a member from the upper house, the Hon. Tung Ngo, and we looked at how bullying complaints are handled. Some of the evidence we heard was around the hierarchical nature of health and how that made it hard for bullying complaints to be resolved adequately. There was a lot of influence by having these hierarchies in place, and how this culture can be broken and how complaints are handled we see as key requirements the committee we will have to address.

We then went to the South Australian Ambulance headquarters at Parkside in regard to fatigue management and the great work they are doing in recognising fatigue and elevating it to be a core part of their rostering decision-making so that at all times fatigue is looked at. Their fatigue management, while quite simple, seems to be very effective. I am certain that is something that the committee will look at going forward.

Finally, the member for Davenport and I then went to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, where we looked at the safety learning system that is used to report incidents that are occurring in SA Health. They are also starting to roll out a program about speaking up for safety, which aims to promote professional accountability. This is all really important to provide for the health and wellbeing of not only medical professionals in the South Australian health system but also, ultimately, patients, in that the medical professionals who are treating them are not subject to bullying and fatigue.

I thank the committee for their efforts. I thank parliamentary officers Mr Eugene Braslavskiy and Mr Simon Macdonald for their hard work and, previously, Ms Anthea Howard.

Motion carried.

Motions

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT REGULATIONS

Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation, No. 2, Mr Teague to move:

That regulations made under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, entitled Development Assessment, made on 20 June 2019 and laid on the table of this house on 2 July 2019, be disallowed.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:41): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order: my understanding is that this regulation was disallowed in the upper house last night. As such, the regulation does not exist as in the format on the *Notice Paper*. It would be inappropriate for us to debate a matter that actually does not exist.

Mr Pederick: We are not; we are postponing it.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Why would you postpone it then? It does not exist.

The SPEAKER: We have the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Let the Speaker make the ruling.

The SPEAKER: Yes, we have the point of order. It is on the *Notice Paper*. I am going to take it in chronological order, but the member for Light does raise a good point. If it is postponed, in any case it will become obsolete anyway. We have the motion to postpone; it has been moved by the member for Heysen. I thank the member for Light.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: LAKE BONNEY BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:43): I move:

That the 32nd report of the committee for the Fifth-Fourth Parliament, entitled Lake Bonney Battery Energy Storage System, be noted.

In 2017, the South Australian government established a Renewable Technology Fund to incentivise the deployment of the next generation of storage technology. The Department for Energy and Mining advised the Public Works Committee that four of the projects awarded grant funding under the Renewable Technology Fund required referral to the Public Works Committee as the projects grants equalled or exceeded \$4 million. The projects to be referred included the Lake Bonney battery energy storage system.

The Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 requires that no funds should be expended on actual public works until the work has first been examined by the Public Works Committee and the final report presented to the parliament. The Public Works Committee has been advised that some construction-related milestone payments have already been paid in relation to the Lake Bonney battery energy storage project. The Department for Energy and Mining has submitted the project to the Public Works Committee for consideration. The committee held a public hearing for the project on 17 October 2019 and heard evidence from officers of the Department for Energy and Mining.

The Lake Bonney battery energy storage project involves the design, installation, testing and commercial operation of a 25-megawatt and 52-megawatt Tesla battery energy storage system that is co-located with the existing 278.5-megawatt Lake Bonney Wind Farm in South Australia. The battery is expected to provide additional dispatchable generation in the state to help meet peak demand.

The primary objectives of the project are to generate energy cost savings for customers and to provide system security services to the South Australian distribution network. When fully charged, the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) will have 52 megawatt hours of stored electricity for dispatch through the network.

The Public Works Committee has scrutinised written and oral evidence in relation to this project, and 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. Having given regard to the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, I am pleased to report to parliament that the Public Works Committee recommends the scope of the proposed public works.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:46): I certainly support this report from the very capable Chair of the Public Works Committee. I want to put on the record the importance of this development. It is not a development on its own; we now have four grid-scale batteries in South Australia, which is something we called for very strongly while in opposition throughout the debate on energy policy. Energy policy was one of the key features leading up to the last election but extended for around two or three years before the election.

This battery, which is being reported on today, is in Lake Bonney in the South-East. We also have another battery at Dalrymple at the bottom of Yorke Peninsula, one in Lincoln Gap near Port Augusta, and everyone would be aware of the 100-megawatt battery in Hornsdale, near Jamestown. That battery will soon become 150 megawatts, or I think a total of around 195 megawatt hours of capacity.

This is important because it is part of our government's policy to harness renewable energy. Renewable energy is fantastic. It is absolutely terrific for so many reasons we are all aware of, but we need to harness it so that it works for consumers and so that it is affordable, reliable and dispatchable on demand. Grid-scale storage is a key part of that, but grid-scale storage does much more: it has the capacity to help with frequency control, voltage control and also with providing synthetic inertia.

Those things will help us avoid a significant number of blackouts. We have had blackouts in this state at times when we have not had enough electricity to meet demand and also at times when there were shocks to the system. These are usually caused by under or over frequency, under or over voltage, and insufficient inertia.

I hope and expect that over time there will be more of these batteries. They are a critical part of the Marshall government's energy policy and they will remain incredibly valuable in providing a range of services in our electricity system for decades to come.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:48): I am certainly very appreciative of the minister's additional insight and his commitment, not only to this project but to the scope of works right throughout the state, to ensure that we have energy security, that we are meeting our commitment to deliver cleaner energy in this state, and to adopt new, versatile and useful technology that I am sure will continue to serve our interests for many years.

I know that the minister has brought a great deal of horsepower and focus to this topic. He has rolled out a battery scheme that is the envy of other states and the commonwealth. It was featured in the course of the last federal election campaign. It takes real commitment, passion and thoughtfulness to deliver a project of that scope and magnitude. It also takes courage to drive real reform. We cannot overlook in this place the minister's commitment to real reform in the energy market in South Australia and this government's commitment to reducing energy costs as well.

We know, of course, that standing offer arrangements have reduced energy prices for those moving to a standing offer and also that energy prices in the market are experiencing a decline. This government's policies are putting downward pressure on prices in South Australia. This is not an easy market to correct, in view of the policies of the previous government, but the minister certainly has the courage to ensure that our policies are delivered.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HYDROGEN PARK SA PROJECT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:50): I move:

That the 33rd report of the committee, entitled Hydrogen Park SA Project, be noted.

The Department for Energy and Mining recently advised the Public Works Committee that four of the projects awarded grant funding under the Renewable Technology Fund, which was established in 2017, require referral to the Public Works Committee, as I mentioned earlier. The project grants equal or exceed \$4 million. The Hydrogen Park SA Project was one of the projects to be referred in those circumstances.

The Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 requires that no funds should be expended on actual public works, as I also earlier remarked, until the works have first been examined by the Public

Works Committee and the final report presented in this place. The Public Works Committee has been advised that some construction-related milestone payments have, in fact, already been disbursed as part of the Hydrogen Park SA Project.

The Department for Energy and Mining submitted the project to the Public Works Committee for consideration. The committee held a public hearing for the project on 17 October 2019. The first stage of the project is expected to deliver a hydrogen production and distribution facility using a 1.25 megawatt electrolyser to demonstrate hydrogen production from renewable electricity and recycled water. It is very important project. The project will also demonstrate the blending of hydrogen and natural gas for injection into Australian Gas Networks' gas distribution network for the use of blended gas by local residential gas users.

The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and 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. I am pleased to report that, 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 scope of the public works that I have outlined and that are described in more detail in the final report that is before the house.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:53): I also rise on this report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Hydrogen Park SA Project. This is a really great project that is occurring right here in South Australia. After sitting and evaluating this report, once the Public Works Committee had interrogated it and given approval and sign-off's I was lucky enough to see works progressing on it.

On Monday, it was a great day to be with the energy minister (member for Stuart), the Premier and also the member for Elder to see the ground breaking of this fantastic facility. In terms of what it is looking to do, hydrogen really has a fantastic ability. It is going to provide clean energy going forward, and it will support the transition to low-emissions energy across not only electricity but also potentially going forward heating transport and industry as well. The member for Kavel previously spoke about trying to get reliability into the electricity network now that there is a lot of intermittent renewable electricity generation. What is really required is to be able to get capacity in there and dispatchable electricity, and hydrogen going forward will certainly be one way to do this.

In terms of the specifics around this proposal, it is looking at generating hydrogen or producing hydrogen. A 1.25 megawatt electrolyser will be built there, and then the hydrogen produced will be able to be blended into the normal natural gas network, and then 780 local homes just in and around Tonsley will be part of the trial. In terms of the gas, it is around 5 per cent blended natural gas with hydrogen, and so the end user should see no difference in their consumption of gas and its heating properties, and also their appliances will be able to be used.

If we look back in time many years ago, hydrogen was used as part of the gas network, as part of town gas, but that hydrogen was produced using coal. This hydrogen is looking at using green energy, renewable energy to produce electricity that then the electrolyser uses to convert into hydrogen. If I could just touch on the impact, it is the first of its type in Australia. It is very exciting that here in South Australia we are looking to progress this.

There is a fantastic opportunity not only in South Australia but also worldwide to export long-term hydrogen. I know that the Premier has seen what the potentials are both in South Korea and Japan, and there are some exciting abilities for this to be an export market for South Australia. South Australia, of course, is blessed with both complementary wind and solar, and so to be able to produce green hydrogen is certainly very important.

I think that Bill Gates has said that one of the answers to trying to support the transition to low-emissions energy is going to require there to be technology evolution. We cannot just use our current technology: we have to create new technologies to be able to solve some of our problems going forward. I think that, with the rate of energy consumption increasing throughout the world as well, it is really a challenge for the global society, and technology is really going to be fundamental towards solving those problems.

Certainly hydrogen has great opportunities, and so it is fantastic that this government has put in place steps towards seeing this project, which will be a trial, and then going forward hopefully it will be expanded. As the energy minister said, people will look back in 10 to 20 years and say, 'Well, this was a first step but a vital step going forward for not only South Australia but also nationally.'

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:57): I appreciate very much the contribution from the member for Morphett not only to this debate but also to the work of the committee. The member for Morphett is a valuable member of the committee. We draw on his engineering expertise frequently, and we certainly appreciate that he is available to us as a resource, as much as he is available to this place. I thank him for his commitment, as I say, to the project and to the work of this parliament, and I also acknowledge the work of the minister in ensuring that this project can be brought forward.

It is right to say that this project is visionary and requires dedication to a vision to ensure that it can be delivered, and we know of course that the minister has that commitment, vision and willingness to embrace new technology to ensure that there is a future that not only fully embraces renewable energy and ensures that we are meeting our climate commitments but also ensures that we have a reliable energy supply. New technology is fundamental to that cause and that mission.

Motion carried.

Bills

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:59): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to regulate government advertising, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce the Government Advertising Bill 2019, which gives effect to the government's election commitment to introduce stricter controls on taxpayer-funded advertising. Essentially, the bill makes it unlawful for government advertising to feature the voice or image of a member of parliament or a minister.

On 19 October 2017, I introduced a private member's bill that had a more expansive scope of operation into parliament to amend the Electoral Act 1985. The catalyst for this bill was the behaviour, and absolute waste of taxpayer funds, of the then government during their extensive campaign for their Fund My Neighbourhood grant funding scheme and the multimillion-dollar advertisements spruiking their electricity policy.

After the election in 2018, the government prepared a new standalone bill for consultation with a range of government agencies, and valuable contributions to the bill have been made during this consultation process. In March 2018, this government amended the Marketing Communications Guidelines, which regulate government advertising and other communications. The government has continued to review the guidelines regularly to ensure appropriate controls and transparent processes are in place.

Since 1 July 2019, the Government Communications Advisory Committee has maintained operational responsibility for reviewing and approving government communications, marketing and sponsorship activities under the guidelines. The guidelines set out an approval process for government communications that varies, depending on the level of expenditure. The total cost and an evaluation summary for communications initiatives above \$50,000, excluding GST, are now published on the Department of the Premier and Cabinet website. This bill:

- gives statutory recognition to the Marketing Communications Guidelines discussed above;

- provides that government advertising must not contain the voice or image of a member of parliament or a minister;
- defines government advertising as advertising purchased by a government agency under a contract or arrangement for commercial media distribution;
- provides for regulations to prescribe or exclude advertising from the definition;
- provides an audit function for the Auditor-General, who must determine, in conducting an audit, if a breach of the act has occurred; and
- provides a reporting function for the Auditor-General in relation to any determination that he makes.

The bill balances the need for transparency and accountability in the use of taxpayer funding for advertising, with the implied constitutional freedom of political communication. I commend the bill to the 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

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines terms to be used in the measure. Key definitions include:

- government advertising, defined as advertising purchased by a government agency under a contract or arrangement for commercial media distribution. The regulations may prescribe advertising that is to be included and excluded from the definition;
- government agency, defined as a Minister, an administrative unit of the Public Service, an agency or instrumentality of the Crown or a person or body declared by the Minister by notice in the Gazette to be a government agency. The definition of government agency allows agencies to be excluded from the definition.

Part 2—Government communications guidelines

4—Government communications guidelines

The clause provides that the Minister must prepare and maintain government communications guidelines, to be published on a website to be determined by the Minister, setting out the following:

- requirements relating to the style and content of government communications;
- matters relating to approvals required for government communications;
- requirements relating to the manner in which government communications may be disseminated;
- any other matter the Minister thinks fit.

Part 3—Regulation of government advertising

5—Ministers and MPs not to be in government advertising

The clause provides that a government advertising campaign must not contain the voice or any image of a Minister, a member of Parliament or a candidate in an election.

6—Auditor-General to conduct audits of government advertising

Subclause (1) provides that an audit of the government advertising of a particular government agency may be conducted on the Auditor-General's own initiative in relation to a financial year. Alternatively, a Member of Parliament may request that the Auditor-General conduct an inquiry of particular government advertising notified in the request.

Subclause (2) provides that if an audit is conducted, the Auditor-General must determine whether the content of government advertising constitutes a breach of proposed section 5.

Subclause (3) sets out that government advertising will not constitute a breach of proposed section 5 if the voice or image of the Minister or Member or Parliament was recorded or taken at a time when that person was not a Minister or Member of Parliament or if the Minister or Member of Parliament did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that their voice or image was to be used.

Subclause (4) provides that the Auditor-General may exercise the powers and functions under Part 3 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987 in relation to an audit under this section as if it were an audit under that Act.

7—Auditor-General to report on government advertising breach

This clause provides that if the Auditor-General determines that there has been a breach of proposed section 5, they must prepare a report on the matters set out in the clause. The report must be delivered to the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly, and published in a manner set out in the clause.

Part 4—Miscellaneous

8—Delegation

This clause provides power for the Minister to delegate powers or functions under the proposed measure.

9—Regulations

This clause provides power for the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Mr ODENWALDER: Mr Chair, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 4 December 2019.)

Clause 23.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, do you have another question?

Mr ODENWALDER: No, we can move on.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 24 and 25 passed.

New clause 25A.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I move:

Amendment No 13 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 17, after line 10—After clause 25 insert:

25A—Insertion of section 105IA

Before section 105J insert:

105IA—Power of direction by police officer

(1) If a police officer is satisfied—

(a) that a person proposes to carry on an activity of a kind prescribed by the regulations or any other activity that the police officer is satisfied may cause a fire; and

(b) that because of weather conditions the fire, if caused by the activity, might get out of control,

the police officer may direct that person to refrain from carrying on the activity during a period specified in the direction.

(2) Before giving a direction under subsection (1), a police officer must take into account any relevant information contained in—

- (a) the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice published by SACFS (as in force from time to time); and
 - (b) any other code or policy prescribed by the regulations.
- (3) A person who contravenes, or fails to comply with, a direction under this section is guilty of an offence.
- Maximum penalty:
- (a) for a first offence—\$5,000 or imprisonment for 1 year;
 - (b) for a second or subsequent offence—\$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to speak to your amendment, minister? No. Member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Odenwalder-1]—

Amendment to Amendment No 13 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 17, after line 10, inserted section 105IA(1)—after 'If' insert:

, on the advice of an authorised officer of an emergency services organisation,

Amendment No 2 [Odenwalder-1]—

Amendment to Amendment No 13 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 17, after line 10—after subsection (3) of inserted section 105IA insert:

(4) In this section—

authorised officer means an officer or other member of an emergency services organisation authorised by the Chief Officer of the emergency services organisation to act as an authorised officer under this section.

Before I speak to my amendments, I want to reiterate what I said yesterday, and that is that I have no intention of delaying the passage of this bill. There are some important measures in the bill. I have had a chance to consider them more thoroughly, and I think this bill does some things that are probably overdue. Having said that, I still reserve the right to seek amendments in the other place as we go through and as I continue to consult with the stakeholders concerned.

I do insist on these two amendments, except for the amendment moved by the minister, which essentially replaces the direction powers from the CFS, the local CFS or any CFS officer, to any police officer. It is that which is the crux of the problem. I reiterate that I sought a briefing from SAPOL. I emailed the minister's office last Thursday. I still have not received a reply to that email, let alone a briefing. My knowledge of what SAPOL think of this is partially anecdotal and partially based on the evidence that Assistant Commissioner Bamford provided to the select committee.

I have read some of that into *Hansard* but I will add what I think is the crux of the matter for the police—it certainly was in February. I remain to be corrected. The police view, as far as I am aware, is, and I quote Assistant Commissioner Bamford:

I think that there's a lot of value in police supporting the CFS, as we do the fire service at the scene of a fire in the metropolitan area, but is it really the job of a police officer to go in and do what you're asking here? My intuitive response is no, it's not our primary job. To support it as a fallback, yes, I get that, but to ask us to make all those determinations all the time I think is outside the role of police.

That is the crux of the problem with the government's amendment regarding police officers. On the face of it, it seems pretty reasonable. The select committee recommended something along these lines, although it was quite a long report and it included, obviously, the transcript of Assistant Commissioner Bamford's evidence. I believe and I believe that the police believe that they are not necessarily equipped to assess fire risk.

For instance, you could have a probationary officer, fresh out of the academy, posted to somewhere on Eyre Peninsula who has to, on any given day, make an assessment according to the way that this amendment is phrased whether some harvesting activity is or is not dangerous. That puts them in a precarious position.

You could have the opposite, of course: you could have a very well experienced police officer who is also a member of the CFS. But, in the case of an inexperienced police officer or an experienced police officer who has no experience of fire and assessing fire danger, they are put in the position where if they believe something is fairly risky they tell the farmer or the harvester that their behaviour is risky and to cease that behaviour, and that farmer goes on to lose money—I do not know how much money a day of harvesting would cost a farmer—for no reason other than the police officer's own assessment of that fire risk.

On the other hand, they could assess that there is no fire risk that day and there could be a fire. Does that make that police officer liable under this section? Is there some liability attached to the police officer who does not, on his own assessment, think there is much risk of fire when it turns out that there is and that assessment is made from a position of inexperience and a lack of knowledge.

What my amendments do is accept the premise of the government's amendment, which is to give police the power to enforce the law—which they do anyway. It allows them to go onto a farmer's land and ask them to cease activity, only on the advice of an authorised officer and the authorised officer would be the chief officer of an emergency services organisation—in almost every case the CFS—or his or her delegate.

I think this strikes the right balance. It gives the police some protection. Of course, the police will always act if they think life or property is at risk of imminent danger. We all know that. They will go in and do whatever they feel they have to do. However, as to making assessments about fire risk on a day-to-day basis, that is not the job of the police. They are happy to enforce it when another more experienced agency in this field gives them advice, but it is not their job to assess fire risk. Therefore, I will accept the government's amendment with my amendments.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I start by saying that the government will not be accepting the member's amendments and I will outline why. Yesterday, I spoke about the select committee and how we got to this point from the Holloway review back in 2013. The question to the select committee was quite clear and it had two parts.

The proposed power to direct was referred to a bipartisan select committee with two specific questions: (1) is the power to direct still required and, (2) if so, who should have the power? That is what was put to the select committee and the select committee came back with, yes, the power to direct was required and it should go to SAPOL.

What the member for Elizabeth is doing, in essence, is giving that back to the CFS, which was the reason for the select committee in the first place. I do not think that is where the intent of this select committee was. I also notice these amendments were filed on Tuesday, and as I have looked over them, that is the position that has been made very clear. I am advised, however, that this was not consulted on with Grain Producers SA. I note in the *Stock Journal* today that Grain Producers SA have come out saying how happy they are for the select committee—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The *Stock Journal*? No, that is a media outlet. I can show you where it is. It is a media outlet that is distributed through the country, so you may not see or read it. Grain Producers SA are very supportive of the consultation process and where we have landed. Back to those two points: is the power to direct still required? Yes. Who should have them? SAPOL. That is where we have landed with this. To clarify, in this amendment we are making, the second part states:

- (2) Before giving a direction under subsection (1), a police officer must take into account any relevant information contained in—
 - (a) the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice published by SACFS (as in force from time to time); and
 - (b) any other code or policy prescribed by the regulations.
- (3) A person who contravenes, or fails to comply—

It goes on. There is that opportunity there. I think that is really clear, and I think the select committee made it really clear where they want it to go. The amendment you are putting forward is actually heading back to the CFS, which was again, as I stress, the reason for this select committee.

What we have established and what there will be is a working group between SAFECOM, CFS and SA Police to establish this operational model whereby suitably qualified CFS personnel will assess and interpret information to support when it may be appropriate for a police officer to issue a direction to cease activity. I must also stress that the proposed power will not be implemented for this current harvest season. This is going forward and that is where we are landing.

To add to that for the avoidance of doubt, a working group, as I pointed out, has been established, and that will be pulling together the regulations for this. That will be SAFECOM, CFS and SA Police and that is already underway.

Mr ODENWALDER: First of all, I am not tampering with the idea and the suggestion of the select committee that a police officer has the power to direct. I accept what you have said about a working group and I accept what you have said about (2)(b) 'any other code or policy prescribed by regulation'. The way the government amendment is written does not make any of that clear at all. I take you at your word, minister. I know that you are a man of your word, and I know that there will be a working group set up and these systems will be put in place, but nothing in the act dictates that, so that may not be the case. Things may change and nothing in the act would prescribe that.

At the moment, it simply says any police officer. Presumably, any police officer needs to be familiar with the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice. I do not know if many are right now, so I do not know if that is going to take some sort of training to get every police officer in the state up to speed with the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice. Apart from the working group, what prescriptions do you intend to make in the regulations that will make this crystal clear that a police officer off their own bat is not making determinations about fire risk?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am glad you referred to that working group because that is the fundamental body, as I have pointed out. SAFECOM, the CFS and SAPOL are very involved in that. What we learned through the select committee, and you would have noticed this in reading the report, is the amount of information that is actually out there in the community. This is really exciting on a number of fronts. One is, it is giving more information to the emergency service workers, police and communities to help them know the conditions in their local area so that localised decisions can be made, which will be the benefit of what we are talking about here.

The select committee did a great job in unearthing that and that technology is advancing by the day. It is great for the industry and great for everyone, and by sharing that information we will be able to make better decisions. That is what the select committee will be able to work through to make sure that utilisation of all that information in making the decision will give SAPOL all the information they need when and if they need to make that decision.

I stress the point, and we made this early in the committee stage in this conversation—and I have outlined the reasons and the questions that the select committee asked—that this came about because of people who were doing the wrong thing, or the perception they could do the wrong thing, and making sure we could do something before a catastrophic event or something very bad unfolding. Again, through the select committee process, it was made abundantly clear that pretty much everybody felt that, whilst the majority, 99.9 per cent of people, were doing the right thing, there is that 0.1 per cent that having this power would stop doing the wrong thing.

The ability is to use the threat of this power, for want of a better term, for someone in the community to ring and say, 'All the indicators say you shouldn't be doing what you're doing. If you don't stop, we will call the police,' and we have that path to go down. At the moment, they do not have that path. This and what we are doing here is giving them that path. I think that will knock the majority of this on the head, but if someone still does the wrong thing police can then step in.

That was the consensus of the select committee and from everyone I spoke to when I went around the regions and met with a lot of people. Specifically, I had a meeting in the Riverland where they talked about this and they were abundantly clear that that is where it needed to be—and that was very early days—that it needed to be with the police. My concern is that the amendments you

have steer it back to the CFS. That is what put us in this position. I appreciate you taking me at my word because this working group, with esteemed experts in this area coming together and formulating the regulations, will land us in the spot that will see us able to deliver what the intention is from the select committee.

Mr ODENWALDER: My amendment does not put it back on the CFS in the same way that the original bill was phrased. The original bill was phrased in a way that suggested any CFS officer—and this was all borne out in the select committee, of course. This was the reason for the select committee and it was the reason the Deputy Speaker here called for the select committee—that it put the onus on any local CFS volunteer, who may well be a neighbour, a friend or an employee of the person on whom they are trying to enforce the law.

I think it is a step in the right direction to give SAPOL the power to direct, but my amendment enhances that. It gives SAPOL the power to direct on the advice of someone who actually knows what they are talking about in terms of fire risk. I do not accept for a second that I am reverting back to the original intention of the bill, which was a nonsense and proved to be a nonsense in the select committee. What I am trying to do is tidy up the government amendment so that everyone is clear.

Minister, the speech you just gave sounds reassuring, but none of that is in here. None of that is written here. There is one subsection (2)(b) which says 'any other code or policy prescribed by the regulations.' I think we need you to be absolutely clear today about what those regulations will prescribe. For instance, will there be a written direction? Will landowners have some sort of notice that, if they do not cease an activity in a certain time frame, a police officer will come marching on their land and switch the harvester off?

Will there be a written order from the police officer to prescribe how long the harvester or whatever it is needs to stay off and the penalties that would apply with a breach of that written order? None of this is in this section, so if we are to take you at your word we need some sort of guarantee that those things will be prescribed by the regulations.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure that is a question, but I will take as one and say to the member again the point that I have reiterated. We have set up the committee to work through with SAFECOM, SAPOL and the CFS to come up with the regulations. They are the experts so we will get them to do that work. To be clear, police do not have to prove anything. It is about a direction power, so that is what it is. It is giving the power to police.

To reiterate the point—and you have raised it yourself, so I appreciate you doing that—(2)(a) and (2)(b) make it abundantly clear in this amendment: 'the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice published by SACFS (as in force from time to time)' and, as you point out in (b), 'any other code or policy prescribed by the regulations'. That is what this expert group will come up with, and I back them to actually come up with the formula that will work for police engaging with CFS, and SAFECOM to have oversight as well, to make sure that we get the best outcome. So that will be done in regulation and that will be the best way to get the best outcome so that we can implement what the select committee found.

Mr ODENWALDER: Minister, you state that SAPOL or a police officer, any police officer, does not have to prove anything. Since there are penalties attached to contravening a direction of a police officer, surely the police officer has to have some sort of evidence that someone has breached some sort of condition. None of this is clear in here. Since there are penalties, there must be a legal avenue for challenge, so the police officer could potentially be brought before some sort of court (you will have to enlighten me on what that is) in order to prove their case that a certain person was given a direction lawfully and has thereafter breached that direction.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will take that statement as a question and reiterate that this is about avoiding a catastrophic event. The situation we have at the moment is that police can act after the event when the devastation has occurred. We want to avoid that. Again, I have gone to great lengths to explain that it is really clear in the community, and this goes back to the Holloway report and the advice there from 2013 when those opposite were in government.

We have a situation where at the moment, after the event, police can prosecute. That is fantastic, but we do not want to get to after the event. That is the whole intent here: we want to make sure that, if there is someone doing the wrong thing, the police can have the power to prevent it

happening. It is about avoiding a catastrophic event, and that is why the select committee decided that the power was needed, because that is what came out of the Holloway review back in 2013. So that was still needed. That was a tick. That is what the select committee found. They also found that that power should sit with police, and that is what we are delivering.

Mr ODENWALDER: I have no argument with anything you just said, minister, but that did not address any of my concerns. How many questions do I have left?

The CHAIR: It is your amendment, so you have carriage of it. You can speak as many times as you like.

Mr ODENWALDER: I guess I will ask the minister a question: is he satisfied that SAPOL support this government amendment as it stands?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The short answer is yes. As I have outlined, the detail will come in the regulation, and we have the key stakeholders working through that, which is the CFS, SAPOL and SAFECOM as well. So, yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Further to that, is the minister satisfied that the Police Association of South Australia is entirely happy with this amendment as it stands?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said yesterday and will continue to say today, this amendment has been on the table for a number of weeks now. Everyone has been engaged in this process. It has been going on for quite a long period of time. Everyone has had a chance to have input into the select committee. Where we have landed here with this amendment and getting a group together to put the regulations in place will give us the best outcome to achieve what the select committee found to be the best way to deal with this issue, and I have every confidence in that.

Mr ODENWALDER: With respect to the minister, Chair, and with your indulgence, he did not answer the question. I asked specifically whether he was of the view that the Police Association of South Australia are supportive and happy with this amendment as it stands?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The Police Association of South Australia have not raised this issue with me.

Mr ODENWALDER: Did you consult on this amendment with the Police Association?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: This is your amendment.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, the amendment that you brought, the one amendment.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said, it has lain on the table for a couple of weeks. Any stakeholder out there has had an opportunity—Grain Producers SA reached out to us and said, 'We like what's going on, we like where you're going, it meets what the select committee said.' If anyone else had any issues, they were free to raise that with me.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will not delay the house with any further questions.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just add that I have just been informed that my office and SAFECOM met with Mark Carroll over this amendment. So they did meet and they have had discussions. To my knowledge, there were no major concerns that came back to me. As I said, I think it was explained to them that work is being done through this group to bring that together. There was no definitive line to question, if you like, because that group—involving, as I have stressed, SAFECOM, SAPOL and the CFS—are working on those regulations.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will just quickly respond to that. I look forward to, between the houses, my own consultation with the Police Association. I also look forward to eventually receiving a response to my request for a meeting with SAPOL so that I can discuss this with them and make a determination about whether this amendment should ultimately be supported in the form in which the government has put it.

Amendments to amendment negated; new clause inserted.

Clause 26 negated.

Clauses 27 and 28 passed.

Clause 29.

Mr ODENWALDER: Minister, this is about substantially changing the command structure within SES units. I will not be opposing this actively in this place; however, I reserve my right to seek further consultation with the Volunteers' Association. I have had some consultations with the Volunteers' Association. Anecdotally, I think there is some concern among unit members that this changes the form of local democracy that they have come to enjoy but, as I said, I will not be opposing it here. Can the minister outline what this change does to the basic structure of the SES? Is it intended to reflect the way the CFS works? Who asked for it? What consultation has been undertaken with the volunteer association?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his questions. I am informed this is another longstanding tidy-up, for want of a better term, that has been hanging around for years and years, back to the previous government. So the opportunity was taken to tidy this up. I think you hit the nail on the head and that is that it is to bring the structure in line with the CFS. I am informed the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 does not provide clarity for the SES regarding the appointment, termination or disqualification of volunteer SES members, and the powers of command and control, as they relate to volunteer officers, are unclear.

While the act provides the chief officer with broad-ranging powers in section 109, similar to those of the CFS chief officer, it does not specify a command structure for the SES. Again, my information is that this is just tidying up an anomaly that has been there for a number of years. Some might say—it could be a little bit harsh—that the previous government never got around to doing this and we are just tidying it up now.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will not dwell on this, but do I take it then that the previous amendment, which deletes any reference to a constitution that relates to this obviously, means that there will be no local democratic structure at all in the SES? As a corollary to that, do any exist in the CFS at the moment?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In essence, what you are doing is going back to a previous amendment that you have already passed. I am informed that the need for unit constitutions is a legacy matter relating back to a time when SES units were separately incorporated bodies, so that is the reason fundamentally.

Clause passed.

Clause 30 passed.

Clause 31.

Mr SZAKACS: Minister, I am interested in the statutory definition to which you turn to for defining 'employment' under new section 127A.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, could you repeat that.

Mr SZAKACS: I am interested in the statutory definition to which you turn to define 'employment' under section 31, or new section 127A.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that section 33 of the Emergency Management Act 2004, section 772(1)(h) of the Fair Work Act 2009 and the National Employment Standards provide volunteers with some protection from dismissal if they are absent from work to respond to an emergency. This section provides legislative protections from dismissal for all emergency services workers and it has been supported by the CFS.

Mr SZAKACS: What new protections or otherwise does this clause provide, in addition to, for example, the codes under the Fair Work Act?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that what this is doing is putting into statute the role volunteers play and, as outlined in the amendment, they are not liable to be dismissed or prejudiced in employment for reasons of absence doing their work as an emergency service worker.

Mr SZAKACS: Is there anything new in this clause then, further to your previous answer, around the fair work code?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. That was outlined in my previous answer. That is the information I have been given. I have been informed that came from the Holloway review, so that was back in 2013. Were you here? The shadow minister might have been, but that was from that time. Actually, you were probably in high school. Look at your young face.

Mr SZAKACS: Almost. Minister, you may or may not be aware then that under the Fair Work Act there are special provisions which exclude small businesses from unfair dismissal protection. You must, in any instance, have been an employee for six months before you can seek remedy for unfair dismissal. If you work for a small business, that must be 12 months. To what extent does this new clause interplay with the Fair Work Act, and in particular I am interested in the principles of the federal law to any inconsistency overriding state law?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I take your question as I think it is intended, this does not override federal law, obviously. That still stands as it is, as you have outlined. What we are doing here is just putting it in a statute and making it even clearer that a person who is absent from employment on official duties as a member of an emergency services organisation in connection with a fire or other emergency is not liable to be dismissed or prejudiced in employment by reason of that absence. It just makes it really clear that, if someone is out there serving their community, they cannot be dismissed for that reason. The other federal laws would all still stand as they always do.

Mr SZAKACS: I take it then from the last couple of answers that this is more of a statement of principle than a new protection at law, because if you are correct in your answer that the federal law still applies, which it does, then a volunteer is still liable to be dismissed for any reason if they are an employee of a small business or if they have not been employed for six months or 12 months, depending upon the statutory threshold?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What we probably need to note is that there are some generalisations going on in your question, and we cannot generalise about the employment contracts of different people because there are state-based IR laws as well—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, if I can just finish, what this does is it shows our support to volunteers, because it is really—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Hang on. Sorry, if I can just finish, it shows our support to volunteers and sends a very important message to employers that we are supporting them. That is the key factor with this, and I think it is something that needs to be made abundantly clear in this place. We need to show our support to volunteers. They do an outstanding job.

We have just been over on Yorke Peninsula, and many people in this place have spoken about what volunteers have done in recent events. Again, there is some generalisation in what you are saying. State-based IR laws are in place and, without going through every one of those, they do stand, but the intent of this is to very much support our volunteers.

The CHAIR: Member for Cheltenham, you have had four questions, but I am filled with Christmas cheer today, so I will allow one more because I know this is a passion of yours.

Mr SZAKACS: You are magnanimous in your—

The CHAIR: But this is your last question.

Mr SZAKACS: Minister, I appreciate your sentiment and agree entirely. The better protection we can have for our volunteers in respect of their protections to be treated more fairly at work is very important. Should somebody, a volunteer, be wronged or seek remedy under this new section, in which jurisdiction would they seek that remedy—which tribunal and under which jurisdiction?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, that is a very generalised question. It would depend on the person's employment arrangements—how they are employed, what IR set-up they are employed under. So it would be specific to specific people, depending on their industrial relations agreement with their employer.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given the minister's previous answers and his obvious respect for our volunteers, will he be making representations to his federal counterparts about possibly changing federal law so that it reflects the measures outlined in this section?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his question. Just to be clear, as I am informed, the Fair Work Act 2009 and the National Employment Standards provide volunteers with some protection from dismissal, so that would be federal matter. From the state-based perspective, we are putting this into the legislation to make sure that we show and we are very clear in our appreciation in respect of our volunteers and the work that they do. We are making it very clear to their employers where we stand.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (32 to 34) passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I move:

Amendment No 15 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 20, line 10—Delete 'Related amendments and transitional' and substitute 'Transitional'

Amendment No 16 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 20, lines 11 to 24—Delete Part 1 and the heading to Part 2

Amendment No 17 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 20, lines 25 to 28 [Schedule 1, clause 2]—Delete clause 2

Amendments carried; schedule as amended passed.

Long title.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I move.

Amendment No 18 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Long title—Delete 'and to make a related amendment to the *Emergency Management Act 2004*'

Amendment carried; long title as amended passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:49): As a third reading contribution, I want to reiterate some of the things I said. I do not want to delay this bill either in this house or in the other place. There are probably some important changes that need to be made here. As we go through it, it is becoming clearer that there are some important changes that need to be made.

I still have reservations, however, that the police are not given proper guidance and, indeed, proper protection by this bill. The amendments I have tabled would go some way to do that. I am happy for the government to bring further amendments to those amendments in order to tidy them up. I am not convinced that the provisions within the current bill as it stands now properly direct or protect police. Having said that, I do not intend to see the bill delayed in the other place unnecessarily, although I think we will be insisting on at least those amendments up there.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:50): I thank the member for Elizabeth and the member for Cheltenham for their contributions, and I do note that this has been a long time in coming. The Holloway review was in 2013 and it had six years under the previous government. It has now been just over 18 months in this place with us.

I thank again the member for his support of this bill and reiterate his concerns. The group we had of SACFS, SAPOL and SAFECOM working on the regulations will land us, in my opinion, in a very good place to make sure that the intent of the select committee's findings and what we want to do here—to make sure that we keep people safe and we have this ability to prevent things happening in the future—will be a win for all South Australians and add to the safety of our state.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) BILL

Second Reading

Second reading.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (12:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In November 2017, parliament introduced two new offences and associated penalties applying to trucks and buses on the South Eastern Freeway descent into Adelaide. These offences and penalties came into operation on 1 May this year and were implemented in response to recommendations from a coronial inquest following repeated crashes involving out of control heavy vehicles that tragically resulted in the loss of lives and serious injuries.

The first offence was for exceeding the relevant speed by 10 km/h or more, and the second offence was for failing to use a gear that was low enough to enable the vehicle to be driven safely when descending the down track of the South Eastern Freeway. The associated penalties included a six-month licence disqualification, six demerit points and a \$1,036 expiation fee for individuals and an additional \$25,000 body corporate levy for a business where the vehicle detected speeding was registered to a business and that business failed to nominate the driver of the vehicle.

The government acknowledges and is seeking to address concerns regarding the severity of the penalties that have been introduced, especially in regard to the impact on small business, while continuing to support positive road safety outcomes. The government has moved amendments to the Statutes Amendment (Suspension of South Eastern Freeway Offences) Bill 2019 as introduced into the Legislative Council on 16 October 2019 by the Hon. Frank Pangallo MLC.

The government supported clause 1, with amendment to commence on proclamation, and clause 2, with amendment to the title to remove 'Suspension of', as well as clauses 4 and 7. The government passed further amendments to apply the following revised sanctions and penalties to both offences for trucks and buses on the prescribed section of the South Eastern Freeway:

- remove the six-month licence disqualification applying for a first offence and reduce the duration of licence disqualification periods applying to second offences from 12 months to six months and the third offence from three years to 12 months and subsequent offences remaining at three years;
- reduce the duration of court-imposed licence disqualification periods applicable to first, second and subsequent offences to ensure parity between the applicable penalty levels as follows:
 - for a first offence from maximum \$5,000 penalty plus 12 month licence disqualification to maximum \$5,000 penalty plus six month licence disqualification;
 - for a second offence from two years' imprisonment plus three years' licence disqualification to two years' imprisonment plus 12 month licence disqualification;
 - for a subsequent offence there is no change to the existing two years' imprisonment plus three years licence disqualification.

The government's amendments also remove the six month immediate loss of licence given to the driver for a first offence roadside. Currently, if a truck or bus is detected roadside for either the low gear offence or the speeding offence, SA Police can issue a six month immediate loss of licence to the driver for a first offence. This amendment ensures a consistent enforcement approach between the two offences and for the speed offence, whether detected roadside or via camera.

In addition, the amendments moved by the government propose to reduce the current body corporate levy, from \$25,000 to \$5,000, where the offence is expiated. Where the matter proceeds to court and a business is convicted for failing to nominate the driver of a vehicle detected for a South Eastern Freeway speeding offence, the government amendments reduce the current amount that can be applied by a court from not less than \$25,000 and not more than \$50,000 to not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$20,000.

The government believes this proposed reduction in the body corporate levy will have a positive effect on businesses, particularly small businesses that would otherwise struggle or be unable to pay the \$25,000, thus being forced into liquidation. Drivers detected after the commencement of the proposed amendments—on a date to be fixed by proclamation—will incur no licence disqualification for a first offence, but will still incur a \$1,036 expiation fee plus six demerit points.

The government amendments will be communicated widely to the heavy vehicle industry via a mail-out to registered owners of trucks and buses, updated information on the DPTI website and social media, a fact sheet prepared for industry and a ministerial media release, as well as reminders on motor vehicle registration renewal notices. It should be noted that the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure undertook an extensive communication campaign before the heavy penalties came into operation on 1 May this year.

This included targeted advice via a mail-out to almost 2,000 South Australian clients in March 2019 who have a vehicle registered with a GVM between 4½ tonnes and six tonnes or a GVM of less than 4,501 kilograms but more than 12 seats. The mail-out advised owners that their vehicle is classed as a truck or bus and the 60 km/h or lower posted speed limit applies to these vehicles from the Crafers interchange to the bottom of the South Eastern Freeway. Visual cues and clarification were provided through the inclusion of a large SUV, a small commuter bus, e.g. a Toyota Hi-Ace, and a motorhome all depicted on a postcard included in the mail-out information.

On 22 March 2019, letters were sent out by the department to all registered owners of trucks and buses—approximately 22,000 in total—advising them about the new laws and the significant penalties that will apply. Owners and operators were also provided with a detailed fact sheet for distribution among their employees and other networks.

Other communications have included a media release, digital notifications and updates on social media, a dedicated South Eastern Freeway webpage, printed material at rest stops, a press ad and letters sent directly to industry bodies and stakeholders across the country. Additional signs have also been installed on the down track of the South Eastern Freeway reminding truck and bus drivers about the impending steep descent and the need to use low gear and descend safely. The department will continue to promote the new laws via its website and social media, as necessary.

I seek leave to have the remainder of my second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

It should be noted that all trucks and buses cannot be driven by the holders of a 'C' class driver's licence. Drivers of these vehicles are required to hold an 'LR' class licence as a minimum or higher. This should be a clear indicator to drivers of trucks and buses that they are subject to the new laws.

By removing the six month licence disqualification for a first offence, the Government is striking the right balance between acknowledging that this is the most dangerous stretch of road in South Australia that has been home to some awful accidents and sometimes some poor behaviour and wanting to send a strong signal about that but on the other hand not wanting to essentially have the penalties so harsh that they create unintended consequences and potentially affect people's livelihoods.

Reducing the body corporate levy from \$25,000 down to \$5,000 is still almost 2.5 times more than the existing body corporate levy applicable to all other red light and speed offences detected by camera but also reduces undue financial burden on businesses where the driver is not nominated.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause is formal.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Motor Vehicles Act 1959

4—Amendment of section 81BC—Disqualification for certain offences relating to section 45C of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*

Under section 81BC the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is currently required to give a person who expiates an offence against section 45C of the *Road Traffic Act 1961* (exceeding a speed limit by 10 kph or more, or failing to engage a low gear, on a prescribed part of the South Eastern Freeway in a truck or bus) or section 79B of that Act (being the owner of a truck or bus that appears from camera evidence to have been involved in exceeding a speed limit by 10 kph or more on such a part of the Freeway) a licence disqualification for a period of 6 months for a first offence, 12 months for a second offence or 3 years for a subsequent offence. This clause amends section 81BC to alter the period of disqualification to none for a first offence, 6 months for a second offence, 12 months for a third offence and 3 years for a subsequent offence.

Part 3—Amendment of Road Traffic Act 1961

5—Amendment of section 45C—Speed and gear restrictions for trucks and buses on prescribed roads

This clause amends section 45C to change the disqualification period that must be imposed by a court on conviction of a person for an offence against section 45C (exceeding a speed limit by 10 kph or more, or failing to engage a low gear, on a prescribed part of the South Eastern Freeway in a truck or bus) from a minimum of 12 months for a first offence and 3 years for a subsequent offence to a minimum of 6 months for a first offence, 12 months for a second offence and 3 years for a subsequent offence.

6—Amendment of section 45D—Power of police to impose licence disqualification or suspension for section 45C etc offences

Under section 45D police officers are currently authorised to give a notice of licence disqualification or suspension to a person for an offence against section 45C of the Act (exceeding a speed limit by 10 kph or more, or failing to engage a low gear, on a prescribed part of the South Eastern Freeway in a truck or bus) or section 79B of that Act (being the owner of a truck or bus that appears from camera evidence to have been involved in exceeding a speed limit by 10 kph or more on such a part of the Freeway). The notice applies for a period of 6 months and can be given whether the offence is a first or subsequent offence. This clause amends section 45D to provide that such a notice can only be given by a police officer in the case of a second or subsequent offence.

7—Amendment of section 79B—Provisions applying where certain offences are detected by photographic detection devices

Under section 79B it is an offence to be the owner of a vehicle that appears from evidence obtained through the operation of a photographic detection device to have been involved in the commission of an offence against section 45C(1) of the Act (exceeding a speed limit by 10 kph or more on a prescribed part of the South Eastern Freeway in a truck or bus). This clause makes a number of amendments to section 79B.

Currently, where the owner is a body corporate, the penalty on conviction by a court is a minimum of \$25,000 and a maximum of \$50,000, and the expiation fee is the expiation fee for a natural person plus \$25,000. This clause changes the penalty on conviction by a court to a minimum of \$10,000 and a maximum of \$20,000 and changes the expiation fee to the expiation fee for a natural person plus \$5,000.

Currently, where a natural person is convicted of the offence by a court, the disqualification period that must be imposed by the court for the offence is a minimum of 12 months for a first offence and 3 years for a subsequent offence. This clause changes that to a minimum of 6 months for a first offence, 12 months for a second offence and 3 years for a subsequent offence.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Petitions

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson): Presented a petition signed by 1,136 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take measures to disallow private accommodation facility developments in their current proposed locations in Flinders Chase National Park, and instead insist that the proponent returns to the original proposed project and sites, approximately one kilometre inland and adjacent to the existing Kangaroo Island Wilderness Walking Trail.

KANGAROO ISLAND VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson): Presented a petition signed by 1,340 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reinstate the registration concessions for residents of Kangaroo Island in the next state budget.

SOUTH ROAD

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 1,826 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to endorse a tunnel for the section of South Road between Darlington and Torrens River.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—

Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council Annual Report 2018-19

Tea Tree Gully, City of Annual Report 2018-19

Wattle Range Council Annual Report 2018-19

Whyalla, The Corporation of the City of Annual Report 2018-19

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Museum Board, South Australian—Annual Report 2018-19

Public Sector (Data Sharing) Act 2016—Ministerial Direction to Share Data Report

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

Training Centre Visitor—Visiting Program and Review of Records Adelaide Youth Training Centre Report October 2019—Term 1

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

Evidence Act 1929—Suppression Orders—Annual Report 2018-19

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

National Health and Medical Research Council—Ethical guidelines on the use of assisted reproductive technology in clinical practice and research Report 2017

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

Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse—
Annual Report 2018-19

Training Centre Visitor—A Perfect Storm? Dual status children and young people in South
Australia's child protection and youth justice systems—
Report 1 Report November 2019

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

Increasing production from the Adelaide Desalination Plant—Minute to SA Water Minute
2 December 2019

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Local Government Grants Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2018-2019

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:06): I bring up the sixth report of the committee, entitled An Inquiry into the Economic Contribution of Migration to South Australia.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:06): I bring up the 44th report of the committee, entitled 2018-19 Annual Report of the Public Works Committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 45th report of the committee, entitled Snowtown Battery Energy Storage System Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 46th report of the committee, entitled Reactivation of the Repat Health Precinct Phase 1 Works.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

SA HEALTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to Premier. Who are the members of the Premier's cross-agency task force into SA Health?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I have provided that information to the house twice. I am happy to provide it thrice. I wrote—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet earlier in the week, and in fact I think it would have been on Tuesday afternoon, asking him to establish the interagency task force and to report before Christmas, and invited him to have representatives of the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, obviously the Department for Health and Wellbeing, and any others who he thought would be assisting this task force in the preparation of advice to the government before the end of this year.

SA HEALTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier choose the members of the cross-agency task force or was that responsibility left to the Chief Executive of DPC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): It is difficult to add any more information than what I have already provided. Again, I am happy to go through it. This is the fourth time. This is the last—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The representatives on the committee will come from the agencies which I have outlined hitherto on multiple occasions, and the chief executive will invite those people and any others that he deems would be helpful to him in preparing his report to the government by the end of this year.

SA HEALTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): For clarity, my question is to the Premier: who is choosing the members of the cross-agency task force? Is it the agencies themselves or the CEO of DPC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): I can't be any clearer than what I have actually provided.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been one minute, so I am giving the leader one more and then the member for Waite.

SA HEALTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Will the CE of the Department for Health and Wellbeing be a member of the cross-agency task force?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): That will be a matter for the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurua is warned, and the member for Elizabeth is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to go through it again. We want to have—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a timely response to the commissioner's report to the parliament, which was tabled in this place on Tuesday.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We wanted to set this up as a matter of alacrity, which we did. It is going to report to the government by the end of this year. I can't imagine a more timely response to any report ever. What we know and what we saw over a long period of time from the previous government—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —whenever there was something that was untoward within the previous government's administration, they commissioned an inquiry. That usually took a couple of years, cost a couple of million dollars, and by the time it finally arrived the ship had sailed. We are not in any way, shape or form interested in the same sort of delay. We have been working on fixing the problematic health system since we came to government 20 months ago and we are going to be working every single day that we are in this place to advance that cause.

We have already put more than \$1 billion—more than \$1 billion—into the health system since we came to government. We have established five new local health networks in accordance with plans that we took to the last election. On 1 July this year, the new boards, the new governance arrangements, much closer to the action than under the previous administration, came into effect. When we came into government we had the most centralised, bureaucratised health administration in the nation with the highest costs and the worst outcomes. Something had to change.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

Mr Picton: You've doubled ramping.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Of course, there have been significant problems associated with ramping in South Australia in recent times, and if we go back to the reasons—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —exactly and precisely why that has occurred, we don't have to look too much further than straight across the chamber. The last time the capacity was increased—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Patterson: You closed the Repat.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They hate the fact that we are fixing their mess. The previous government, of course, underscoped—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —significantly underscoped, the capacity of the Flinders Medical Centre. It was never built to the capacity that was required, and they should have known that when they did the last upgrade in 2010. In 2012, they received—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the Monaghan review into the Flinders Medical Centre and the problems that existed within that emergency department. I didn't see any useful implementation of the recommendations of the Monaghan report thereafter. Since that was released, when they knew they had problems at the Flinders Medical Centre, what did they do? They downgraded services at Noarlunga Hospital and closed the Repat Hospital, which further exacerbated the pressure on the ED at the Flinders Medical Centre. That is why—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —it was with great pride today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that I was down at the Flinders Medical Centre with the member for Davenport, with the member for Elder, with the member for Waite—

The SPEAKER: Could the Premier be seated for one moment. Point of order from the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the Premier spent three minutes debating.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I have allowed the Premier to sometimes roll the arm over. I ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite dislike the fact that we are fixing the health system that we inherited. They are constantly suggesting to us that ramping is a problem, and I'm just providing information to the house regarding ramping and what we're doing to address that.

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the Premier continues to talk about the opposition, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order. I ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How arrogant are you?

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Back to the substance of the question: I am convinced—100 per cent convinced—that the interagency task force that we have put in place will report to the government by the end of this year and provide us with the information that is required to continue—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Is Tim on it?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with the clean-up that has already started. It started on the first day that we came to government. It's a big task. We're not complaining about it. In fact, we love cleaning up their mess. We're very good at cleaning up their mess. Every single day that we're in here, we're doing more and more of that, and today was a perfect example, down at the Flinders Medical Centre, when the capacity for the adult emergency department was doubled. This is a massive improvement and will see very great benefits for the people of southern Adelaide.

STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:16): My question is also to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how the government has delivered this year for the people of South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16): I thank the my good friend the member for Waite, the former member for Davenport—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —who knows that this has been a good year for the government. It has been a good year for the government because we focused on the things which are important to the people of South Australia—not cheap political pointscoreing but focusing on the very things that we were elected to do to back the people of South Australia.

Can I say, it has been a very productive time in this house. I can't speak for the other place, but I know that in here 39 separate pieces of legislation have already passed so far this year and there could be more. In particular, I was very pleased that the area of land tax was dealt with. Under the previous administration, it was swept under the carpet. Complex problems were kicked down the road, never addressed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This parliament, and in particular those on this side of the house, have dealt with a complex issue and delivered a massive reform to a complex area like land tax. But it doesn't stop there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell! Deputy leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I congratulate the Minister for Environment and Water on dealing with the Natural Resources Management Act—courageous—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to deliver for us new legislation, Landscape SA, and I congratulate him. I congratulate the Attorney-General on the excellent work that she has done on a raft of legislation in this house. In particular, I would like to highlight—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the excellent work that she has done with regard to the introduction of mandatory drug treatment for young people in South Australia, and also the groundbreaking national work to introduce a new offence for strangulation in situations of domestic and family violence.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Tell us about the 'monatorium'.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would also like to particularly single out the Minister for Education in South Australia, who took a look at the Education and Children's Services Act. This was an act first put in place in 1972, untouched for over 16 years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of the previous failed administration. Plenty of reform in that work, which was done, and much more to come. We are very pleased with this year. We have been able to put land tax legislation through this place, and lower, slash, payroll tax on 1 January this year. The people in small business in South Australia—

Mr Duluk: They hate small business.

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —are thanking us for reducing that tax burden. We have continued to slash the emergency services levy bills for people in South Australia—another \$90 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —going back into the pockets of hardworking South Australians. We've been able to reduce the cost of car registration, a 3 per cent reduction in electricity

bills for those people on market contracts and we have also, importantly, committed to the long-term reduction in water bills in South Australia. We uncovered the rort—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the absolutely shameful rort put in place by the previous government. They laughed at the rort. Well, no more. We have exposed that rort and lower water bills are coming for the people of South Australia. I would also like to congratulate the Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure in South Australia: a record infrastructure spend for South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —\$11.9 billion going into infrastructure in South Australia: more roads—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the Gawler electrification project, which was neglected by those opposite because it was in a seat that wasn't swinging; and a massive investment into regional roads in South Australia, with \$1.1 billion going into those. There are better services in terms of health and in terms of education, putting the people of South Australia first. We have very much enjoyed the opportunity, the privilege, of serving the people as government for the first 20 months since the election, and we are very much looking forward to the years ahead.

The SPEAKER: One moment, leader. I didn't want to interrupt the Premier's answer, so I am going to intervene now. The member for Hurtle Vale was on two warnings. She continued to interject. I am going to ask her to leave the chamber for half an hour under 137A. Thank you. When she does, the leader will have another question.

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

The SPEAKER: I remind the member for Playford that he is also on two warnings.

STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Supplementary: if 2019 was such a successful year for the Premier and his government, why the need to prorogue the parliament and reset the government's agenda?

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

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:21): In fact, I am happy to answer the question, sir.

The SPEAKER: The minister has decided to answer the question, so I rule play on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Leader of the Opposition would probably be aware—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that any consideration of prorogation is a matter that would be for the cabinet to suggest to the Governor, and no such recommendation—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, he is answering. Yes, he decided to answer the question.

STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier then rule out proroguing the parliament and resetting his government's agenda?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:21): Prorogation is a time-honoured tradition. It provides a wonderful opportunity for governments to introduce legislation that the parliament might think better of in the future, things that the people of South Australia want, things like rate capping of council rates, things like shop trading hours, which are very, very popular in the community. I'm sure that the opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —for us to contemplate such matters will be available to us in the period ahead.

The SPEAKER: As entertaining as this is, if this level of interjections continues, members will be leaving today.

SA HEALTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Since the Premier cannot name the members of his cross-agency task force, can he advise the house what the terms of reference are for his cross-agency task force into SA Health?

The Hon. A. Piccolo: He's phoning a friend.

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): I don't have that detail in front of me, but I'm happy to come back to the house and provide some information.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: He's checked out.

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

SA HEALTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that there actually are some terms of reference for the cross-agency task force into SA Health and, if so, can he release them this afternoon?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): I can't add anything to my further answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, be quiet.

SKILLING SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the state government's Skilling South Australia program is supporting businesses and creating jobs for more South Australians?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:23): I can do that, and I thank the member for Finniss for his question and his interest in job opportunities and skills in his electorate. Our first year of Skilling South Australia has delivered much-needed reforms to rebuild South Australia's training system. We were the first state to sign a national partnership agreement with Canberra in the Skilling Australians program. Skilling South Australia is a \$200 million current investment, in addition to the state government's increased vocational education investment, boosting both TAFE SA and non-government service providers here in South Australia.

As a matter of fact, this government, in its first two budgets, has spent \$91 million more on skills training than the previous government did in its last two budgets. In our first year of Skilling South Australia, we have achieved over 13,000 new apprenticeship and traineeship commencements, which is within 96 per cent of our first-year target agreed with the federal government. The Marshall government continues to turn the system around.

Skilling South Australia is getting results. Preliminary NCVET figures show South Australia experiencing a significant increase in apprentices and trainees—almost a 30 per cent increase this year, from January to June this year, compared to the same period last year. Of course, that is the largest percentage increase in Australia.

South Australia has also experienced an increase of more than 22 per cent in government-funded vocational education and training activity, when compared to the same period. So not only are we seeing more people in apprenticeships and traineeships but we are also seeing more using the VET system here in South Australia—more South Australians hearing the government message about the job opportunities that VET delivers here in South Australia.

These figures are encouraging and show that our Skilling South Australia reforms are having a positive impact. Seven hundred businesses in South Australia took on an apprentice for the first time over the last 12 months. Our eight Industry Skills Councils have strengthened the industry's influence over skills and workforce development here in South Australia. This is ensuring that funding for our skills training is directly aligned to industry priorities.

We have developed and rolled out new apprenticeships and traineeships in industries that have not traditionally used them, such as cybersecurity, applied technologies (which is an apprenticeship pathway to a diploma and which would take the first year off a university degree if you decided to do an engineering degree after completing that apprenticeship), Microsoft apprenticeships and Aboriginal health and individual support paid traineeships—the first time that such a program has been used here in South Australia.

Last year, we exceeded training growth targets across many industries, including construction, mining and energy, the education and service sector, food, wine, tourism and hospitality, and transport and manufacturing. In March, I launched the Building Capability framework in the VET sector. This is of course to lift the capacity of those in the training sector, those who are delivering the vocational education we need here in South Australia.

The state government's \$1 million investment is building the capability of vocational education and training here in South Australia, which is an important expanding market. We are working directly with industry and training providers to restore confidence and quality across the vocational education system in South Australia to build the capability of our trainers and raise awareness about the value of skilled careers here in South Australia. Our work continues to ensure that South Australians have access to the right training now so that they are ready to step into jobs today and enjoy rewarding careers in the future.

Parliamentary Procedure

MCDOWELL, MR J., CORRESPONDENCE

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27): I table correspondence between myself and Jim McDowell, the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, from Tuesday afternoon, which deals with the matters that those opposite have raised. I wanted to save the dream factory the postage stamp to request the FOI and provide it today. In doing so—

The SPEAKER: Are you tabling the document?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. In so doing, can I just correct the record that in fact there are two representatives from the Department for Health and Wellbeing that I suggest in this letter, one being the chief executive and one being the chief executive of a local health network.

The SPEAKER: One moment, Premier. The issue of tabling has been done. Are you seeking leave to make a personal explanation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

The SPEAKER: You are just tabling the document?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will table that.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has tabled a document.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir, he has tabled a document and quoted from it. I would like to table the entire government docket.

The SPEAKER: No, the Premier was looking at that document and he tabled it, and it has been tabled. The member for Kaurna.

Question Time

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:28): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order. You have been doing it all day.

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Premier. If the Chief Executive of SA Health is a member of the task force, is that appropriate, given that he is under independent investigation in relation to procurement practices and conflicts of interest, issues which are identified in the ICAC report in regard to the department?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): Yes. I don't see any problem with that appointment whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader! The member for Elizabeth is also on the edge. The member for Kaurna would like to ask a question.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. How can the Premier be 100 per cent convinced, as he said, that the task force will address the issues of the ICAC report when he couldn't even tell the house the names of all the members of the task force on it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): I have every confidence that the task force will be able to provide government information and advice regarding an action plan or an implementation plan following on from the receipt of the commissioner's report to parliament. I think it's a very important report, as I have stated publicly and repeatedly. We thank the commissioner for his report. To be quite honest—

Mr Malinauskas: It's so important that you didn't read it.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To be quite honest, sir, the issue—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To be honest, sir, many of the issues which were raised in this report were issues which were well known to the government. In fact, they would have been well known to the opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, of course, was the health minister. Many of the issues that were raised in the report go back for many years. They deal with very important issues, like the administration of data.

We know that there have been many problems in terms of data and IT systems and record keeping in the health department for a long period of time. We saw, firsthand, the debacle that was the implementation of the Oracle system under the previous government. Potentially, the member for Kaurna was an adviser to the health minister at the time of the Oracle debacle: Oracle debacle 1,

Oracle debacle 2 and then, of course, there was the EPAS debacle—and we are still fixing up the mess of EPAS now.

There have been major problems in this department for an extended period of time. What is different now, and why I have confidence that we will fix up the mess of Labor, is that we are shining a light on this. This is not a problem that we are kicking under the carpet; this is one that we are exposing. We have tabled the report at the very first opportunity. There has been no redaction in our document. It's gone right out to every single person in this state.

More than that, we have been working on the implementation—the cure plan, if you like—for the failure of the health system under the previous administration since the very first day that we came into office, and we are very proud of the work that we have done in that area. Today was another classic example. The member asked the question: why should I have confidence? Well, take a look at what we announced today.

That's proof positive of a government that is investing \$86 million to fix the problem which unequivocally was caused by the failure of the previous government to understand the capacity requirements of the ED at the Flinders Medical Centre and then to compound that problem by reducing the services at the adjacent Noarlunga Hospital and then closing the Repat Hospital. So it was a very obvious requirement to increase the capacity.

We are very proud that today, when I was down at Flinders Medical Centre with members from this house and also the minister from the other place, we were able to announce not only a doubling of the adult capacity within the ED department, which is a very substantial increase, but also 12 new acute medical beds at Noarlunga Hospital, which will allow for the upgrade in the services provided at that hospital.

Of course, one of the problems associated with the Flinders Medical Centre—and this is one of the reasons why it gives me confidence that we will be able to rectify the problems, because that's exactly and precisely what we are already doing—one of the reasons that we were having compounding problems at the Flinders Medical Centre was that there was a massive transfer from Noarlunga Hospital to the Flinders Medical Centre. There weren't adequate resources there because the previous government—and this is a statement of fact—closed the acute medical beds at Noarlunga Hospital, massively downgrading it and pushing all those patients to the Flinders Medical Centre because they didn't think about it.

We have taken the time to come up with a plan that is going to rectify the situation, and that's what gives me the confidence that we are going to be able to fix up their mess.

STATE DEVELOPMENT

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the action the government is taking to build South Australia, grow jobs and reduce traffic congestion?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:34): I thank the member for Elder for her question and note that this government is doing a huge amount—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to help do all those things in her electorate of Elder. I note her help and thank her for her help in that regard. This has been a year of delivering for South Australians—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —whether that be in the planning space, where we are putting in place a system that is going to improve value-adding opportunities in regional South Australia and improve the quality of infill development inside our city, whether it's increasing consultation time frames or helping to speed up application assessment time frames, this is a government that is

delivering a better planning system for South Australia. We are also helping to improve heritage, with some 208 new local heritage places signed off since we came to government.

In transport, we have taken some very bold steps to move our transport system into the 21st century, whether that is undertaking autonomous vehicle trials, whether that is now undertaking on-demand bus trials in Mount Barker or up in the Barossa Valley, whether that is not accepting the poor level of service that our public transport services—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Light!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —currently provide, or taking the very strong, bold and, may I say, right decision to outsource our train and tram services here in South Australia. We secured a contract to make sure that our buses continue to be built here in South Australia by South Australian firms Scania and Precision. We also fixed up the South Australian taxi subsidy scheme mess that the former government left us and we have negotiated with the commonwealth to get a good deal for people living with a disability who have transitioned to the NDIS.

We have upgrades to public transport on the Gawler line electrification, the Paradise park-and-ride, the Tonsley train station, as well as securing the funding to deliver on the Flinders Link extension out to Flinders University. We also allowed e-scooters to ride on our city streets for the first time in South Australia's history. Earlier this year, we also made decisive change to help keep dolphins safe in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary. I think it is a very good step forward for vulnerable users (including dolphins), as well as kayakers and canoeists in the Port River.

When it comes to transport and when it comes to infrastructure, this has been a year for delivering for South Australia. Whether it be working with the federal government to secure funding for 10 intersection upgrades, including two grade separations: one at Hove and one at Ovingham or whether it be working with the federal government to secure \$5.4 billion towards the next stages of the north-south corridor, this government is delivering.

Finally, after five years of mess, we have given the people of Carrickalinga an answer to what's going to happen with the wave generator. We have also seen construction start on the Adelaide Oval hotel—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson and member for Waite!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —a facility that is going to keep Adelaide Oval world class and help keep tourists coming to South Australia. We have also put money on the table to fix the dilapidated piece of kit which is called the Granite Island Causeway. A problem that they neglected for 16 years, we have delivered on as part of this new government. We finally fixed up the City South tram stop, a problem that existed for ages. We also helped to secure Thomas Foods and their upgraded abattoir here in South Australia, securing 2,000 jobs for South Australians.

The most important initiative that we undertook this year was to secure \$1.3 billion to upgrade roads in regional South Australia. This initiative will save lives. This initiative is a record in South Australia's history and this is a program of works that is going to help give back to the people of regional South Australia, who have given so much to our state.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Will the South Australian Health CE, Dr Chris McGowan, have to declare a conflict and excuse himself from the cross-agency task force in relation to matters of procurement and conflict of interest since he is under independent investigation in relation to his conduct in relation to procurement and conflict of interest?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38): I appreciate and thank the member for his question. With regard to the task force, there are many things that will need to be canvassed as part of that investigation and reported back to us by the end of the year. It is true, procurement is one of those issues that sits alongside many other issues: issues to do with the culture of the organisation, ways that salaried specialists provide their services and different research

issues that were raised. All those will be raised and considered by the interagency task force that has been created.

I do refer the member back to my previous answers to this house regarding Dr McGowan's self-referral to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment regarding the matters that have been raised. My understanding is that the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment has, of course, considered that and appointed an investigator to look at that. My understanding is that that response should be received soon.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Kurna, I welcome to parliament today students from Cedar College, who are being hosted by the member for Enfield. I also welcome in the gallery today the former member for Chaffey and former minister for water, the Hon. Peter Arnold, and his wife, Val. Welcome to parliament again.

Question Time

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:40): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier satisfied himself that none of the members of the cross-agency task force have ICAC complaints made against them?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:40): I have absolute faith in my chief executive, Jim McDowell, to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

The honourable member for Elizabeth having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have every confidence in my chief executive, Jim McDowell, to set up an interagency task force to look at this issue. It is a very important issue. We look forward to receiving the advice from the interagency task force, which should be received by the end of this year. The important issue is that we have a plan to address each and every one of the issues that has been put forward by the commissioner.

I do remind this house, though, that these are issues which have sat around for a very long period of time. It is not correct to suggest that we haven't been working on each and every one of these issues since we came to government, but we do appreciate the work of the commissioner to bring it together into a report. This gives us an opportunity to go through, to provide our cure report, to work through it, to implement it and to monitor it over time.

I would remind this house that, on coming to government, we found such a mess within the Central Adelaide Local Health Network that we appointed KordaMentha to take a look at the issues that were there. This has been very well publicised, some of the atrocities that they found that were presided over by the previous government. In particular, I remind the house of the many tens of millions of dollars worth of activity that had occurred within the Royal Adelaide Hospital that had never actually been sent to the commonwealth for payment. This is absolutely outrageous.

This was the level of incompetence that was presided over by the previous administration. Of course, we all know who the minister for health was under the previous Labor government—

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

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —it was none other than the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Premier, be seated for one moment, please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is clearly debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I do believe that the question was quite broad. I have allowed the Premier some opportunity to provide some relevant preamble, but I will ensure that he doesn't deviate from the substance of the question. The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The question was about the establishment of the interagency task force and the work that they will be doing to fix up the issues that were addressed by the commissioner in his report. I stated at the outset—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that I have every confidence that Mr Jim McDowell will chair that well. He will select the people onto that committee well and they will provide that advice to the government. But I make the point that we have been working on our cure plan for the problems that we have found within SA Health since the day we came to government. I have provided this house with an example of the failure of SA Health to in fact invoice the federal government for activity that they had done. This is work that has been identified since we came to government, hitherto swept under the carpet, by KordaMentha and a rectification plan has been put in place.

There is only one party in this parliament that was actually violently opposed to the appointment of KordaMentha to clean up their mess, and that was the Australian Labor Party. They hated the fact that we were getting on and cleaning up their mess, but the people of South Australia want—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Piccolo: The clinicians really like it, too. They really like it, the clinicians.

The SPEAKER: Member for Light!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a better health system than they had delivered under the previous government. It's not enough just to open bright, shiny new hospitals. We want better services in our hospitals in South Australia, and that is evidenced by the fact that today we have been announcing more services at the Flinders Medical Centre. In fact, this year my understanding is that there have been 70 new beds opened in South Australia and there will be more to come on the Repat site and at Flinders Medical Centre next year.

We want better services for the people of South Australia. This is our number one focus and this will be the work that the interagency task force will be doing. They will be providing the government with that advice before the end of the year and we will take that on board. We won't be sitting on it. It won't be going onto a shelf and gathering dust. What we will be doing is referring to it on a continuous basis to make sure that we can fix up these problems, many of which have sat around for years and years.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier met with the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, since the report into SA Health was tabled at 11am on Tuesday and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:45): I meet with the ICAC commissioner on a reasonably regular basis. I haven't met with him this week. I haven't had a request to meet with him this week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Playford, you can also leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I meet with the commissioner on a reasonably regular basis, but I haven't met with him this week. I know for a fact that members opposite quite often had to meet

with him on a reasonably regular basis. That was within a completely different arrangement: they were appearing before the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption asking questions about their behaviour. That hasn't been the case since I came to government, but I do enjoy meeting with Mr Lander—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is on two warnings. Premier, come back to the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —those opposite are suggesting, but I know for a fact that I have not appeared before the ICAC. I would know that and I would remember that. Some people have selective memories, some people have conversational swearing, some people preside over all sorts of administrations. The fact of the matter is I have not appeared before the ICAC as those opposite have suggested.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Check the *Hansard*.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is we have touched a raw nerve. Every time the word 'ICAC' comes up, there is a certain member for whom it sends a little shiver up his spine. We respect the work of the ICAC. We respect the work of the ICAC and we thank him for his important work, not just with this report but all the work that he and his hardworking, assiduous team have done.

That is one of the reasons why we on this side of the house, when we were in opposition, suggested for a long period of time to establish an Independent Commission Against Corruption. Those opposite, many of them now advocating, were of course doing everything they possibly could to make sure that that type of reformist legislation never saw the light of day. I am pleased that we as a parliament did put that level of protection in place to establish an Office for Public Integrity, that we established the crime and public integrity committee within this parliament—

Mr Malinauskas: Done by your government? It was our government.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, if the Leader of the Opposition was paying attention he would have understood that that is exactly the point that I have just made. I think he is coming in and out of consciousness. It's the last sitting day of the year, or is it? I'm just saying.

The reality is that we thank the commissioner for his important work and this review. We worked hard to establish a commissioner's role here in South Australia and we are grateful that that legislation prevailed. It is, of course, one of the reasons why since coming to government we have significantly increased the resources to the ICAC here in South Australia. The most recent budget, I think, had a \$15 million increase in the budget that was handed down in June this year. I think I will leave it at that.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I can hear the member for Lee.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on action the government is taking to deliver more affordable and reliable energy for South Australian families and businesses?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:49): Yes, I can; in fact, it's a pleasure to do so. The Marshall Liberal government is making tremendous headway in this very important area. We are in a transition. South Australia is in a very important transition with regard to energy. The transition actually started about 10 years ago. The first 8½ years of that transition were clearly not going very well. The first 8½ of that transition saw increasing electricity prices.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsey is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We saw the first statewide blackout in the nation's history as part of that transition, which was being handled incredibly poorly. But now, as I have said in this place many times, in opposition we very carefully put together our energy policy. We kept some things that the previous government was doing, which we believed were helpful. We got rid of a lot of rubbish as well, and we brought in some incredibly positive initiatives.

While those opposite pretend that they don't like it, they should be pleased for all South Australian electricity consumers to see the change that is taking place. Independent analysis has shown that the last financial year's household average electricity prices for customers were 3 per cent lower than the financial year before, and the financial year before was half a per cent lower than the one before that. The tide has turned, and we are also very pleased with the fact that last summer was the first one in many years that we did not have any blackouts due to load shedding.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We enter into this summer as cautiously as we always do, so we will again do everything that we possibly can to avoid any blackouts this summer. Summer is always a risky time, but things are improving—things are always improving. We are harnessing renewable energy—in partnership with industry, in partnership with the regulators, in partnership with consumers even—so that it works for consumers, so that it becomes cheaper, so that it becomes more reliable, so that it continues year after year to become cleaner and cleaner as well.

We are doing the things that we said that we would do. We are seeing the fact that there are now five virtual power plant offerings available to retailers in South Australia. There are now four grid-scale storage systems available to harness renewable energy and, perhaps more importantly, to contribute to the quality of that renewable energy: frequency, voltage control and provision of synthetic inertia. We are seeing the development of the Home Battery Scheme going very well. We have new figures. Its take-up is accelerating all the time.

We have already announced one of the measures from the grid-scale storage scheme—\$15 million to go to Neoen to increase the capacity of the Hornsdale battery. What we are doing is paying after the capacity is put in place for the services that it delivers, not just handing out money so that the capacity increase can be funded by industry. We are going to spend taxpayers' money to pay for services that benefit taxpayers once they have been delivered. Four minutes is far too short to go through all the things we are trying to do, but let me just say that what we are doing is working.

The SPEAKER: The members for Waite, West Torrens and Lee are all on two warnings. The member for Kaurana.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Did your health minister announce a task force on Tuesday morning that didn't exist until your writing of this letter to your chief executive on Tuesday afternoon?

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:53): This has been extraordinarily well canvassed already.

An honourable member: No, it hasn't.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: A letter was sent to establish that. I have tabled that in the parliament. That was the formal correspondence that went off. It went off on Tuesday afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

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

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. Why does your letter to your chief executive about the task force not include a date and not include tracking numbers in compliance with State Records guidelines?

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna, address your remarks through the Chair. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54): It was signed on Tuesday afternoon, and I very distinctly remember signing it Tuesday afternoon.

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order. The member for Kurna and then the member for Narrunga.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. Has the government checked with the Independent Commission Against Corruption that the commissioner is satisfied that the government's appointment of a cross-agency task force is a satisfactory response to his damning report?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I have not made any inquiry, but we will certainly be responding to that report. I have certainly not had any complaint from the ICAC commissioner on this issue. We are very satisfied that the response that we have is the responsible and measured way to reply, and of course we will have more to say about that once we receive the advice from the task force which has been established.

SCHOOLS WITH INTERNET FIBRE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:55): My question is the Minister for Education. Can the minister please update the house on action the government is taking to ensure all South Australian students have access to a world-class education system?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:55): I am very pleased to have this question from the member for Narungga. The member for Narungga cares passionately about schools in his area and the futures of the young people in his area. I know this because he speaks to me about it very regularly.

He will be very pleased, as will indeed students, families and schools in his area, to learn that the Yorketown Area School is in fact having its new fibre optic internet connection done this very week and next week will be joined by the Port Broughton Area School and the Mallala Primary School—potentially too late for this year, but next year they will have access to the fastest internet in the country along with so many of our other schools. This year we have gone from the slowest internet in the mainland for our school system to, indeed, being well on the way to being the fastest.

There are 329 sites already connected. This is a project we announced in the member for Morphett's electorate at Glenelg Primary School just at the end of last year, and it is already 61 per

cent complete—a wonderful \$80 million partnership with Telstra to deliver the best internet infrastructure for our schools, which is a critical part of the school infrastructure that is needed, with 150,000 students and 17,000 educators already benefiting from this.

But it is, of course, not just the internet infrastructure, the capacity of the internet, which is so important for the 21st century: we also need our learning areas to be appropriate for the 21st century. This government has record investment in school buildings and infrastructure, with \$1.3 billion on the books, \$185 million in new announcements this year, partly to deal with year 7 moving to high school, partly to deal with the significant capacity crunch hitting our public school system.

For the last five years we have had that big bubble coming into our public school system. It is about to hit our high schools. The former government did all too little about it, and inadequate preparation has left us in a difficulty, but the investments being made by this government will benefit schools, communities and students. Three new schools in Whyalla, in the northern suburbs of Adelaide and in the southern suburbs of Adelaide to meet that population demand—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —and, of course, to address the long overdue demand for improved educational facilities in Whyalla. Of course, that also goes hand in hand—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: — with working with our partners in the non-government school sector, who, for the first time in the last two years, have benefited from investments in their capital by the state government, like every other state, like the investments in other states have been for a number of years, and so far we have had \$11 million in investments in each of our first two years that will benefit students who are learning in those partner institutions.

This is matched by record recurrent investment in our public school system, record investment in the ongoing funding of our schools. The National School Reform Agreement in fact required the state government to invest an extra \$700 million in our public schools over the next decade to unlock the increased commonwealth funds that will also support our schools to meet the incredibly ambitious targets we have for school improvements in our schools so that all our schools can deliver all our students a world-class education. That means every student, that means every classroom, that means every school in every town and in Adelaide right across South Australia.

How we spend that money is critically important. Last week, we talked about the year 1 phonics check and the dramatic improvement we have already seen in just one year in how we are rolling out phonics instruction in our classrooms and interventions for those students identified by the check as needing extra support. The Aboriginal Education Strategy, the language strategy, the Music Education Strategy, our five entrepreneurial schools that started their work this year, the incredible reforms to vocational education announced recently and, importantly, a complete rehabilitation of TAFE SA, which was left to rack and ruin by those opposite and this year was reaccredited for seven years, the highest reaccreditation that ASQA can do.

We are doing the work that it takes to deliver our students a world-class education, and this government is turning it around for the kids of South Australia.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Who is drafting the implementation plan following the ICAC report? Is it the task force or, as your letter to your CE says, they will merely be reviewing the plan that has been drafted internally inside the health department?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): My understanding is that the health department has already done some work on this report—

Mr PICTON: So independent.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and this will now go to the interagency task force. They will be the ones who are providing the advice to the government by the end of this year.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is on two warnings and has the call.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:00): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. In this supposedly cabinet-style government, why didn't the decision to launch a task force to respond to the ICAC report go to cabinet to be discussed?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education.

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

The SPEAKER: 'Supposedly', yes. Would the member like to rephrase?

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Premier. Why didn't the decision to launch a task force to respond to the ICAC report in SA Health go to cabinet to be discussed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:01): I formed the opinion that we needed to make an immediate response, and that's precisely what we did.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:01): My question is to the Premier. On what day next week is the task force meeting?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:01): It beggars belief—it beggars belief. I don't have that information with me.

NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Could the minister update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's delivery of its election commitment to increase ranger numbers across the state?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:01): I thank the member for Newland for his question. He is a great advocate for our national and conservation parks, and I know he regularly speaks to me about his desire to see more park rangers serving—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —at the coalface of our environment. We went to the election in March 2018 saying that we would increase park rangers in this state by 20. Do you know what we have done? We said we would do that by 2021; we have already achieved it. We've now got 22 new park rangers—new positions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —working in the revamped and revitalised National Parks and Wildlife Service South Australia. But more than that, not only those 22 new FTEs but we put a message out into the environment department and said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —'Are there people in this department who are interested in becoming workers on the front line of our agency's work?' People put up their hands, surprisingly enough. They wouldn't have under Labor because the transition to a ranger under Labor would have meant a transition out the door, but—

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. One moment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the minister is now debating his Dorothy Dixier.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, and I ask that the interjections on my left cease. If not, members will be leaving, and I don't care if they have grieves. Minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I'm just providing useful context. We said to the department, 'Who would like to be a ranger?' and we got another 12 people who were working in the department who have transitioned to become front-line rangers.

So that is 22 new FTEs plus another 12—an additional 34 rangers working in the National Parks and Wildlife Service. This is people working at the front line, engaging with our friends groups, working with communities, expanding the capacity of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, which means more practical outcomes on the ground.

This can only be a good thing for our national parks. It can only be a good thing for our tourism economy—because of course rangers connect with tourists and provide a more engaging service on the ground—and, of course, this is a great thing for regional communities as well. The majority of our parks are found in regional South Australia. We have a whole range of new rangers going to regional communities. The members for Flinders, Narungga, Finnis, Hammond, MacKillop and Mount Gambier—the communities that they represent will benefit from a boost in ranger numbers, and we have metropolitan rangers as well, of course.

We also have a big focus in this government on coastal protection. There are 5,067 kilometres of coastline in this state, and we want our rangers to be focused in terms of their skills, their experience and their expertise, on the unique challenges that face our coastal environment. So we see nine new rangers specifically focusing on our coastal parks at Port Lincoln, Ceduna, Kangaroo Island, Victor Harbor, Innes National Park—again, in the member for Narungga's electorate—and the precious Coorong as well.

We are backing our rhetoric. We said that we would increase the number of front-line services looking after our precious environment in this state and that is exactly what we are getting on and doing. We are hugely committed to our national parks: 21 per cent of our state is found within our parks network. That is such an important part of our state to protect in the face of a changing climate because, of course, land that is controlled by government can be rapidly activated in terms of conservation, so we are getting in there and we are providing the resources that our national parks need.

We have this new focused National Parks and Wildlife Service, not blended into other parts of the department anymore but empowered to get out there and connect with communities and connect with people who want to be part of environmental preservation. Under the previous Labor government—16 years—when a ranger walked through a national park—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated for one moment. Debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have always allowed some compare and contrast. Minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Compare and contrast is so important. I will finish on this: 93 rangers when we came to office and now we are over 130—what a great thing for our state.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:06): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier or anyone in his office ask minister Stephen Wade to pull out of a scheduled interview with Leon Byner on FIVEaa on Wednesday?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:06): Not that I'm aware of, no.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It's your question time.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:06): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier's Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, offered his resignation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:06): No.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:06): My question is to the Premier. Where is the Chief Executive of SA Health? Does anyone have the foggiest where he is?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier? Would someone like to answer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): The standard of the opposition's questions is extraordinary. I don't have his exact whereabouts at the moment, but perhaps you can call his office and find out.

DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr MURRAY: Shush over there, please—Transforming Health. Can the minister inform the house on the findings of the Auditor-General's Report into the Darlington upgrade project?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:07): I want to take this opportunity to update the house on the report that was handed down a couple of days ago by the Auditor-General in relation to the Darlington project, a project that it is fair to say has encountered difficulty over its life.

What we heard on Tuesday was a laying bare of the issues that have existed in this project, including two of the largest findings around the fact that, within a few days of that contract being awarded back in May 2016, a significant variation to that contract, which basically soaked up all the contingency that existed within that project, exposed that project to cost pressures from day one.

What the report also highlighted was the fact that, in the early days of the project, the scope was not clarified in relation to early service relocation works. This again created a huge amount of difficulty and a huge amount of compromise in the way that this project was set up. So not only did we not see a rationale for why those contract variations were put in place, not only did we not see any sort of disciplined record keeping that actually would have explained that decision or helped to mitigate a lot of the risk in relation to that decision, but what it did do in the end is expose South Australian taxpayers to tens and tens of millions of dollars worth of cost claims by the contractor—some \$70 million worth of claims by the contractor—in relation to issues that happened when this project was first initiated.

The good news is, and what's highlighted in the report, is that the hiring of a new chief executive, Mr Tony Braxton-Smith, was a real change in the way that this project has been undertaken. What the report highlights very clearly is that there has been a disciplined response to the Auditor-General's findings in relation to the way that records management is kept, the way that risks are mitigated and the way that decisions are recorded so that there is a rigour around how we are spending the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money that are being spent on this project.

What is very clear from the Auditor-General's Report is that there was a mess that needed to be cleaned up, but I think that South Australians can now understand that that mess is being fixed up. At the end of the day, there is a hugely beneficial road project that is hurtling very quickly now towards completion. We have now seen major milestones in relation to the opening up of the Tonsley underpass, the opening up of the Ayliffes Road bridge, the opening up of sections of the lowered motorway as well as some of the surface treatments. This is such an important project for South Australia. It would have been a whole lot better if it had been done properly in the first place, but,

nevertheless, 2018 was a prescient moment in our state's history, and this project is one that has benefited from that change of government.

Can I say to all those long-suffering residents in the South who have had to put up with delays to this project because of the way that it was initiated, delays that have been laid bare, and the cause laid bare in the Auditor-General's Report: you now have a government that's getting on with the job of delivering this project professionally so that the people of the southern suburbs can get the benefits that they have been promised for such a long time.

Grievance Debate

STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:11): I think what is abundantly clear to people on our side of the chamber—indeed, I would hope in the parliament generally—is just how precious the gift of government is. In government you have the opportunity to set the course of your state. You have the opportunity to establish an agenda and then pursue it passionately throughout the life of your government to ensure that you are delivering on your solemn obligation to the people of this state to act for their benefit and for their betterment, and you seek to deliver a higher standard of living for our diverse community.

What has become clear to the opposition, and increasingly to the people of South Australia, throughout the course of calendar year 2019—only the second parliamentary sitting year of this government—is that we have a Premier and a ministry who have no intention of taking up that privilege, taking up that opportunity and delivering on an agenda for the state. Let me be honest with the chamber about my reflections at the end of 2018 and the beginning of 2019.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: What about your reflections as the health minister? What did you do as the health minister? What did you do? Nothing.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Innovation and Skills is called to order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: His zingers are always particularly special. There is one good Pisoni; we know there is one good Pisoni in the family.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: What did you do? What did you do? Nothing.

The SPEAKER: Minister!

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Aided and abetted, that's what you did.

The SPEAKER: The minister is warned.

Ms Stinson: Chuck him out!

The SPEAKER: I might—I might. The leader has another 20 seconds. You get an extra 20 seconds.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. At the beginning of the year, the opposition set about establishing a plan for our objectives in 2019, contemplating what the government's agenda was. There was a serious exercise undertaken in the Leader of the Opposition's office, trying to premeditate and contemplate what this government's plans would be throughout the course of this calendar year, and we literally did not know what they were.

The year 2019 represents a very significant milestone for the Liberal Party of South Australia. This is the first calendar year that this party has been in charge of the state in 18 years. The last time it occurred was in 2001. One would have naturally expected that we would be witnessing a government full of steam—crystal clear about what their vision was for this state. After 18 years of not having a run-up like they have now, one would have reasonably expected them to be rolling out one plan, one program and one piece of legislation, one after the other.

Instead, we have seen no agenda, no vision and no plan. The consequence of that for the people of South Australia is that they get to now witness and experience the consequence of a government literally making it up as they go along. No-one at the beginning of this year was predicting

that the government would privatise our public transport system. No-one at the beginning of this year anticipated \$500 million of new taxes, charges, fees and levies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No-one at the beginning of the year had heard of the bin tax. No-one at the beginning of the year was conscious that this government would break the nexus between fees and charges and inflation, and no-one—particularly every single member of this government, barring maybe Mr Rob Lucas from the other place—knew of a plan to dramatically change and increase land taxes in South Australia. Who pays the price? It is the people of this state.

They now have to endure higher fees, they now have to endure higher costs, they now have to endure the economic consequences of that: fewer jobs, higher unemployment than was the case at the beginning of last year, the lowest final demand in the nation, with two consecutive quarters of state final demand contracting.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: They now have to experience hospital ramping twice as bad as it was when this government came into existence. This is a government without a plan, without an agenda and without so much as a vision of this state. They got elected on a slogan. They got elected on a promise: more jobs, lower costs, better services, no privatisation agenda. What we now see are fewer jobs, a higher unemployment rate, higher costs represented through higher fees and charges, and we have seen cut service after cut service, and the big banana, the big kahuna: we have seen privatisation after privatisation after privatisation.

We will not repeat the mistakes of this government. We will take our opportunity in opposition seriously to develop a plan and agenda which we will take to the next election and which will represent a very stark choice for the people of this state in 2022.

Time expired.

HAMMOND ELECTORATE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:17): I want to talk about what a great year it has been in Hammond under the Marshall Liberal government. I want to start off with the great announcement from Thomas Foods International, who will rebuild their plant, and work is ongoing, and the fast moving of the regulatory work so that we can get the roadworks sorted out off Mannum Road into the new greenfield site so that the beef plant can be up and running in 2020-21. Those 2,000 jobs, so badly needed, can then come into my community to support the meat industry, not just in South Australia but as a hub for drawing in livestock from right across Australia. Murray Bridge is exactly the right location.

Working with the federal government, \$24 million is going into community infrastructure with roadworks, water infrastructure, gas installation and power connection. We will make this work. It will also connect into the 4,500 jobs that come in behind those 2,000 direct jobs at Thomas Foods. I salute Costa Adelaide Mushrooms for their investment of over \$70 million in doubling their plant at Monarto. Costa Adelaide Mushrooms is a great investment, a great employer in my electorate and a big investment. Big River Pork have made a \$14 million investment, increasing their offering so that more pork can be put through that plant. It is so good to see pork on the up lately in Australia.

There was the opening of the Gifford Hill racecourse, and what a great racecourse it is. I was there again only the other day. I have been to several events there. The Bridges Event Centre is there, and they are diversifying running events right across the board. John Buhagiar and his team are doing a great job, with a \$35 million build that is transforming racing in this state. It is the premier track in this state, and anyone who has had a horse on there, any jockey who has ridden on there, anyone who has spoken to me about that track reckons it is the best in the country. That is saying something because it has been down for over seven years waiting for the facilities to be built.

A greyhound track has just gone in: an \$8 million investment for the greyhound industry operating in Murray Bridge, usually on a Sunday evening or night. It is a fantastic venue with a fantastic atmosphere to go to the dogs to see a few races. There is also The Bend Motorsport Park with Sam Shahin and the Peregrine Group and their investment of over \$160 million. What an investment into my area, into my community, that is providing much-needed employment right across the sector. I see sons and daughters of mates of mine from Coomandook, Tailem Bend and further afield as far as Tungkillo working there.

We have the Bridgeport Hotel redevelopment, and it is great to see that finally getting underway under the Tregoning Group: a \$40 million investment into a six-storey, four-star hotel, which is going to be so good for accommodation in my area. There is the \$55 million investment in the Monarto Safari Park, \$40 million of which is coming from Gerry Ryan of Jayco, Victorian money, with the state government and the federal government putting \$15 million into the new entrance facilities there.

There is also the magnificent development at the Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital, the new emergency department I lobbied for and managed to get as an election promise under this government. A \$7 million new emergency department will be such a boon for medical needs right across my community. Millions of dollars will go into the Browns Well and Ngarkat highways to get them up to 110 km/h. As part of the \$80 million investment in schools and fast broadband, plus the millions of dollars going into the STEM project, there are new facilities and new classrooms and this investment going into my community is absolutely fantastic. Plus many hundreds of millions of dollars are going into solar farms across the board.

In the last few seconds, I want to reflect on the crippling drought across the country affecting some parts of Hammond worse than others. It is great to see the success that some farmers have had on very limited rain. But my heart does go out to those who have suffered for a second and third year of drought. Let's just hope for everyone's sake, whether you are a dryland farmer or an irrigator, that it rains real soon.

CHILDREN IN CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:22): I rise to speak on matters of concern in child protection. There are now 4,040 children in care, and that is 457 more little lives in the hands of the minister since she first took office—457. I say that figure is a figure from now with some caveat because those statistics are the latest available publicly, and they date all the way back to August. We heard yesterday that these so-called latest figures are four or five months in delay because the minister's department simply has not kept up with its annual reporting cycle this year, which of course happens every year.

It is pretty easy to see why the minister's staff are under such strain. Despite the minister's pre-election promise to reduce the number of children coming into care, and despite her quite specific promise last year to limit the rise of children coming into care to 3 per cent, it is plain that she simply failed to deliver. Those 457 extra children coming into care under minister Sanderson represent a 13 per cent jump in the number of children in state care since March last year. There is no sign of relief for those hardworking staff. The latest Auditor General's Report states:

DCP budgeted to expand its workforce with an additional 340 FTEs to be recruited in 2018-19, but actually only recruited an additional 100 FTEs.

So last financial year the minister fell a whopping 240 people short of the budgeted and targeted level of recruitment. Such a serious shortfall in child protection workers raises some very serious questions about what risks there might be to children and staff from that huge gap in manpower.

That report has been available for a while—more than a month to the parliament and weeks before that to the minister—yet under questioning in the Auditor General's Report hearing yesterday it was as though this was a fact that had completely escaped the minister. Asked whether the 240 unfilled positions were operational, professional or administrative, she could not answer. 'What classification were they in, or what area in the department?' She could not say. 'When will the remaining staff be hired?' She did not know. 'Will they all in fact be hired?' She could not say.

It is not comforting for the workers in the Department for Child Protection that their minister cannot answer the most basic and obvious of questions, the hardworking staff who are doing their best. But probably worst of all was the minister's inability to say why those staff had not been hired. She outright rejected any suggestion that there was any difficulty hiring staff. If there is no difficulty, why has it not been done?

It can only make you wonder if it is intentional to cut costs and bring down the cost of providing care to make the figures look better. You have to ask: what will be the ultimate cost for children in care and for those who care for them? Of course, the minister could not answer questions about those cost savings either. This news about hundreds of child protection roles being left unfilled comes on the back of an absolutely scathing report from the Guardian for Children and Young People.

It found that minister Sanderson's department is 'in crisis' and that poor decisions are being made on a day-to-day basis, especially around placements. She said that those decisions amount to a betrayal of children. Some young people spoke to the guardian about the abuse they had suffered in care and said that they would rather be in youth detention than returned to their residential care homes.

At the heart of this report was a dysfunctional department that she described as 'in crisis'. Surely, failing to recruit more than two-thirds of your promised workforce is part of that crisis. When the minister came in we did hear some rather lofty promises and some targets that the minister was going to meet, but few if any of those have actually been delivered. What we have now is a minister who is missing in action. There has barely been a peep from her this year.

You can count on one hand the number of radio interviews the minister has done, and I am not sure that there has been a single television interview. This is aside from a rather stellar interview in which she managed to tell Lauren Novak at *The Advertiser* that this job is actually harder than she thought it would be. I hope that in the new year the minister does find her voice, stops listening to those people who tell her to be quiet and actually does something for children in state care.

CLEVE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:27): I rise on this day, which is likely to be the last sitting day of the year, to compliment—

Ms Stinson: Do you know something we do not know?

Mr TRELOAR: —I said it is likely to be; I think we are all thinking that—one particular town in the electorate of Flinders, which is well known to the Minister for Police, the town of Cleve, which was his birthplace. Cleve is the agricultural hub of eastern Eyre Peninsula and is very much reliant on the agricultural hinterland it services for its wellbeing. It is no secret that the last three years have been challenging season-wise. To their credit, the Cleve community have really been kicking some goals through what would otherwise be some fairly tough times. I am going to run through a few of those.

Recently, at the Adelaide Show year 10 students from the Cleve Area School won this year's South Australian schools merino wether competition. This year's feature sheep competition at the Adelaide Show drew 67 entries from 37 schools around the state, with 201 sheep at the judging. I did go down to the sheep pavilion on that particular day to witness some of the judging going on. I spoke with students and staff who were there from Cleve, as well as from Wudinna, Karcultaby and some other schools.

Eight Cleve students made the trip to Adelaide to show the top six wethers from a year-long program teaching students skills, including sheep selection, the art of showing, wool quality and meat quality. Between two teams of three, with a manager each, the Cleve Area School won the Show team development award, second for the most professional Show team, first and second for best meat value, third for most valuable skins, third and fifth for the best pen of three wethers, and third and seventh for most valuable fleeces. The prize for overall highest meat and fleece quality went to the Cleve team of Britney Crosby, Taylah Haire and Renae Coulter, managed by Courtney Grigg. Congratulations to them.

Just this week, a two-woman team of year 8 students from the Cleve Area School took home the national title at the Brilliant Business Kids Festival. Cleve Area School students Georgia Macgowan, of Darke Peak, and Jorja Newlyn, of Rudall, pitched their winning concept for a solar-powered water sensor and app in Sydney last week in front of a national audience.

Cleve Area School was the only South Australian school to win a spot in the prestigious program, which focuses on fostering leaders in agriculture through industry mentorship and design thinking. The students' Handy Trough app, which receives alerts from a sensor located in each trough, is designed to save farmers time, money and stock, keep them off rural roads for longer and relieve the mental stress of livestock upkeep. Cleve Area School is also home to the award-winning Sims Farm, Australia's top dryland farming school enterprise.

It was also announced this week that the Motor Trade Association (MTA) board has approved the purchase of the Cleve training centre site and is currently working through the process with the owner. This commitment to regional automotive training is great for Cleve, it is great for Eyre Peninsula and for the ongoing support of automotive businesses and apprentices. To top it all off, although this is a precursor to some of what I have talked about, Cleve was crowned South Australia's inaugural Agricultural Town of the Year. To quote from the Minister for Primary Industries' press release:

Strength in the face of adversity and community collaboration over the past 12 months has helped the town of Cleve stand out from four other finalists to win the Marshall Liberal Government's inaugural 2019 Agricultural Town of the Year...

'Cleve is an outstanding example of a community working together to support the growth of agriculture and this win is a true testament to its resilience in tough times'

It is also the home every second year to the Eyre Peninsula Field Days. That is a longstanding event that alternates with Paskeville. My congratulations to the people and town of Cleve on their achievements through this past 12 months. I am not necessarily saying that other towns have not strived also, but I thought I would highlight the efforts of Cleve.

I would also like to wish you, Mr Speaker, and everybody in this place (and I know it will be done again later in the day) a safe and happy Christmas and I look forward to the new year.

WATKINS, AUNTY CHERIE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:32): South Australia has lost another great Aboriginal woman leader with the passing of Aunty Cherie Watkins, who died on 20 November. I am indebted to my friend Alison Denee, Aunty Cherie's daughter, for the following brief history of this amazing lady, who was such a good friend of the Florey Reconciliation Task Force, particularly in its early days.

Cherie was born at Taillem Bend on 3 October 1939 to Lister Frederick and Yvonne Lisette Turner. Lisette was the daughter of an ANZAC veteran and his French war bride. Cherie's father was a contractor who travelled the country, not staying very long in one place—a theme in Aunty Cherie's later life, too.

When she was about 10 or 12, the family moved from Victor Harbor to Leigh Creek. A significant early experience she remembered was that for one of her birthday parties, the white people of the town did not send their children to her party because Aboriginal children would be there. She often spoke about being a teacher from this age, because her teacher at the time would leave the classroom to go to the pub across the road and leave her in charge. She also told the story of how old Tom Cruise once brought her a brand-new pair of shoes. He had taken a drawing of the outline of her foot on one trip and the next time he was there, so were her new shoes.

Aunty Cherie returned to Adelaide for most of her secondary schooling and after eventually moving to Gilles Plains met the man who became her husband. Not long after that, her parents moved to Streaky Bay on the West Coast. Alison, my friend, was born to a young mum. Shortly after, Cherie's mum and dad moved back to Streaky Bay. When they decided they were not coming to town again, Cherie's new family followed them not long after.

Cherie worked as a bookkeeper there before coming back to Adelaide, to Taperoo, where a new baby boy, Mark, was born and then another move, to Angle Park, where a second baby girl, Cherylyne, was born. This baby contracted whooping cough, a terrible disease, and Aunty Cherie

exhausted herself nursing this little one back to health. Not long after, the growing family acquired a much-loved little Morris Minor, which took them, and many local children as well, everywhere. In 1966, Cherie's dad had a serious accident and lost his life.

The move to Angle Park saw Cherie become very actively involved as the secretary of the Aboriginal Women's Council. Aunty Gladys Elphick was the president and led a group of women with great strength. They lobbied together in Adelaide for the referendum in 1967 on behalf of Aboriginal people Australia-wide.

Cherie then studied social work and graduated with her diploma. Port Adelaide, her place of work, had many Aboriginal families. She maintained her activist work with Aunty Ruby Hammond and many other prominent Aboriginal women. At this time Don Dunstan and Robin Millhouse were very supportive of the group, ensuring that inclusive bills were passed through parliament. During her study times, she wrote a few songs focused on the dilemmas of the Aboriginal community, and would always love a singalong by the fire.

It was also a time when many who travelled to Adelaide were always able to find a bed and a meal with Aunty Cherie. Aunty Leila Rankine became a close friend around then, and through her much early family history and how Cherie fitted into it became clearer. Cherie eventually found her beloved Virginia farm where many children, as well as her own, were in her house either fostered through government processes or family ties.

Cherie transferred from Port Adelaide to Gawler where there were many stresses with her working life at DCW, as it was known at the time. She struggled with government policies and their impact on Aboriginal communities, and cases played on her mind. After 10 years, she made the hard decision to leave the department.

In the 1990s, there was another move to Munno Para, and a little home where Cherie started all over again, learning and teaching the Kurna language. Cherie was very passionate and worked with the Adelaide University on the retrieval of the Kurna language along with Aunty Alice Rigney and Uncle Lewis O'Brien. She then taught the language at Tauondi College and Para West Adult Campus, Salisbury High, Fremont Elizabeth City High School and Kurna Plains School where I first met her and saw her magic with all, especially children.

Kurna Plains School life was a wonderful time. The friendships with staff and students were very special, and Cherie adored all she worked with and always had a special place for them and anyone needing a kind word. She taught Kurna language and culture with passion, teaching alongside the very talented Uncle Kevin Duigan. Together they were a great team, and she loved the times when they were travelling and performing in Adelaide—even teaching prime minister John Howard and his entourage to count in Kurna language through the Number Rock song. She was so happy being able to share her passion for Kurna language and work with the children who she treated like her own grandchildren.

Cherie eventually started to cut back on her working duties and became involved with Salisbury, Port Adelaide and Playford councils, and she was recognised by Salisbury Council with the Living Legend Award in 2008. In her retirement from 2009 onwards, Cherie still maintained her connections with community. In 2012, Aunty Cherie was diagnosed with a memory loss condition, and over the next few years her family gradually lost the person who was their beloved mother. She still held some of her humour, her funny times and compassion, and still loved everyone around her, and they were always there for her until the end.

Aunty Cherie Watkins has been an inspirational role model for many, especially young Indigenous people in our community. She has been respected and loved by all who came into contact with her. She supported many Salisbury initiatives and involved herself in the Indigenous community wherever she could. Our heartfelt condolences to Alison and her family and Aunty Cherie's extended family and friends. They were lucky to have Cherie as their mother and friend, and I was one of the lucky ones to know her just a little. Vale, Aunty Cherie. You and your contribution to so many will always be remembered.

SOUTHERN HEALTH EXPANSION PLAN

Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:37): We promised we would undo the damage of Labor's disastrous Transforming Health policy, and we are delivering on that promise day in, day out. Today, we have announced a landmark Southern Health Expansion Plan. I know how important this is for people in my local area and the southern region who want to know that they can get the health care they need when they need it and close to home.

We inherited a basket case of a health system, with the former Labor government downgrading and closing health services right across a number of hospitals and of course none of us can forget that Labor closed and tried to sell the Repat. So what are we as a government now doing to repair the healthcare system? We are reopening the Repat, and this morning with the Premier, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and the members for Davenport and Waite we revealed an \$86 million Southern Health Expansion Plan.

This plan includes establishing a 12-bed acute specialist facility at the Repat, which complements the dementia care village that will be at the site; creating an acute ward and increasing overnight medical cover at the Noarlunga Hospital; and expanding the emergency department at Flinders Medical Centre with an additional 30 treatment spaces, which comprises 12 more emergency extended care unit beds, 12 more treatment bays and six flexible beds. Importantly, to support this expansion, there will be an additional 45 full-time equivalent doctors, specialists and nurses.

This means people living further south can get the care they need closer to home at Noarlunga Hospital. Further, the acute ward at Noarlunga Hospital will also reduce the number of ambulance transfers to Flinders Medical Centre. This, combined with the actual expansion of the emergency department at Flinders Medical Centre, is a game changer for residents not just in the south but right across metropolitan Adelaide with a positive ripple effect.

Of critical importance to my local residents, this plan encompasses our work to reactivate the Repat, as we promised. When residents told us that the Repat should not be closed and sold, we on this side of the house listened and we acted. When South Australians told us they want better health services, the Marshall Liberal government listened and acted. As we near the end of 2019, I look back on all that we have done to repair and improve our healthcare system, not only in metropolitan Adelaide but in regional South Australia as well. It has been a big year.

At the Repat site alone, we are developing a 78-bed dementia care facility. This is a South Australian first, with the state government partnering with HammondCare to deliver innovative homelike accommodation to care for people at varying stages of dementia. We are building a 26-bed transition care ward and we are establishing a veterans' wellbeing centre and refurbishing the SPF Hall. Of course, the Repat site is a big site and these are just some of the things that we are doing after developing a master plan and working very closely with the community and healthcare practitioners.

Our Marshall Liberal government has been getting on with the job. This is our investment in our clinicians, services and world-class infrastructure to better support the health and wellbeing of all South Australians. We had a strong plan for real change and we are firmly focused on delivering this change, not only for the wonderful residents in the electorate that I represent and fight for every day but for all South Australians.

Parliamentary Procedure

BROADCAST USE ON SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS

The SPEAKER (15:42): Before I call the Minister for Transport, I rise to make a short statement regarding the use of broadcast media on social media platforms. Members, following a number of queries and complaints being raised with me recently concerning broadcast material of parliamentary proceedings appearing on social media platforms, I take this opportunity to remind those users of social media who republish or broadcast proceedings of parliament, or excerpts thereof, of the terms and conditions that apply.

However, before referring to the terms and conditions, I would like to say that the various social media platforms that are available today offer a unique opportunity to share news and information about the work of the parliament. The House of Assembly's Facebook page is an obvious example. However, while the level of engagement in social media is such that it cannot be ignored, it is important that social media users who participate in or comment on parliamentary proceedings are clear about the rules and how they will be applied.

With respect to the broadcasts and rebroadcasts of proceedings and excerpts of the proceedings of the House of Assembly, I draw the attention of social media users commenting on parliamentary proceedings to House of Assembly standing order 400, which refers to the terms and conditions that relate to the transmission and broadcast of proceedings or excerpts thereof. In referring to these terms and conditions, social media users are advised that the use of broadcast material in contravention of the terms and conditions imposed by the House of Assembly via the standing orders may constitute a contempt of parliament.

The beauty of social media is that it can instantly bring parliament to a much larger audience than other forms of communication. It also facilitates engagement with sections of the community who might not otherwise be interested in the institution of parliament and its central role in South Australia's system of representative democracy. The importance of social media for popular engagement with parliament suggests that it should not be discouraged nor restricted from its use. These terms and conditions do not in any way restrict the use of social media commenting on parliamentary proceedings. I ask members and their staff to take these matters on board.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:44): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (South Eastern Freeway Offences) Bill. I note that we are trying to get some fairness and equity into this legislation, notwithstanding the safety outcomes that we need and must always look for when we are introducing legislation like this.

I used to drive trucks and semitrailers down the old curly track that went around Eagle on the Hill and the Devil's Elbow—not the long, seven-kilometre long haul—back in 1992 and 1993. During the harvest, I brought around a dozen loads of my own wheat to Port Adelaide from Coomandook, so I know you have to come down in the appropriate gear. You only have to be one gear out to find that your brakes are smoking when you get to the bottom. It is wrong to come down too quickly, but you can manage it with gearing.

In 2019, we have far better trucks than we did in the old days. Some have automatic transmission and there are ways to control them; however, there have been some issues with what has happened here. Under the current legislation, a driver of a truck or bus can be issued with an expiation notice for a South Eastern Freeway offence, which includes fee of over \$1,000, a loss of six demerit points and a licence disqualification of six months for a first offence, 12 months for a second offence and three years for a subsequent offence.

We are tidying up this legislation because people have an absolute fear, even though they believe they are doing the right thing. It is a fact that occasionally, in a heavy vehicle of over 4.5 tonne, which is the legislated limit, sometimes you have to touch the brakes. Even if you are in the right gear, you might need to keep it under speed. Some of these rigs have 18 gears or more. You may have slipped into too high a gear and have to pull it back.

In the main, I think the lessons have been learned due to the extra signage that has gone up over the years and the compliance that has been imposed. Unfortunately, we have witnessed some terrible accidents in previous years. Some of these were purely because those people had never driven the long journey down the hill. James Venning, of Pinnaroo, paid for it with his life. Sadly, we have seen smaller vehicles come down and it has caused a loss of life.

While we need to make sure that we have the right outcomes for safety, which is absolutely paramount, we also need to ensure that the truck-driving industry does not seize up because people are paranoid about coming down the freeway, or they lose their job because they have lost their licence. You have to obey the law. I must say that I think coming to some middle ground is a great outcome.

My Liberal Party branch has lobbied me in relation to this. Norm Paterson is a great man and a great leader in the Liberal Party. He is the patriarch of Paterson Bulk Transport in Cooke Plains. Norm was keen to get this legislation in place. I hope that it gets a smooth passage through the house because we need to get the balance right. We know that some people have paid the body corporate levy, which I believe is about \$25,000. I believe that, with this upgraded legislation, we will get that balance correct, so that we are still getting those safety outcomes and we are taking some of the angst out of the community.

We have had some issues with people who have been in a Ford F-450, which is right on the 4½-tonne limit, but they do classify it as a truck. The problem is that, as soon as you pay the expiation fee, you have basically admitted guilt, and it is very difficult, if not impossible, to roll that back. I think we are making inroads into this today. I hope that we have generous support across the chamber. With those few words, I support the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:50): I indicate to the house that I am the opposition's lead speaker on this matter. I start by saying that I congratulate the government on having the foresight to listen. I think it is a good sign that the shadow minister is beginning to listen.

Mr Pederick: That's you listening?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I said 'the minister'.

Mr Pederick: You said 'the shadow minister'.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I didn't. Only the Government Whip would attack me while I am congratulating the minister. Only a cantankerous, old, past his usefulness Government Whip who cannot keep his word on pairs would attack me.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: Says the Grandfather of the House.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think I am still younger than you, old man.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: He's only 48.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: You.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. How old is this old man?

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: The same as you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is it 1971? I'm in August. We will skip a bit of history here. The Hon. Frank Pangallo in another place was inundated by a number of constituents who had been penalised by a piece of legislation that was developed by the previous Labor government in response to a Coroner's inquiry into an accident on the South Eastern Freeway down track. It was a very horrific accident. I should say it was a crash, rather than an accident.

That crash resulted in legislation. That legislation was formed on the basis of that Coroner's inquiry and report. That legislation passed the parliament in the last parliament. It passed when the former government was still in office. It was proclaimed in May of this year. I think 'became operational' is the correct term. What has occurred since then is that a number of people, who were not potentially the intended recipients or targets of the new legislation, bore the brunt of many of the recommendations made by the Coroner.

The minister and the opposition have worked quite well together to come up with a compromise, but I say this to the house: I do not have access to officers anymore. I do not have access to the police commissioner, to any other road safety experts or to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. I am relying on the advice given to us by the government and the minister, and I accept

him at his word that the changes the government are making will not make the down track any more dangerous and that they live up to the spirit of what the Coroner recommended.

What we are attempting to do is make sure that there are no unintended consequences in the legislation that we moved and that was passed in a bipartisan way. I congratulate the minister and the Hon. Frank Pangallo on accepting many of the recommendations we made. One that we wanted made that cannot be made—and I accept the minister's explanation here—gave some retrospectivity to the penalties that have been applied already. The minister tells me he has no power to offer ex gratia payments and no power to retrospectively change court decisions that have occurred already.

I think there probably could have been a way to work through that, but I think the government is racing towards the end of what they call a glorious year. They want to prorogue the parliament: because everything has gone so well, they want to reset, which is very interesting in itself. The opposition will be supporting the speedy passage of this legislation through all stages, as we did in the upper house.

The minister has now indicated, late, that he has a transitional provisional amendment he would like us to support. I have not been briefed on that transitional amendment. The minister has given me a very brief, Stephan Knoll-like explanation of 'she'll be right'. Again, I accept the minister on his word—his advice to the house—that this will not in any way change the intent of the amendments of the upper house.

With those few words, this is an example that unfortunately the public will not see of the government, the opposition and the crossbench working well together to get an outcome through cooperative, democratic agreement. Hopefully, it will happen again, but I doubt it.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:55): I thank all members for their forbearance on this and note that the opposition has been agreeable and amenable. This was a bipartisan piece of legislation back in 2017, and I think it remains so now. We have four minutes to do what we can do, so I will leave it here.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Just to clarify, the government's opposition to this is that at the moment the clause states that the act comes into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. In order to actually move and shorten the transition period, we would like to change that to on assent, which is earlier. It just means that we can introduce the new penalties, the lower penalties, quicker.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I accept the minister on his word.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Thank you for that cooperation.

Clause negatived.

Remaining clauses (3 to 7) passed.

New schedule 1.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I move:

Amendment No 2 [TransInfrLocalGov-1]—

Page 4, after line 20—Insert:

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Interpretation

In this Schedule—

South Eastern Freeway offence means—

- (a) an offence against section 45C of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*; or
- (b) an offence against section 79B of the *Road Traffic Act 1961* constituted of being the owner of a vehicle that appears from evidence obtained through the operation of a photographic detection device to have been involved in the commission of an offence against section 45C(1) of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

2—Transitional provision

The provisions of the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* and the *Road Traffic Act 1961* as amended by this Act do not apply in respect of a South Eastern Freeway offence committed or allegedly committed before the commencement of this Act (and the provisions of the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* and the *Road Traffic Act 1961* as in force at the time of the offence or alleged offence will apply instead).

If you commit an offence before the assent the existing penalties apply. After the assent of this bill, the new penalties apply.

New schedule inserted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 4 December 2019.)

The CHAIR: We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 in relation to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services and also the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. I remind members that the committee is in normal session and, as such, any questions will need to be asked by members while on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19. I understand, member for Elizabeth, that we are beginning with police, so please reference your page and ask a question.

Mr ODENWALDER: I thank the minister and his advisers. I have a lot to fit into half an hour, so I will start with page 329, which refers to total net revenues from the SA government of around \$900 million. Were any of the \$38 million worth of budget cuts demanded by last year's 2018 budget realised this financial year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised that SAPOL met their budget. In fact, they were only slightly under budget. The \$888 million net revenues from the SA government that you talk about came in \$5 million under budget. That is the figure. I should say, on expenditures they were \$5 million under budget.

Mr ODENWALDER: You will have to bear with me as I am not an accountant. Regarding the savings imposed by the 2018 budget by the Treasurer, were any of those cuts or savings made during the last financial year and can you identify where those savings were made?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We have been through this before, but I am happy to run these figures by you again. When we took over and came into government, the previous government—that would be the South Australian Labor Party—had cuts in place to the tune of \$10.7 million in 2018-19, \$20.3 million in 2019-20, \$22.9 million in 2020-21 and \$24.6 million in 2021-22. They were quite substantial cuts that you put in place.

The savings measures that we brought in were \$12.5 million in 2018-19, \$12.5 million in 2019-20, \$13.8 million in 2020-21 and \$14.1 million in 2021-22, so you can see they are substantially lower. If you are referring to budget cuts, I think it is intriguing to point out the level of budget cuts put in place by the previous Labor government before we came in. By comparison, it is quite contrasting.

Mr ODENWALDER: The extra commentary notwithstanding, can you identify where that \$12.5 million was for the financial year we are talking about today?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You are looking for those in the Auditor-General's Report? We are responding here to the Auditor-General's Report and I am not sure where you are going as far as the Auditor-General is concerned. I do not see any notes in here from the Auditor-General about the cuts that Labor put in place that I have just outlined—the substantial cuts—nor the operating savings measures that we put in place. I am just at a loss to see which reference point you are referring to.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, are you able to specify—

Mr ODENWALDER: I was talking about the total net revenues from the SA government, which total \$888 million, so presumably they need to be expended. You have identified that there was \$12.5 million of savings in this financial year compared with the previous financial year. I want to know where those savings were found. What was cut to the value of \$12.5 million?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I think that you are getting this slightly confused. They would be reflected in the budget papers, so the specifics of that are not here in the Auditor-General's Report. Again, I go back to the—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: This is questioning on the Auditor-General's Report. That is what you are questioning me on. So the answer is: as you point out, \$888 million was the total net revenues from the SA government. I appreciate that. I have outlined to you the Labor cuts just so you are aware of what they are, because they were quite significant, and then the efficiencies that we had. I am informed they came in \$5 million under budget. I am also informed that that question was answered in a parliamentary estimates committee process, so you actually have received that answer.

Mr ODENWALDER: It seems so long ago. I refer to page 333, the Shield Business Transformation program. It is also referred to on page 330. My understanding is that there was a total project allocation of \$55 million overall. Total spending to date on investment and operating and recurrent expenditure is \$43 million. My first question is: over which years was this \$43 million spent?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell you is that the police records management system, also known as Shield, stages 2 to 4, was approved by the government in November 2013. The Shield program, stages 2 to 4, was allocated an investing budget of just over \$29 million. The Shield application can manage all aspects of crime recording, investigation, intelligence management, custody management, property management and case preparation.

The remaining functionality has been bundled into stage 2+, because the actual implementation of the remaining functionality is dependent on understanding the complexity of the legacy systems and dependencies, with associated processes, hence providing a delivery path that is achievable from a systems and business change perspective. So it has been happening since then.

In September 2015, release 3 implemented functionality to support the reporting of missing persons events and subsequent investigations. This has been rolled out over time, obviously. In November 2016, release 4 implemented functionality to support the reporting of vehicle collision and an upgrade of the Niche RMS system user interface. The new user interface is capable of working on a wide range of desktop and mobile devices. You would be aware that there is a move towards mobile tablets as well.

During 2017, a number of maintenance releases were implemented to resolve known defects and provide functional improvements to the system. It has been rolling out over a period of time. It is a highly complex piece of operation that is continuing to be rolled out.

Mr ODENWALDER: There is \$8 million left to spend. I note on page 333 that delays have been identified with the full implementation of stages 2 to 4, which is what we call 2+, I gather. It is likely to be extended by two years. My questions are: why the delay, how much extra will this cost taxpayers and, if you do not know the answer, when can we expect an answer to that cost?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that the funding requirements arise due to delays in the Shield program. The Shield program has experienced total delays in the order of 1½ years due to delays in delivery by the primary vendor; significant and ongoing changes to the core application to meet SAPOL requirements; impacting corporate projects and programs, i.e. organisational reform program, including implementation of the district policing model.

As you would be aware, DPM 1 was rolled out when Labor was in government. At the last budget, we funded \$18 million for SAPOL to roll out DPM 2 because the funding was not there. The police commissioner has come out and spoken about how that will improve policing in South Australia in the metropolitan area and ensure that we have more people out there proactively policing on our streets.

There has been difficulty in attracting and retaining suitably qualified staff, as well as challenges associated with the change management process across SAPOL's workforce, integration with existing systems across the criminal justice sector and allowing for criminal justice reform projects. The project life has been extended by up to two years, with SAPOL internally funding the additional cost by a budget redirection. That is where that stands.

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget redirection from which area?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that comes from within the capital budget for SAPOL.

Mr ODENWALDER: That begs the question: what are we forgoing in order to fund the continuation of this project?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, it just comes from within the capital budget. The commissioner has—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, let me finish. Sit down and let me finish.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Let me finish. You are wasting time by standing up when I am giving you the answer.

Mr ODENWALDER: Chair, please. We have five minutes.

The CHAIR: The minister is answering.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish, it comes from the capital budget. The capital budget is allocated by the commissioner. He decides on where the capital budget is allocated and it has come from there.

Mr ODENWALDER: Is this intended to interact with the iSAFE system? Have they been designed to complement each other at all?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As far as the integration of those systems is concerned, the intent is very much to have a more uniform and crosscovered IT system. We know that by information sharing across these systems—Corrections, of course, are rolling out the iSAFE system, as you pointed out. This shield system that was implemented by your government previously, or by the commissioner through your government, has that intent, along with courts.

We know all these agencies are looking at ways they can get their systems to talk to each other better and to share information better. It is very similar to the MAPS program, where agencies come together, collaborate and share their information to proactively get better outcomes for our community. The intent will be to share information.

From a technical standpoint, I am not a technician. When you ask if they will talk to each other, I cannot answer to those specifics, but the intent here is very much, across these agencies, to make sure that information that is within Corrections can be shared with the police agencies, and the courts and for that matter, and other agencies as well. For issues like domestic violence and these sorts of things, where these are—

Mr ODENWALDER: Chair, we have limited time. The minister is clearly filibustering. The question was quite specific: do the two systems interact or not?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I was saying and explaining to you, when you say interact and talk to each other, as a technical term I am not sure what you mean there, and I do not know that you are technically positioned to understand if they talk to each other. What will happen is the information between one system and the other systems will work together. That is the absolute intent, yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Page 329 talks about a decrease in expiation fee revenue. What is that as a percentage reduction on the previous year, and does the minister have any explanation for why this would be the case?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I am informed, there is a range of things to have the reduction, like driver behaviour and people doing the right thing. What you will have noticed, and we have been driving this again, is that we have been putting up signs to actually let people know that when you get to an intersection that there is a red light and speed camera there and what the speed limit is. We are making it really clear to people. We did have a road safety audit as well. A speed camera—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I am not saying that. I am saying it is those sorts of measures. That is one we hope will have that, but people's change in behaviour is hopefully one of the reasons they are not offending. I am not sure if that is not what you want to see, but we would think that if people are actually doing the right thing, as a result of that revenues have come down.

I know we had the issue with the Lidar last year, when there was a calibration issue that was challenged through the courts. Police worked diligently with the government. We also thank the opposition for their work on that to rectify that system to make sure they could work properly and meet the legislation and the legislation meet the intent. There are those issues as far as the operational issues and as far as Lidar, as well. Again, I do not know the figure from Lidar and I do not know the percentage reduction but, fundamentally, changing behaviour and people doing the right thing is probably the key there.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am surprised by the answer. Did this data influence the decision by the government to increase expiation fees in last year's budget?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, that was made very clear. I thank you for asking that because that was put forward by the police commissioner to have road safety benefits. We have seen this year's road toll, and again I do not like using that term because it just becomes a number when it is in fact people's lives and families who are being impacted by this.

No, the commissioner's advice was that that would have an impact. We are always looking at things that will have an impact on changing behaviour because that behavioural change is what will make people safer on our roads and have a safer road system. That was the advice from the commissioner and that is what we did.

Mr ODENWALDER: I just want to be clear about this. The data saying that revenue had dropped had no impact on the budgetary decision to increase expiation fees?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, none whatsoever. I made that abundantly clear in my last answer. The commissioner has put to us that having that impact on people and actually hitting the hip pocket does help change behaviour as well. We want to do everything we can to make sure that people are behaving appropriately on the roads, on the highways and on our streets around the metropolitan area to make sure that they are doing everything to stay as safe as possible and keep people on our roads as safe as possible.

The CHAIR: We move now to sport. We might stop the clock while we change advisers, and we will give you an extra minute.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, in relation to the \$8 million grant to the racing industry, are there restrictions or specifications in relation to how the money can be spent?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify, since we came into government we provided \$4 million or thereabouts to the racing industry in the first budget, and that was for non-recourse, so there were no ties to that. That was because of the point of consumption (POC) tax brought in by—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —hang on—those opposite. After that—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just hang on a sec. Stop talking. If you keep talking over me, I cannot give you my answer.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sh!

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Can you shoosh so I can give you the answer?

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I think the minister raises a fair point. You have asked a question, he is answering it and we are listening for that. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair, I do appreciate your protection. To be clear, \$4 million last year, non-recourse. With respect to the \$8 million in this budget, \$4 million was for infrastructure spend. So there is \$4 million that can be spent on infrastructure, and that does come across my desk and I sign off on that to make sure that we are investing in infrastructure that is going to grow the industry and grow racing in South Australia.

This is a great industry that produces a lot of jobs for a lot of people right across the board. The trainers, the strappers, those sorts of people, are employed through this industry, so we want to see it grow. They came to us because they were hit by the POC tax that the Labor government implemented on the industry. They did not get any recourse from the government, but we have done that.

The \$4 million was for infrastructure funds, and the other part of that is an ongoing \$4 million they can spend on the industry, again with a focus around growing racing, growing the industry, growing employment and growing opportunities in South Australia.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, what is the process for reconciling the expenditure?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To enlighten the member, what I did not say about the second \$4 million—the \$4 million we talked about last year, the two lots of \$4 million which make \$8 million which you referred to—was that there was also some governance review implications in that. If they have a financial acquittal, that will be done against the purpose of the grant. The grant agreement is struck, and it is outlined in there what they need to do, what needs to happen, and that is laid out quite clearly.

In the case of the infrastructure spend, they need to then show that that money has been spent on the infrastructure that we have agreed to and signed off on, so that gets done there. Likewise with the second \$4 million, if they have governance reviews or governance structures we have asked them to change, and they get the money according to actually delivering on those changes, we acquit that against the outline of what they had to do, the process they had to go through, and make sure that that ticks off. So, if they have done the changes, they have done the governance changes, then we say, 'No worries at all. There are the funds. There's the tick-off.'

Ms HILDYARD: Has your request to amend the constitution of the Thoroughbred Racing SA board been agreed to and, if not, what is the status of your attempt to appoint the Chairman of the Darwin Turf Club to the board of TRSA?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The constitution was changed to talk about the selection panel process because that was part of the condition of us getting the funding to racing. What we said was, 'We're happy to give you this money because we believe in the industry. We think the industry can grow. We think there's an upside in the industry,' so we had to change the constitution to outline that they would get that funding if they made the constitutional changes.

If they made those constitutional changes, we then made the appointments, the appointments were recommended to me and they were passed on to the board. That is progressing well. But from that end, the changes that you are talking about were to make the changes so that I could make the recommendations through a panel. In TRSA's case, there were three members on the panel that I selected. Country Racing and SAJC also had a member on the panel to determine who the best people were to join their board, and those three appointments were made by the TRSA.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, I understand your answer in relation to the selection panel, but you have not answered the question about the status of your request for Thoroughbred Racing SA to change their constitution in order to be able to appoint the Chairman of the Darwin Turf club. Can you please answer that question?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I made it abundantly clear—

Ms Hildyard: No, you didn't—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Listen. Stop talking over me, please.

Ms Hildyard: Well, answer the question.

The CHAIR: Order! The minister raised a fair point. Member for Reynell, you ask a question and he answers. That is how it works.

Ms Hildyard: But he didn't answer it.

The CHAIR: Well, the minister, any minister actually, can answer the question as he sees fit, so if you will just be patient I am sure the minister will get to his answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is why you have to stop doing this, member for Reynell. I really need to be clear. What I do want to make clear with you is that the constitutional changes that I made were around the funding that went to the racing industry, that I asked them to make to their constitution so that we could give them the funding—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Listen. It was hinged around the funding. These were the changes that were made. We said, 'If you want this funding, we need to make these changes,' so the process of appointing people to the board goes through the panel, whereby I have appointed three people to that panel and Country Racing and SAJC both appoint one each. That is how that change was made to go through to make sure they get the funding. The industry said, 'Yes, we want the funding,' and, yes, they made those changes. That went through, the recommendations came back to me and I passed them on to TRSA.

Ms HILDYARD: Is the Chairman of the Darwin Turf Club now appointed to the board of TRSA?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, to the best of my knowledge. Yes, he is.

Ms HILDYARD: Did you ask Thoroughbred Racing SA to change their constitution to enable that appointment?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: For the third time, I need to be really clear about what happened with the constitutional change. I will say it again: they wanted \$24 million. That was the proposal that we put forward, and we said, 'If we are giving that money to the industry, we want to make sure that it is actually going towards growing the industry and taking the industry forward, growing jobs and growing racing in South Australia.'

Racing had been dying for a number of years under the previous government and its operations, so we said, 'We will give you that money, but what we need to have is a constitutional

change so that, when you appoint the people to the board, there is a selection panel.' On that selection panel, I appoint three people. Someone comes from Country Racing and someone comes from SAJC. That panel meets, interviews everyone. Recommendations are made to me. If I accept those recommendations, we pass them on to the TRSA and the TRSA appoints them to their board.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, in assessing the value of the racing industry, did you receive advice about the amount of government revenue generated by the industry?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, what page were you referring to in Auditor-General's Report?

Ms HILDYARD: All of these are in relation to 3.2, which sets out the racing grant. Your statement does not actually have pages, so I can show it to you—3.2, racing industry fund grant. There are actually no pages on your report.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So what page are we looking at?

Ms HILDYARD: There are no pages on your report—none—3.2, grants and subsidies, racing industry fund. You did not even publish this agency's report.

The CHAIR: As I indicated earlier, member for Reynell, all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report.

Ms HILDYARD: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do you have that?

Ms HILDYARD: Your government did not actually put any pages on the report.

The CHAIR: For my benefit, member for Reynell, can you ask the question again please.

Ms HILDYARD: In assessing the value of the racing industry, did you receive advice about the amount of government revenue generated by the industry?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think I have found what you are after; I think it is page 16. You are just referring to the \$8 million that was given under grants and subsidy. I am just clarifying that it is page 16, 3.2, racing industry fund. I have clarified what you are talking about. As far as revenues are concerned, that is a matter for the Treasurer.

Ms HILDYARD: Oh my goodness. Can you confirm, minister, that you did not receive advice about the amount of government revenue generated by the racing industry?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Government revenue through what source? I am not with you.

Ms HILDYARD: It is a question for you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, can you explain what source is this revenue coming from? Are you talking about income tax from people who actually work at the SAJC? What are you talking about? I do not understand. Please explain.

Ms HILDYARD: I am asking you a question—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I just need more clarification on the question if I can, please.

Ms HILDYARD: It is alright, we have a minute and a half. I was asking a question—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I know, and I want clarification on the question. Can you just explain, please—

The CHAIR: Minister, can you take a seat.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, did your agency receive details of any modelling done on the revenue impacts of changing the rate of the betting consumption tax.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for West Torrens is sitting next to you; he would know that tax is a matter for the Treasurer. That is a matter for the Treasurer. If you have a tax question, fire away at the Treasurer.

Ms HILDYARD: Did your agency receive any details of any modelling done on the revenue impacts of changing the rate of the betting consumption tax? Did you, as the Minister for Racing, receive any modelling in relation to that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to be clear, none of the tax revenue comes to my portfolio. It is an \$8 million grant that you have outlined that comes to me as—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It impacts the industry you govern.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: But I do not tax the industry; you actually set up the tax.

Ms HILDYARD: I will move on.

The CHAIR: Last question—probably the final question, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: I understand that your racing industry fund, as you have said today, includes governance requirements for the three codes. What investigation has your government undertaken into the governance, financial status and operations of the South Australian Harness Racing Club?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to be clear, we do not fund the Harness Racing Club. We fund Harness Racing SA, just as we do not fund the SAJC or Country Racing SA. We fund Thoroughbred Racing SA; likewise with greyhounds: we fund Greyhound Racing SA. So it is the actual overarching—

Ms HILDYARD: You might have to talk to some of your colleagues about this.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, listen. Just to be clear, Greyhound Racing SA, Harness Racing SA and Thoroughbred Racing SA are the avenues that they go to. I am happy to explain it to you later over a coffee, that's cool.

The CHAIR: There is an offer. Time has expired. We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 in relation to the Minister for Environment and Water. I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions have to—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I am trying to talk. Everybody take a breath.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Hear, hear, sir. Follow by example.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for West Torrens. Everybody take a breath. I am going to begin again. We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 in relation to the Minister for Environment and Water. I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions have to be asked by members on their feet and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19. I call the deputy leader.

Dr CLOSE: I understand that we are starting with the EPA and that we will move through in order so that your advisers can organise themselves. The first question I have relates to page 99 and the EPA. There is a reference to the 24 targeted voluntary separation packages that cost \$2 million. Can the minister give me a summary of the roles that those positions occupied and how those roles have been subsequently addressed, assuming that they were not, in fact, unnecessary?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I thank the deputy leader for her question. I am advised that, if we look at a breakdown of the 24 positions that were given targeted voluntary separation packages as part of the EPA's process, the best breakdown I can give in terms of the areas of the organisation is that it included 10 roles from the regulation area, seven from the science and information area, four from the finance and corporate area, one from the people and performance area, and two from the strategy area of the department.

In the view of the management of the EPA, the availability of the TVSP program gave the EPA an opportunity to refresh what they do and how they do it. That has seen a fairly significant restructure and repositioning of the organisation over the last 12 months or so to enable it to achieve budget saving requirements while also maintaining a positive re-energised and progressive organisation best positioned to achieve its Strategic Directions 2018-2022 and to also ensure that it

is meeting the policy directions and priorities of the current state government. That is how the division of TVSPs was handled and why the management of the EPA and the board of the EPA believe that the repositioning has been able to deal with 24 fewer FTEs involved.

Dr CLOSE: Can the minister please tell me the percentage of the workforce that is represented by 24 FTEs?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I do not have the calculator right in front of me, but it is around about 9 per cent of the workforce.

Dr CLOSE: I have one more question on this area. The minister mentioned the scientific area. How many of the TVSPs in that area were qualified scientists, and roughly in what fields were they qualified?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you again, deputy leader. That is a little bit more than the advice that I have in front of me in terms of detail. I am happy to take that on notice and provide to the deputy leader the specifics of those positions and their scientific focus.

Dr CLOSE: If we turn to page 101, the second dot point under expenses refers to an increase in the provision for doubtful debts. I would like an explanation for that.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There is a dispute with a fairly large levy payout. The government has been in dispute with them since 2018, I believe.

Dr Close interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The company's name cannot be released at this time; it is a commercial-in-confidence dispute. Well, it is a bad debt, essentially, that the government is pursuing against an organisation that should otherwise be up for a fairly large levy. That is being pursued through the appropriate compliance channels.

Dr CLOSE: A little further down in the reference to the nearly \$1 million decrease in supplies and services, there is a reference to a decrease in scientific and technical services, due predominantly to less chemical analysis work required. I would like to understand if that is because there was a reduction in the number of scientists and that the EPA is choosing, by reason of cuts, to not do as much chemical work, or is there another explanation for that?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I can seek more information on this, if you would like, deputy leader, but the reduction certainly would not be as a consequence of the reduction in the scientific staff because this decrease in demand was in the previous financial year. That decrease did not occur until more recently, in terms of the staff decrease. It must have just been fewer of those issues, in terms of the compliance work and the analysis work of the EPA coming across the desk.

Dr CLOSE: A couple of lines below that, there is a reference to additional legal fees. Would that likely be associated with the bad debt that was mentioned earlier, or is it spread over more organisations?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: That was spread over the organisation. No doubt some of that would be associated with pursuing bad debt, including the debt that I referenced in response to the deputy leader's previous question. There were also quite a lot of legal fees associated with the Dob in a Litterer program, which became problematic to implement and pursue. That was unexpected.

Dr CLOSE: My last question on this page relates to the next dot point, which talks about a decrease in grants and subsidies following the cessation of some grant projects and a reduction in the EPA's grant program. Is it possible to have a list of the grants that were previously provided that have now been discontinued?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am advised that this information is available on page 22 of the EPA's financial statements for the year ending 30 June 2019, but it does require a bit of compare and contrast. The main one is the cessation of the federal government grant scheme, which was the Catchment to Coast scheme. That was a large grant. We were getting hundreds of thousands of dollars: \$634,000 in 2018. With the winding up of that federal program, it dropped to \$80,000 in 2019.

Just looking at the figure in the dot point you quoted of \$671,000, the vast majority of that would have been attributable to that federal grant winding up. However, on page 22 of those audited financial statements there are some small reductions across other grants.

Dr CLOSE: Chair, I am happy now to go to the Department for Environment and Water.

The CHAIR: We need to change advisers, and we will add on an extra minute.

Dr CLOSE: If we go to the first page, which is page 106 in the summary, the first dot point refers to the completion of significant capital works projects. I would be interested in some more detail of what has been completed for the Coorong, the Lower Lakes and the Murray Mouth?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I will probably have to provide you with some more detail on notice as to the ins and outs of the program. Some fairly significant pieces of infrastructure were undertaken. I had the opportunity to visit some of those, both in the Riverland and around the South-East of the state—infrastructure projects largely around manufacturing and environmental benefits through the Riverine Recovery and of course the South East Flows Restoration Project, which seeks to have a positive environmental benefit on the lower end of the Coorong while also removing water from agricultural land in the South-East of the state.

I do not have any more in the way of project summaries. I know the projects, I have visited the projects, but I am more than happy to get a project summary of each of those fairly large environmental infrastructure projects that have been brought about through the funds of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you. I would appreciate that very much. A couple of dot points later it refers to the TVSPs. Was it in the end just the eight rangers who were given TVSPs, or were there any others?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The TVSP package for the Department for Environment and Water included 119 staff. As you mentioned and as the report highlights, eight of those were park rangers. As mentioned both in parliament and the estimates process, that was part of a refocusing of ranger roles in different parts of the state and a general restructure of that part of the organisation and the creation of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Dr CLOSE: Were there any other positions that were given TVSPs that then had people employed into the same job title?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: No, that was not the case under the rules of the TVSP program.

Dr CLOSE: A little further down there is reference to the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act being transferred, as was the unit. This may stray beyond, so it is up to the minister if he feels that it is sufficiently relevant to this audit report. Is the Department for Environment and Water nonetheless engaged in the review of the pastoral act?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am happy to answer that question because, although as part of a policy of the government the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act with the relevant business unit, which formerly was in our department, was moved over to Primary Industries and Regions SA, our department continues to retain a fairly significant interest in the work of that business unit because, of course, our pastoral lands cover a huge proportion of our state. The environmental management of that land remains very important. The sustainability of that land remains very important. We are definitely involved in the review of the act and it is something that I discuss with both the senior management of my department and the Minister for Primary Industries regularly.

Dr CLOSE: On the following page there is reference to problems with DEW's bank reconciliation processes. Are they still unresolved subsequent to this report?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: This is a situation that has been highlighted in most of the Auditor-General's Reports for the last decade, largely as a result of the department's huge number of small transactions and the changing nature of those—the changing nature of permits, park entry fees, new parks coming onto the system, the changing of permits and the like across a whole variety of business units. I am advised that our bank account is used by 16 separate entities and 22 separate funds, which are established to support specific commonwealth and South Australian government

programs. The Auditor-General has highlighted that this is getting better and that there has been some improvement, but there is more work to be done.

In order to deal with this, I have had a discussion with the chief executive of the department, Mr Schutz, and an external contractor has been engaged to resolve the system issues, with existing internal resources being used to clear historic items. The program in question is called Bookeze. We get some 3,000 transactions through it a week. I think we can do better, but there is definitely a strategy in place to tighten that up.

Dr CLOSE: At page 111, there is a reference to issues remaining largely unresolved. Is the minister confident that that will be resolved, or is it going to just be a lingering issue?

The SPEAKER: What was the reference?

Dr CLOSE: Page 111, just above 'Incomplete and unapproved attendance records'.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: As you identified, again, this is an issue that has been being resolved over a number of years and extends quite a few years into the past. The department have assured me that the improvements which have been suggested or encouraged by the Auditor-General over the last couple of years have now been implemented. The benefits of those improvements should flow through to the current financial year figures.

Dr CLOSE: We will see in 12 months whether we are having the same conversation. I am now happy to move over to SA Water. I refer to page 388, 'Significant events and transactions'. The second dot point refers to the dividend equal to 100 per cent of after tax profit each year. Can the minister give me an estimate of how much money that is?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The total amount of the dividend paid during 2018-19 was \$179.4 million. That is the total, and 5 per cent of that is about \$9 million or thereabouts. Again, I do not have the calculator in front of me, but we can do that offline.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, if I can refer to 'Significant events and transactions', I have been contacted by a constituent who did some work on a development which required an upgrade of water infrastructure, which SA Water—

The CHAIR: Which page are you referring to?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Page 388. I wish to raise this with you for your consideration over the 12-month period. The dramatic upgrade in the infrastructure required exceeded all expectations for the budget of the build. Unlike with other regulator monopolies, there is no method to recover the costs from adjoining businesses who may also wish to upgrade or develop their infrastructure to receive a payback either to the original developer or to SA Water.

I think it would be unwise for SA Water to be held as a bank for that type of operation but, if developers who wish to get on with building are able to recoup some of those costs from adjoining properties that benefit from the upgrades that they have made, have you considered any amendment to legislation, or just even regulation, that would allow those developers—much as with electrical infrastructure—to recoup those costs?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, member for West Torrens. This is a matter that has been raised with me in the fairly recent past regarding a couple of developers who have been undertaking very worthy projects. Because they were the first mover, they had what I would probably describe as 'first mover disadvantage', which made their very good project instantly financially unworthy.

I have been in early talks with my colleagues around the cabinet table and also with some people in SA Water about looking at the policies that sit alongside this. I certainly would consider those things you have suggested. I understand that in a regulated body like SA Power Networks, there are the instruments and mechanisms to enable the smoothing of the costs over a period of time or a group of people who would benefit from that uplift. From an economic development point of view, I think this is something that SA Water should certainly be looking at. I am happy to provide you with an update as we progress with that.

Dr CLOSE: Still on page 388 and significant events, there is a dot point that refers to the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme. I gather that \$94 million has been spent thus far (\$73 million in the financial year to which this report refers) and that it will ultimately be \$155.6 million. Is it possible to have a project plan for when the different stages will be expected to be rolled out?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thanks for your question, deputy leader. It is certainly a very large state building project that seems to have quite a few iterations to it over both the planning stage and the implementation stage. I am more than happy to provide the deputy leader with a copy of what is available in terms of a project plan or equally arrange a briefing with SA Water and, to an extent, Primary Industries officials, who can provide you with an outline of how that is perceived to develop and grow in that region over the coming years.

Dr CLOSE: Is that project on track?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am advised that the construction of the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme is on track. The South Australian company Leed Engineering and their joint venture partner, Valoriza Agua, have been awarded contracts for the first and second stages of the construction. That is to deliver the first six gigalitres of annual water flow.

Construction commenced in March 2018 with the first milestone due under the funding agreement being met by the end of April 2018. The second major milestone was the completion of 31.5 kilometres of trunk main in June 2019. Construction for the first of the distribution mains is scheduled to commence imminently in December 2019 to enable water to be delivered to customers in the first six months of 2020. That includes an intensive stakeholder engagement process, to ensure the local community has been involved, and also a market sounding process. As I mentioned, I am happy to provide a more detailed briefing with officials on the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If I could ask a supplementary question on this very same item, firstly, is the uptake of the scheme by consumers the same as when the project was announced or first started? Secondly, what plans does the minister have to extend the project to the areas around Hillier and Reeves Plains?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I thank the member for Light for his question and extend to him also the invitation to attend the briefing that I am more than happy to set up for the deputy leader on this. I think the uptake is not quite what we expected, and I think growers in your neck of the woods would be aware of that. I think it is quite common knowledge.

Uptake is not terrible but it could be better, and I have asked SA Water to look at ways in which we could encourage increased uptake. I think some of the connection fees that were built into the business case may have been off-putting. I think we may have a situation where some people are holding out to see whether those connection fees come down. We are also obviously working within a regulated cost recovery environment where SA Water is seeking to recover costs, but this is an important focus for government and me as the minister to try to drive that uptake.

I am also in regular talks with the Minister for Primary Industries in relation to future areas of growth, because uptake in one area does not necessarily equate to potential uptake in another area. We are in talks about a range of geographical areas where the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme could be extended.

The CHAIR: I will allow another question, if you want. We did lose a bit of time when changing advisers. The deputy leader has one more.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you. I will just ask one more question then. The controls opinion findings refers to seeking legal advice. I wonder whether you could briefly explain why that is necessary. It is back on page 388.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: This refers to what is known as long-lead items and is seeking legal advice in terms of what defines the beginning of complex construction projects. SA Water undertakes these massive infrastructure projects with potentially long lead times, and the clock starts ticking and the money starts being accrued before what laypeople I guess would say was the official starting of construction, and this was seeking legal advice in relation to the Public Works Committee in particular.

Dr Close interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Yes, and particularly the interaction with the Public Works Committee and what defines the firing of the starting gun on a project, essentially.

The CHAIR: Thank you to all involved. We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 in relation to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government and Planning. I remind members that the committee is in normal session and, as such, any questions need to be asked by members while on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19. We will begin now. The member for West Torrens has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I noticed the certificate from the chair of the board and the chief executive officer and the chief financial officer. Can the minister tell me when he first met Tristan Ashley Just?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Tristan Just is someone I met well before coming to government, so he is someone who has been known to me for the better part of six or seven years potentially.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Was he a consultant for Barossa Fine Foods?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Mr Chairman, I am not responsible to the house for that and it is also not something that the Cemeteries Authority deals with.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If I could offer some context, the former chair of the Cemeteries Authority was sacked by the government, removed by the Governor. It was first attempted by the minister in a letter to her claiming he had the authority to remove her from the board on the basis of gender equality. Then later on, in Executive Council, he had her removed and replaced with Mr Tristan Ashley Just. The opposition understands that Mr Just was a former Commonwealth Bank executive who advised Barossa Fine Foods. The opposition would like to know whether Mr Just had a relationship with the minister, before he entered parliament, as a financial adviser.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I will answer the question to the extent that I am responsible to the house for answering that question, but I do dispute very, very strongly the assertion that gender was an issue in relation to the replacement of the chair. Quite clearly, the issue with the Cemeteries Authority Board was that, after having undertaken a skills matrix in relation to the Cemeteries Authority, it was pretty clear that there were some skill deficiencies on that board. There were a number of members whose positions became vacant. Mark Ward, former multiple-fail candidate for the Labor Party, resigned and Sue Clearahan did not seek re-election at the 2018 local government elections, is my understanding. She was formerly a councillor at Adelaide city council.

Again, working from memory, the former Labor member for Torrens Robyn Geraghty's term was also expiring, so we took the opportunity at that point to refresh the board, having undertaken a skills matrix and having looked at improving the financial background of some of the members of that board in order for there to be a better mix of skills.

Can I correct the record to say that, while Sue Clearahan retired from local government in November 2018, we are still in the process of trying to fill her position on the board, which requires the consent of the Local Government Association, which is working through their process to replace her. She is technically still there until she is replaced; however, that replacement is in the process of happening in conjunction with the Local Government Association.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The minister also recommended to the government Executive Council the appointment of Joanna Louise Andrew. Is Ms Andrew a member of the Liberal Party?

The CHAIR: Before the minister answers, member for West Torrens can you reference that for my benefit, please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The board of the Cemeteries Authority through the audit period, which includes the period when Ms Joanna Louise Andrew, the niece of the former Howard government Speaker Neil Andrew, was appointed to the board.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, that is not something that I am responsible to the house for, but I would say that Ms Jo Andrew is a partner at Mellor Olsson. She was partnered at that law firm at an extremely young age and is somebody who is very well credentialled. In fact, it is my understanding that the former government appointed her to the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board, so she does actually come with board experience under the previous government and she is extremely well credentialled to help bring some legal expertise to that board.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When did the minister first meet, as he said, 'Jo' Andrew?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I cannot recall, but it was certainly before the March election.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is Mr Johnathon Peter Matthews a member of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Mr Chairman, I do not think that is something for which I am responsible to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is the minister aware, or has the minister ever seen, Mr Johnathon Peter Matthews at any Liberal Party event?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, Mr Chairman, I refer to my previous answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: One way or another, the minister is going to answer these questions, either here or somewhere else. I would have thought it would be better to have them out in the open, rather than looking like he has something to hide. I do not have the power to compel the minister to answer these questions. I know other bodies do, but I would have thought the appropriate thing to do now would be to just 'fess up and tell the truth.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, we are examining the Auditor-General's Report and you know full well that you can ask questions and the minister—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But I cannot compel him to answer, sir. I do not have that power. I wish I did, but I just cannot get to him.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, I am speaking. You have been a minister. You have answered questions. You are able to do so as you see fit.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sorry, can I answer the question?

The CHAIR: The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What I would like to point out to the committee is the people who were constituted on that board prior to us having made the change and highlight the lineage of the people who were sitting on that board. First off, we do have the former Labor member for Torrens Robyn Geraghty, who sat on that board for a number of years.

Also on that board was the former failed Labor candidate for Boothby and, as I understand it, the Davenport preselections. Interestingly, as I understand it, he resigned because, as a public sector employee, he realised that he was not going to be paid for sitting on that board, and actually asked to be paid even though he was a public sector employee.

You also had a man named Wayne Hanson, who happens to be the father of Justin Hanson MLC. We had a board that was filled with Labor Party affiliated people, and what we sought to do was to bring experience and skills to this board. I point out that we are actually dealing with the Auditor-General's Report for the year ending 30 June 2019. These appointments were not made until August, so they are actually outside the scope of this report.

One of the people we replaced them with was a man with significant commercial experience working at Ernst and Young and the Commonwealth Bank, who has significant experience in undertaking transactions and helping to bring financial to bring financial acumen to a board which, according to the skills matrix, lacked it. We replaced them with somebody who the former government thought it was okay to appoint to a board, but it is obviously okay for them to do it and not for me to do it. She is a partner at a well-established law firm and South Australia and, again, somebody who brings enormous credentials to this space.

We also replaced them with somebody who has successfully run and sold businesses in South Australia, including businesses that I know the former government championed. But again these positions were filled by people who have very strong credentials to help improve and bring to a unit within government a degree of skill and business acumen that we felt was lacking prior to that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: For the audit period, did the minister ask the Chief Executive of the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority to interview any of the people I mentioned?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I cannot recall whether I asked, but certainly there were discussions about what was needed on the board and the skills that were needed to replace people on that board. There was a degree of discussion about that. I do not recall having asked him to meet with people, but whether he did that of his own volition, that may have occurred.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just to be clear, the minister, during the audit period, never asked the Chief Executive of the Cemeteries Authority to interview any of those three people and he did not join them at the interview at Parlamento, next to his office, during the audit period?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It may be that the CEO may have met with a number of these prospective candidates. He did not do it at my urging and I did not attend, to the best of my knowledge. I am trying to think of the last time I ate anything at Parlamento. That said, the insinuation here is that it is not okay for prospective board members to seek to get information about board appointments they may or may not be seeking to undertake. I would have thought that it is good governance for anybody to undertake to learn more about the organisation they seek to become a board member of, so I do not understand by imputation what the member thinks is wrong.

What we were doing was replacing a board filled with Labor cronies with people who, in my opinion and in the government's opinion, are very well-credentialed people to help run an organisation that is in the process of undertaking some change. At the moment, we are seeing demand for cremations increase and the fact that this government, through the last budget, put money on the table to help upgrade the crematoria that we have so that we can deal with the increased demand and also upgrade the crematoria to meet the latest emissions standards.

We are also putting in some money to help upgrade facilities for the Cemeteries Authority so that they can continue to provide the top class funeral services they need to provide, and we are seeking to help rejuvenate this organisation that had been left to wane under the previous administration.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not know why Ester Huxtable is being called a Labor crony. To the best of my knowledge, she is not a member of the Australian Labor Party, nor has she ever been. She is just a well-respected lawyer, and there was an attempt to have her terminated unlawfully.

I think the minister has confirmed that the chief executive may have interviewed these people for board positions. If the minister did not say that, I apologise, but that is the gist that I got. Can the minister explain to the house how it is that the chief executive of the Cemeteries Authority would know Tristan Ashley Just, a Commonwealth Bank executive who advised Barossa Fine Foods; Jo Andrew, the niece of Howard government minister Neil Andrew and a member of the Liberal Party; and Johnathon Peter Matthews? How would the chief executive of the Cemeteries Authority come to know those three people?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think I answered that question in my previous answer. The rank hypocrisy here I find really quite galling. Again, these people are very well-credentialed people in their own right. To somehow try to portray meetings between a chief executive and prospective board appointees—I do not understand where the issue is here. In my mind, it is good governance.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The issue is that the opposition has suspicions that the minister attempted to intimidate board members to resign and, when they refused to resign, he sent them letters claiming that he could remove them with the powers under the act that empowered him to remove them. He was then reminded by the board members that he had no such power and that it would be required to be done by the Governor in Executive Council, which he then did.

This exposes the Governor, the minister and everyone here involved in this scandal to very, very serious allegations of misconduct, maladministration and/or corruption, because the minister would have us believe that, independent of any recommendation by him, three people known to him—three people who have close associations with the Liberal Party—were independently interviewed by the CEO of the Cemeteries Authority while there were no vacancies on the board and while the chairperson was seeking reappointment. It was not vacant and the other board member positions were also not vacated. That will be sorted out, no doubt, some other way. I have some other questions I would like to ask the minister now, if I could.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I would like to respond to that. There was not an interview undertaken. As the member knows, these appointments are made to the Governor on recommendation from the cabinet, and that is the process that was gone through. But again, somehow that it is not okay for two people to meet until after a board appointment is confirmed, I do not understand why there is an issue there. Again, the member can look up the gazettal notice to see when those board appointments and changes were made. The member can also know that those board members continued to be board members up until that gazettal took place.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer the minister to page 497, Urban Renewal Authority and the scope of audit, audit findings and significant events and transactions. I would like to ask the minister a very specific question. Did the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment conduct an investigation into the entire senior management of Renewal SA during the audit process and the audit period?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: For reasons the member might understand, that is not a question I am able to answer at this time in the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, I did not ask if there was an integrity agency investigation into the executive of Renewal SA. I asked if the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment conducted an investigation into the entire leadership team and executive team of Renewal SA.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I refer the member to my previous answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Chairman, I ask you to direct the minister to answer the question.

The CHAIR: I do not actually have that authority, member for West Torrens, and you know that. You can ask a question and the minister can answer it as he sees fit.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have no power to direct you. I would like to, but I do not have that power—but I will get my hands on you, eventually. The opposition has been advised that the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment conducted an investigation into the entire leadership team of Renewal SA, all of them—from the chief executive and the deputy to all the executive team. Can the minister tell the committee whether they were all conducted by Ms Erma Ranieri or whether she delegated those investigations to other chief executives?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I refer the member to my previous answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can the minister tell the committee why he will not answer these reasonable questions? I am not interested in the minister giving any information about any integrity investigation that is ongoing. I am talking specifically about Erma Ranieri, the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, a statutory officer who is currently conducting an investigation into Dr Chris McGowan and who has organised an independent investigator for that.

The government is happy to talk about that in question time all day. I am not asking about what Bruce Lander is doing, or anyone else. I am asking whether or not the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment commissioned an internal investigation into the entire leadership team of Renewal SA.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: This is a dance that the member and I do every estimates committee or every Auditor-General's Report, where he asks questions that, for reasons he knows full well, I cannot answer. In trying to make me answer portions of those questions, he creates issues and difficulty in relation to the broader scope of the questions that he is seeking to have answered. We

can play this game for the next 11 minutes, and I am happy to do that, but the point here is that the member knows full well why am responding in the way that I am. He can keep asking the questions and I will keep answering them in the same vein.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think we are cross-purposes here. For the benefit of the committee, there was a public announcement by the ICAC commissioner that he was conducting an investigation into Renewal SA officials. I am not asking about that. I am not interested in that in these inquiries. What I am asking about is the commissioner for public employment.

Did the commissioner for public employment conduct an investigation into the leadership team of Renewal SA? Was that investigation conducted entirely by Ms Erma Ranieri, or did she delegate it to the chief executive of DTF and other chief executives to conduct the investigation? Were the people investigated exonerated? Were any stood down during the investigation? What are the outcomes of that investigation? I will find out about the outcomes of the integrity investigations because they will be tabled in the parliament, so I will know about those. I am not asking about those. I am asking about the commissioner for public employment.

In regard to the commissioner for public employment, just by way of background for the house, there are no secrecy provisions and there are no legal requirements not to discuss or talk about any inquiry. The commissioner for public employment is a statutory officer who can investigate any chief executive or any executive officer, either through her own motion or through a referral from the minister or the Premier. So there are two very separate issues here.

The minister is attempting to tell the house that I am asking about an integrity agency investigation; I am not. The reason I am not is that I know that the minister made someone an acting chief executive, Mr Mark Devine, who has now subsequently left Renewal SA.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: A little bit of information is very dangerous in your hands.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is it?

The CHAIR: Continue, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My understanding is that there was a series of complaints made about the operation of Renewal SA. The commissioner for public employment commissioned an inquiry not into just the chief executive—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Point of order, sir: I ask that the member reference this investigation in the Auditor-General's Report.

The CHAIR: He did and he would be able to. You could remind us, member for West Torrens. I assume you are looking at page 497.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Page 497, 'Significant events'. I would have thought an inquiry into the entire leadership team is a significant event.

The CHAIR: So it is page 497—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

The CHAIR: —of the volume, Report 6, Part C? Yes, he referenced that. Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Given that the minister will not answer any of those questions, can you tell me if there are any commissioner for public employment investigations that are ongoing in Renewal SA—not ICAC, not the Ombudsman, no integrity agency but the commissioner for public employment?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I refer the member to my first answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did the commissioner appoint Mr Mark Devine as acting chief executive while he was under active investigation, yet forced two other executives to stand down on full pay?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I appointed Mark Devine as the acting chief executive. I was fully confident and remain fully confident in his ability to do that role. He gave very valuable service to the

government. He did a fantastic job and he is a real loss to the agency. I do wish him well in his private sector role. He was a man of utmost integrity, and I thank him very much for his service.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition does not question Mr Devine's integrity. The opposition does not understand why two members of the executive team who are under investigation by the commissioner for public employment are stood down, yet the others are not. I would like to hear from the minister the process he went through to satisfy himself in regard to the non-integrity agency investigations occurring in his agencies. We will put the ICAC investigations that your agencies are subject to one side, and we will just talk about the ones that the minister controls, that is, the commissioner for public employment.

If the commissioner for public employment is conducting an inquiry or an investigation and everyone is exonerated, great, the minister should say so. That would be excellent. The subsequent question to that would be: have the people who made the accusations against these executives been cautioned? Have they been investigated? Were false accusations made? This is the line of inquiry that I would like to get from the minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, I think there is some sort of fancy imagination going on in the mind of the member for West Torrens. He has concocted some version of events that he believes exists. I will leave them to him, but they are certainly not something that the parliament needs to spend its time on. But I would pick the member up on the fact that Ms Erma Ranieri and the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment do not report to me. I am fairly certain that I actually do not have an ability to direct them to do anything, so I think the line of questioning is actually flawed in its construction.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If I can turn now to Lot Fourteen and controls that the Auditor-General has found in the audit findings at page 497 about procurement. Can the minister assure the house that all contracts issued by Renewal SA at Lot Fourteen went to the lowest bidder?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Here we are. This is how I know the member for West Torrens does not have anything new because this is actually something that has been the subject of questioning previously. I have answered those questions to the house. In relation to what I believe is the contract and the awarding of the contract that the member speaks to, again, full probity was exercised in relation to that contract.

It is not always that the government goes with the lowest cost bidder on a project. Sometimes previous history plays a factor and sometimes local content also plays a factor. The fact that we want to maximise using the industry participation policy, local jobs for local people becomes a factor. Especially when we are dealing with high-risk, high-complexity construction projects and high-risk, high-complexity demolition projects, we often want to make sure that the people putting their hands up to do the job know how to do the job and have a demonstrated experience in doing the job.

I can confirm to the house that all the contracts that have been undertaken and awarded have been done so with all due process, keeping very much in mind the wise spending of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

The CHAIR: A question on local government and planning?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Actually, I have a question on DPTI, which I think the minister is responsible for.

The CHAIR: He is. With three minutes to go. The member for Light has the call.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: My question to the minister relates to page 274 under 'Controls opinion findings'. The Auditor-General made a finding that 'improvements in procurement and contract management are necessary'. My understanding is that this finding has led to changes in risk managing service providers and contract providers. My question is: what impact have the changes instituted by the government had on the ability of small contractors in regional and rural South Australia to tender for projects?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I almost thought the question was about something relating to the Auditor-General's Report, but we just got there. The question that the member is seeking to ask is in relation to our road maintenance reform program.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order.

The CHAIR: There is a point of order. Let's sort this out.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As long as he does not use up my time.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The member's question is in relation to the disaggregation of contracts or the ability for small contractors to be involved in the procurement process. Those are the words that the member used. This government has done a whole heap of very good things in helping to make sure that local contractors are able to get access to government contracts.

In fact, at the moment—and it was the subject of a separate report to the house in relation to the across-government facilities management agreement—we are actually undertaking significant reform with a view to looking at how we can make sure that we maximise local contractor involvement in that very significant contract. Through our road maintenance reform and the outsourcing of the remaining sections of road maintenance contracts within regional areas, we have again done a whole heap. In fact, as part of the contracting process we have mandated that head contractors need to engage subcontractors and local subcontractors to make sure that those people are able to get access to work and get access to government contracts.

In relation to the Joy Baluch Bridge or the Port Wakefield overpass projects, as well as the Regency to Pym project, we have also used an alliance model. This is a model that the former government used on the Torrens to Torrens and on the Oaklands crossing as a way to help create a contracting environment underneath which local contractors—especially tier 2 and tier 3 contractors—can be engaged in large construction projects to make sure, once again, that we maximise local industry involvement.

The CHAIR: The committee has further examined the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 and has completed its examination of ministers on matters contained therein.

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (COMMENCEMENT OF CODE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

GAMBLING ADMINISTRATION BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

LOTTERIES BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Adjournment Debate

VALEDICTORIES

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (17:42): On indulgence, I rise to make some concluding remarks for the year 2019. This has been a very important year for our government. It is the second year that we have been in government. It is the second year in a very long period of time. It has been a productive year.

Earlier today, I outlined to the house that 39 separate bills have passed this chamber during this year. Although the Manager of Government Business points out to me that this is not an unusually large number, I do point out that many of the bills that we dealt with this year were issues of very significant reform, and reform that was long overdue. I must say that, as the Leader of the Government, I feel very proud that we tackled some of the hardest, most complex, but necessary, pieces of legislation through this house. I thank all members for the contributions they have made.

In particular, this afternoon I would like to pay my very special thanks to the Deputy Premier, the Attorney-General in this place, the member for Bragg, who has supported me now as the deputy leader of the Liberal Party for much of the last seven years. I think we are already the longest serving leadership duo in the Liberal Party since Tom Playford was the Premier of South Australia, so it is quite a long period of time, and long may it continue. I am particularly grateful to the Deputy Premier for the way she has applied herself, particularly in this chamber and in the cabinet supporting the government's agenda.

I would also like to draw attention to the work of the Manager of Government Business, the member for Morialta, who carries a huge workload during sitting weeks. He makes an enormous contribution in cabinet, and for that I am very grateful. I am grateful also to our whip and deputy whip, who have to keep everybody in line. They do that most of the time, but they always do it with a great degree of humility and humour.

We have spoken in the past about the work of our government compared with previous governments and other governments around Australia, and we do have a great working relationship in our cabinet. Cabinet has met twice per week since we came to government, once as Executive Council on Thursday mornings with His Excellency the Governor of South Australia, the Hon. Hieu Van Le. It is an honour, a privilege and a pleasure to work with him and the team at Government House.

We have an excellent Governor in South Australia. I was so delighted earlier this year when Her Majesty The Queen extended his service to the people of South Australia for another two years. That will take his total service as the Governor of South Australia to seven years. Of course, before that he had seven years as the Lieutenant-Governor of South Australia, so this will be an enormous 14 years of contribution in a vice-regal role in South Australia. I do not think we have ever had somebody who has made such an enormous contribution and we certainly thank him for the important work he does.

I acknowledge the work of the Treasurer and our leader in the other place, the Hon. Rob Lucas, and thank him for his leadership in that place. Can I acknowledge all the members on my side of the house. We have 11 new members this term out of 25 on this side of the house. It is an enormous changing of the guard for the Liberal Party. It is really important to have that renewal within a political party. Sometimes it is a difficult period, when many people with experience leave and many new people come in, but I just want to commend everybody in the joint party room for the way that they have welcomed the new members in.

I particularly want to commend the new members for the incredible contribution that they have made. It is like they have been here for decades with the contribution that they make. I think that the efforts they are making in their individual seats are outstanding and I always enjoy visiting their electorates. Long may that continue.

I would also especially like to thank my assistant minister, the Hon. Jing Lee. Jing has many passions and one of those, of course, is multicultural affairs in South Australia. This is a task she has dedicated herself to over a very long period of time. That is a real point of differentiation for our state: we have very harmonious multicultural relations in South Australia. We should be grateful for that and must never take it for granted. I am very pleased that all sides of politics and every one of the 69 members of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council dedicate themselves to making sure that we can maintain these harmonious multicultural relations we have here in South Australia. Long may that continue.

To the Leader of the Opposition and his team, we thank them for their contribution this year in this house and in this parliament and the contribution they make more broadly in South Australia. I extend that grateful thanks to all members of parliament, including the Greens, SA-Best and, of course, the Hon. Mr Darley.

In my own office, 2019 has pretty much been a changing of the guard. My longstanding chief of staff, James Stevens, left and went to the federal parliament. He is now the member for Sturt, and we wish him all the very best for that. My deputy chief of staff, Alex May, the longest serving member of my team, also left this year to pursue a career in the private sector. I would certainly like to acknowledge the contribution they made to my coming into this role. There is no doubt in my mind

that I would not be the Premier of South Australia without the excellent service of James Stevens and Alex May.

I also congratulate Courtney Morcombe and Paul Armanas on filling those positions vacated by James and Alex. Both Courtney and Paul have worked in my team for a long period of time. I think it is great to be able to promote from within. I think that we have a very tight and very hardworking team in my office, and for that I am very grateful.

I am also very grateful to Ashton Hurn, who stepped into the role of the leader of our media team. She will tell me off in a minute for not knowing her title. She really runs a very capable media team. In fact, she is the Director of Media and Communications and the Senior Press Secretary to the Premier. There you go—she wrote it down for me. I would like to acknowledge the great work of the media team in South Australia: Greg Charter, Belinda Heggen, Kathryn McFarlane, Eleisa Hancock, Todd Clappis, Katrina Stokes, Simon Halliwell, Ken McGregor, Ryan Smith, Gemma Coombe, Dave Franchitto and Mackenzie Mansell.

It is really important that we communicate what we are doing as a government to the people of South Australia. These are difficult roles, and I am very grateful for the work they do, as I am also very grateful to my advisory team, which is very ably led by Richard Yeeles, who has played such an important role in the policy development of this government. So, to Richard Yeeles and to all his team, I say a very grateful thanks.

I would also like to thank Penny Gordon, who looks after my electorate office. It is a very busy electorate office. I love spending time in my electorate. Sometimes people who come into this place and take on leadership roles have very safe seats. I think that at the last election my margin was 0.9 of a per cent. It has crept up ever so slightly to about 5 per cent. It is an electorate I love and I will never take for granted. I am certainly very grateful to Penny and the team there for the incredible work they do on a daily basis when I am often elsewhere.

Can I thank the team who work here in Parliament House. I think that we should all feel very grateful to work in such an historic and important building. It is a privilege to come into this building every day. I feel very humbled to be in this chamber where we have created every law in South Australia since 1889, and I think it is a very great and special pleasure to be in the old chamber where important pieces of legislation, including granting women the right to vote and to run for parliament, passed through that chamber, just adjacent to this chamber, 125 years ago.

It is a great pleasure to come here and work on a daily basis, but it does not come without a lot of dedicated service from the men and women who work here, many of whom have been here for a long period of time. Can I particularly thank the Clerk of our house, Rick Crump—thank you, sir—and to David. Thank you very much for the great work that you do and that all the House of Assembly staff do. We are very grateful for the professional way in which you go about all your work in this place. I also acknowledge the work of the Clerk in the Legislative Council and Black Rod, Chris Schwarz and Guy Dickson.

I would particularly like to draw attention to the work that David Woolman does in looking after the fabric of this incredible building. As I said, it is a great privilege and a pleasure, and I think that at every turn there are opportunities to improve this, and in every term of government we should be looking at ways in which we can enhance the fabric of this building. David is doing it a little bit tough at the moment because his father is very ill and we wish him all the very best for a full recovery.

Can I thank the staff in the South Australian Parliament Research Library, led by Dr John Weste, who have made very significant enhancements to the fabric of the library in recent times, and of course the quality of the research that is done there is always of the very highest order.

Can I thank the members of the catering team, led by Creon Grantham, who always make us feel very special when we have important guests who come into the dining room. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the people who really run this building, Nicky and Karen in the Blue Room. They always bring a massive smile to my face when I head down to the Blue Room. They are often sending me text messages during my contributions in this house. There might be one coming through right about now. Sometimes they are yawning quite significantly, and I think that they should be more

respectful in future, but it is always fantastic to have the Blue Room team, recently augmented by Belinda.

Thank you very much to all the people who work in Hansard. Thank you very much. I cannot believe you do the work that you do. My goodness, you should get paid danger money for some of the rubbish that you have to sit through in this place. Thank you very much. There are so few people with the incredible skills you have, and to have such a large number of people with those skills here in this building is an honour for us, so please pass on our grateful thanks.

To the procedures office, the cleaning staff, the switchboard team, the maintenance team and our dedicated security team, I say a massive thank you. To the team who look after the finances and also the team at PNSG team, led by Lorraine Tonglee, I also say thank you very much. We are getting toward the end of the year and this is a time when people will get an opportunity to spend some time resting, some time with their family and with their friends. On behalf of my team on this side of the house, I wish everybody a very merry Christmas and I wish them all the very best for a happy and successful 2020.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (17:55): I, too, rise on indulgence to reflect on the year we have had. I would like to start by acknowledging members across the other side of the aisle. It is often reflected upon just how brutal and tough politics is, and I think that is self-evident to anyone who ever sits in this chamber and manages to sustain a question time. It is a challenging environment for anyone to work it, and it is particularly unique.

I do not think there are too many other workplaces or environments whose very existence is established to be so combative in nature. This has its benefits, in that I think it makes for a robust democracy, but it has its downsides too. It incites conflict where often there may not otherwise be conflict. It is an important part of our process, but I think on occasions like this it is probably worthwhile reflecting that most people—I think almost everyone in this place—is committed to doing good work on behalf of their constituents in accordance with their values and their value systems.

Although, not surprisingly, I have disagreements with the Premier and his ministry, I would like to pay homage to their hard work. Being a member of the front bench in government or in opposition is difficult, but being in government as a minister does bring with it extraordinary responsibility, and that is particularly true if you are the Premier of the state. I want to acknowledge their hard work and their commitment to their respective causes and their portfolios. It is worthy of recognition. I also want to acknowledge the family members of those members of the government.

We go at it hammer and tongs in this place, and that is the nature of the beast, so to speak. But family members have to observe all this unfold and watch their loved ones suffer extraordinary scrutiny, and that is difficult for them. I would like to acknowledge the family members of the members of the government: children, partners, wives, husbands, girlfriends, boyfriends. It is tough and I want to acknowledge those people and wish them a safe and merry Christmas with members of the government and the front bench. I want to particularly mention the Premier in that context. I know that being Premier of the state must be an incredibly difficult job, and I hope the Premier gets the opportunity to have some well-deserved time off over Christmas with his family.

To everybody involved in the operation of the parliament, allow me on behalf of the South Australian Labor Party and the opposition to acknowledge their fine work and their commitment to their roles and generally to the people of South Australia, starting with you Rick and David. To the Clerk and Deputy Clerk, thank you for all your hard work, patience and perseverance. To all the House of Assembly attendants, thank you for your stewardship and the gracious service you provide to all members within this place.

To Hansard, I echo the Premier's remarks. Sometimes, I really wonder what you must think when you go home at the end of the day. Quite interestingly, *Hansard* is an incredibly useful tool in opposition. There have been a few occasions when I have been very glad for the fact that you have recorded every last word said in this place. Occasionally, in government, that may not be appreciated as much, but I do thank you for all your hard work. It is a unique skill, as the Premier said, and I hope you, too, get some downtime. It is exhausting at the end of the day sometimes, finishing up here in our roles, but I cannot imagine how much that would be the case for you. The constant need

for attention and trying to put into The Queen's English some of the rubbish that comes out of our mouths must be extraordinary, so thank you for your hard work.

Then, of course, everybody else. To the catering staff, Creon and the entirety of his team, thank you for keeping us fed. It is probably a good idea, as people can get grumpy around here at the best of times; I cannot imagine how much worse it would be if they were hungry, so thank you to Creon and his team, particularly in the dining room, the members' bar, the Blue Room and every other facility within this place.

To the team that maintains the building, Keith and everybody else, thank you for all your hard work. There are people in here at very early hours of the morning, including the cleaning staff, and that should be acknowledged as well. A lot of work goes on behind the scenes. To PNSG, who are responsible for the operations of our IT, it is very technical, I find IT frustrating, and I cannot imagine working with it all the time, so thank you for all your hard work.

To my parliamentary colleagues on my side of the chamber, I cannot express enough my eternal thanks for entrusting me with the extraordinary responsibility of being Leader of the Opposition. It is a rare privilege. We have not had too many leaders and deputy leaders on this side of the house. I am very, very grateful for the honour and intend to give it everything I have for as long as I am fortunate enough to hold this position.

I am only able to do it and do it well because of the extraordinary support of the whole team. It would be wrong of me not to acknowledge in particular the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (member for Port Adelaide). She is a good woman who represents her constituents well, but more so she does the Labor Party a great service with her raw intellect and genuine passion towards a number of policy areas. She has been an important support to me.

Not surprisingly, I would to acknowledge the Leader of Opposition Business (member for West Torrens), who is a ferocious parliamentarian but, more importantly, a fine man and a loving husband and father of his children. He has been a longstanding supporter of mine, and I am very grateful for his assistance. We are a better party for his advocacy and a great parliamentary team for his leadership as Leader of Opposition Business, amongst other roles.

To the entirety of my front bench team, we have a great shadow cabinet with an extraordinary amount of talent. I think it is a team that is capable of being a good cabinet into the future. They are very assiduously going about the work of opposition, and I thank them for their support. Having had time in government as a minister and having time in opposition, one had a consciousness in government of how tough opposition would be, with the lack of resources and so forth; now we have to live through that. It is difficult, and they do a fine job under difficult circumstances. I thank them for their support.

In the other place, they are ably led by the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC. I have known Kyam for a number of years. He does a fine job in the Legislative Council, and that is particularly true in his roles as the shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs and the shadow attorney-general, amongst other things.

I would like to acknowledge the crossbench. As I said, opposition is tough, but we are a team. Often on the crossbench you are doing it with a far smaller team, if you are a team at all. I would like to acknowledge the three Independent members we have in this place: the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Florey and the member for Frome. They represent their constituency incredibly well and do a fine job of keeping up to speed with the various events and goings on in this place. This is equally true in the Legislative Council for members of SA-Best, the Greens and the Hon. John Darley MLC.

To my staff, it is a great team that we have upstairs in the dream factory. They are an incredibly hardworking group of people, led by Mr John Bistrovic, but I would like to mention the others as well: Adam, Pam, Rik, Lucy, James, Peter, Nadia, Cheyne, Sandra, Matt, Wendy, David, Minh, Corey and my EO, Gayle. We also lost the services of Chad earlier this year. I should also, of course, mention the Premier's favourite, Mr Kevin Naughton. They work incredibly hard and assist not only me in my functions but also the whole opposition team. I would like to thank them for their dedication not just to the Leader of the Opposition's office but to the broader labour movement.

To other members of my parliamentary team, the caucus, I should acknowledge that we started the year with a couple of by-elections. We had the opportunity to undergo our own renewal, losing two fine members in the former member for Cheltenham and the former member for Enfield, who were replaced by two excellent members in the new members for Enfield and Cheltenham. They no doubt have an incredibly bright career in front of them and I look forward to working with both those members, along with the rest of my team, who in this place on a day-to-day basis are ably assisted by the whip and the whip's office, an often difficult and thankless job. On more than one occasion, I have reflected on how lucky I am to be in this place with the member for Playford, a long-time friend, and also the deputy whip, the member for Taylor.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to acknowledge the family members of those members on this side of the house. I know that in each and every instance they are an extraordinary support for each and every one of us. We cannot do it without them. I know that there are some amazing and beautiful family stories on this side of the chamber, each unique in their own special way, as is the case in any sort of modern society, but I want to thank the family members of all members on this side of the house, particularly my own.

I want to thank my wife, Annabel; my daughter, Sophie; and my son, Jack. My wife is an amazing woman. She is a bit unwell at the moment, which makes it particularly hard, but she just goes about it, rarely complaining, putting up with the fact that almost every night I am not around to help get the kids into bed and so forth. I am often not around in the morning. She works, too, and is an incredibly bright woman. She somehow manages to bring this all together. I cannot thank her enough. I love her dearly.

To my children, I cannot wait to spend a bit of time with them on Christmas Day and the associated period. In these roles, you have a permanent sense of guilt with young kids and that has not gone away over the last 12 months. But I know that one day, hopefully, they will understand that this is as much about them as it is anyone else and I love them dearly and thank them for their support and patience.

Finally, Christmas is a good time to reflect for all of us, regardless of whether you are a person of faith or not, regardless of what your faith is, if you have one. It is a special time to spend with family in this country and it is a good time to reflect on just how lucky we are. Our political system is robust and often it is ugly, but I am utterly convinced that it is a system that serves this country incredibly well.

I think we all hopefully share a Christian value—that is not exclusively Christian but, nevertheless, it is a Christian value—of trying to look after the less fortunate in society. When I think about how lucky I am on Christmas morning waking up with a loving family in a safe and secure environment, able to provide presents for my children and so forth, it is worthwhile thinking about those people who are not so fortunate.

I think we all have a responsibility in this place to try to aid people in those circumstances and live up to that egalitarian value and mission that I think we all share as a country. At this special time, hopefully during the course of our reflections, we can contemplate how this parliament can aid their cause throughout the course of calendar year 2020. I wish everybody a very safe and merry Christmas and a prosperous and peaceful 2020.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (18:11): Much of what I want to say has been said, but I just want to say a bit as a member who almost lives in this house when we are sitting. I would like to acknowledge all the staff in this chamber: obviously, the Clerk, Rick Crump; David Pegram, the Deputy Clerk; the Serjeant-at-Arms, Lauren Williams, who also works on behalf of the Police Security Services branch; and Senior House Services Officer, Tonia Coulter, who also doubles as my parliamentary bowls secretary—and a fine bowler she is.

I would also like to thank the house services officers, including Glen Anderson, Will Coad, Jesse Fyfe and Antoni Rejman; the parliamentary officers, Anthea Howard, Dr Josh Forkert and Shannon Riggs, who is on leave currently with his first child. I also thank parliamentary assistant, Shane Hilton. If I have missed anyone, text me later.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: We will deal with it next Thursday.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, we will deal with it later. As far as people who help make this house work, I would like to acknowledge everyone, including building services and their manager, David Woolman, and Paul Chadwick and his team from KOJO who are in charge of broadcasting and filming. I am very enlightened by Paul's texts during the day and have some great conversations with him.

I would like to thank the catering division and manager, Creon Grantham. I do not know whether Creon realises how much power he has in this state. He runs a very tight ship. To him and all his staff—Karen, Nicky and the team—I congratulate them on getting us fed and watered and wonder when Bundaberg rum might be on the menu again in the members' bar. I would like to thank Pauline Thomson and her team from Corporate Services, as well as Kent Nelson and his team from finance.

I would also like to thank the ever-hardworking Hansard team and John Clarke, the Acting Leader. You never know how many friends you have in life, but I have found a lot in Hansard, I think, because they are very keen to talk to me at moments like lunchtime to ask how late we are going and this and that. Sometimes I think if I knew those answers I would be in another job rather than in this place. However, I appreciate that they are trying to find out if I can predict destiny. I do my best, Hansard, I do my best. I congratulate Hansard on their resilience because they, like us, have to hang around here until the bitter end and many times we do not know when the bitter end is. They make us sound human and I really appreciate their work and their friendship.

I would like to thank the parliamentary library and Dr John Weste. He is a great man and does some great work in the library with his team getting historical artefacts together and a whole range of material together. It is great when you take people through there. He takes his time if he sees you and shows you a few things that are going on there.

I thank the Parliamentary Network Support Group: Lorraine Tonglee, the manager, and her crew. I thank the cleaning staff. I have known Tammy for a long time. I occasionally see her coming in—I think I saw her today on her way in. Merry Christmas, Tammy, and all the cleaning staff. To all our staff, my staff and our families, you are all the people who keep us here and help make this place function. To everyone, including anyone I might have missed, thank you so much for your service.

I would like to acknowledge the Opposition Whip. He and I usually have a very harmonious arrangement, and I am glad that we can have some pretty up-front conversations and come to an arrangement. That is the whips' role: we are here to make the place work, so I appreciate those conversations. Through all the carnage of the Westminster style and its robust system, we can work it out and get there at the end of the day.

I think we will be back later on next week, but I would like to thank all my colleagues, all the opposition and the crossbenchers. I thank those people in the other place, even though I am still trying to work out the strange workings of the other place. I would like to wish everyone a merry Christmas and a happy new year. Let's have a successful, robust debate here next year.

Mr BROWN (Playford) (18:15): It is always hard to follow the relaxed contributions of the Government Whip, but I will try. It is an honour and a privilege for anyone to be able to stand to represent a community in this state. I regard it as a particular honour and a particular privilege for me to be able to represent my own community of Playford. This Christmas, I thank the people of Playford for allowing me to stand again in this place.

This is the second of the four Christmases of this parliament, which I think is worth noting. It has been a good year for this side of the chamber. A particular highlight has been the success of the by-elections that were held earlier this year, with an addition of two new members, the member for Cheltenham and the member for Enfield, both of whom have made excellent contributions to the advancement of the lives of working people since coming into this place. I look forward to 2020 being another year of holding the government to account but also of allowing us to deliver for our communities.

I would like to thank my electorate staff and my whip staff. Unfortunately, this year I have had to say goodbye to the exceptional Will Mellor, but I know that my loss is the law's gain as he

proceeds with his legal career. Luckily, I was able to entice the redoubtable Caleb Flight from the bright lights of Canberra to come to work with me here in Parliament House and in my electorate office. I know he is doing an excellent job in running the office. I thank him for not only his advice but also his energy in doing the job.

I would like to thank the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk and all the chamber staff for their exceptional work throughout the year. I know that both the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk would occasionally have an excuse for getting sick of me asking questions about standing orders and precedents, but I know that they take it with good humour. They are always very knowledgeable and very helpful, so thank you.

I would like to thank the Hansard staff for being able to figure out what people are saying from time to time. I always try to enunciate very clearly, but I know that some of my colleagues are a little bit harder to understand. Somehow, you manage to figure it all out, so thank you very much. I would like to thank the catering staff, particularly when they are very useful in letting us know when the house is likely to sit late. If you want to find out definitely what is happening, you should always ask the catering staff. That is a bit of a tip that I have learnt over the years.

I would like to thank the committee staff of various committees as well—not only the staff of the ERDC, of which I am a member and which is chaired under the steady and relaxed hand of the Government Whip, but also all the committee staff. I would like to thank the library staff, in particular Dr John Weste, the Parliamentary Librarian.

My own children and other people from my electorate have been very interested in tours of this place. I thank the library for always being the most exciting part that people go to when they are on tours. Dr Weste's enthusiasm for the things that are in the collection that the parliament holds is very infectious. I know that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, are particularly interested in the library, and I thank you for your interest in making sure that things in the library are kept and preserved for future generations.

I would like to thank the support staff throughout the entire building for all the work that they do in not only keeping this place clean but also functional, and for assisting us to do our jobs. They do not often get the recognition that they deserve, and so merry Christmas to them.

I would like to thank the Speaker and also you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for the work you have done throughout the year. I know that from time to time I have had reason to think that the Speaker has a hair-trigger when I am asked to leave the chamber, but I think on balance he does a pretty fair job, even if I necessarily would quibble a few times that has happened. I do note that I do not think I have been chucked out of the chamber by you, Mr Deputy Speaker, so thank you so much for that. Thank you for the excellent job that both you and the Chair of the Economic and Finance did during the estimates committees earlier this year.

I would like to thank the Government Whip and the deputy government whip for being people with whom you can deal on a regular basis. I am pleased to say that in all my dealings with the Government Whip I have never had cause to complain about anything he has done. I hope that relationship continues, even if his relaxation can occasionally be infectious.

I would like to thank my colleagues for putting up with me throughout the year. I know that from time to time I have to be the bearer of bad news and also someone who tells them that they are not able to leave when they want to leave the building, but I do my best to incorporate what they want. I thank them for their forbearance and also for their understanding.

I would like to thank the member for Taylor, the deputy opposition whip, for his assistance throughout the year. He certainly makes it a lot easier for me to do my job, and I thank him for all his assistance. I would also like to finally thank my colleagues on the JPSC, who do an excellent job in helping to maintain this place. I know that there is a great atmosphere of JPSC members, who just want to make sure this place runs as well as it can. I think it is an exceptional committee and does an exceptional job. I am pleased and honoured to be a member of it.

To all those and to everyone else in this place, I say happy Christmas, even though I know we are coming back next week now, thanks to our friends upstairs and the great work—or, rather,

potentially, lack of work—they do. I allow my comment to stand. Merry Christmas to all. Hopefully, we will not be back for very long next week.

At 18:22 the house adjourned until Thursday 12 December 2019 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (26 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): In response to questions 13 and 14 I have been advised the following:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the SA Housing Authority—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Est Result (\$000)	2019-20 Budget (\$000)	2020-21 Estimate (\$000)	2021-22 Estimate (\$000)
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	To provide grant funding to Specialist Homelessness Service Providers.	66,813	66,836	70,226	70,198
Private Rental Assistance Program (PRAP)	To provide financial assistance to households experiencing difficulty establishing a tenancy in the private rental market.	12,294	14,136	14,650	15,175
National Rental Affordability Scheme (NRAS)	To provide an annual financial incentive to housing providers for up to ten years if eligibility requirements continue to be met.	8,023	8,491	8,159	7,461
Emergency Accommodation Assistance	To provide financial assistance into budget hotels or motels for people who need emergency accommodation, often as a result of domestic abuse.	7,649	4,420	4,336	4,250
National Partnership on Remote Housing (NPRH)	To contribute to addressing housing need, building more sustainable remote housing management systems; increasing Indigenous employment, workforce participation and education opportunities, housing options and home ownership; and supporting the outcomes of the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement and National Indigenous Reform Agreement.	2,205	4,460	0	0
CBD Respite Facility	Financial contribution to the construction of a facility that comprises 18 purpose-built, flexible serviced apartments available for short-term stays for people with a disability and their carers. The facility is located at 43 Franklin Street, Adelaide, and forms part of a larger development that includes retirement apartments and a mixture of affordable and social housing.	5,803	0	0	0

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Est Result (\$000)	2019-20 Budget (\$000)	2020-21 Estimate (\$000)	2021-22 Estimate (\$000)
Affordable Housing Grants	Affordable Housing Grants are a subsidy paid to HomeStart Finance in respect of the EquityStart loan product. The EquityStart loan is a subsidised loan to assist public housing tenants buy or build their own home.	570	202	0	0
Other Grants & Subsidies	Minor grant payments.	86	80	82	84

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the SA Housing Authority—Administered:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2018-19 Est result (\$000)	2019-20 Budget (\$000)	2020-21 Estimate (\$000)	2021-22 Estimate (\$000)
CSO Subsidy—HomeStart Finance	Payment of government subsidy to HomeStart Finance.	6,921	7,256	7,623	8,009
Social Impact Bond (Aspire Adelaide)	Payment of financial return provided by government on social impact bond with Aspire Adelaide.	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,710
Interest-free loans to Domestic Violence Service Providers	Payment of government subsidy to HomeStart Finance.	0	101	145	188

The following table details the new commitment of grants in 2018-19 for the SA Housing Authority – Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Aboriginal Family Support Services Inc	Youth Accommodation Aboriginal Specific Homelessness Service	1,142,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Aboriginal Sobriety Group Incorp	Western Adelaide Aboriginal Specific Homelessness Service	658,600
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Anglican Community Care Inc	Southern Country Generic Homelessness Service	2,316,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Anglicare SA Ltd	Financial Services Clinic	90,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Anglicare SA Ltd	Northern Generic Homelessness Service	2,811,200
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute	AHURI National Housing Research Program	123,695
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Community Transition Worker (Westcare)	193,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Eastern Adelaide Aboriginal Specific Homelessness Service	643,100

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Inner Southern Youth Homelessness Service	1,225,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catherine House Inc	Catherine House Supported Accommodation Service	987,700
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	Limestone Coast Domestic Violence Service	554,700
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	Murray Mallee and Adelaide Hills Domestic Violence Service	735,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	Outer North Youth Homelessness Service	1,384,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	Schools Assertive Outreach	422,050
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	Whyalla Generic Homelessness Service (Youth Focus)	712,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	Whyalla Regional Domestic Violence Service	464,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	Young Family Support Program	2,011,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Centacare Catholic Country SA Limited	Ceduna Generic Homelessness Service	564,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Centacare Catholic Country SA Limited	Ceduna Regional Domestic Violence and Aboriginal Family Violence Service	941,700
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Community Housing Council of SA	MHACF	539,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Department for Child Protection	Adolescent Community Brokerage	361,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Department for Correctional Services	Housing Exits (Corrections)	45,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Housing Choices South Australia Limited	Common Ground Adelaide Ltd (Light Sq & Flinders)	659,600
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Hutt Street Centre	Eastern Adelaide Generic Homelessness Service	1,166,900

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Junction Australia Ltd	Fleurieu & KI Generic Homelessness Service	331,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Junction Australia Ltd	Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island Domestic Violence Service	258,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Junction Australia Ltd	Outer Southern Youth Homelessness Service	1,321,800
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	KornarWinmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Homelessness Workforce Development Training	178,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	KornarWinmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Intervention Order Response Model	107,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Life Without Barriers	Riverland Assertive Outreach Service	343,600
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Lutheran Community Care	Outer Southern Generic Homelessness Service	1,350,100
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	NPY Women's Council	Cross Border/APY Lands Aboriginal Family Violence Service	516,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Nunga Mi:Minar Inc	Northern Regional Aboriginal Domestic Violence and Family Violence Service	658,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services of SA Inc	Ex-Custodial Homelessness Support Service	2,127,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Relationships Australia SA Health Promotion Services	Child Focused Support	1,289,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Shelter SA Inc	MHACF	386,200
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	St John's Youth Services Inc	Ladder St Vincent Street	651,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	St John's Youth Services Inc	St John's Youth Services	2,258,800
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	St Vincent De Paul Society (SA) Inc	St Vincent De Paul Homeless Men's Crisis Accommodation Service	1,105,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	SYC Ltd	Eastern Adelaide Youth Homelessness Service	536,400

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	SYC Ltd	Get a Place—MHACF	107,700
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	SYC Ltd	Integrated Housing Exits (Youth Justice)	387,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	SYC Ltd	Tenant's Information and Advocacy Service (TIAS)—MHACF	524,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	SYC Ltd	Youth Homelessness Gateway	481,600
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	The Corporation of the City of Adelaide	Homeless and Vulnerable People Project	40,700
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	The Don Dunstan Foundation	Dame Louise Casey Adelaide Visit	10,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Adelaide Domestic Violence Crisis Accommodation Service—Bramwell House	283,800
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Inner North & North East Youth Homelessness Service	1,360,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Port Augusta Generic Homelessness Service	680,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Towards Independence	1,038,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Communities Incorporated	Adolescent Community Brokerage Program—Homelessness Service Support	353,780
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Communities Incorporated	Domestic Violence Anti-Poverty Brokerage	228,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Communities Incorporated	Extreme Weather Response Brokerage Service	100,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Communities Incorporated	Homelessness Gateway Service	1,070,600
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Communities Incorporated	Kurlana Tampawardli (Aboriginal Transitional Housing Outreach Service)	1,074,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Communities Incorporated	Therapeutic Youth Service (Adelaide & Mt Gambier)	3,695,500

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Country SA Inc	Cooper Pedy Homelessness and Support Service	42,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Country SA Inc	Cooper Pedy Regional Domestic Violence and Aboriginal Family Violence Service	610,200
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Country SA Inc	Port Augusta Regional Domestic Violence and Aboriginal Family Violence Service	490,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Country SA Inc	Port Augusta Youth Homelessness Service	586,000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Country SA Inc	Yorke & Mid North Generic Homelessness Service	1,519,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Country SA Inc	Yorke and Mid North Domestic Violence Service	464,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	Inner Southern Generic Homelessness Service	1,235,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc	Western Adelaide Generic Homelessness Service	1,610,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc	Western Youth Homelessness Service	1,384,200
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Unity Housing Company Ltd	The Terrace Boarding House	288,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Unity Housing Company Ltd	The Terrace Boarding House Liaison Worker Program	133,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Victim Support Service Inc.	DV Safety Packages Program	666,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Welfare Rights Centre SA Inc	Housing Legal Clinic—MHACF	176,900
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	West Coast Youth Service Inc	Pt Lincoln Generic Homelessness Service (Youth Focus)	724,100
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Domestic Violence and Aboriginal Family Violence Gateway Service	1,238,300
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Eastern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service	1,114,200

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Northern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service	1,566,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Southern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service	1,068,500
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Southern Regional Aboriginal Domestic Violence and Family Violence Service	773,700
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Statewide CALD Domestic Violence Service	608,400
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Incorporated	Western Adelaide Domestic Violence Service	1,140,600
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement (NHHA)—Specialist Homelessness Services	Yarredi Services Inc.	Port Lincoln Regional Domestic Violence Service	583,300
National Partnership on Remote Housing (NPRH)	Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Inc.	Fregon Road Project	463,936
Private Rental Assistance Program (PRAP)	Various individuals	Financial assistance	11,198,823
Emergency Accommodation Assistance	Various individuals	Financial assistance	7,648,702
Other Grants & Subsidies	Australian Red Cross Society	Register-Find-Reunite service	33,264
Other Grants & Subsidies	Unison Property Corp. Pty. Ltd.	UNO Apartments property manager	48,994

The following table details the *new* commitment of grants in 2018-19 for the SA Housing Authority – Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
CSO Subsidy (1)	HomeStart Finance	Payment of government subsidy	6,921,000
Social Impact Bond (1)	Aspire Adelaide	Payment of financial return provided by government	1,200,000

(1) Items newly transferred to the SA Housing Authority responsibility during 2018-19.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (26 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): In response to questions 13 and 14 I have been advised the following:

TABLE A—The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Human Services (DHS)—Controlled:

Programs/sub programs	Purpose or grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated Result \$'000	2019-20 Budget \$'000	2020-21 Estimate \$'000	2021-22 Estimate \$'000
Communities					
Community Connections and Support	Program promotes opportunity and affordability for vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians through a range of state government concessions.	2,355.00	15,816.00	15,993.33	14,958.41

Programs/sub programs	Purpose or grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated Result \$'000	2019-20 Budget \$'000	2020-21 Estimate \$'000	2021-22 Estimate \$'000
Community Services	Program that supports policy development, funding and partnerships which build opportunities and inclusion for all South Australians, including Aboriginal people and communities, carers, low income households, young people, cultural diverse communities and LGBTIQ people.	21,299.00	18,633.00	18,842.63	18,893.05
Youth Services	Supports South Australian young people through grant programs and services, including initiatives designed to implement the youth strategy.	1,637.00	2,076.00	1,605.17	1,225.05
Volunteer Services	Supports the implementation of the Volunteering Strategy for South Australia and the Advancing the Community Together Partnership through grant programs designed to build community capacity, support civil society and increase volunteering.	819.00	843.00	852.66	874.34
Community Services Care	Program includes a range of services which enable vulnerable South Australians to live independently and safely in the community.	34,314.00	26,896.00	24,231.21	24,501.22
Status of Women	Supports the full and equal participation of women in the social, political and economic life of the state. Includes addressing violence against women, equality for women in every aspect of life, and women's economic empowerment.	2,486.00	1,941.00	1,467.58	1,504.31
Youth Justice	Provided Statutory services to children and young people in the justice system which aim to reduce re-offending and acknowledge the victims of crime.	522.00	537.00	575.16	587.38
NDIS and Disability Services					
Disability SA	Provides case management, allied health and therapy, and specialist early intervention services for adults and children with disability.	2,302.00	46.00	60.39	61.90
Disability Accommodation Support	Provides supported community accommodation services to people with intellectual and physical disability, including through group homes.	503.00	556.00	721.23	739.29
Equipment Services	Provides equipment and home modification services to NDIS participants as well as state disability clients and older people.	29.00	29.00	37.25	38.18

Programs/sub programs	Purpose or grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated Result \$'000	2019-20 Budget \$'000	2020-21 Estimate \$'000	2021-22 Estimate \$'000
Non-Government and Individualised Funding	Includes Individualised funding and provides funding to non-government organisations for people with disabilities and their carers.	116,129.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NDIS Reform Support	Provision of strategic advice and development of national policy settings under the NDIS; planning and oversight of the transition of disability and Domiciliary Care services to new arrangements.	11,471.00	2,709.00	2,368.33	1,508.57
Social Housing	Facilitate the transfer of funding to the South Australian Housing Authority to enable it to develop, implement and provide housing services for people who are at risk or in high need and improve the standard of, and access to housing across the state.	834,088.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		1,027,954.00	70,082.00	66,754.94	64,891.70

TABLE B—The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2018-19 and across the forward estimates for DHS—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose or grant program/fund	2018-19 Estimated Result \$'000	2019-20 Budget \$'000	2020-21 Estimate \$'000	2021-22 Estimate \$'000
Charitable and Social Welfare Fund	Established to provide small one-off grants to a wide range of community organisations and service providers	3,997.00	3,800.00	3,800.00	3,800.00
Community Service Obligations	Water and sewerage rate concessions for exempt properties	19,646.00	20,333.00	21,016.00	21,738.00
Concessions	Provides a range of State Government concessions to promote opportunity and affordability for vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians	161,005.00	166,859.00	172,124.00	177,808.00
Consumer Advocacy and Research Fund	South Australian Council of Social Services Research and Advocacy Project	529.00	419.00	357.00	310.00
Emergency Electricity Payments Scheme	Provides assistance to households in a financial crisis who are unable to pay their electricity debt.	338.00	348.00	356.00	365.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund	Services and projects to minimise or address problem gambling	6,101.00	6,179.00	6,255.00	6,300.00
Home for Incurables Trust	Provide housing for people with impaired ability to live independently because of an acquired brain injury, degenerative neurological condition or physical condition resulting in disability.	496.00	508.00	521.00	535.00
Personal Alert Rebate Scheme	Assists frail older people who live alone and are at risk of falls or medical emergencies to obtain a personal alert system.	2,732.00	2,778.00	2,825.00	2,852.00
Total		194,844.00	201,224.00	207,254.00	213,708.00

The following tables detail grants in 2018-19 for DHS—Controlled:

DHS Controlled Items—Grants payments to Non-Government Organisations (NGO's) in 2018-19

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Care Services—Adults with Chronic Conditions	Royal District Nursing Service	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	5,490,000.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Adelaide Day Centre for Homeless Persons Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	118,298.44
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Aged & Community Services SA & NT Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	87,055.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Aged Care & Housing Group Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	393,654.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	247,995.52
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	453,494.04
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Boandik Lodge Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	91,603.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Calvary Community Care	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	103,833.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Camden Community Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	100,397.49
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Carer Support & Respite Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	782,170.64
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Carers Association of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	686,916.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Carers Link Barossa	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	405,666.68
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Country Home Advocacy	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	125,573.56
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Country North Community Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	266,380.32
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Dementia Australia Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	282,729.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Elderly Citizens Homes Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	135,545.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia Consolidated Trust	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	96,347.76
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Greek Orthodox Community of SA	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	71,013.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Helping Hand Aged Care	Refer to Table A—Community Services Care	495,273.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Hutt St Centre Ltd	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	405,484.52
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Italian Home Delivered Meals and Services Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	58,047.61
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Kura Yerlo Council Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	65,353.28
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Meals on Wheels (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	203,219.00
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Mental Illness Fellowship of SA Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	96,885.08
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Mid Murray Support Services Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	50,596.39
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Northern Carer's Network Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	1,089,700.56
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Pika Wiya Health Service Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	135,230.04
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Royal District Nursing Service	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	4,744,530.00
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	St John Ambulance Australia SA Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	136,861.00
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Tailem Bend Community Centre	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	91,781.93
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Umoona Aged Care Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	191,186.00
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	1,718,971.76
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	352,804.00
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	West Coast Community Services Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	96,562.00
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Yorke Peninsula Community Transport Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	339,471.56
Community Care Services— Home and Community Care	Young Men's Christian Association	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	289,987.68
Community Care Services— Supported Residential Facility	Eureka Care Communities (Mount Gambier) Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	81,873.93
Community Care Services— Supported Residential Facility	Eureka Care Communities (Salisbury) Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	190,648.08
Community Care Services— Supported Residential Facility	Glenelg Supportive Care Kris & Jacob & Mary & Peter	Refer to Table A— Community Services Care	138,658.22

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	Hindmarsh Lodge Supported Residential Facility P/L	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	113,906.28
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	Magill Lodge Supported Residential Care	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	124,964.04
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	MGB Residential Care Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	150,301.68
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	MT Moroney & PK Moroney & G Nedelkos & P Nedelkos	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	167,914.17
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Oaks at Rosewater	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	88,818.72
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Oaks on Sussex	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	53,258.55
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Suzanne Marshall Trust Adelaide Rest Homes P/L	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	228,386.42
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Thomas Riley Family Trust	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	76,467.92
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Trustee for EGO Trust	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	230,471.64
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Trustee for J&K Moroney Business Trust	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	105,372.72
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Trustee for Joyan Sunnydale	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	162,797.34
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Trustee for Ocean Grove Supportive Care at Myrtle Bank	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	192,840.96
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	The Trustee for Supportive Care Trust	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	102,588.36
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	Torchio Trading Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	94,854.12
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	Trustee for the Buckton Family	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	111,170.59
Community Connections and Support—Community Services Grants	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table A—Community Connections and Support	73,621.00
Community Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Aboriginal Family Support Services	Refer to Table A—Community Services	95,000.00
Community Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	185,536.00
Community Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Community Services	83,032.00
Community Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Koonibba Aboriginal Community Council	Refer to Table A—Community Services	111,167.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Services— Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Women's Council	Refer to Table A— Community Services	1,310,904.00
Community Services— Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Plaza Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	92,098.00
Community Services— Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	92,098.00
Community Services— Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Raukkan Community Council Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	95,000.00
Community Services— Community Services Grants	Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia Consolidated Trust	Refer to Table A— Community Services	150,000.00
Community Services— Community Services Grants	Indian Australian Association of SA	Refer to Table A— Community Services	54,055.00
Community Services— Community Services Grants	Narungga Nation Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A— Community Services	104,000.00
Community Services— Community Services Grants	Riverland Singh Society Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	153,750.00
Community Services— Community Services Grants	South Australian Special Operations Group (SA Special Ops)	Refer to Table A— Community Services	333,000.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	885,455.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Anglicare SA Ltd	Refer to Table A— Community Services	823,895.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Australian Refugee Association	Refer to Table A— Community Services	98,601.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Carers Association of SA Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	111,634.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Catholic Family Services	Refer to Table A— Community Services	269,053.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Centacare Catholic Country SA	Refer to Table A— Community Services	215,551.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Centacare Catholic Family Services	Refer to Table A— Community Services	204,832.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Child and Family Welfare Association	Refer to Table A— Community Services	135,335.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Community Centres SA Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	194,170.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Community House Port Lincoln	Refer to Table A— Community Services	84,718.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Eastwood Community Centre Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	81,751.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Grandparents for Grandchildren SA Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	120,000.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Junction Australia Ltd	Refer to Table A— Community Services	134,409.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Junction Community Centre Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	134,656.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	121,518.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Lutheran Community Care	Refer to Table A— Community Services	207,910.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Marra Murrangga Kumangka Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	91,291.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Midway Road Community House	Refer to Table A—Community Services	74,438.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Milang & District Community Association	Refer to Table A—Community Services	87,527.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Multicultural Youth South Australia Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	245,753.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	North East Community House Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	116,857.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Northern Area Community & Youth Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	524,554.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Plaza Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	214,315.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	108,326.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	SA Council of Social Service	Refer to Table A—Community Services	439,017.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Survivors of Torture Trauma Assistance & Rehabilitation	Refer to Table A—Community Services	78,175.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	The Food Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	101,108.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	The Hut Community Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	222,161.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	The South Australian Financial Counsellors Association Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	135,133.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	601,640.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	887,568.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	Refer to Table A—Community Services	1,099,095.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide	Refer to Table A—Community Services	1,193,678.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	Vietnamese Community in Australia / SA Chapter Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	104,009.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	West Coast Youth & Community Support	Refer to Table A—Community Services	107,220.00
Community Services—Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	140,399.00
Community Services—Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Anglicare SA Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community Services	299,732.00
Community Services—Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Centacare	Refer to Table A—Community Services	101,669.00
Community Services—Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Centacare Catholic Country SA	Refer to Table A—Community Services	101,666.00
Community Services—Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Foodbank of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community Services	220,000.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Good Shepherd Microfinance	Refer to Table A— Community Services	1,512,120.00
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	57,448.00
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Lutheran Community Care	Refer to Table A— Community Services	409,622.00
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Money Mob Talkabout Limited	Refer to Table A— Community Services	58,000.00
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	The Trustee for the Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Refer to Table A— Community Services	243,408.00
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	711,272.00
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	Refer to Table A— Community Services	1,049,063.00
Community Services— Financial Hardship Programs (formerly Affordable Living Programs)	UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	Refer to Table A— Community Services	131,026.00
Disability SA—NDIS Services	Child and Youth Services	Refer to Table A— Disability SA	3,473,504.20
Disability SA—NDIS Services	Child and Youth Services	Refer to Table A— Disability SA	60,000.00
NDIS Reform Support— Disability Grants	Adelaide Oval	Refer to Table A—NDIS Reform Support	50,000.00
NDIS Reform Support— Disability Grants	City of Holdfast Bay	Refer to Table A—NDIS Reform Support	100,000.00
NDIS Reform Support— Disability Grants	City of Mount Gambier	Refer to Table A—NDIS Reform Support	100,000.00
NDIS Reform Support— Disability Grants	City of Victor Harbor	Refer to Table A—NDIS Reform Support	100,000.00
NDIS Reform Support— Disability Grants	Corporation of the City of Adelaide	Refer to Table A—NDIS Reform Support	100,000.00
NDIS Reform Support— Disability Grants	Corporation of the City of Whyalla	Refer to Table A—NDIS Reform Support	100,000.00
NDIS Reform Support—NDIS Sector Development	First Peoples Disability Network (Australia) Limited	Refer to Table A—NDIS Reform Support	100,000.00
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Access2Arts	Refer to Table A—Non- Government and Individualised Funding	76,102.00
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Amandus Lutheran Disability Services	Refer to Table A—Non- Government and Individualised Funding	1,430,264.29
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Anglicare SA Ltd	Refer to Table A—Non- Government and Individualised Funding	5,191,257.94

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Assured Home Care	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	505,489.41
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Autism Association of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	2,032,535.78
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	2,102,840.16
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Barkuma Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,170,409.88
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Barossa Enterprises Incorporated	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	746,727.27
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Bedford Phoenix Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	745,465.94
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Calvary Community Care	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,078,194.15
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Cara Incorporated	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	20,983,307.68
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Centacare Catholic Family Services	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,817,072.33
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Community Bridging Service	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	242,375.92
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Community Business Bureau Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	246,160.68
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Community Living Australia Ltd	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	7,768,505.55
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Community Living Options Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	5,213,902.57
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Community Living Project Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	875,164.90
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Comrec Australia Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	765,510.51
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Disability Living Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	2,659,257.81
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	EBL Disability Services	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	2,960,160.02
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Enhanced Lifestyles Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	237,784.36
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Eureka Care Communities (Salisbury) Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	242,717.94
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Guide Dogs Association of SA&NT Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	751,070.23

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Hills Community Options	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	2,781,525.13
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Holiday Explorers Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	140,092.40
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Homecare Plus	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	3,185,019.95
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Inclusive Sport SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	132,915.90
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Incompro Aboriginal Association Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,418,877.84
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Individual Supported Accommodation Services	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,122,267.45
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Interchange Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	114,527.82
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Kincare Homecare (SA) Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	483,228.00
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Life Without Barriers	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	3,699,479.18
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Lifestyles Assistance & Accommodation Services	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	891,542.41
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Lighthouse Disability Limited	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	5,944,422.85
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Lions Hearing Dogs Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	73,650.20
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Minda Incorporated	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	24,375,067.16
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Multiple Sclerosis Society of Australia	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	55,789.10
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	National Disability Services Ltd	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	219,895.68
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Northern Adelaide Supportive Care Pty Ltd	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	409,252.60
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Novita Children's Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,156,534.45
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Orana Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	4,769,996.33
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Riverland Respite & Recreation Service Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	247,790.02
Non-Government and Individualised Funding— Disability Grants	Royal District Nursing Service	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,177,777.29

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Royal SA Deaf Society Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	318,931.68
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Royal Society for the Blind of South Australia Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,986,801.85
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	SA Support Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	234,773.51
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	SACARE Lifestyle Support Services	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	263,720.15
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Skill Teaching & Resources Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	82,399.87
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Spastic Centre's of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	2,483,346.13
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Tauondi Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	54,280.20
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Technology for Ageing & Disability (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	76,120.75
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	The Brain Injury Network of SA	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	140,577.98
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	The Trustee for the Nextt Health Trust	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	981,580.27
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Tullawon Health Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	218,201.86
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Tutti Ensemble Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	159,057.76
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	2,415,528.30
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	691,596.72
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Windamere Park	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	278,895.54
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Workers Educational Association of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	97,531.65
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Xlent Disability Services	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	497,144.10
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Victim Support Service Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	187,325.22
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Victim Support Service Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	734,000.00
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Women's Emergency Services Coalition Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	148,200.00
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Women's Safety Services SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	106,875.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Women's Safety Services SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	372,428.00
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Women's Safety Services SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	172,000.00
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Working Women's Centre SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	452,000.00
Volunteer Services—Volunteers grants	Northern Volunteering SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Volunteer Services	73,289.00
Volunteer Services—Volunteers grants	Volunteering SA&NT Inc	Refer to Table A—Volunteer Services	484,206.00
Youth Services—Youth grants	Multicultural Communities Council of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Youth Services	86,500.00
Youth Services—Youth grants	Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Youth Services	127,547.00
Youth Services—Youth grants	The Trustee for the Salvation Army(SA) Property Trust	Refer to Table A—Youth Services	124,723.00
Youth Services—Youth grants	Youth Affairs Council of SA	Refer to Table A—Youth Services	389,318.00
Grants < \$50,000	Includes Grant Recoveries 2017-18		3,636,758.08
Total			175,641,041.50

Note: As per 2018-19 DHS Financial Statements.

DHS Controlled Items—Individualised Funding payments in 2018-19

Funding Band	Count	Percentage
Between \$150,000 and \$199,999	3	4.2%
Between \$100,000 and \$149,999	2	2.8%
Between \$50,000 and \$99,999	14	19.4%
Between \$10,000 and \$49,999	33	45.8%
Under \$10,000	20	27.8%
Total	72	100.00%

Total paid to Individualised funding is \$2,663,102 (Note: the highest individualised funding amount was \$190,572.34).

DHS Controlled Items—Grant payments to other organisation types (non-NGO's) in 2018-19

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Alexandrina Council	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	68,296.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	1,073,255.84
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Burnside	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	69,371.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Charles Sturt	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	83,860.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Holdfast Bay	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	324,879.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Marion	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	364,976.77
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Mitcham	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	68,175.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	58,259.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Onkaparinga	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	603,265.79
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Playford	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	507,075.31

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Port Adelaide/Enfield	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	600,704.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Prospect	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	61,548.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Salisbury	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	153,072.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	City of Tea Tree Gully	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	171,138.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	160,228.82
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Corporation of City of Unley	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	214,007.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Corporation of the City Campbelltown	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	58,240.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Country Health SA	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	4,648,737.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	District Council of Mount Barker	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	388,179.66
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	District Council of Mount Remarkable	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	201,479.04
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	District Council of Victor Harbor	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	215,994.04
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	District Council of Yorke Peninsula	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	94,958.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Murray Mallee Community Transport Scheme	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	90,353.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	Port Augusta, Corporation of	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	51,553.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	SA Health (Central Office)	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	1,267,534.00
Community Care Services—Home and Community Care	The Barossa Council	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	275,150.47
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	Central Northern Adelaide Health Service	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	667,730.76
Community Care Services—Supported Residential Facility	Country Health SA	Refer to Table A—Community Care Services	153,965.00
Community Connections and Support—Community Services	University of SA: Revenue Office	Refer to Table A—Community Connections and Support	136,364.00
Community Connections and Support—GlassesSA	OPSM	Refer to Table A—Community Connections and Support	257,850.00
Community Services—Aboriginal Connections Program	Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community Services	399,650.00
Community Services—Community Services	University of SA: Revenue Office	Refer to Table A—Community Services	80,000.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	City of Marion	Refer to Table A—Community Services	249,918.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	City of Onkaparinga	Refer to Table A—Community Services	576,570.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	City of Salisbury	Refer to Table A—Community Services	221,221.00
Community Services—Family and Community Development	City of Tea Tree Gully	Refer to Table A—Community Services	192,170.00
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Country Health SA	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,028,160.00
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Disability Services Commission	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	281,108.00
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	The Flinders University of SA	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	52,761.62
Non-Government and Individualised Funding—Disability Grants	Women's & Children's Hospital	Refer to Table A—Non-Government and Individualised Funding	1,007,888.65

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Social Housing—Grants to South Australia Housing Authority	South Australia Housing Authority	Refer to Table A—Social Housing	834,168,443.00
Status of Women—Office for Women grants	Department of Social Services	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	121,730.00
Youth Justice—Youth grants	Department of Education & Children's Services	Refer to Table A—Youth Justice	360,000.00
Youth Justice—Youth grants	The Flinders University of SA	Refer to Table A—Youth Justice	58,476.00
Youth Justice—Youth grants	University of SA: Revenue Office	Refer to Table A—Youth Justice	59,507.00
Grants < \$50,000			667,293.58
Total			852,615,096.35

The following table details the *new* commitment of grants in 2018-19 for DHS—Administered:

DHS Administered items—Grant Payments in 2018-19

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Anangu Ngangkari Tjutaku Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	50,000.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	173,257.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Australian Refugee Association	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	89,459.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Community Centres SA Inc	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	50,129.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	83,790.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Migrant Resource Centre of SA Inc	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	81,285.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Multicultural Communities Council of SA Inc	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	92,538.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Nature Foundation SA Inc	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	50,890.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Second Chances SA	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	175,301.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	The Port Church Incorporated	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	54,520.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Time for Kids Inc	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	100,000.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Welfare Rights Centre (SA) Inc	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	68,640.00
Community Services Obligations	SA Water Corporation (Adelaide)	Refer to Table B—Community Services Obligations	18,995,000.00
Consumer Advocacy & Research	SA Council of Social Service	Refer to Table B—Consumer Advocacy and Research	219,214.00
Consumer Advocacy & Research	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table B—Consumer Advocacy and Research	59,842.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Aboriginal Family Support Services	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	420,499.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	105,612.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Eastern Health	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	220,000.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	187,145.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Offenders Aid & Rehabilitation Services of SA	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	208,259.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Overseas Chinese Association	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	149,168.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Psychmed Psychologists	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	476,028.50
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Psychmed Pty Ltd	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	483,028.50
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Relationships Australia SA	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	2,426,010.00

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	500,000.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	The Flinders University of SA	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	260,000.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	550,936.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Vietnamese Community in Australia / SA Chapter Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	175,892.00
Grants < \$50,000			2,485,465.00
Total administered grants			28,991,908.00
Total subsidies and client payments, including concessions			161,222,324.60
Total Administered Grants, Subsidies and Client Payments			190,214,232.60

Grants less than \$50,000 are summarised at the bottom of each table. Please note:

- Total grant payments may vary depending on recoveries.
- Accounting treatment may vary between the financial statements and this response because of materiality (statement only addresses grants greater than \$million by recipient—this document addresses grants greater than \$50,000).

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (26 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2018-19 for the Department of Human Services and the SA Housing Authority in question 13.