

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7 September 2021

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.B. Teague)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended up to and including Thursday 9 September to enable ministers and members to speak and conduct business from any seat within the chamber and the Speaker's gallery, and that members of the Legislative Council be prohibited from admission to the Speaker's gallery.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority is present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I put the question at once.

Motion carried.

Members

MEMBER FOR WAITE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (11:02): I address the matter of investigations by the Speaker undertaken early in 2020 immediately prior to the commencement of a police investigation and subsequent prosecution against the member for Waite about which there has been renewed interest in recent days.

I have, in considering all of the circumstances, taken up the matter and I have made inquiries, including to the court, in relation to matters of process and with a view fully to informing myself particularly of the evidence before the court and of its findings of fact. I am sufficiently able to deal with the matter now so I want to do that without delay.

On 17 January 2020, the Speaker announced that he had commenced a fact-finding exercise, the object of which was to find out particulars of what took place concerning alleged conduct of the member for Waite at a Christmas party held in the corridors of Parliament House during the afternoon of 13 December 2019.

On 5 February 2020, the Speaker advised the house that the reason for embarking upon the fact-finding exercise was the unsatisfactory circumstance that an allegation of harassment by one member against another was at that time beyond the jurisdiction of the Equal Opportunity Commissioner. Any investigation by the commissioner was otherwise consequent upon a complaint of which none had been received.

The Speaker at that time also adverted to the possibility of other investigatory and/or enforcement agencies, including SA Police, acting on a complaint or indeed that the house might adopt a course of action it considered appropriate to deal with the matter. It transpired shortly thereafter that a police investigation was commenced. That resulted in the member for Waite being charged with and subsequently tried for assault against the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC. Following a two-day trial on 1 and 2 June 2021, on 24 August 2021 the magistrate handed down judgement. The member for Waite was acquitted.

On Thursday afternoon, 26 August 2021, I received a copy of the magistrate's reasons for judgement. Importantly, and particularly for present purposes, as well as dealing with the charge the

reasons set out findings of fact in relation to the subject matter of the Speaker's investigation. Those findings of fact, which the court found proved beyond a reasonable doubt, are set out at paragraphs 25 to 29 of the reasons. They are numerous—more than 20 separate findings of fact—and they address what took place, where and when.

The court having made those findings of fact, it is not for the Speaker to gainsay those matters. There are, of course, processes available to the house and in the court to investigate any error. In the circumstances, the matter the subject of the Speaker's investigation is therefore overtaken by the police investigation and completed by the subsequent judicial process.

Honourable members, I make some observation in relation to the regulation of members' conduct. Members' conduct is regulated in many ways, including with regard to investigation and adjudication of complaints. I refer to the report of the Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament laid on the table on 26 October 2004, which sets out at paragraph 4.4 the provisions then regulating conduct of members. They did not then include such investigation or adjudication in respect of complaints by a member against another member, nor the later establishment of the ICAC.

The 2020 amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act have the effect of remedying that unsatisfactory circumstance. I emphasise that both the Speaker's investigation to determine particulars of what happened and the police investigation in this case took place prior to those amendments. By that later amending act, parliament also inserted section 93(4), expressly stipulating that the commissioner, relevantly, may not proceed to investigate a complaint until any criminal proceedings in respect of the same subject matter are completed.

Tellingly, it remains clear that the only role for the Presiding Member in relation to complaints to the commissioner arises in circumstances where a matter of privilege is raised; in this case, I am not aware of any such issue having been raised. Nor is it an ideal situation for the Speaker to undertake the work of an investigator—far from it. It places the Speaker in an invidious position. The Presiding Member is not a judge and, more particularly, does not sit in judgement of members.

The review of harassment in the South Australian parliament workplace undertaken soon after these events now further reinforces that view, finding at page 136.5, in respect of investigation by the house and, by extension, the Speaker, I quote:

...in the event that there was some kind of investigation process put in place, it is unlikely that victims would seek to have their allegations dealt with in this way; the process would not be viewed as sufficiently independent or confidential.

The review also finds that confidentiality in respect of witnesses and any subsequent investigation must be maintained in order to ensure confidence in the process for all concerned.

In all of the circumstances, I do not therefore intend further to undertake investigations into the matter. As the Speaker said in February 2020, and I reiterate now, there is nothing preventing any aggrieved person from making a complaint to any relevant body, at any time, or for the house to adopt a course of action it thinks is appropriate further to deal with the matter.

Bills

AQUACULTURE (TOURISM DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2021.)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:10): I just want to continue my remarks on this bill. For this side of the house, there are great opportunities in assisting our agricultural industry to grow from both a trade perspective and a tourism perspective. South Australia is already renowned for our clean, green produce and our seafood in particular. I can see tremendous opportunities in this area if it is properly managed. In principle, we support the bill in this chamber; however, we reserve our position between the houses to propose amendments. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:10): I certainly rise to support this bill, the Aquaculture (Tourism Development) Amendment Bill 2021. I will go through some of the direct particulars in relation to this legislation, which I believe will be a great boon to South Australian tourism, especially in this COVID time. What we are seeing with restricted and in some places almost nil border access to South Australia, with the excellent COVID management we are running in this state, are these internal tourism drawcards that I do not think we can have enough of.

In regard to the West Coast, Eyre Peninsula is a fantastic part of the world. It is so far from Adelaide—and the member for Flinders would understand this—that you can easily forget about Adelaide when you are on the West Coast and enjoying life in that community, which has many assets. You can go from Port Lincoln, obviously on the seafront there, and then go up around either coast. There are many amenities along the way in places such as Tumby Bay, Smoky Bay, Streaky Bay and Ceduna.

You can get around to Fowlers Bay, which is a lovely little gem that I have found in the last five or six years. It is a great part of the world and these places are being discovered by so many more people because instead of those billions of dollars going overseas, with travellers and tourists heading overseas, they are finding the real gems inside our state. Certainly, that is where these tourism developments come in so importantly in regard to aquaculture, which is an ever-burgeoning industry in this state.

I commend all the operators in whatever line of aquaculture they are in. It can present a lot of issues, and a lot of management is involved in getting things right, whether it be oyster farming or fish farming in particular, making sure the nutrients are right, making sure the flows through large tanks are correct, nutrition, getting rid of waste, etc.

Another thing that happens on the West Coast in particular is the harvesting of tuna. It has gone a long way from pole fishing off boats back in the day to essentially going out in the gulf and way out to the border of Western Australia, out Eucla way, and netting large schools of tuna, towing them back to Port Lincoln and farming them in pens, which have also had to put up with ingress of predators. They developed technology to get around that and that is great to see, especially in light of the tuna industry's recent progress with more tuna being sold to Japan, noting the recent difficulties we have had with trade with China.

Certainly in regard to this legislation, this bill does seek to provide a one-stop shop point of entry for agricultural operators, so that it streamlines the application process for establishing tourism-related structures that are directly associated with the farm production.

This bill will make it easier for aquacultural operators to obtain approvals for those structures, which are oyster-tasting platforms right out on the water and they will provide certainty for existing operators and encourage further investment in aquaculture-related tourism. I think that it is absolutely vital to value-add to this industry—which is already a successful industry—but anyone involved in primary industries will know that if you can add a dollar and keep a dollar you are so much better off in putting that directly into your local community and into maybe exporting that work interstate or overseas.

There is certainly an emerging regional tourism experience for tours and on-water tasting of oysters at the state's successful Eyre Peninsula oyster aquaculture operations. We have businesses—for example, such as Oyster HQ at Coffin Bay and South Australian Premium Oysters at Smoky Bay—that offer a unique tourism destination experience, where people can enjoy freshly harvested oysters and refreshments on platforms in the water, which are providing a drawcard to attract visitors to their regions.

These tourist platforms are currently not lawfully approved under planning and development legislation. I know that probably everyone here has had something to do with their own individual experience with getting things approved under planning and development legislation over time. We have recently streamlined the process—which I commend—that came under the planning act, which was reversed in 2016 by former Minister Rau, the former member for Enfield at the time.

There can be some challenges. You can have things that are not zoned, you can go through a process to get them approved—and that is an extra process and so it should be—but anything that can streamline the process, such as this legislation, I really commend. Operators have, in light of

that, raised concerns with the government that the processes to obtain proper approvals for such developments are not clear despite engaging with multiple agencies.

Under the current legislation, proponents are required to separately seek development consent under the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 from the Attorney-General's Department in the Planning and Land Use Services division and seek an authority to construct on the seabed under the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993 from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

This is in addition to requiring aquaculture infrastructure approvals and licence condition approvals from the Department of Primary Industries and Regions under the Aquaculture Act 2001. Under the Aquaculture Act 2001, the responsible minister has the power to assess and approve applications for the construction of infrastructure on the seabed for the purposes of farming aquatic organisms or aquaculture such as finfish sea cages and oyster farms, which obviously includes post and long lines.

This process includes extensive consideration of environmental impacts, referrals to the Environment Protection Authority and undertaking ecologically sustainable development risk assessments. However, one thing that the Aquaculture Act 2001 does not currently provide is a process for the approval of the structures which are associated with the aquaculture business but which are not directly required for the farming of seafood species.

What this bill proposes to do is provide like-for-like approval powers to the minister responsible for the Aquaculture Act 2001 for aquaculture-related tourism. That relates to the structures where they are established inside an approved aquaculture zone, as exists for aquaculture farming structures.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions will consult with all relevant agencies in relation to aquaculture tourism structure proposals, as per the current requirements for consulting on aquaculture farming structure proposals. One would think that would go side by side, that if there is a new development for a farm, and they are thinking about doing a tourism proposal as well, that consultation goes along side by side to streamline that process.

This is a minor amendment to the act that will reduce red tape and frustration for aquaculture development proponents and support an emerging tourism sector in regional South Australia. As part of the bill, it will provide for the establishment of regulations that will stipulate what types of tourism developments are not to be covered by this streamlined one-stop shop approvals process.

The bill also makes a number of consequential amendments and, consistent with existing provisions in the Aquaculture Act 2001 for carrying out unauthorised aquaculture activities, a maximum penalty of \$35,000 will apply for carrying out an unauthorised aquaculture tourism development. Should this bill progress through the parliament, the government will work with Oyster HQ and SA Premium Oysters to become compliant with the new requirements, providing them with the certainty operators have been seeking.

I really take my hat off to people in the fishing industry generally, whether it is finfishing, net fishing, fish farms or oyster farms, which is what we are talking about here today. There is a lot of investment, a lot of risk and, as with any primary production, the income from these sorts of proposals does not just fall at your feet. There is obviously a lot of risk. Over time, many of these farming practices, especially with finfish, and farming fish in tanks can be fraught with a whole range of issues, and I saw some happen many years ago now.

Heading towards 18 or 20 years ago, at a little place called Bedford, which is a little site just outside Cooke Plains in my electorate not far from where I live at Coomandook, there was some fish farm work there because there is quite saline water right throughout our district. It is not good enough to irrigate, and there are little pockets at Cooke Plains, just to the east of me but not very far away.

It is quite salty and a lot of work was done in farming fish. I cannot remember offhand what they were, but it went on for several years and I would have to check if any infrastructure is left out at the site. I know at least one operator, a couple of brothers I believe, set up an operation under that and invested a lot of money. I do not believe it was quite as successful as they had hoped, but that is the level of risk people are prepared to take to invest in industry and get on board.

In regard to oysters and oyster farming, which is a process that has gone on for many years, I remember that I went over there when I was the shadow spokesman for fisheries way back in either my first or second term. It was classic: out on a little boat, we had a guy who operates from Port Lincoln who takes video footage for Channel 7, and we were there shucking oysters down on the boat live on camera. They were straight out of the water, absolutely fantastic and fresh, and really did the job.

This is a similar experience, but you will not be out in a boat; you will be on a structure that I am sure will be built adjacent to the processing premises these companies will have and not too far from these oyster farms out of the water. It is something to see, whether you are at Coffin Bay or Smoky Bay or other areas on Eyre Peninsula, how these farms are set up. As I said, they go through all the approvals, through the Environment Protection Authority, to put them in place.

Fishing is not without its struggles. When I was the shadow spokesman, the former minister at the time, the former member for Mount Gambier, Rory McEwen, was going through a process. He said, 'We are going to double their licence fees.' It caused an uproar. I am not sure if his maths was so hot because the fees were actually quadrupled. I went over to the West Coast and we had meetings with hundreds of people involved in the industry. Thankfully, we got a result and pulled those fees right back to a far more manageable position so that people were not taxed out of existence and so that they could have a far more successful outcome.

This is another factor that these people are putting in place. There are some real entrepreneurs over there on the West Coast, including Gary Zippel. I know him; he went to school with one of my brothers at Urrbrae. A lot of these people are thinking outside the square, not only with setting up farming operations but now to add this bit where you can have a platform out amongst the farm and I am assuming you can sit there with your legs in the water or not—it depends on how the structure is set up, I suppose—and have a beautiful, pleasant day.

All of these locations around the West Coast are magnificent spots to get away and to have this opportunity to take in some of the fantastic oysters that are farmed and grown in this state. Obviously, Coffin Bay oysters, all of these oysters, are world renowned. When borders open up, which they will one day, we will be able to have that overseas opportunity for more people to salivate over this produce. As I indicated, there is a great resurgence where people can and do tour throughout the state.

As I have indicated in this place before, I think it was last October that I went north of Hawker and it was almost like Hindley Street, the amount of traffic up there. Trying to get a coffee at the stop at Hawker, there was quite a queue, which is quite different to other times I have been through the Flinders Ranges or the Far North. That is a good thing to see because in all the troubles that we are having with COVID—and there are plenty of people who are suffering, and sadly some businesses have fallen down—there has certainly been lots of support from us as a state government to try to minimise that, and also from the federal government, which has put in over \$300 billion in supporting people.

The real winners here are ventures in South Australia. I think that will go on for many years to come, sometimes because people will have to because they cannot go anywhere else, quite frankly, or it is just too risky. They can see the great gems that we see right throughout our state. It interests me sometimes when you see groups of people in Broken Hill. It is great for people to travel, but then they find that it is difficult to come home. We do what we can as local members, and I am sure there are a lot of local members on both sides of the house who get involved in that process.

In terms of opportunities, you can go down the South-East. I know Robe in the member for MacKillop's electorate, which is normally quiet over winter, has had quite a season. It does get windy and cold at Robe. I was only there last week and did it blow. It certainly shows what can happen in these tough times. So right throughout the South-East, down through Robe and Mount Gambier, and then you can come up through to the Mallee areas and Upper South-East, up around my electorate, where people can go to national parks. You can go through Ngarkat, for instance. The Border Track has been a great drawcard for many people, over against the Victoria border.

Obviously, we have great drawcards around the place like The Bend Motorsport Park, which has the classic cars on Sunday. At Murray Bridge, we have the fantastic, new six-storey Bridgeport Hotel, which is absolutely magnificent. You move up through the state to the magnificent river through

my electorate, through the Riverland, right up through the Flinders to the Far North and Innamincka and then across to the other side of the state as well.

There is a lot of opportunity here in South Australia. I think the more we can do to enhance that opportunity, which is part of this legislation, in regard to aquaculture businesses and the sooner this is fast-tracked through both houses of parliament so we can assist those businesses to further maximise their investment in this wonderful state, the better it will be, not just for those people and those businesses that take those risks but for the state and the economy as a whole. I commend the bill.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:31): I rise today to support the Aquaculture (Tourism Development) Amendment Bill. I do so wholeheartedly as the member in this place who represents the vast majority of aquaculture ventures in the state. It is no secret that 90 per cent of the oysters produced here in South Australia—it may even be 95 per cent—come from the beautiful waters around Eyre Peninsula, from Cowell all the way round to Denial Bay in the Far West.

I will talk more about that a little bit later because it is not just about oysters, although that is the first thing that comes to mind in relation to aquaculture and aquaculture production. In dealing with aquaculture, we are also talking about mussels, abalone, tuna and any other opportunities that might arise. The member for Hammond spoke about some dryland aquaculture ventures.

This bill particularly proposes amendments to the Aquaculture Act 2001. It will allow the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, on behalf of the minister responsible for the Aquaculture Act, to assess and approve applications for building marine tourism structures related to aquaculture within dedicated aquaculture zones. There are 12 aquaculture zones around this state. They are contained within coastal regions such as the Limestone Coast, Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula on the West Coast. Of course, for the last two areas I am the representative member.

It will make it easier certainly for the South Australian aquaculture industry to expand into tourism. A number of aquaculture sites have already been extended to accommodate some tourism. It will make any new entrants more easily able to gain approval for what they do. I do know that for the two that I am currently thinking of, a venture at Coffin Bay and another at Smoky Bay, it was a vast amount of work and a vast amount of red tape for both of those ventures to gain approval ultimately, but I am sure it was worth it. Both are enjoying success.

People realise there is nothing better than sitting out on an oyster lease and shucking fresh oysters straight out of the sea, as fresh as they can possibly be. Often, it is complemented with a glass of Eyre Peninsula riesling, dare I say. There is nothing better than to get out onto an oyster lease on a barge, see how the operation works, hear from the operators themselves about the challenges and the rewards that are available in that industry.

It has not been all beer and skittles for the oyster industry, of course. Three years ago Pacific oyster mortality syndrome hit. It did not come to South Australia but it arrived in Tasmania, and Tasmania at that time was the sole source of spat for Pacific rock oysters for South Australian growers. That border was closed immediately, so our oyster growers in South Australia were without spat for some time. They need spat to put out on their racks and begin the growth process to ultimately get oysters to a size where they are saleable and can get to market.

Two things happened from that. The first was that oyster growers were severely hit and their businesses were severely affected, but ultimately—and I will give credit where credit is due; the previous Labor government was very supportive of this, as were we from opposition—we helped establish oyster hatcheries in South Australia. We now have a number around the state, mostly on Eyre Peninsula, one being combined with an abalone hatchery. In difficult times, people think laterally and often people do not change until they have to, but we are now totally self-sufficient in spat production in South Australia, so that has provided some surety to our oyster growers in relation to a long-term supply of spat. I am thinking that it has probably reduced the cost somewhat too.

The next thing that happened for our oyster growers, our aquaculture industry and many industries, full stop, was the arrival of COVID into Australia and around the world, and of course that impacted people's ability to, in the first instance, go out and eat at restaurants. It also changed the dynamics for those aquaculture producers who were exporting overseas, because the market dynamics changed significantly, not the least being the availability of readily reliable air freight, which

is absolutely necessary for fresh seafood to get to overseas markets, primarily in East Asia but some further to the Middle East and also into Europe.

The member for Hammond spoke about adding value to primary production businesses, and I fully concur with him. Certainly coming from an agricultural background, the ultimate goal for many producers was to be able to add value to their product and increase the profitability of their businesses. That certainly is what some growers have been able to do, and the amendments to this bill will provide an easier opportunity through the cutting of red tape and a more streamlined approvals process for other growers to get the opportunity.

Another thing that happened with COVID is that we saw a lot of intrastate travel, and anecdotally I heard was that on about the June long weekend in 2019 there seemed to be a lift in localised tourism. Certainly, places like Tumbly Bay, Cowell, Coffin Bay, Streaky Bay and out to Ceduna saw an increase in tourists, often from suburban or metropolitan Adelaide, many of whom had not been to Eyre Peninsula. They saw what a delight it is, and I am sure that as a result they will return. So we have had a busy time.

At the same time, other tourist operators, those more reliant on international visitors, saw a significant drop-off in their patronage, and I know that they are still suffering in that light. But we live in a changed world and, like all things, it will pass, but things probably will not ever get back to what we knew as normal and there will be a new normal.

Aquaculture is the fastest growing livestock industry in Australia and is expected to increase in value nationally to \$2 billion by 2027, which is really only six years away, and it is all on the back of increased global demand. South Australia is recognised as a world leader in the ecologically sustainable development of aquaculture and currently has the only dedicated aquaculture legislation of its kind in Australia with our current Aquaculture Act, which we are seeking to amend to allow aquaculture producers, should they wish, to venture into tourism.

I mentioned earlier that it is not just about oysters, but that is the one that comes to mind. Of course, on Eyre Peninsula we also farm mussels. There is now land-based abalone, tuna ranching has developed and little boutique industries, such as tourism industries and dining experiences, have developed around that aquaculture. This will give those the opportunity to expand should they wish—always looking for opportunities.

The tuna industry in Port Lincoln is celebrated by the annual Tunarama event, the first of which was held in 1961, which really celebrates the importance of that fishery to Port Lincoln. Port Lincoln is a fishing town—there is no doubt about that—but primarily it is a tuna town, and it remains primarily a tuna town. Unfortunately, Tunarama was cancelled last year, and I understand that this week there is a meeting of the committee to determine whether the next Tunarama, scheduled for the long weekend in January next year, is to go ahead or not. I am sure they will make the right decision. There will be lots of things to assess, but I am sure they will make the right decision.

We have recently heard that the Oysterfest at Ceduna has had to be cancelled, all as a result of the risk COVID brings to gatherings and celebrations such as these. The Oysterfest celebrates the oyster industry on, in this case, the Far West Coast. Places such as Streaky Bay, Haslam, Smoky Bay and Denial Bay feed into that Oysterfest, with people coming from far and wide to enjoy the products. In a way, I guess that is a tourism offshoot of the oyster industry as well; however, this amendment really is about those who want to develop tourism within their aquaculture site, within the lease they hold.

I am more familiar with Coffin Bay than the other places, although I know them all well now, purely because of my proximity to Coffin Bay and the fact that we often spent summer holidays there as kids. What a delight that was.

It is worth recalling the early days of the oyster industry in Coffin Bay. In the very early days, it was discovered that there was a naturally occurring oyster present in the waterways, the inlets, of Coffin Bay. It is an estuary system with any number of bays and inlets, and an ideal habitat for oysters. There was a naturally occurring oyster known as the angasi that the early settlers stumbled upon and quite quickly began to harvest, using small ketches and sail, dredging the bottom.

Coffin Bay was named after Isaac Coffin, a great supporter of Matthew Flinders and later an admiral in the Royal Navy, becoming Sir Isaac Coffin. It was named not as the result of someone's untimely death during Flinders' expedition but, rather, after a supporter of his. The first settlement

there was known as Oyster Town, and it was just a conglomeration of shanties and seafaring types who dredged the bays and dredged up the oysters.

They put them into wheat sacks, sewed them up, took them by dray overland to Port Lincoln where they went on a ketch to Port Adelaide, where they were sold as a relatively cheap source of protein to the small population that existed in Adelaide at that time. I recall a fellow by the name of Morrie Hurrell, who was the patriarch of a famous fishing family in Coffin Bay. He is long dead now, but I remember him as an old man when I was a boy. He was old enough to have worked on those ketches, dredging for the angasi oysters.

It is probably no surprise to people now viewing it in a historical sense to discover that they actually fished out the native oyster, completely depleted the bays of the angasi oyster. So the industry closed, and Oyster Town eventually became Coffin Bay and the hub for finfish fishing, particularly whiting and other finfish, which found a ready market as well.

It was in the early seventies when the first oyster lease, the first oyster farm, was established in Coffin Bay. It was right within what we call Coffin Bay proper, where the shacks, homes and settlement now is. I remember, as a boy, when it was installed. For many years, it was the only oyster farm in the vicinity and just happened to occur where freshwater entered the saltwater of Coffin Bay and provided this beautiful habitat for growing oysters. They did not farm the angasi, the local native oyster; they actually discovered that the Pacific oyster was eminently suited to the waterways, and grew well. In fact, they are filter feeders and there was an ample supply of nutrients within Coffin Bay, as there are within the other bays around the state.

In around 1990, some others decided to experiment with oysters further out in different waters, still within the Coffin Bay estuary itself, and slowly the industry has grown from there. Interestingly, that very first oyster farm still is in place. It is not a commercial venture as such, but there is a tourist operation working that particular farm now. It is known as Oyster HQ, and they take visitors out onto the farm with waders. I recommend that all should do it if they have the opportunity. You wade out, you shuck oysters, you taste and you hear the history of the industry. It is a great opportunity to see what can be achieved in relation to tourism as it sits within the aquaculture industry.

There are other opportunities, I am sure, for people to expand. Who knows what the future might bring? I fully support any opportunity for streamlining the approvals process, for cutting red tape and giving opportunities to people who really have done the hard yards and established businesses in primary production industries, which is never easy. There is always great expense when establishing these businesses and ongoing expenses. Often, they are labour intensive but the rewards are there and this gives growers another opportunity. Who knows what it might bring in relation to mussels, tuna and abalone in the future?

So I commend the bill to the house. I congratulate the minister on bringing it to the house and look forward to the passage of the bill and the opportunities it will bring, not just for aquaculture producers around the state but, most particularly, in my case at least, on Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:47): Firstly, I would like to thank the speakers on this bill: the members for Ramsay, Hammond, Flinders and, many weeks ago, the member for Chaffey. This is an important bill to enable these aquaculture leases to progress down the path of the opportunity that exists there for tourism. It is very much about making it easier here in South Australia for people to expand into tourism in the aquaculture industry.

At the moment, it is a very complicated process of making sure you get the approvals from many departments if you want to enter this space. Firstly, you need your aquaculture licence to be operating coming from PIRSA; then, if you want to do tourism on there, you may need to go to the EPA; you may need to go to the Department for Environment and Water or the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, where there would be issues around navigation; and you would also need to go to the Attorney-General's Department in relation to planning issues. So this is a very complicated piece of process that needs to be followed through to get these structures in place in aquaculture leases.

We have seen a couple in operation. Being able to sit out on the water eating oysters, having a glass of wine, enjoying the water and enjoying the ambience of where the oysters are grown is a great opportunity. Listening to the member for Flinders talk about his part of the world and the history lessons around Coffin Bay and its naming was a fascinating insight into that part of the world. It is certainly a beautiful part of South Australia and an example of what is available for us in South Australia.

The changes will very much allow us to make sure that we are able to make it easier for these wonderful businesses that are operating out there. Aquaculture is such an important part of the South Australian economy. We have seen significant expansions in this space, particularly in the last 12 months or so, in returns to the economy. There are over a thousand direct jobs involved in aquaculture, plus another 1,500 flow-on jobs that exist for aquaculture businesses operating in South Australia. It is a great industry. It underpins our seafood industries going forward, as we are able to take advantage of the things that we do well, the environments we have in South Australia and what we are able to achieve.

This is just the natural extension, putting facilities out on the tuna cages in the areas off Port Lincoln and being able to have experiences out there watching how the fish are fed and reared through the stages on those tuna rings. There are real opportunities there, such as, as I mentioned, having oysters sitting in the oyster fields. These are wonderful parts of South Australia that we can enjoy, and enjoy to the fullest, by having a simple mechanism for people to go through to apply for these opportunities.

I guess the key thing is making sure that this is simple. Coming to one department rather than many is certainly going to enable people to make sure that they can get through the process. Having to go through the current situation, where you may need to go to multiple departments to get approvals, you may get rejection at one and approval at all the others, which then leads to the frustration of having to go through that process. This will enable us to consolidate all that so that they will find an appropriate way to make sure that we are able to underpin the industry going forward.

The importance, though, is that we do not compromise the approval process as well. It will certainly see the referrals still going through to those agencies of interest. We do not want people just whacking up whatever on the water. It needs to meet the building codes. We do not want people putting toilet facilities out on the water that are not appropriate. They need to meet the EPA requirements. It is making sure that those requirements are still being met but making it so much easier for people as they are making those applications, so that, rather than going to multiple points of entry, they can have a single point of entry.

It is really important that we continue to work with the aquaculture industry as it grows and see what new opportunities are out there. To me, there is a real interest in this space. Currently, we have 12 aquaculture zone policies located in regional coastal areas of the state, including the Limestone Coast, Yorke Peninsula and, in the member for Flinders' area, Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast. As the member for Flinders stated, he certainly has the bulk of the opportunity in this space. The waters there are probably more protected than some of those down on the Limestone Coast, for example, but there is a real opportunity for development.

We also need to make sure that this is a cost-effective way of going forward, ensuring that we do not see a cost burden that is unreasonable. We need to make sure we continue to manage keeping the red tape and the costs down for these areas.

The infrastructure related to these facilities is very unknown as to what is required for these new and emerging spaces. We do not know exactly what people's ideas are going to be coming forward, so we need to make sure that we have the opportunity to understand that and make sure that we can facilitate going forward with those new and exciting opportunities.

We must also remember that we need to make sure that we maintain its importance, that we protect the environment itself and that we do not put risks out there. We need to make sure that there are no navigational risks that are currently covered by others. All those things are part of the process of approval, but we need to make sure as we go forward that we are able to make it easier for people to get these tourism activities up and going. With that, I thank those who made comments in relation to the bill and look forward to it progressing to the next stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I thank the minister for the briefing provided to the opposition. There were some answers provided to questions taken on notice from that briefing, but we would like to have them on the public record so we will be asking some of them again here. In particular, we want to ask about where the push for this bill came from.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I have been informed that it has been driven very much by the current proponents of tourism activities in this space, who have been frustrated by the processes of bringing this forward.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously, this is something we look forward to looking at because, as shadow minister for tourism, the opportunity to provide unique opportunities within our different regions is something we look forward to doing. The questions that I have, and some of the issues that have been raised by the different groups, are: is this bill actually supported by the Environmental Protection Authority? Do they have some concerns and, if so, have those concerns been alleviated?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Thank you very much for the question. Yes, the EPA were consulted and are supportive of this bill. It is very important that we continue to have the EPA involved in this space and that the requirements facing these proposed developments into the future meet the same requirements they would have under the old structures and the need to meet the EPA requirements.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: My concern is, and obviously this is a normal question that we would ask, but there does seem to be, in this instance, more concern because there is a sense of urgency around the fact that this has been brought forward to the house, and as I understand it, there are two operations out there that perhaps this will be retrospective for. Of course, it is important that we make sure that we are crossing the t's and dotting the i's because we would like this to flourish and we would like this to grow.

It is not clear to me regarding the consultation that you have had with different groups. Could you detail the consultation you have had, not just with peak bodies but with conservation groups as well. Also, I am keen to understand if you have had any consultation with local governments.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Thank you for the question. I am informed there has been consultation with the Department for Environment and Water, the EPA, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, and the Attorney-General's Department. There have not been consultations with local governments, as local governments do not cover the water areas in this respect; and no, there has not been any consultation with the NGOs in relation to the environmental groups, etc.

The CHAIR: Final question, member for Ramsay.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I seek some clarification. It is very concerning to me that you have not had any conversations—I think there is an oysters progress association. We obviously have an incredibly active aquaculture industry. In fact, I think you were on radio just yesterday talking about how important it is. Can you just detail again the fact that you have not had any consultation with those peak bodies or associations involved in the industry. You might also detail whether you had any conversations with the Tourism Industry Council of South Australia.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that we did consult with the aquaculture industry itself. It was more around the environmental groups that we had not had consultation with.

Ms MICHAELS: Given the extensive reform of the planning system over a number of years that has really just come into play, why would we, at this point in time, so quickly pull out this sort of development from that entire system?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: The key thing here in part of this piece of legislation is to streamline it to make it easier for these particular circumstances. These are operating in a completely

different space from normal land-based approvals. These are just within the aquaculture zones that are required to be licensed to operate in those aquaculture zones. This is literally bringing everything into that one approval spot. They are seeking to get approval to be operators in the aquaculture space, but they can also now seek, if this passes, to have their tourism approvals, whether it be structural, if that is what they are needing to do. Not everything will require a structure. It is about streamlining it so that everything comes through the one-stop shop.

Ms MICHAELS: For those development things that do require a structure, are you saying the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act does not have a streamlined process after all the reforms?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: It is about bringing all the points of contact to one spot. For anyone wanting to make an application to operate in this space it means that, if they are going to operate in the aquaculture space, at the same time they can apply for aquaculture tourism, which will then go through the assessment process, which includes the building requirements and approval within PIRSA rather than having to go to different agencies. It is all about streamlining for these businesses.

Ms MICHAELS: Can you explain to me how aquaculture zones interact with marine parks and how aquaculture tourism structures have been approved in aquaculture zones to date?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: In relation to marine parks, as I said, there are 12 current aquaculture zones in place. They are areas that are chosen for aquaculture. They take into consideration marine parks and their locations, the environments required, etc. The interaction is as needed, understanding what is there. These facilities and this bill will apply only to aquaculture zones themselves. Can you please repeat the second half of your question?

Ms MICHAELS: How have tourism structures in the aquaculture zones been approved to date?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Currently, the process to get approval is to go to multiple agencies to get approval for all the different things that you might require, whether it be the EPA or the Attorney-General's Department or Planning. It needs to go to all of those different agencies as well as having the aquaculture approvals required under PIRSA. My understanding is that there are currently two in operation.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: In terms of the cost-recovery arrangements, in the written response to opposition questions you stated that currently the minimum development approval fee would be \$1,220 and could be more subject to the cost of the development, as various fees are a percentage of the development cost. In point 3 of the letter to the shadow minister you stated that, by policy decision, these costs will not exceed existing application and annual fees as apply under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. For the public record, can you confirm that the minimum fees for development approval will not increase under this new proposed system, that the annual fees for seabed licences will not increase under this new proposed system, and that there will be no additional type of fee?

The CHAIR: Member for Mawson, we are of course dealing with clause 1, which is the title. It is usual for the opposition to ask questions about consultation. I am prepared to accept it this time. There will be ample opportunity as we go through for members to find the appropriate clause, but the minister can answer that if he wishes.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously, we think this legislation has somewhat been rushed in. I think the intention of it is positive, and I think we have a lot of opportunity in the future to expand the offering of tourism products and services in this field. In fact, I think it is one area where South Australia can stand up very proudly and share what we do with the rest of Australia and the world. Minister, can you talk us through when you envisage this will come into effect, and what lead time is needed to change the processes?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: It is very hard to put a time line on this. It certainly depends on its passage through both chambers. There is also some work that needs to be done on the aquaculture regulations in relation to this that will need to commence immediately on the passing of this bill.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In your second reading speech, minister, you said:

PIRSA will then progressively review all current aquaculture zone policies and consult with industry to determine if any relevant provisions governing aquaculture-associated tourism developments are required and, if so, undertake the prescribed amendment process under the Aquaculture Act.

If this is the situation, how can it then be cost neutral to PIRSA when that level of action is then necessary and required by the department, and how will you resource it within the department?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As part of normal operations within PIRSA, the review of aquaculture regulations occurs, so this can occur within that normal structure of review and assessment of regulations.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As just a clarification on that, when will you proceed with the next review?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that currently the Lower Eyre Peninsula policy is being reviewed. There is no defined time frame on the review of these policies, but it is an ongoing process.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I understand it, while we have our 12 aquaculture zones, there are some pilot aquaculture zones. I stand to be corrected if that is not true. The question I have is: will this be enacted on those pilot zones?

We have said quite clearly that we think this is an opportunity that could be pursued, but obviously those pilot aquaculture zones are pilots because they have not been determined to be ongoing at this point. Given that you can have up to a 30-year lease for some kind of tourism development, there are some concerns over whether that is going to be in a pilot aquaculture zone.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that the pilots are not aquaculture zones: they are pilots and they are not part of that process. Aquaculture zones go through a very rigorous assessment on their establishment, including consulting with different agencies around effects on environment, etc. Anything outside those aquaculture zones is not covered by this bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In clause 4, where it talks about some of the definitions around those industries and parts of this bill, my question is: how many aquaculture licence holders do you anticipate will apply for this tourism development approval? Perhaps within that answer you could talk about how many different businesses already have an aquaculture licence, and therefore how many potentially could be, and how many you expect.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed there are currently 423 aquaculture licences in the marine sector and that, currently, as I stated before, there are only two that have these facilities. It is very hard to anticipate the uptake and, of those 423, how many may wish to enter the space.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just for clarification, how will you make those 423 aquaculture licence holders aware? Obviously, I think this is potentially a very positive opportunity for people to have a unique tourism experience. How will you actually promote this to those licence holders? What is your marketing program? Is this something that your department is putting at the top of its agenda?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Thank you very much for the question. It would be great to see the uptake of this, as it is an important part of getting tourism out into the regions. It is certainly the intent of PIRSA to write to all those 423 licence holders to inform them of the ability to enter this space, including explaining to them how they go through the process of applying if they wish to go into this exciting new area of tourism out in the aquaculture zone.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just for clarification on that, is there a particular officer who will be responsible? I know this is supposed to be a one-stop shop. If one of those 423 licence holders would like to progress a tourism development, do you have someone who is responsible?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: The one-stop shop will be PIRSA's fisheries and aquaculture sector. That will be where they currently have engagement in relation to their aquaculture licence, so it will be the same point of contact going forward if they want to go down the tourism path.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We talked before about the 12 aquaculture zones. My question is about the impact for aquaculture operators who are not in aquaculture zones. Have you considered extending beyond the zones? What is your thinking around the possibility of including aquaculture development in all aquaculture leases?

I have been in this parliament nearly 10 years, and I know the aquaculture zones have had some people who are very supportive and some people who have been concerned about it. Obviously, the intention here is to take a unique industry that we have here and provide a value-add. It is not only a value-add that gives a tourism potential but a value-add to employment in some of those regional areas. With the ups and downs of farming, whether it be aquaculture or wheat or barley, this will potentially provide other streams of cash flow into those operations. Now we are going to have two different models: those that are in aquaculture zones and those that are out of aquaculture zones. That is the nature of our concern and our question.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed about 90 per cent of aquaculture is inside the aquaculture zones, so certainly a strong majority is in those zones. The operators outside those zones will not be covered by this process. They can still go down the path of seeking development approval for any works that they might like to do, but they will not be covered by this one-stop shop. These aquaculture zones have had more scrutiny in their set-up originally. It means that they are able to be put through this process, whereas those outside go through a longer process of getting development approval. It will allow some of those other assessments that will not be required here to be followed.

Ms MICHAELS: I refer to clause 4 and new section 58B, which provides that the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act does not apply to aquaculture tourism development. You talked about the one-stop shop in PIRSA with the fisheries and aquaculture section. What expertise is there in that section to make planning decisions? Now being the shadow minister, it appears planning laws are incredibly complex, and people making those decisions have years of experience in planning laws. You are now dealing with a development that potentially is sitting in a department that does not have the expertise in planning. Can you explain how that would work?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: The process of this is very much that it will be a case management type approach that PIRSA will be conducting. They will not be doing the work that would currently be done by Planning; they will actually be referring it to those people to have it done.

It is about making the point of contact one spot rather than multiple for these organisations so that they can simplify the fact that they are operating in an environment that requires multiple agencies' approvals to go forward. This is about bringing it to one spot where PIRSA will case manage it and get those approvals for them, but it is still going through making sure it meets the requirements of planning.

Ms MICHAELS: How does that work, minister? If it is referring to the planning department for those decisions, yet 58B says that the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act actually does not apply, what legislative basis has the planning department for taking any referrals from PIRSA on that?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that currently under the law development approval is not required in an aquaculture zone, and this will be like for like, so it will not need development approval as such through this process. We do need to make sure that the building of structures is adequate. Under 58 it talks about the need for the buildings to be certified to the standards required, so that will be part of the approval process.

Ms MICHAELS: To clarify, does the building approval you say you will refer to the planning department have a legislative basis for even considering that if we have 58B inserted, which specifically says that the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act does not apply?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that, even though development approval is not required, it is required that buildings are certified and will be signed off by certifiers for those buildings, so it is very much making sure that the structures are safe and built according to the requirements under the building rules.

Ms MICHAELS: I think I will move on to something else. On the same clause, clause 4, what limits are there on the scale of activities that might be caught under this legislation? How can we be confident that it will not allow for some boutique offshore hotel to be developed and that, if we get a different minister, they would be happy to approve it under this legislation?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I thank the honourable member for her question. The key thing in this space is that it must complement the aquaculture activity being undertaken and that it must be taken wholly and solely within the aquaculture zone. It must be ecologically sustainable, and it is there to enhance the experience of the aquaculture lease itself, not to replace or overburden that aquaculture zone with a structure that is beyond delivering the requirements of aquaculture.

Ms MICHAELS: Can the minister explain, regarding new section 58G, why the requirement for newspaper advertisements is now an option and you could actually just advertise on a website rather than in a newspaper?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed it is the same as what is currently in the Aquaculture Act. It is the same process, that it can be advertised either by newsprint or online.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Looking at new section 58F—Concurrences and consents, it provides:

The power of the minister to grant an aquaculture tourism development authorisation, a tourism lease or a tourism licence in relation to certain land is subject to—

- (a) if the land is vested in the minister responsible for the administration of the Harbours and Navigation Act 1993, the requirement under section 15 of that act for the concurrence of that minister; and
- (b) if the land is vested in any other entity, the concurrence of that other entity; and
- (c) the concurrence of any other entity that may be responsible for the care, control and management of the land.

Given that the minister must concur if the land is vested in the minister for harbours, how does it actually streamline the process? The primary industries minister still has to refer to the EPA and get the concurrence of the minister responsible for the harbours act, who is the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. How does this actually streamline the process if this is still a requirement in this situation?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: The purpose of this bill is to enable people to come to one point to make their application. It does not mean that other bodies get ruled out of the process. They will be part of the process, but the one-stop shop is coming to one point of entry to government to make their application rather than having to go to multiple agencies to progress this. It is about bringing it to one point of contact for these tourism opportunities.

The CHAIR: Given that clause 4 is particularly extensive, I am happy to take further questions, if members have any. If not, we can move on. There is no pressure.

Ms MICHAELS: New section 58I talks about the removal of unauthorised developments. How does the minister see that working in practice? When would that provision be used?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Can you please repeat that?

Ms MICHAELS: Under 58I, the minister can direct a person to remove unauthorised developments. How do you see that working in practice? Can you give an example of what that might involve and who would actually do the removal works if the person failed to do that?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: This mirrors the same thing with aquaculture itself, that if unlicensed aquaculture occurs there is the ability to issue a notice for removal. This is to make sure people do not put structures in there that are not approved, and there is a maximum penalty of \$35,000 for people putting in structures that are not to be there. As I said, they can be directed by notice to remove them.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have a question on 58G relating to public notice. Obviously, one of the key things that this bill does is to set out the process by which you can apply for tourism development on an aquaculture lease. You must give notice and publish it on a website determined by the minister or in the newspaper. Paragraph (b) talks about taking into account 'any submissions received in response to the notice within a period following publication of the notice specified by the Minister'. It is curious to me that it says it 'must be at least 10 business days'. Can you share with the house as to why 10 business days was chosen? It seems to me quite a short period of time, given that people might have concerns about different developments.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that under the Aquaculture Act currently it has no time frame at all. The opinion was that there was a requirement to at least put a minimum of 10 days, which is currently the minimum procedure they operate with under the Aquaculture Act to make sure that there is the opportunity for people to respond. They have just mirrored their current practice in aquaculture in the aquaculture tourism space, with a minimum of 10 business days—two weeks. It can be extended in relation to a more complicated proposal.

The CHAIR: Final question, member for Ramsay.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: My question, then, is: do you think it is adequate to put a notice on a website or in a newspaper, given that some of these developments could be quite substantial? We are talking about up to 30 years, and it could be a hotel or it could be a pontoon. So we are talking about a wide variety of different developments. Do you not think that the right thing to do would be to write to other leaseholders in that area, as we have talked about? There were 12 aquaculture zones and if someone was to put up something in Coffin Bay that is new, rather than just having it on a website or in a newspaper—particularly if it is substantial but even if it is not—is this an adequate amount of information for those other leaseholders?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that, under the current Aquaculture Act and the aquaculture leases approval process, prior to public notice PIRSA's procedure is to make email contact with those leaseholders in the relevant zone. They also make contact with the local council, the Department for Environment and Water, the EPA, the Conservation Council and other relevant bodies in relation to any applications. That is the same process that will be followed going forward to inform those people if there are developments going ahead.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Clause 5 is the amendment of section 59, reference of matters to EPA. The bill allows for referral to the Environment Protection Authority to determine whether an aquaculture tourism development or variation should be approved. It does not seem to me that that is clear about what is the threshold for referral. Obviously, the whole point of this bill is that we streamline and have a one-stop shop, although, as is quite clear, often you have to involve quite a few different departments as well. What will be that threshold for referral? My question within that would be how many of the applications you would expect would reach that threshold.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Currently under the Aquaculture Act, the EPA is required to approve all aquaculture licences, and under this it will be required to do the same. There are provisions in the act that, in consultation with the EPA under regulation, you could set up an exclusion process for particular developments the EPA does not require its approval to be given for, but that would be set up under regulations in consultation with the EPA.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: That did not really give me any clarification at all. What we are trying to ask here is what would be the threshold for referral. Given that you are changing quite significantly how decisions are made around tourism developments in aquaculture licence areas, people are very keen to understand when you will be referring. It might be covered in regulations, but I think it would be interesting for people to understand your intention.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Just clarifying, the way this is written is that until those exemptions are in place everything is referred. Until we have the exemptions of what the EPA are happy to go through without their approval, everything has to be referred, but it would be envisaged that there will be some consultation with the EPA to work out what they are happy to allow through because they do not see any risk going forward.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: If I were to sum up the concerns of people, they are about not having the EPA as involved as they have been. That is what we have heard. Can you give some examples of circumstances where you think an approval will be not required from the EPA and why?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I guess the key reason for the EPA involvement is to remove the risks of pollution, as a better way of describing it. Therefore, if there is no risk of pollution, whatever that pollution may be, whether it be the management of toilets, contaminants from food or something that may end up going out to the aquaculture lease—to me, those are the things the EPA would want to be involved in.

It is hard to try to think of all the possible options that may not need their involvement. For example, if it is a glass-bottomed facility, so that you are looking at the lease itself and there is no contact with the lease—you literally walk past and you are gone again—that is a very simple unlikely need for EPA involvement because there is no risk of pollution.

Ms MICHAELS: On the classes being approved by the EPA, how long do you think that process will take and how does it tie in with the commencement date of this bill?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: At this point in time, we currently only have two tourism ventures out there that are operating on these leases, so it is very hard to determine what the requirements will be in the development of those regulations. I envisage that those regulations will be developed in time as more and more of these applications come forward and we have some understanding of the different requirements of the EPA and others in this space.

It is very hard to determine a time frame for regulations, and I think they will be adapting to the developments as they come forward. I do not see the development of those regulations holding up the implementation of the bill itself, as they are things that can be changed as more and more knowledge of the different tourism ventures are brought forward.

Ms MICHAELS: So you would need the classes approved by the EPA prior to the commencement of the bill, or do you not have that intention?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As I said, at this point in time there are only two, so it is hardly worth setting up classes for the structures that are currently before us. But, as we go forward, we are hoping to see growth in this space, so it would be sensible to set up classes going forward.

Ms MICHAELS: Are there any precedents in any other legislation where there are these sorts of classes that can be used as a guideline for coming up with something beforehand so that people are aware of what to expect in terms of EPA referrals?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that under the Aquaculture Act there are classes of development the EPA do not want to see. For example, just splitting a lease in half, they do not care about that process. That is an example of a class where the EPA are not involved. That is an example of class operations.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In regard to reviews, in a previous answer to a question, minister, you said that there are regular reviews of the different aquaculture zones, and I think you said the Lower Eyre Peninsula is currently undergoing one at the moment. While those reviews take place and there is a process for that, when people are looking to invest in tourism and have a development there, they obviously are putting everything together, and one of the things that frustrates them is the time line it takes to get the approval to go ahead. I know that is the ambition here with a one-stop shop. What I do not see in here is some clarity. New section 60(1)(e)(i) provides:

- (i) a decision of the Minister not to grant an aquaculture tourism development authorisation, a tourism lease or a tourism licence under that Part;

It does not give any indication of how long or when you would have to respond to an applicant. Is it 60 days? Is it 90 days? In these situations, and for those of you who have spoken on this bill, people would often have to have some financing, and they would look to engage builders and construction

and potentially even employ people to help assist in the running. How timely will you be in letting people know if it is a green light, or they are unable to go ahead?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Thank you very much for the question. Under the bill, there are some proposals around some of the time frames and earlier we mentioned the 10 business days in relation to public notice. There are some requirements in this on-time time frame, but the intent is that these will be progressed as timely as possible. Under the current aquaculture licence arrangements, depending on how complicated the application is, it depends on the time frames. I am informed that they usually operate on a between six to 12-month approval process for those aquaculture licences.

Ms MICHAELS: On clause 6, the amendment to section 60, is that a review of the decision of the minister by the applicant in terms of basically an appeal to that decision and what body hears that appeal?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Yes, that is correct: it is the applicant making the appeal, and they can appeal to the South Australian Civil Administration Tribunal.

Ms MICHAELS: Do you have any idea of what costs would be involved in that kind of review for an applicant?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that under the Aquaculture Act it is uncommon to the point that we do not have an understanding of any case that has gone through to this process, so I am not sure of the particular costs in relation to going to the tribunal.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: If I can ask the minister for an answer between the houses. No further questions on clause 6.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Clause 7 relates to the public register. Where exactly will this public register be and how will it be accessible?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed that the register will be on the PIRSA fishery and aquaculture website. It is an interactive map, where you can put the licence number in and it will zoom to the location of the particular licence that you are interested in.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 10) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

Members

SENATE VACANCY

Her Excellency the Administrator, by message, informed the Legislative Council that the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia, in accordance with section 21 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, has regretfully notified His Excellency the Governor that, through the death on 29 August 2021, of Senator Alex Gallacher, a vacancy has happened in the representation of this state in the Senate.

The Administrator is advised that, by such vacancy having happened, the place of a senator has become vacant before the expiration of his term within the meaning of section 15 of the constitution and that such place must be filled by the houses of parliament sitting and voting together, choosing a person to hold it in accordance with the provisions of the said section.

*Bills***RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (ALCOHOL AND DRUG OFFENCE)
AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Administrator assented to the bill.

OATHS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Administrator assented to the bill.

*Members***SENATE VACANCY**

The SPEAKER (14:03): I inform the house that I conferred with the President of the Legislative Council and arranged to call a joint meeting of the two houses for the purposes of complying with section 15 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act on Tuesday 21 September 2021 at 10am.

*Petitions***GRANGE BOWLING CLUB**

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee): Presented a petition signed by 432 residents of Grange and greater South Australia requesting the house to take all steps necessary under the Precautionary Principle of the SA Public Health Act to pause the installation of a telecommunications tower at the rear of the Grange Bowling Club, 11 Wilson Court, Grange, until the reports of the World Health Organisation and associated bodies are made public.

*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—

Lease made under the following Act
Adelaide Park Lands—Park Lands Agreement—Park 9—City of Adelaide and
Prince Alfred College
Parliament of South Australia—House of Assembly—Register of Members' Interests—
Registrar's Statement—June 2021 [Ordered to be published]

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Return to Work—Self-Insured Employers
Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia—Prescribed
Public Authorities

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

Electoral Commission of South Australia—State Election Report 2019—Corrigendum
Summary Offences Act 1953—
Dangerous Area Declarations Return Pursuant to Section 83B—Report for Period
1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021

Road Block Authorisations Return Pursuant to Section 74B—Report for Period
1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Disability Inclusion—Restrictive Practices—NDIS

By the Minister for Planning and Local Government (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Planning, Development and Infrastructure—General—Time Periods
Local Council By-Laws—
City of Marion—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Local Government Land
No. 4—Dogs
No. 5—Roads
No. 6—Cats
No. 7—Animal Management
The Corporation of the City of Whyalla—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Local Government Land
No. 3—Roads
No. 4—Moveable Signs
No. 5—Dogs
No. 6—Cats
No. 7—Caravans and Camping
No. 8—Boat Harbors and Facilities

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—General

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. D.K. Basham)—

Management Plan—South Australian Commercial Abalone Fisheries—1 October 2021
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Primary Industry Funding Schemes—
Adelaide Hills Wine Industry Fund—Miscellaneous
Apiary Industry Fund—Contributions to Fund
Barossa Wine Industry Fund
Clare Valley Wine Industry Fund
Langhorne Creek Wine Industry Fund—Miscellaneous
McLaren Vale Wine Industry Fund—Miscellaneous
Riverland Wine Industry Fund—Miscellaneous
SA Grape Growers Industry Fund

Question Time

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier tell the people of South Australia that he expected the parliamentary investigation into the behaviour of the member for Waite at the 2019 Christmas party to continue?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. I made that statement as I was asked the question, and I gave my answer to that. Now we have a ruling that has been made by yourself, sir, and I refer the Leader of the Opposition to that ruling.

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): A supplementary question: why was it the Premier's expectation that the investigation would continue?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): At the time, I thought there was an investigation partially underway, but I think you, sir, have outlined comprehensive reasons for your considered judgement that has been made in the parliament today.

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. As the leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party and a member of the South Australian Liberal Party state executive, does the Premier now support allowing the member for Waite back into the party and his party room?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): That would be a matter for the state executive of the Liberal Party, if an application is made.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, the member for West Torrens is called to order and warned. The member for Elizabeth is called to order.

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. What is the Premier's, as a member of the South Australian Liberal Party state executive, opinion about the member for Waite coming back into the South Australian Liberal Party?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: it is the framing of the question. Standing order 96 invites members to ask ministers questions about public affairs, and the Leader of the Opposition has very specifically excluded any public affairs from the substance of the question by tying it only to the opinion of somebody who is a member of the Liberal Party state executive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left and the Deputy Premier! I am conscious of standing order 96 and I uphold the point of order so far as it was framed in terms entirely outside of the Premier's duties in his capacity as Premier. Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to reframe the question? I will give the Leader of the Opposition the opportunity to ask that question again.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is to the Premier. As the Premier of South Australia and the leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party of South Australia, does the Premier and the leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party have a view about the member for Waite being a member of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): I think I have made several public comments on this issue and I stand by every one of them. The behaviour of the member for Waite in the parliament that evening was completely and utterly unacceptable. This was unacceptable behaviour. The member for Waite is not a member of the joint party room and he is not a member of the parliamentary Liberal Party. He is an Independent member of this parliament.

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier welcome the member for Waite back as a member of the Liberal Party, in his view as the leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): I think the Leader of the Opposition well understands that this is a matter for the state executive of the Liberal Party. We don't—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's work through this slowly for the opposition because they are not that bright today.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The fact of the matter is that the member for Waite is not a member of the Liberal Party. The state executive of the Liberal Party makes a decision if there is an application, and I will not be discussing any state executive matters in this parliament.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. As the Premier of South Australia and leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party, will the Premier express his view on the member for Waite again being preselected as a Liberal Party candidate for the next state election in the seat of Waite?

Dr Close interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): I have made it very clear that the member for Waite's behaviour was completely and utterly unacceptable. He has apologised for this, but that doesn't take away the fact that this behaviour was unacceptable. It has also been found so by the court, although he didn't commit a criminal activity. What we do know is that that behaviour was completely and utterly unacceptable, and I stand by all my public comments in relation to this matter.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the deputy leader.

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Premier of South Australia. Why won't the Premier show some leadership and express a proper view about whether or not the member for Waite should be a member of the Liberal Party and preselected as a Liberal Party candidate?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport! The Minister for Energy and Mining rises on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 97: argument, as the leader knows.

The SPEAKER: The way in which the question was framed might clearly have been seen to provide a premise. I think that the Minister for Energy and Mining is seeking the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Well, I was waiting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I was waiting for you to finish, sir. When will somebody do such and such with an implication and an argument that the member is not doing such and such is outside standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: To the extent that it was a question that was premised on a certain statement of affairs, it might have been seen to be offering argument or opinion. I will give the leader an opportunity to rephrase the question, should he wish, without providing such a premise. Does the leader seek the call?

MEMBER FOR WAITE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Why can't the Premier show some leadership and express a view about the member for Waite's position within the Liberal Party?

The SPEAKER: I will uphold the point of order and I will go now to the member for Flinders.

HYDROGEN

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on projections for the cost of creating hydrogen, and are there any alternative views?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:16): Thank you to the member for Flinders for this important question.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: There are a range of views out there about producing hydrogen. Hydrogen produced by electricity comes from a process called electrolysis. We use electricity to crack water into hydrogen and oxygen. One of the world's largest electrolyzers is under construction in Canada. Hydro-Québec is building an 88-megawatt electrolyser at a cost of \$Can200 million, which is about \$A220 million.

But is there an alternative view? Well, yes, those opposite have an alternative view. The SA Labor opposition is saying that it will buy an electrolyser three times larger than Hydro-Québec's for the same price. That is not even remotely credible. According to the CSIRO, an electrolyser of the size Labor is proposing would cost at least \$326 million. The best-case scenario has Labor \$106 million short of the money needed to deliver its promise.

The price is coming down though, but the CSIRO says Labor's price tag is not expected to be reached until approximately 2030, so it's no wonder that Labor has not released the modelling used or the costings for scrutiny. Labor has, however, released a few paragraphs of modelling assumptions and they make for interesting reading.

Funnily enough, Labor's model claims to use the same capital costs as AEMO's Integrated System Plan, or ISP. That is interesting because the ISP uses the same CSIRO report that I'm referring to for capital costs. So, on the one hand, in their model, apparently all competing projects use verified prices from the CSIRO for electrolyzers but, on the other hand, in their own costings, miraculously it's more than \$100 million cheaper.

So if this report is good enough for their modelling, why isn't it good enough for their secret costings? We have been here before with the dirty diesels, which ended up costing double the price they originally suggested and ended up being independently assessed at \$612 million. Those opposite have form in this area and they are simply proposing to do it all again. Labor would have us believe that they can build a brand-new hydrogen electrolyser and generator, and all the associated hydrogen management and storing facilities, for less money than they spent on their dirty diesel generators four years ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for West Torrens, I call to order the Minister for Innovation and Skills, I call to order the member for Playford and I warn for a second time the member for West Torrens.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Have you ever employed a Tui Comas in your electorate office?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:20): Who, sorry?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Tui Comas.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In my ministerial office?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Your electorate office.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I would have to go back and check my records but, yes, that name has worked in my electoral office, yes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Is Ms Tui Comas related to you by marriage?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:20): By marriage, yes. She is my wife's brother's wife.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. When did Ms Comas stop working in your electorate office?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:20): As I said, I would have to check the records to find the exact dates.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Under what circumstances did Ms Tui Comas depart your electorate office?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:21): I am not really sure about the question, other than I think she got another job.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house if he signed Ms Comas's time sheets to verify the amount of hours Ms Comas was eligible for payment?

The SPEAKER: I will give the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport the call. I am somewhat concerned about standing order 96 at this point.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:21): As the office manager, I would have signed time sheets—as the minister, rather, I would have signed the time sheets—or the member, I should say, and/or the office manager may have signed time sheets as well, from my recollection.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Have any members of his electorate office staff ever alleged with the minister that hours worked by Ms Tui Comas were being fraudulently recorded on time sheets submitted to the Department of Treasury and Finance for payment for hours and days Ms Comas had not worked?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:22): All hours of all people who have worked on my staff are accounted for, like I am sure every other member has in this place. All time sheets are signed in accordance with hours worked.

HYDROGEN

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on the cost of liquefying hydrogen, and are there any alternative views?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:22): I thank the member for Newland for his very important question—and, yes, I can. The government understands the cost of hydrogen products. In fact, we commissioned the Hydrogen Export Modelling Tool, which uses data from the CSIRO and the US Department of Energy, verified with industry, to price all aspects of hydrogen projects.

Hydrogen comes out of an electrolyser as a gas. It can then be compressed and chilled to negative 253° to become a liquid. That requires very expensive equipment. How expensive? Well, in South Korea SK Group recently committed to a hydrogen liquefaction plant of 30,000 tonnes per annum. That plant costs 500 billion Korean won, which is around \$A580 million. Again, there is an alternative view.

Labor's plan proposes 3,600 tonnes of liquefied hydrogen storage at a cost of \$31 million. Well, the export modelling tool says that actually would cost \$71 million. Labor's plan says the tank holds the equivalent of two months' supply of hydrogen power generation; hence, it needs 21,600 tonnes of liquefaction capacity per annum. The export modelling tool said that would cost \$310 million.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Remember the \$580 million South Korean project? That's the closest global comparison we have, and it's just 40 per cent larger than Labor's plan.

That example also verifies that the plant to liquefy Labor's hydrogen will cost around \$310 million, but Labor doesn't include this in the capital costs for its plan. So Labor's plan makes hydrogen, has liquified storage but does not have the plant to turn the gas into a liquid to put it into the storage tank. If anybody doubts this, page 7 of Labor's Hydrogen Jobs Plan states that the total capital cost of their generator and associated hydrogen supply chain is \$593 million. There is no budget in Labor's plan for the \$310 million plant it needs to liquefy the hydrogen.

At its simplest, you cannot liquefy hydrogen without a liquefaction plant. They cost hundreds of millions of dollars and it is absent from their costings. It is like piping natural gas to Gladstone from Moomba, having the LNG export tanker ready to go but not having the liquefaction plant to get it onto the ship. We have been here before with the dirty diesel generators, which ended up costing double, at approximately \$612 million, compared with what Labor originally estimated, and they want to inflict their incompetence again on the taxpayers of South Australia.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Have any members of his electorate office staff ever alleged with him that hours worked by Ms Tui Comas were being fraudulently recorded on time sheets submitted to the Department of Treasury and Finance for payment for hours and days Ms Comas had not worked?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:26): Not to my knowledge, no.

The SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I think I heard the member for West Torrens repeating the answer, but I didn't hear the answer directly from the minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, sir—not to my knowledge, no.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did you or a staff member ever seek to influence a person to record days worked by Ms Tui Comas when she had not worked those hours or days?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:26): Could you repeat the question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did you or a staff member—

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: standing order 104 requires the member to ask his questions of the Speaker, so when he says 'did you' directly to the minister it's out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! Members might be reminded of standing order 104. I uphold the point of order to that extent. It is a point of order that's correctly made. The member for West Torrens might rephrase the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did the minister or a staff member ever seek to influence a person to record days worked by Ms Tui Comas when she had not worked those hours or days?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you for clarifying the question. I have answered this before and every hour that is worked by anyone in my electorate office is accounted for. I am sure it would be the same for everyone in this place for anyone who is employed within their electorate office or any office for that matter.

GOODWOOD/SPRINGBANK/DAWS ROADS INTERSECTION

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on the Goodwood/Springbank/Daws roads intersection upgrade now that major works have been completed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:28): I thank the member for her very important question and we acknowledge that she is a fierce advocate for that project in her local electorate. We know that Labor failed to deliver this after 16 years of government. The member for Elder, in less than four years, has fixed the dogleg, removed the dogleg from this troublesome intersection. For 16 long years Labor did nothing for the people in the south. They had to suffer through this dogleg. The member for Elder gets elected and, bang, this job is done in her first term of a Marshall Liberal government—an amazing achievement.

The 60,000 motorists who use that intersection every day, who were ignored by Labor for 16 long years, had for 16 long years pushed their way through that dogleg, trying to navigate the traffic lights, the tight corners and the unsafe queueing. Shame on those opposite for ignoring those people for so long.

I joined the Premier and the local champion herself, the member for Elder, for this historic occasion on the weekend in the southern suburbs, when the speed limit we announced as of Monday morning went back to 60 km/h for those people who use that intersection—and weren't they happy? The horns were tooting as we were there. It was a great accomplishment. Of course, that ends the major works. There are still some minor works to finish off around that project, but it's delivered months ahead of schedule, much like Regency to Pym, of course, earlier this year.

I will just rattle off some facts about this project because it has been a huge success—first of all, \$61 million to remove that dogleg left by Labor. They left it there for 16 years. We come to government and the problem has been fixed. Some 48 full-time equivalent jobs during construction, with more jobs, people working on the construction site there—48 jobs. The 60,000 motorists—I have

mentioned that already—who use that every day have the member for Elder to thank for this brand-spanking new piece of functioning infrastructure.

The Marshall government continues to invest in projects and we continue to build what matters for the people of South Australia: road infrastructure and infrastructure right across our state, some \$17.9 billion invested in infrastructure in South Australia—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and \$8.8 billion of that is going to roads and public transport and creating jobs in the process. Our investment is a very worthwhile project in that upgrade for the Goodwood/Springbank/Daws roads intersection. It was a notorious problem: 35 crashes, with 11 of them being casualty crashes over the last five years. How Labor saw fit to ignore that for 16 years is beyond me. That said, those on the other side of the house have form in ignoring road projects, especially in our regions.

The Marshall government has invested close to \$3 billion in fixing 4,800 kilometres of roads, the equivalent distance of driving from Adelaide to Brisbane and back again and then to Melbourne as well. That's how much road infrastructure we are improving right across our state. Of course, when we came to government a \$750 million road maintenance backlog was left after 16 years of Labor.

The former Treasurer, the current shadow minister for infrastructure, hated spending money on our roads and he let that backlog build up. Actually, I don't know if he hated spending money on our roads or if he was just incompetent. I don't know which one it was, but either way he did not deliver for the people of South Australia like the member for Elder has. We know that those opposite arc up when we raise this fact, how they let South Australians down for so long, but we are moving on and delivering projects.

Can I also say that, as part of this project, it was great to be with the member for Elder and the Premier again to acknowledge the 100-year anniversary of the first land sales in Colonel Light Gardens, one of the most iconic suburbs in Adelaide. The member for Elder did a great job in gathering her community and celebrating this wonderful suburb in her area. There are still some minor works to finish off. Of course, the member for Elder is working hard on a new public art piece that will go to finishing this project as we build what matters for the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The time for the answer has expired. Before I call the member for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for West Torrens, I call to order the member for Hurtle Vale. I call to order the member for Kaurna.

GIBSON ELECTORATE OFFICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did the minister ever make undertakings to institute changes in his behaviour in his electorate office as a result of mediation by the Department of Treasury and Finance's Electorate Services?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: we on this side have been extremely patient with this line of questioning but it actually is out of order, Mr Speaker. The Treasurer is responsible to parliament for the employment of electorate officers in electorate offices. Standing order 96 also refers to ministerial responsibilities in matters of public affairs, not things like this.

The SPEAKER: I have already—

Mr Picton: A taxpayer-funded office.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Kaurna! I have already indicated my disquiet in relation to standing order 96 as it applied to the line of questioning. I uphold the point of order. The question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order. The member for Mawson is called to order and warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are we allowed to ask questions, sir?

The SPEAKER: Is there a member seconding the call?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You see we have questions. Can we ask them?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir.

GIBSON ELECTORATE OFFICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, with the permission of the Speaker, of course. Did the minister ever participate in mediation between staff regarding his conduct?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: the same point of order as applied to the last question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee on the point of order?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, Mr Speaker. The entire purpose of question time is that the executive government is held to account. We are not talking about the behaviour of a staff member of the minister. We are talking about the behaviour of a minister. If he can't be accountable to this place, then where on earth can he be expected to be held accountable? This is the purpose of the parliament.

The SPEAKER: The relevant standing order—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Elizabeth! The relevant standing order makes clear that questions relating to public affairs may be put to ministers and in circumstances where such questions relate to those matters which, in the opinion of the Speaker, the minister or other member is responsible to the house. The minister relevantly responsible in this regard, it seems to me, is the Treasurer. It's for that reason I uphold the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: standing order 96 very specifically refers to public affairs being the key definition. I think any reading of 'public affairs' would have that the conduct of a minister and the duty of their officers is a public affair that this house should be able to ask questions about.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Kaurna is aware of the procedure available should he wish to deal with the matter another way.

CYBERSECURITY

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister please advise how the Marshall Liberal government is connecting people to jobs, particularly in emerging sectors such as cybersecurity?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:37): I thank the member for King for her question and also for her interest in the new economy in particular. The Marshall government is ensuring there are sufficient skills and actions being taken to address the skills shortages and needs for industry, especially for emerging sectors such as the high-tech sector including cybersecurity.

Last month, the SA Node of AustCyber's national network of innovation nodes held the SA Cyber Connect Talent Jam in partnership with Ribit. I was pleased to have opened the event. Ribit is an online platform that matches the best suited student candidates based on the needs identified by each business with the aim of matching skilled individuals to the right role and company.

Cyber Connect is a curated speed networking event that connects innovative businesses within South Australia with tertiary students and recent graduates to hire for internships, graduate roles and part-time work to build a future talent pipeline. This cyber-focused business-to-student speed networking event was the third year in which the SA Node has hosted such an event.

This year was the first time it was held virtually to ensure that it could provide greater reach and accessibility for both students and employers, whilst also ensuring a COVID-safe environment for this event to take place. Ahead of the event, students were coached on how to pitch themselves to a potential employer. Businesses were given the opportunity to deliver a 30-second pitch as to who they are and what they do before kicking off the one-hour curated speed interviewing session.

Throughout the event, a dedicated group of mentors were on hand to provide support to students and answer any questions they had about working in the industry. Over 40 students were selected to take part, with backgrounds across software engineering, computer science, data analytics, policy and security studies, project management, operations, business, finance, marketing and research.

Employers range from corporations such as EY and CyberCX, as well as some of the many South Australian startups that have established in recent times. The event highlighted the diverse range of employers and career opportunities within the cybersecurity sector, underlying the fact that cyber is needed in every sector, in all workplaces and is underpinning our now digital economy.

This is so important. We know that even a very small business is at threat of a cyber attack, where access could be obtained to banking records, payment systems and false invoices, fraudulent invoices being sent in and passed off as being genuine invoices. We see this happening time and time again, and that's why it is so important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —that these types of activities can be stopped at the front door. That's the role of cybersecurity and why it's such an important part of every business in South Australia. This, of course, is one of the many examples of how the Marshall government is helping connect people and jobs and addressing skill shortages in crucial and emerging sectors here in South Australia. It's not just in those emerging sectors but in those very crucial sectors that we are seeing a growth in pathways such as the social care sector. There is a real revolution happening in that sector as well.

MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Has the member ever been accused by a member of his electorate office staff of physical intimidation?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: these are serious matters, but they are outside standing orders. I say again: the Treasurer is the minister responsible to this parliament for matters of electorate offices, electorate staff and employment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! I have addressed a point of order in relation to a similar question just minutes ago. I uphold the point of order in respect of the question. If the member for West Torrens wishes to seek the call to ask another question, I will give him another opportunity. I make clear that I uphold the point of order pursuant to standing order 96 in respect of those questions.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I heard your new unique ruling, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens.

MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Has any member of his electorate office staff ever informed the member they didn't feel safe in his electorate office as a result of his conduct?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: same point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Every time the member or any of his colleagues asks the same style of question, I will raise the same point of order.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee on the point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Standing order 96 makes it absolutely clear under subsection (2) that questions can be referred to members if they are responsible to the house for those matters. There is no basis on which you can rule that the Treasurer is responsible for the behaviour of the member for Gibson—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —on no basis whatsoever.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I know the Deputy Premier is trying to get me to move dissent in you, sir. I am trying to explain my point of order. There is no basis, sir, on which the behaviour of a minister of the Crown and a member of this place should be held to account via the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He is to be held directly to account by this chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have heard the member for Lee on the point of order. I rule on the point of order. I uphold the point of order. The question is out of order.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:43): I will try again. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Was Ms Tui Comas moved into another electorate office after allegations of falsifying time sheets were made?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Exactly the same point of order again. I am actually becoming increasingly concerned that this ongoing litany of allegations is completely inappropriate as well.

The SPEAKER: I once again uphold the point of order in accordance with standing order 96.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:44): To the Minister for Education: minister, can you please update the house on the impact the Marshall Liberal government's investment in capital works is having on jobs—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The standing orders are quite clear and, in fact, you have just ruled on the same point of order from the Minister for Energy—that questions are to be posed through the minister, not by direct personal pronoun to the minister themselves.

The SPEAKER: We are engaging in an opportunity to consider closely standing order 104. I uphold the point of order. I will, as I gave the member for West Torrens, give the member for Chaffey an opportunity to rephrase. The member for Chaffey might commence the question from the beginning and the member for Chaffey has the call.

Mr WHETSTONE: To the Minister for Education: minister, can you update the house on the impact the Marshall Liberal government's investment in capital works is having on jobs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright!

Mr Brown: Quick, print another one out!

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford! The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Standing order 104: the member for Chaffey seems to be belligerently defying your ruling, sir.

Mr Malinauskas: Come on, Texas, you can do it!

Mr WHETSTONE: Is that the best you've got?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford is warned for a second time. The member for Chaffey is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left! The member for Chaffey has the call.

Mr WHETSTONE: My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the impact the Marshall Liberal government's investment in capital works is having on jobs and on schools?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:46): I thank the member for Chaffey for his question. It's a really important question, and I am very encouraged by the very—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —high level of enthusiasm in the house for the school building program, indeed in Chaffey and around South Australia. There is some very good news in relation to this program because it is creating around the state thousands of jobs and leading a generational improvement in our educational facilities, a \$1.4 billion program of infrastructure works, indeed a

much more substantial program of infrastructure works than ever embarked upon or even promised in the latter stages of the dying days of a 16-year government.

It is an extraordinary investment by South Australia's government because we want to see our schools be world class. We want to see our students and our young people given every opportunity to learn in facilities that are designed for the curriculum to be taught in the way that we now teach the curriculum. There are more than a hundred projects around South Australia and more than five new schools being built, four of which will be in action on day one next year for 2022 and the fifth for the beginning of the 2023 school year.

Indeed, 18 of these projects have already been completed, and that's fantastic news for those schools, many of which are already using the facilities. I understand that at Brighton Secondary School the facility is complete and the students in year 8 will be moving into it at the beginning of term 4 so that they can have the opportunity to experience it, and it will be available for all the year 7s and 8s next year.

In the member for Chaffey's own electorate, the building works at Renmark High School are complete, a \$5.17 million project. I know from when I visited with the member for Chaffey that that school is very much looking forward to being able to occupy those new spaces, as are the students and the teachers at Loxton High School. Their \$5 million project is going to be complete before the end of this year.

Significantly, again in the member for Chaffey's electorate, there is the \$17.8 million capital works program to bring together the two campuses of Glossop High School into Berri to become from year 7 to 12, with 800 students in Berri—the Berri Regional Secondary College as it will become known because, as it turns out, you can't call a school Glossop High School when it's in Berri. The school there is in fantastic shape. Its construction is very nearly completed and students from around that district will enjoy those state-of-the-art facilities. The leadership of the school has done great work.

Around South Australia, other projects have been completed at Balaklava; Blackwood; Brighton; Ceduna; Strathalbyn; Hallett Cove; Port Adelaide at the LeFevre High School, which was the first one to be completed; Mount Barker; Parafield Gardens; Plympton; Renmark; Salisbury; Victor Harbor; Willunga; and Wirreanda. Special options programs infrastructure worth \$1 million has been completed at Kadina, and half a million dollars at John Pirie in Port Pirie, which will complement very well the very substantial works underway at Port Pirie.

Across South Australia there are dozens and dozens of other schools already using facilities from part-completed projects, because many of these schools are seeing not just one new building or one refurbished set of classrooms: they are seeing a number of builds, and as those staged works complete the schools are able to use them.

It is a massive body of work, and I commend all the architects and builders who have been involved in it. I commend those in the schools who have done it, I commend those who have created jobs and I commend the Treasurer and the Premier for having the vision to invest in education a record \$1.4 billion capital spend. We have never provided more support to our schools, and our teachers and our education workforce have never done better work for our students. I commend them all.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for West Torrens, I warn the member for Hurtle Vale.

MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:50): My question is to the Premier, representing the Treasurer in the house. Can the Premier ask of the Treasurer whether the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport ever made undertakings to institute changes in the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport's behaviour in the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport's electorate office as a result of a mediation conducted by the Department of Treasury and Finance and Electorate Services?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): Yes, I am very happy to follow up on that matter.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford can leave for the next 15 minutes pursuant to standing order 137A.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:51): My question is to the Premier, representing the Treasurer. Can the Premier inquire of the Treasurer if the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport has ever been accused by a member of the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport's electorate office staff of physical intimidation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): I am happy to make that inquiry. I also point out to the opposition that there is this other house; it is just down the corridor and it's called the Legislative Council. That's where the Treasurer is at the moment, and they have members of their own party who sit in that house who would be very welcome to ask him directly themselves this afternoon.

COMAS, MS T.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:51): My question is to the Premier, representing the Treasurer. Can the Premier inquire of the Treasurer if Ms Tui Comas, an employee in the then Mitchell electorate office, was moved into another electorate office after allegations of falsifying time sheets were made against the then member for Mitchell?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:52): I will refer that question—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the Treasurer in the other house. If there are any other members, maybe on his own side, and some of their inappropriate behaviour that he would like me to ask the Treasurer about, I will do that at the same time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There have been some matters in the media recently regarding unacceptable behaviour in electorate offices—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for West Torrens will leave for the next 15 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Premier was yelling again and, in doing so, breached standing order 127, making personal reflections on other members.

The SPEAKER: I must confess, member for Lee, I did not hear any such personal reflection. The Premier is in the course of providing his answer. If there is anything the Premier might reflect on in that regard, he has an opportunity to do so. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. The member for West Torrens was asking questions about the member on our side of the house and asked me to make inquiries of the Treasurer. I was just asking the member for West Torrens whether he had any other members in this house he would like me to make inquiries about regarding their behaviour, their electorate offices.

There have been quite a number of issues canvassed in the media in recent times regarding the behaviour of members of the Australian Labor Party, the opposition, who reside on the opposition benches. If he would like me to make inquiries regarding those people, then I am more than happy

to do so. I would also be very happy to make inquiries of the member for West Torrens' behaviour. Of course, we have seen some of his behaviour canvassed by the ICAC commission previously.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They talked about some of the terrible behaviour and language used—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in the course of his work as a minister of the Crown.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Standing order 127 again: this is not an opportunity for the Premier to unreasonably slander another member, particularly when they are not in the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right! Standing order 127 certainly constrains the minister's answer. Digressions, including personal reflections, are disorderly. I remind all members of that fact. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There have been media reports in recent weeks about behaviour or activities within electorate offices. Light comes to mind and Badcoe, Reynell are electorate offices which have had stories in the media regarding the behaviour within those electorate offices, and I am happy to make that inquiry—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on behalf of the member for West Torrens.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: These things probably need to be fully investigated.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Premier is now seeking to smear a whole range of other MPs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker, in your previous rulings—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I haven't finished.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: I ask the member for Lee to withdraw that comment and apologise.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No. No, I won't.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned for a second time. The member for Mawson will cease interjecting. The Premier rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, sir. I take offence at the assertion from the member for Lee, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise for that comment.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Nothing to withdraw and apologise for, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will be aware that the test in these circumstances is a subjective test. The Premier having taken offence, I ask the member for Lee to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker, I am sorry, there wasn't a remark to withdraw and apologise for. I said the Premier is seeking to slander other members. I had preceded that remark with repeatedly raising a breach of standing order 127 about the Premier reflecting on other members. I am sorry if he is offended by that, but I am not withdrawing it and I am not apologising to him.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting. The member for Lee I am asking to withdraw that remark, the Premier having taken offence, and in circumstances in which the relevant test pursuant to the standing order is a subjective one.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am sorry, sir—not even the most precious of people could have been offended by that. There is nothing to withdraw and apologise for.

The SPEAKER: In the circumstances, the member for Lee will leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Are workers being flown in from New South Wales or Victoria to work on the Gawler rail electrification project despite the current risks involved with allowing people to enter South Australia from these other states?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:58): All the decisions with regard to exemptions for essential workers are made not by ministers but they are made, of course, by SA Health. We've got very strict protocols in place. We do have level 6 restrictions in place with other jurisdictions. Therefore, if they are essential workers, those applications for an exemption to those current restrictions are passed through to SA Health. They have an exemptions committee which meets, and they make a determination.

If they do see fit to grant an exemption, and this of course occurs in certain circumstances, they develop a risk mitigation strategy for those essential workers, and that is a matter completely and utterly for SA Health. We don't interfere in that process. Of course, we do from time to time support applications from people who are making that application because there are projects, but ultimately we don't have any say.

Sometimes the exemptions are granted and sometimes they are not. We don't dispute that, of course. I think it is only right that we continue to have this separation with regard to the exemptions process. It has worked very well for us over a long period of time, and I expect it will continue to stay in place for some time to come.

GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): Supplementary question to the Premier: I appreciate the Premier outlining the processes associated with exemptions, but the question being put to the Premier or to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport is: are there any workers being flown in from New South Wales or Victoria to work on the Gawler electrification process?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): I will make an inquiry and come back to the house.

EXPORT PROGRAMS

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall government is enhancing export programs in South Australia?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:00): I thank the member for Kavel for his question. He has taken me to many businesses in his Adelaide Hills electorate and, of course, they are very interested in growing their business, and one way they are wanting to do that is through exports.

The member for Kavel has been very interested in what our merchandise export figures have been over recent months. Back in April, we exported \$12.5 billion worth of merchandise exports. Then, in May, it increased to \$12.6 billion, and for the 12 months to June it increased to \$12.8 billion. Just recently, in the 12 months to July a record \$13 billion worth of merchandise exports was exported out of South Australia to the world. That is a fantastic result, bringing money into the South Australian economy. In fact, it's 18.6 per cent up compared with the year to July 2020.

It's really good work by our South Australian exporters and a credit to them. They have had to battle some really challenging economic conditions. They can't travel overseas, so they have had to use other means to get access to markets, whether that's through our trade offices or their own logistic methods. Compared with nationally, we are up 19 per cent and nationally the value of overseas exports was up 9.1 per cent, so again South Australian businesses are exporting above the trend.

That export is in various forms. Whether that's tuna into Japan, whether that's copper into China or even vegetables into Vietnam, they are all contributing to the success of South Australia and putting premium South Australian produce onto the plates of people around the world. Of course, this is helping to employ more South Australians than ever before, which is a fantastic result. Our aim is to continue to help South Australian businesses to grow so they can in turn employ more South Australians and grow their businesses.

As I mentioned, there are some real challenges and headwinds exporters have faced in terms of international travel, but no more so than in the member for Kavel's electorate in terms of bushfires and the challenges that has brought as well. Pleasingly, I went to Golding Wines, one of the great wineries in the Adelaide Hills. I was there with Darren Golding and a number of other Hills wineries: Longview wines, Tomich Wines, and the Watkins family wines to congratulate them and 16 South Australian wineries in all on participating in our US Market Entry Program, which we are running in conjunction with Wine Australia. This helps them concentrate and grow their exports into the massive US market.

There are complexities involved in this, and we got to talk through some with those wineries on the day. The US market has the three-tier distribution system, and the 50 states effectively make it 50 different markets. This US Market Entry Program will help them understand what the compliance is, what the regulations are, even the marketing, what the price points are, what PR things they could do and even the logistics to try to get them into this very lucrative US market.

Our trade offices in the US will also assist them, whether that's in Houston or in New York, to get them in front of those importers and distributors, which is key to being able to successfully export wine into the US. This is a fantastic initiative. It's the first initiative in our \$5.4 million Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program announced in this year's budget, helping South Australian wineries to export to the world, which in turn helps grow their business and create jobs here in South Australia.

HANLON, MR J.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:04): My question is for the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General have a conversation with Sandi McDonald in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions regarding the ex officio prosecution of Mr John Hanlon, reported in the media today?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:04): No.

HANLON, MR J.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:04): My question is for the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General have the conversation with anybody in the Director of Public Prosecutions' office regarding the ex officio prosecution of Mr John Hanlon?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:05): I think I have answered this before, that I have briefings

from time to time from the DPP. We have regular meetings, at least once a month, in relation to his area, and most recently that has been in relation to Operation Ironside and what resources his division may need. So, yes, I do meet regularly with him and, in relation to individual cases, that's a matter for him or his department.

HANLON, MR J.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (15:05): My question is for the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General refer a complaint from the Office of Public Integrity regarding Mr John Hanlon?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:05): This is very much like a question I have already answered in parliament over the last couple of months. For reasons which are well known to the member, I can't answer that question.

RED MEAT AND WOOL GROWTH PROGRAM

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:05): My question is for the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering the \$7.5 million red meat and wool program and how this is creating job opportunities and growing the economy.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:06): I thank the member for Hammond for his important question. Certainly, his electorate is part of the sheep and beef country of South Australia, and we are seeing the rebuilding of the Thomas Foods abattoir occurring in his electorate—a fantastic facility being built there that will not just serve South Australia but will see also cattle coming probably down from Queensland and the Northern Territory to be processed here in South Australia

The \$7½ million that is being put towards the red meat and wool program is very much to boost herd and flock sizes and help farmers be more productive and profitable. We are seeing that, particularly following the drought periods, there have been challenging times facing farmers in rebuilding their herds, and there have been some programs run by PIRSA to help people understand how best to rebuild their herds.

It's not a simple thing of just breeding your stock numbers up; you actually need to do it in a way that is sustainable and giving you an income on the way through. Helping farmers have those strategies to rebuild their herds is giving a long-term opportunity for these farmers to be supporting the South Australia economy.

The red meat and wool industry in South Australia has the largest manufacturer employer numbers of over 30,000 jobs in this sector. There are 950,000 head of cattle, and more than 11 million sheep are producing 57 million kilograms of wool annually in this state, with a total processing value of \$2.4 billion and \$1.5 billion in exports. There have been significant challenges with the declining stock numbers and the high cost of production and the challenging access to certain market requirements.

Working with the industry, we are meeting those challenges. We are trying to give the opportunity for these farmers to actually take advantage of getting into the premium markets and making sure they meet the requirements of those markets and supply premium cattle and sheep to those markets. That's why we are encouraging traceability in saleyards through the installation of electronic identification technology so that we can better control the data management and make better decisions in relation to those cattle.

We are also encouraging agtech and the adoption of agtech down at Struan. We are very much focusing on livestock, and the opportunities that are there within the livestock industries, to actually improve the output of those properties and see that we are able to be a sector that is able to deliver for the South Australian economy and the South Australian people.

KANGAROO ISLAND PLANTATION TIMBERS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:09): My question is to the minister for forestry. Can the minister inform the house if Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers will begin burning timber on Kangaroo Island this week?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:09): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. It's a very challenging situation that we have on Kangaroo Island, where we have an access issue in relation to getting timber off the island. It's certainly been an issue that we have been aware of for many, many years. When these plantations were planted, there was not much foresight about how the timber was to be got off the island, and the challenges are still there. It is something that we are continuing to have to work on to make sure that we are able to maximise those opportunities.

We are working with the federal government to see whether there is an opportunity for them to support the timber that was damaged on the island by the fires, to get that off using a support scheme similar to the one they operated in burnt timber areas in the Eastern States, in Victoria and New South Wales. We are continuing to negotiate with them in this space to make sure that we are able to get that timber to market.

The most important thing is there is a great asset sitting there on the island. The opportunity is certainly there to bring that timber to market. There are potential buyers out there. We have had numerous conversations with those potential buyers who would like to assess that timber. We have seen KIPT themselves put an expression of interest out for people to clear their land, which includes the opportunity for that timber to be harvested in that process. We are working with KIPT to see what opportunities there are. We will continue to do so.

There is certainly the expectation there will be some burning of some residues on the island, as is normal practice with forestry. There is also some timber, which was damaged to the extent that it has no economic value at all, that may need to be burnt, so I imagine there will be some opportunity for that timber to be burnt. Also, the big challenge about burning timber is that it has to be dry enough to burn. You can't just pull a tree down and burn it; they don't burn efficiently. The opportunity for timber to be burnt is very limited at this point in time.

We will continue to work with KIPT to maximise the opportunity. Particularly in the structural timber space, there is a real opportunity to bring that to market. There is huge demand out there for that timber within the building sector at the moment. We will do what we can to bring that timber to market and we will continue working with KIPT and the interested parties in this space.

KANGAROO ISLAND PLANTATION TIMBERS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:12): My question is to the minister for forestry. How much of Kangaroo Island's timber will be burnt and lost over the next three weeks?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:12): As minister, I am not responsible for KIPT's actions, but my expectation is that there will be no timber burnt in the next three weeks or lost to the market because I think it's outside the KIPT application that's been made. They are looking for people to tender to clear this land, so to see that timber burnt prior to that would be very surprising because it's outside the expectations of KIPT themselves.

KANGAROO ISLAND TIMBER

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:13): My question is to the minister for forestry. What progress has the minister made as to grants that were applied for and discussions with the federal government regarding transport fuel subsidies in order to get the timber off Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:13): I thank the member for his question. As I have previously stated in a previous answer, we are continuing to work with the federal government in relation to support to get timber off the island. They are going through their processes and having a look at this.

This is something that was only offered to the Victorian and New South Wales firegrounds in relation to moving timber to different sawmills. The sawmills that the timber was normally allocated for in those particular states were damaged by fire and weren't able to process, so there was support given to move it to alternate mills. We have approached the federal government for some support to move damaged timber here in South Australia and we are waiting on the federal government to make a commitment.

KANGAROO ISLAND WHARF FACILITY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:14): My question is to the minister for forestry. Minister, you have just indicated that New South Wales and Victoria had an allocation for support. However, on 30 June 2020, the federal government announced \$10 million for the Salvage Log Storage Fund to establish storage facilities for fire-affected salvage logs in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. My question is: how much of the \$10 million allocated to South Australia for salvage log storage has been used to assist timber plantations on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:15): As I stated before, the question that we have been having with the commonwealth is in relation to the transport getting the timber off the island. The opportunities for storage of timber on the island are extremely limited. KIPT is storing some of that timber currently in one of their dams, but it has very limited storage. It certainly can't store significant amounts at all. So we are working with the federal government to get some transport assistance to get that timber off the island.

KANGAROO ISLAND TIMBER

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:15): My question again is to the minister for forestry. Is the minister aware of any alternate proposals that have been put to either himself or his department around the potential conversion of unused timber into chip which could then form the fuel of a biomass plant for Kangaroo Island supplying electricity to residents and industry in Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:16): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. Yes, we are aware of some other particular options, including that KIPT themselves were awarded a grant to progress down this path. My understanding is that it was \$5 million paid by the federal government. My understanding is that their intention is to repay the \$2½ million that I believe they have already received, as they are no longer progressing with that as a project that they wish to proceed with.

LOT FOURTEEN

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:17): My question is to the Premier. What can you tell the house about the proposal for a new cooking school at Lot Fourteen, replacing the International College of Hotel Management and Le Cordon Bleu school at TAFE's Regency Park campus now that a high-tech cyber education centre is being considered instead of the new culinary facility?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:17): I thank the member for the question. In the lead-up to the last election, we were very keen to move the culinary school which is down at Regency Park, which has had an excellent reputation over a very long period of time, into the centre of the city. When that facility was created, it was really cutting edge. It now, of course, has many competitors in capital cities right around the world and doesn't, I think, compete favourably with some of the other sites around the world which are closer to accommodation and closer to CBDs.

We therefore prioritised the move into the city. Since that time, with the closure of borders, the viability of this sector has been significantly undermined. The vast majority of the people at some of those colleges were students who came in from overseas, so it has stalled the negotiations with regard to bringing that project forward. Our primary goal as the new government is to get as many people employed as possible and to get as many people trained for future industries as possible at the moment.

Therefore, we have been considering what alternatives there would be that would create jobs and training opportunities a lot faster. We are still very committed to making sure that we can improve the amenity of the various excellent schools which are based at Regency Park, whether that be at Regency Park itself or whether it be on an alternative site. I don't have anything further to update on that at the moment, but I will make inquiries to check on any further developments with regard to this. We are very keen to see Lot Fourteen develop and to develop in a way that will create as many jobs as soon as possible.

You would have heard earlier today the Minister for Innovation and Skills talk about the great demand for cyber jobs right around the world, right around Australia and, of course, here in South Australia. You would have seen yesterday the announcement that Deloitte will be establishing a very

much expanded office here in South Australia, and a lot of that is around those digital opportunities, those cyber opportunities.

I think that would be something we are considering to move on much faster ahead of the opportunities around hospitality and culinary excellence, but we still remain committed to making sure that we can offer a quality product here, especially as international students return.

LOT FOURTEEN

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:20): Can the Premier then confirm that the 2018 election promise will be a 2022 election promise?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:20): I think I just went through the deliberations with regard to that. I think cyber is the focus at the moment—well, jobs that are immediately available are the focus at the moment, but we do still remain committed. I think the courses that are down at Regency Park are excellent. I think the facilities there are excellent. They are not attracting the international students in the numbers they previously did, and this is really undermining the viability of co-contributions from the private sector to new facilities.

Ms Bedford: You said it was tired in 1970.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Florey!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I've answered the question, sir.

BLACKWOOD COMMUNITY RECREATION CENTRE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Education. Minister, what action are you and your department undertaking to support the Blackwood recreation centre in their lease negotiations with the City of Mitcham?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:21): I thank the member for the question. I do actually have some information about this issue, which I understand has certainly had some social media attention in recent weeks, and I have had some correspondence as well.

Just for members' interest, the Blackwood Community Recreation Centre was constructed on the Blackwood High School site, which I guess is the key relevance to why the education department is involved. It was constructed by the City of Mitcham, funded by council, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, the local community centre and other contributors from the local community. The contribution the Department for Education made was in providing the land.

The centre is a joint use facility. A portion is available for use by the school during school hours; indeed, otherwise it is a centre for the community. The community and the school have separate access points into the building. The structure of the way it works at the moment is that the department leases the centre to the City of Mitcham, which in turn subleases it to the Blackwood Community Recreation Association, which I understand is the group on whose behalf the member asks the question. That recreation association is responsible for the day-to-day management and operation of the centre.

The agreement commenced in 2004. It was a 15-year agreement, expiring in February 2019, and there were three further 15-year options to renew all based on the same terms and conditions as the original agreement and, having expired in February 2019, those options hadn't as yet been exercised in my understanding.

The department's responsibility has been by contributing towards the operating costs, to reflect that there obviously is a certain level of use by Blackwood High School. The council has been responsible for structural and capital maintenance of the centre, and the recreation association has been responsible for breakdown and preventative maintenance.

In 2019, there was a request from council that the department agree to amend the lease agreement and increase the contribution by the department to the costs of the centre. The council and the recreation association at that time identified that they thought the department should take on a higher level of responsibility.

The school is probably the single largest user, but I have asked for some exploration of the usage by the school, as opposed to the community, because I understand that at a recent meeting the council have determined that they would like to make an annual payment to the BCRA of \$24,000, indexed to CPI for 15 years, and that would see them terminating their existing sublease.

The resolution was made subject to the execution of the lease between the department and the BCRA for the use of the centre. At this time, my understanding is that the department hasn't been formally notified by council of that decision, although obviously information has been available. I think the member has written to us and there has been social media, as I said.

We are unclear as to what the residents' association's position is in relation to the decision council has made, whether they will request further discussions with council to seek a change in position. I guess in the interim the existing lease arrangements continue, and there will be no interruption to the use of the facility by the school or the local community. When the council makes their formal approach with a proposition, the department and the government will give due consideration to that approach in the best interests of the taxpayers of South Australia and students, in this case, at Blackwood High School.

Grievance Debate

MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:25): It is always amazing what falls in someone's letterbox. It is always amazing what we find out. But what has been consistent is the allegations made about a certain member's behaviour. Whether it is constituents in his electorate complaining about an infrastructure project they are unhappy about, there are allegations of bullying and harassment. Whether it is volunteer sporting organisations that wish to see the member and talk to him about grants or changes to grants, there are accusations of bullying and intimidation.

Now those accusations of bullying and intimidation have grown into accusations of falsifying time sheets. That event, that allegation, if proven, will have serious consequences not just for the minister but for the government. The opposition does not raise these allegations lightly. We have done our research. We have had this information for a while and have been preparing for this question time for a number of weeks.

The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport is accused of a number of things: he is accused of bullying and intimidating; he is accused of falsifying time sheets. I ask members to reflect on the first question I asked the minister. The first question I asked him was: have you ever employed Tui Comas? The reaction on his face was as if, 'Gee, who's that?' The next question was: is Tui Comas married to your wife's brother? Yes. If my sister-in-law worked in my office, I think I would remember that.

But of course what we have now is accusations of mediation being implemented by the Department of Treasury and Finance Electorate Services on the conduct of the minister. My understanding is that at mediation the minister agreed to alter his behaviour because of the mediation. He did not. I also understand that time sheets were falsified. That is the allegation. The minister has denied that in this parliament.

I suspect there may be other bodies interested in asking him similar questions, where he will not have the Minister for Energy and Mining or a Speaker or anyone else to shield him from answering those questions under what I think is quite an obscure ruling, which says that ministers are not responsible for their actions to the House of Assembly. However, I will wait for the precedence—which other parliament in the commonwealth allows a minister not to answer questions about their own conduct.

I have to say that in this position we are given a lot of public trust. Our global allowances are substantial. There are people in this parliament who have been forced to resign from their political parties who are facing accusations for the same thing the minister has been accused of. There was an unbelievable defence of the minister, yet I have not seen that same defence of the other members who are now sitting on the crossbench. I would ask those members to ponder the difference in treatment from a minister to a backbencher who is basically facing the same accusations. I suppose it depends on who you know rather than what you know.

If these allegations are proven, the minister will have to resign. The minister will have to answer to these accusations and, hopefully, they will be either disproven or proven and the parliament will know. But the idea that this parliament can be censured in any way in asking ministers of the Crown questions about their conduct in their electorate offices—well, then we have no role as an opposition. The idea that we cannot ask a minister if they physically intimidated a member of their staff—this is not just bullying and harassment; this is now to the level of physical intimidation. If those allegations are true, that member does not belong in this house, let alone in the ministry.

I have heard from a number of members of his constituency about behaviour that I think is appalling, absolutely appalling. What does the Premier do? The Premier tries to deflect by attacking other people—which is typical of his conduct—rather than actually dealing with the substance of the argument. Are these allegations true? What will the Premier do about these allegations? Will he now launch an independent investigation? I think the answer to all those questions is that he will do nothing.

The Premier must launch an independent investigation. He must refer this for independent investigation—and not by someone who answers to the Premier but by an independent statutory officer who has the power to call for evidence and compel witnesses to give evidence as public officers. Until that occurs, we will never get to the truth of what happened in the Mitchell electorate office.

Time expired.

KING ELECTORATE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:30): I rise to update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering for the people of One Tree Hill and protecting our local King community by installing a permanent generator in the One Tree Hill township. This is a major win for our local community in One Tree Hill, thanks to the Marshall Liberal government and the advocacy of local community members.

The installation of the permanent backup generator will occur by the end of the year—a critical need that had been ignored for over a decade by the Labor government. The Minister for Environment and Water advised me that SA Water will connect a permanent generator at the One Tree Hill water pumping station. This will, importantly, allow the backup generator to automatically come into operation in the event of a power outage—very important during bushfire threats.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

Ms LUETHEN: I hope the leader will stop yelling at me once again and allow me to continue. Since 2011, there have been over 100 power outages experienced by the One Tree Hill community, during which residents have no access to water. The permanent generator will also mean that residents will have greater accessibility to water during bushfire scenarios, reducing the risk to residents.

The One Tree Hill Progress Association and residents of the local community have been lobbying for this important change for over a decade, and I give my thanks to these groups for their advocacy and for bringing this issue to my attention so that I could work with the government to deliver a solution. In January 2021, I convened a meeting to identify a solution with key stakeholders, including the office of the Minister for Environment and Water, the office of the Minister for Emergency Services, SA Water, the CFS, the One Tree Hill Progress Association, and the City of Playford.

At this meeting with key stakeholders, the problem and solution were clearly identified, and we now have a fully funded plan due to be finished by the end of the year. I thank each of the attendees for their contribution and collaboration, which resulted in a very positive outcome. As your local member, it is my highest priority to ensure that your views are heard and critical projects like this one are delivered.

On another note, I recently had the opportunity and real pleasure of attending the Golden Grove Primary School term 2 assembly, presenting eight students with kindness awards. I would like to thank Golden Grove Primary School for going above and beyond to look for opportunities to recognise students who are kind. Golden Grove Primary School awards students in every year level for outstanding kindness. Thank you for giving me the opportunity at the end of each term to recognise students who display wonderful acts of kindness, and thank you to school principal Wendy

Moore for her excellent leadership and commitment in recognising and encouraging kindness in the school.

At the recent assembly, most of the recipients told us they won the award for helping friends and standing up for others. The students who received the recent kindness awards were as follows: Saxon Spicer, Daniel Avendano, Zali Lawrence, Abby Thorn, Keira Johnson, Harry Hernen, Mason Campillo and Riley Perger. Congratulations to the recipients: your award and recognition are well deserved.

At the assembly, there was a group of students who sang a song reinforcing that 'you have a voice'. This made me cry because that is why I entered politics—to give young people in our community a voice. I also offered a challenge to think about how we could become the kindest place to live in the world. After being voted third best livable city, why can we not also be the kindest Last weekend, we were acknowledged as the kindest place in Australia. We are on our way—how beautiful. I look forward to recognising kindness across the King electorate. Thank you for this opportunity.

SUPERLOOP ADELAIDE 500 INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:34): I rise today to talk about the revelations of the Budget and Finance Committee yesterday. Most disturbing is that a fire sale is to take place next week, an auction for the infrastructure items of the Adelaide 500. Let us remind ourselves that we are 193 days away from the state election, and there is a very clear difference between Labor, which will bring back the Adelaide 500, and Steven Marshall, who has axed it.

Why are you selling the infrastructure now? You made this decision, and thousands upon thousands of South Australians have knocked down my door, knocked down the opposition's door, saying, 'No. We love this event, bring it back.' Let us remind ourselves that in 2019 there was \$45.9 million in economic impact involving more than 450 full-time equivalent workers, not to mention nearly 15,000 accommodation nights. So next week you can bid for a pit building, a shade structure, track infrastructure and operational infrastructure for the Adelaide 500.

How much will this fire sale make? How much do they expect to make? Those questions were not answered. What this is is the Premier sabotaging the opportunity for the Adelaide 500. He is saying, 'Even though we know people love this event, even though we know we are going to an election, we are going to sell it anyway.' We are committed to bringing back the Adelaide 500, but this decision is vandalism and we called it out, and we said it true.

Another thing we could not find out about is how much it cost to cancel Supercars in 2021. We asked the question: did we pay more to cancel Supercars than it would have cost to hold it? Even then the Tourism Commission would not give us their understanding, and that concerns me. How much did we pay Supercars for cancelling the event? Own up to it and tell South Australians.

What was very disappointing was the lack of preparation for the Budget and Finance Committee. I have never been at a committee where so many things were taken on notice. 'Is the name of the Adelaide 500 still registered, and who owns the name?' 'I don't know. We have to take it on notice.' 'How much did it actually cost for the annual storage of this infrastructure, the infrastructure we have to sell off?' 'I don't know. We will take that on notice.'

When we asked what was the decision process to flog off the Adelaide 500 merchandise, we heard that some of it has gone to an archery club and we heard that the overpasses have been part of sponsorship, but there were no answers about this process. 'How did you make this decision about who was going to get this merchandise?' It was unbelievable that these questions could not be answered in a parliamentary committee session.

Maybe we would expect that with more recent events that have been announced, questions asked about them could be answered. When talking about Bloom—which is now quite a wilted festival or a wilted collective—we asked, 'How much did it cost to launch it?' 'Don't know. We will take that on notice.' 'How much was the cost of the exclusive lunch for the 45 influencers?' 'Don't know. We will take it on notice.' 'How much were the promotion and website costs?' 'Don't know.' We do know the events advisory committee, the think tank for events to replace the Adelaide 500, met six

times, but they would not tell us how many of their ideas were rejected, what ideas had been put forward by this Events Advisory Group. There were no details of that again.

Finally, the \$14 million supposed to be ring-fenced for new events is for both new and contributing to events that are going. The reality is that this is sabotage and that this is vandalism. Stop the sell-off.

NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION WEEK AND FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARER WEEK

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:39): September is a very busy and exciting month in the child protection space, with a variety of activities to recognise National Child Protection Week, from 1 to 7 September, and Foster and Kinship Carer Week, from 8 to 14 September. Child protection is extremely important work. It is complex, challenging and sometimes heartbreaking but equally rewarding.

Firstly, I would like to give my sincere thanks to all foster and kinship carers who open up their hearts and homes to provide our children with a safe and supported environment to improve outcomes in their life. Thank you to all government departments, staff and volunteers who tirelessly strive to provide the best outcomes for our children and young people, whether that is through advocacy, service or program delivery.

As the first dedicated Minister for Child Protection, I am pleased at our achievements since coming into government in March 2018, and I look forward to continuing to improve our whole-of-government approach, alongside our incredibly hardworking carers, staff and volunteers.

Child Protection Week is recognised in the first week of September and is an initiative coordinated by the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN), which is celebrating its 31st anniversary. The aim of the week is to raise awareness in the community about the work being done by our foster and kinship carers, by the non-government agencies and by the many government agencies that are involved in protecting our children and young people. The 2021 theme is:

Every child, in every community, needs a fair go. To treat all of Australia's children fairly, we need to make sure every family and community has what kids need to thrive and be healthy.

That is exactly why the Marshall Liberal government has a whole-of-government approach to child protection. We are heavily investing in intensive family support services through the Department of Human Services, along with our family group conferencing pilot program, which has now been established as an ongoing program and further expanded to include unborn childcare concerns and an Aboriginal focus program.

We have also recently announced an expansion of reunification services, along with the Newpin reunification service being funded through a social impact bond. Newpin is a centre-based service that teaches parents how to parent safely with the aim that children can be safely reunified. This program has had great success in the Eastern States.

Children who cannot be safely returned home with their parents also need a fair go and that is why we are investing in the Sanctuary therapeutic residential care model throughout our DCP homes. We have closed several of the large bed facilities, the large units, that existed under the former Labor government and we have capped others, along with introducing our MyPlace initiative that allows children and young people to be part of decorating their homes and bedrooms to give it a more homelike feel.

Tomorrow, the Premier, Steven Marshall, will be launching our state's first ever South Australian Child Protection Awards. As minister, I am extremely proud of the excellent work that occurs every day to make a difference to the lives of our children and young people. I have read through all the finalists and their categories, and I am thrilled to be recognising their contributions to our sector.

This event recognises the valuable contributions of our DCP workers and partners, who provide vital support for at-risk families, children and young people in care, including NGOs, our philanthropic partners, foster and kinship carers, government staff, journalists, young people with care experience and volunteers. The Premier and I look forward to recognising and honouring the individuals and organisations that are going above and beyond to support children and young people in care.

For anyone interested in working in the sector, the department has a continual recruitment drive for residential care workers. Simply go to iworkfor.sa.gov.au for further information. For anyone who has ever considered becoming a foster carer, what better time than now? I encourage those who are interested in becoming a foster carer to go to the website and take the quiz at www.fostercare.sa.gov.au or call 1300 2 FOSTER for more information. There is no greater gift you could give a child or young person than to provide a loving home and a stable environment that will enable them to thrive.

MAWSON ELECTORATE COMMUNITY SPORT

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:44): This is a great time of year to be out and about in our communities at local footy and netball finals. On the weekend, I was on Kangaroo Island for the grand finals of both the netball and football competitions. It was terrific to see the level of competition going on. In the netball, I reckon Parndana probably took most of the titles on the day, but also Wisanger and Wonks had a few wins as well. That was great.

Out on the footy field, it was an amazing effort by one particular family, the Florance family. The two sons, 13-year-old Kane and 15-year-old Blake, took the field in the Colts and won a premiership. They had the medals around their neck, and then they had to jump off the back of a truck, give the medals to their mum and go out and play alongside their dad, Dan Florance, in the B-grade premiership, where they won another flag.

Many people go their entire lives without winning a premiership, but these young fellows, 13 and 15, won two flags within about two hours of each other. Five of the Colts players also went on to play in that B-grade premiership for the Kingscote Hounds—the mighty Hounds—the favourite team of Dusty, the Kangaroo Island kelpie.

What made it even more remarkable was that 13-year-old Cain had taken out the best and fairest medal in the whole league for the B-grade competition. He is 13 years old. His brother was best on ground in the Colts and his dad was best on ground in the B-grade. They all had medals but, not to be outdone, their mum, Jasmin, won the best sportsperson award in the netball league as well. The Florance family is a very talented family.

The thing about footy on Kangaroo Island—footy and netball—is that there are only 4½ thousand people on the island, yet they sustain five clubs. Nearly everyone on the island—even some who are getting a bit long in the tooth and maybe some who are not as svelte as they once were—pulls on the boots and gets out there each week and plays footy or netball because that is such a big part of the community. They have modified the rules a little bit so that in footy there are 16 people on the ground each time because, during a long winter, it covers for injuries and lack of players.

Interestingly, this year, given there are five clubs, when the lockdown happened and we lost two weeks of footy, there was one round due to be completed when football was allowed to be played again. The Kangaroo Island Football League decided that, instead of playing that one round—which would have thrown out how many clubs had played each other during the season—they said, 'We'll go straight into finals.' They said, 'We will have a final five instead of a final four,' but there are only five clubs in the competition, so everyone made the finals this year, including Western Districts, who finished bottom, with just one win for the whole year.

The reigning premiers from 2019 competition made the finals because there was no 2020 comp because of COVID, bushfires and everything else. The reigning premiers from 2019, having won one game, won the first final, the second final, the third final and they then went up against Wisanger in the grand final on Saturday. They could not quite get there. As much as everyone loves the Wonks, because they lost their clubrooms in the bushfires and they are a great bunch of people, people were pretty happy that Wisanger—the Panthers—won their first flag since 2005. They broke the drought, and I think people were pretty happy.

The next morning, I was at McLaren Vale Oval, home of the McLaren Eagles, to watch the grand final between the Mini Colts. There were some amazing displays of talent. I have watched these kids a bit during the year and they kick long, they kick to position and they have very good eyes and great talent. Without doubt, Dylan Mitton was best on ground. We saw a young Jessie Ellis have a good game as well, and it was terrific that they won the flag over Strathalbyn.

There are more finals this week, preliminary finals. Willunga has made all four finals and, in the A-grade and the B-grade, they will be up against the McLaren Eagles, so that is bigger than a Port versus Crows showdown. That is going to be really interesting down at Encounter Bay to see who gets a grand final berth. And to the mighty South Adelaide footy club, it has been a long time—1964 since you won your last flag. All the very best in your final against North Adelaide on Sunday. As Mike Rann used to say, 'Go Panthers!'

BIG RIVER PORK

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:50): I rise today to speak about an excellent company in my electorate, Big River Pork. This company is an exemplar of process, managing people and managing animal welfare. I have worked alongside them for many years as a major processor in my area.

In light of a COVID-19 incident locally in Murray Bridge, I want to go through some media and community advice in regard to that. It is headed, 'Business as usual at Big River Pork abattoir facility' and reads as follows:

Misleading reports and rumours circulating in social media about an ongoing Covid exposure at the Murray Bridge facility of Big River Pork are NOT correct.

Big River Pork chairman Geoff Hampel says three people who were possible contacts of a truck delivery driver who checked in at the facility last week are now in self isolation after testing negative for Covid on Sunday. When it was discovered late last week that the driver had been reported as a positive case, the company then worked with SA Health to track any contacts.

'We informed SA Health that a truck driver who delivered to the business last week had limited contact with our security person when the driver was required to fill in travel documentation and to be temperature tested,' Mr Hampel said.

The incident was recorded on the company's CCTV system and the video was provided to SA Health investigators to assist in their investigations. 'Our security person who was wearing protective equipment, recorded information from the driver, did a temperature test and the driver then went back to his truck to drive to the load-out dock area of the plant.

'At the Load-Out area of the plant, two workers checked documents and then used a forklift to load bins onto the truck, which then departed. 'Taking advice from SA Health, those three workers have been tested and are now self-isolating at home and we are providing all assistance to those employees and their families.

'There is no [and I stress no] community contact and we can say that all the proper processes were carried out to protect our workers and the community. We want the community to feel positive and safe at this time. No parts of the abattoir facility are under any quarantine and everything is 'business as usual' at the plant,' Mr Hampel said.

Professor Nicola Spurrier said at the media conference this morning:

The driver was there to pick up some freight and take it away. Just to say very clearly that Big River Pork have got fabulous Covid management plans in place, so it's completely contactless delivery and also members of the public cannot come on site. And also, the driver cannot wander around that premises and come in contact with people.

'Our team have worked very closely with the owners of that particular establishment (BRP) and they have looked at the CCTV footage, there were a couple of people that were in closer vicinity of this truck driver and so those people have been directed into quarantine and they have been tested—but I wanted to have everybody tested across that whole facility, so people were SMS'd and again with the manager being very helpful providing us with contact details. Plus, my understanding is that SA Pathology set up testing there particularly on site, so that all of the workers there could be tested. SA Pathology says there were about 80 people they were still chasing up to get tested, but the rest had been done and they were all negative, so that's very reassuring.

I will continue quoting Professor Spurrier, as follows:

Just for people in Murray Bridge, I think the risk for you is very low because of course this particular company had a very good COVID management plan in place. We are doing the additional testing, again just to be sure, and there will be a couple of people who will need to be in quarantine.'

I want to commend Big River Pork and Geoff Hampel and their team. I have been on the phone in the last couple of days. I have direct contact with Geoff and he is a great contact to have. If I need to contact him, I ring him directly or he rings me. I want to commend everyone at that company for how they manage the site because something like this is something they have been prepared for for 18 months. It has worked seamlessly. There are only three people in self-isolation just to be sure. It is business as usual. There is not a wider threat to the community of Murray Bridge and beyond, and may the Murray Bridge abattoir facility Big River Pork be stronger now and into the future.

WAR WIDOWS' GUILD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:55): This year marks the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the War Widows' Guild of South Australia. Many may not be aware of the history of the guild and the place it has in South Australia's and indeed Australia's military history. I am indebted to Helen Adamson for her remarks on the 70th anniversary in 2016 and, in light of the auspiciousness of this year's anniversary, feel it necessary to put some of those remarks on the record in the lead-up to this year's events.

The War Widows' Guild was formed across Australia through the leadership of Mrs Jessie Vasey. Her husband, General George A. Vasey, cared not only about his men but also about the widows and orphans of his soldiers. When he was killed in an air accident in 1946, Jessie was determined to carry on the work her husband had begun by founding the War Widows' Guild and serving as its president until her death in 1966.

The broad aims of the guild were to watch over and protect the interest of war widows. Mrs Vasey believed the surest way to help the widows maintain a dignified standard of living was by rehabilitation through the formation of craft groups. Here was a twofold purpose: sharing the company of women grappling with same issues of loss and the prospect of supplementing meagre compensatory pensions through craft works—hence, the original title of the organisation was the War Widows' Craft Guild of Australia.

In South Australia in September 1946, Mrs Jefferson Walker was contacted by Mrs Vasey to begin the guild in this state. Initially, there was some opposition to the organisation being established here but help arrived from a number of different areas, including Adelaide's then Lord Mayor, Mr Jack McClay, who made a room at the Town Hall available for guild meetings. The first meeting of the branch was subsequently held in the Lady Mayoress's room at Town Hall on 20 October 1946.

The first general meeting was held at the Women's Auxiliary National Service Headquarters on North Terrace on 8 November 1946. The guild's first office was set up at Kingsway House at 89 Flinders Street, remaining the South Australian headquarters for the next 13 years.

Help continued to come from various areas and in different forms. The South Australian branch of the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia, now the RSL SA, helped sponsor a public meeting to raise awareness and John Martin & Co. Ltd held an exhibition and sale of selected handcrafts in the shop's gallery, with Wholesale Furniture Manufacturer Pty Ltd supplying furniture for the Flinders Street office.

In April 1947, the first AGM of the guild was held at the Adelaide Cheer-up Hut. This same year, the RSL SA made their music room available for monthly general meetings, which took place on the first Friday of each month. A council of up to 20 members was formed in the 1950s to organise the social side of the guild, one activity being the now famous bus trip outings held on the third Friday of each month, still being enjoyed by guild members today.

In February 1955, a small shop was acquired for the sale of members' handcrafts in the suburb of Unley. In 1957, Kingsway House was sold and the committee began looking for a more serviceable venue. As well as an office for their headquarters, they needed accommodation for some of the more elderly members of the guild. A house was found on the corner of Fullarton Road and Hewitt Avenue in Rose Park and was later named Vasey House in honour of the guild's founders. The backyard began to be used for the guild's monthly trading tables to sell handcrafted items made by guild members.

More accommodation was needed and in 1959 a two-storey structure consisting of 12 self-contained flats was built. In 1966, another building was erected with six additional flats and a very large meeting room for monthly meetings. It was named Lorna Hosking House, in honour of the guild's then president who had worked so hard and tirelessly to secure the buildings. An office and kitchen were also included and all these facilities are still in use today.

It is important we remember the wives and children of those soldiers who did not return, who are arguably left to bear the true cost of war. Seventy-five years ago, the promise of the government of the day was: 'If the husband died for their country, their widows and orphans would not want.'

The work of the War Widows' Guild has done much to alleviate the pressure of this burden and to ensure war widows are not forgotten. This work goes back to the ANZAC campaign, and each year I am happy to buy Anzac cookies from the War Widows' Guild.

Because of this care for widows and their children, it is no surprise that Legacy Club South Australia and Broken Hill is happy to welcome the war widows' participation in the annual Australasian Soldiers Dardanelles Cenotaph Commemorative Service each year. The memorial was unveiled on Wattle Day on 7 September 1915—the first such memorial after the great losses of 25 April.

It was wonderful to see War Widows' Guild SA President, Jan Milham; Vice President, Helen Adamson; and secretary, Jill Davidson, on Sunday 5 September this year, with a wonderful address by Veterans SA Director, Catherine Walsh, and participation by Adelaide's Turkish community, led by Mrs Tanya Kaplan OAM.

I look forward to celebrating the 75th anniversary with War Widows' Guild of South Australia on Thursday 21 October at Legacy House and urge all members to do everything they can to support the work of the War Widows in their electorates.

FUTURE MOUNT GAMBIER

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:59): I rise to talk about Future Mount Gambier and district, a plan that has been put together with consultation from industry experts and locals who understand the challenges and the unique opportunities of their sector and our region as a whole. Mount Gambier is the second largest city in South Australia and the centre of the Limestone Coast region, with its own unique character, assets and geographic challenges.

With a population of nearly 30,000 and a catchment of over 85,000, this city deserves its own strategic direction and plan for the state government to focus on that is independent of other South Australian regions. The plan encompasses 17 initiatives, totalling \$85 million, and includes:

- forestry future;
- housing for all;
- infrastructure investment fund;
- community investment fund;
- tourism;
- freight action plan;
- business attraction and retention;
- drug and alcohol services;
- mobile connect;
- mental health;
- on-demand public transport;
- skilled workforce attraction package;
- waste and recycling initiatives;
- family violence;
- cross-border commissioner;
- regional TAFE board; and
- creative activation fund.

Today, I just want to talk about one of the 17: the housing for all initiative. One of the biggest concerns facing our region is a lack of affordable housing. A housing boom has seen real estate prices skyrocket, pushing homes out of the reach of first-home buyers and making rental properties scarce and unaffordable for many in our region.

Research is required to determine the backlog of maintenance on SA housing properties and steps taken to address this continuing issue. Service agencies are reporting the lack of affordable housing as their number one issue, forcing many into homelessness or insecure situations, and, as a result, a demand for crisis and emergency housing. This is affecting a wide demographic, including older single residents, young people attempting to buy their first home, women in domestic and family violence situations, skilled professionals attempting to relocate to the region, pet owners and residents affected by unemployment and other factors.

Resolving this issue requires a coordinated approach from agencies and all levels of government. It is multifaceted and includes stamp duty incentives, low-cost housing inclusion for new housing estates, maintenance for public housing, emergency and crisis accommodation, and short-term and contract housing for skilled workers.

One of the challenges we face in attracting workers to Mount Gambier and district is housing. I know of teachers who have relocated to Mount Gambier who are staying in a caravan park because they cannot not find rental accommodation. Sir Thomas Playford had a very good scheme where, if you worked for the government, he would provide housing for you at an artificially low rate, and that made working for the Public Service or the government a very attractive option. We need to get back to that type of thinking, where there could be industry incentives for large employers who want to build and put their money into housing for their workers with some type of government assistance, very similar to the Sir Thomas Playford scheme many years ago.

In terms of professional housing, I would like to see a dedicated set of newly developed houses for our nurses, teachers and police, in very close proximity to each other, so it generates that professional development, ongoing bonding and acceptance within the community and attracts those professionals to our region. Of course, there are many incentives we need to look at and pathways forward, but the future Mount Gambier and district road map certainly lays out the starting point for some of that discussion.

Time expired.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES 2021) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2021.)

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being a quorum present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:06): I rise to make some contribution on the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill and indicate I will be the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition. I also indicate that we will be supporting the budget measures bill, and I also foreshadow, as the government has done, that the opposition has placed some amendments on file, to which I have given a notice of motion, which we will consider at the conclusion of the second reading stage.

The budget measures bill proposes amendment to five acts but really gives effect to four main changes. The first is a change to the Land Tax Act, which proposes to provide some legislative basis for a new scheme that will benefit developers or homebuilders proposing to build homes for the sole purpose of renting them, providing a land tax discount for that purpose. There is also a curious change to the Payroll Tax Act, which seeks to abolish the payroll tax exemption available on application for certain screen productions that occur in South Australia. I will speak about that a little further in a moment.

Perhaps the most significant changes legislatively are the changes to the Road Traffic Act and to the Motor Vehicles Act, which seek to provide a legislative framework to enable a new type of traffic camera to be rolled out in South Australia: mobile phone detection cameras. These are not cameras in mobile phones but cameras that would detect drivers using mobile phones, rather than

focusing solely on the task at hand of driving. There is also a change to the Mining Act to provide a changed treatment, or perhaps a more robust treatment, for the taxation of minerals under the state's royalty regime. I will start referring my comments to the changes relating to the Land Tax Act 1936.

This is a remnant change left over from the package of measures, which ended up being considered by the parliament in the second half of 2019. You will recall that the 2019-20 budget, released in June 2019, contained an initiative to change the Land Tax Act's land aggregation arrangements and also the treatment of land held in trusts. The idea at that time was to raise an extra \$40 million a year. There was not only surprise but some outcry at that time about those measures.

Of course, over the period between June and late November, when the parliament finally considered a final package of land tax changes, the show had moved on quite considerably from what was initially proposed. The government estimated they would raise \$40 million from that package. As it turned out, after they had some modelling done they were subsequently estimating to raise more than \$100 million a year from those changes.

The government were required to consider and eventually commit to a whole series of additional measures to offset the very significant additional impost in land tax bills that the Premier and the Treasurer were proposing to impose on South Australian property owners. Some of those were reductions to the relatively small number of property owners who owned more than \$1 million worth of taxable land. They received very significant land tax cuts, while thousands of residential property owners and commercial property owners were required to pay a lot more money.

In the end, rather than raising more than \$100 million a year of additional revenue from those land tax aggregation and trust changes, the government were estimating to raise an extra \$86 million a year from South Australian property owners—hardly consistent with the lower costs mandate that we were promised by the now Premier, the member for Dunstan, in the lead-up to the last state election. That reduction in the top rate was not the only offset that was provided by the government in their eventual land tax package.

There were all sorts of concessions that needed to be made by the Treasurer in the other place in an effort to convince some members of the crossbench in the other place to support that legislation. One of those concessions was to introduce some changed arrangements to public housing. There was also the rollout of more energy-efficient technology to try to reduce the cost of power bills, as well as some other initiatives.

One was sought by the Urban Development Institute of Australia, in particular, and without question, the Master Builders Association—the two leading voices in South Australia when it comes to property developers and commercial, residential and even industrial builders. Those two bodies, most prominent in prosecuting matters on behalf of the property industry here in South Australia, had sought some changed arrangements for both display homes and for a new build-to-rent measure. Now, not quite two years on, we are getting to the legislative consideration of the second of those and that is a build-to-rent property.

The bill introduces a 50 per cent land tax discount for eligible new build-to-rent properties. As far as I am advised, the strictures around this regime are still yet to be settled. They are to be based on the New South Wales build-to-rent guidelines, which have been promulgated and in force for some time there. Eligible projects will attract a discount of 50 per cent of the land tax that would otherwise be liable for the land value of the parcel of land being used for that sort of development.

If we are honest, it is probably not going to make a significant difference in the scheme of things when it comes to housing affordability in South Australia. We know from the government's own admission that there are over 16,000 South Australians on the Housing Trust waiting list and that there are many tens of thousands more South Australians seeking to get into a private rental property but who are unable to. The government estimates that it is going to forgo the princely sum of \$50,000 in the first year of the scheme's operation and \$100,000 a year on an ongoing basis.

You can imagine, Mr Deputy Speaker, that on an average-size proportion of land that may attract a land tax liability of some hundreds of dollars or, if it is aggregated with other properties, perhaps \$1,000 or more, then this is not going to equate to very many properties at all. Nonetheless, it is better than nothing. The question will be, though, how the rubber hits the road and how developers actually bring stock to market, making use of this scheme.

What we do not want to see is a private version of what the housing minister, the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place, is proposing to do in my electorate of Seaton and that is knock over 35 admittedly old and past their use-by date Housing Trust properties and try to replace them with 101 properties on the same footprint. In fact, I will not say the same footprint; it is actually a smaller footprint because some of that land that those 35 properties occupy within one block of area within Seaton is to be taken up with a reserve and land required for access to those properties and so on.

It does not take much to gather that an area of some 20,000 square metres, accommodating 101 properties, even if they had access to all that land, would have an average block size of only 200 square metres. Once you start removing parts of that 20,000 square metres for a more than 2,000 square metre reserve and so on, those properties are going to be on very, very small blocks of land.

Minister Lensink has attempted to throw down the gauntlet to me when it comes to affordable housing. She said, 'If the member for Lee doesn't support what I am doing in Seaton, I challenge him to come up with an alternative.' I can say to the minister that my alternative would be that if you are going to redevelop Housing Trust properties in Seaton, first of all that gets a tick from me. That is something I support, and she would know that her chief executive undertook some master planning work in 2016 and 2017 when I was the housing and urban development minister.

She does not need me to convince her that I am in favour of redeveloping this area because some work has already been undertaken. That work was not taken up, unfortunately, just as we have seen the minister take up in some areas proposed dwellings that were too small and at a density level that was far too high for what I consider to be appropriate for the area.

I support redevelopment in Seaton. What I would support is that, if you can knock over 35 houses, then at least replace the number of Housing Trust dwellings with what you have taken away. You might have had the impression, when I said 35 being knocked over and 101 being delivered, that all them were going to be public Housing Trust dwellings. Unfortunately, they are not. Only 16 of them will be—so 35 down to 16.

Other properties will be developed for sale to the private sector. Even that in itself I am not outright opposed to. I think if we are going to redevelop some Housing Trust stock, particularly older houses on much larger blocks, it provides some opportunity for new dwellings to be built and properties to be made available to particular people in the private sector.

For the area of Seaton, for example, I am thinking of young families, etc., who are keen to move into a good suburb like Seaton, with all the facilities nearby, such as the West Lakes shopping centre, the new WEST development and, of course, the mighty Seaton Ramblers Football Club, located on Pedlar Reserve. There is also a terrific high school—Seaton High School—that the former Labor government committed \$20 million to upgrading. I was pleased to be there with the former Premier Jay Weatherill and former education minister Susan Close to announce that. It is a good area.

You can knock over Housing Trust houses as long as you replace them with the same number of Housing Trust dwellings. You can even make some additional properties on excess land available for the private sector. The one thing that I cannot countenance, that the minister for housing is doing in trying to provide additional properties to the private sector, is just selling off vacant blocks without any prescription on what is to be built there, other than housing, because that will mean that we will not get a bespoke, well-designed, well-planned type of development in this part of the western suburbs.

I certainly do not support excess sale proceeds from that process being taken out of Seaton and being used elsewhere. What the Hon. Michelle Lensink is proposing to do at Seaton is create sales of up to \$17 million and then take more than \$7 million of that revenue and use it elsewhere around the state. I think the people of Seaton, particularly the Housing Trust tenants in Seaton, deserve that that money should be reinvested in the area from which it is raised.

If the government cannot afford to make its Housing Trust redevelopment programs stack up on their own merits, then they should be supplementing them from the central budget, rather than effectively taking money from one area of high-density Housing Trust and moving it to another. The

people of the western suburbs, and of Seaton, deserve much better than how the minister for housing is treating them. That is what I think we should be doing when it comes to providing affordable housing.

I notice that, aside from this build-to-rent scheme, there are some measures the minister for housing would like us to believe will significantly change the demand for public housing—changing the income and assets threshold. She herself has admitted that it will reduce that Housing Trust waiting list, which is currently over 16,000, we are told, by only 600. It will not even make a 6 per cent difference to the Housing Trust waiting list, and I think that is regrettable.

I would have liked to think that this government would do far more when it comes to addressing the Housing Trust waiting list and the demand particularly of category 1 people on the waiting list. I also note that in this build-to-rent scheme, the New South Wales guidelines on which we are told the South Australian scheme is to be based will require a minimum development size of 50 properties. That is a significant number of properties; that is a significant level of investment.

That will necessarily preclude this measure from a lot of people who would like to contribute to providing some more rental properties here in South Australia and basically limit it to those companies that have the financial capacity to be able to bankroll a development of at least 50 properties. While there are many builders in South Australia, not a huge number have the capacity to commit to such a large development. In that respect, it is unnecessarily restrictive.

I understand why that threshold has perhaps been reached in the New South Wales context and I can understand even from the Treasurer's perspective, or Treasury's perspective, that they would want to limit it to the top end of the housing construction market because it probably lowers the financial risk of somebody taking on a development and not being able to deliver it.

Perhaps in the current context of the housing construction market, which is pretty hot at the moment, the HomeBuilder scheme has superheated the housing market here in South Australia to the point where we are struggling to find sufficient materials to build these houses. Nonetheless, it seems that we have another two years to fully investigate the guidelines that this build-to-rent scheme will adopt, because the budget impact does not commence until the 2023-24 financial year and that is at a half-year cost of \$50,000 before the full-year cost follows the next financial year in 2024-25.

So it seems there is still 18 months to go, maybe even a little longer, until these guidelines will be settled. This will be one of the areas that we are keen to pursue during the committee stage of the bill, trying to find out as much information as we can about how far developed these guidelines are and what other requirements there may be in the future once the scheme is rolled out.

As I said, it is a lasting and perhaps final reminder of the debacle that were the land tax changes of 2019. I was going to say that it was the only time I have seen the government announce a significant change in tax policy without knowing how much revenue it would raise, how many people would be paying it and how much it was going to cost them, let alone how the government would actually administer changes to the taxation regime.

Even as we meet here today, there are still land tax bills which are being sent out for the previous financial year which will mean that for many people who have land tax liabilities they will be receiving two bills for subsequent financial years in a matter of weeks from one another. If they should find themselves in the circumstance where they had to apply to RevenueSA during the course of last year's COVID-impacted circumstances and they deferred their land tax, they were required to pay that land tax back in the last six or so months as well. So it is even conceivable that they have had three years of land tax bills to pay in a 12-month period—hardly reasonable on many property owners who are still struggling to regain their livelihoods after the financial impacts of the pandemic.

I was going to say that it is the only time I have seen tax reform undertaken like that but, of course, there is another bill on the *Notice Paper* that is a good example of that, and that is the introduction of an electric vehicle levy, another announcement of a change in tax policy with no comprehension from the government about how they would roll it out—but, of course, we will not speak on that, will we, because that would contravene standing orders.

The next measure is the Mining Act. The changes to the Mining Act seek to introduce a regime where the government will impose an observable market index price or similarly independently determined sale price in cases where the mineral sale price declared as part of the royalty self-assessment is not considered with the market price of that commodity.

Clearly, there is a concern either in the energy minister's department or in the Treasury department that when some miners are self-assessing for royalty payments they might be under-declaring the amount of money they have to pay to the government in royalties. For example, they might be saying that, given the amount that has been mined, extracted and proposed to be shipped off to another market, they declared too low a price to which a royalty rate would apply.

I was interested when I was briefed on the bill—and I am grateful to the officers who made themselves available for a briefing on the bill—and I asked on how many occasions had there been a concern about underquoting the price to which the royalty regime should apply, the response was that they were not aware of any, which makes me wonder why we are even contemplating this. If there is no problem, if there is no mischief afoot, then why on earth are we doing this?

Are South Australia's miners currently meeting their obligations and declaring an appropriate price against which royalties are calculated, or is there something else that is going on here? Are there leases or tenements held by people, companies or organisations which the government is concerned or suspicious about that, should they start mining and exporting in the future, they may be under-declaring what they need to pay the government for royalties? We look forward to trying to get to the bottom of that. I am not quite sure that there is the need for this given the assurances we have had from the government to date, but I am happy to be corrected. If there is a problem here, then we look forward to hearing the details of it.

One thing I was keen to ask during the briefing is: who will monitor this regime? On the basis that there is a regular acquittal for the purposes of calculating the royalties of a miner letting the government know how much they have mined, what it is worth and what the royalty rate should be, who administers that within the government and who is checking whether that price is reasonable? Now that the legislation is more prescriptive around the fact that it must be effectively an accurate market price, who will be taking on that assurance work within government? Who will be regularly checking? Will there be any additional effort put into this measure?

From the briefing I received on the bill, it seems that there is not any proposal to put additional effort in. That leads to the question of how much additional revenue is to be gained from this, and if the answer is none, it looks like the parliament is considering legislative changes which certainly are not needed, and that takes us to the amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act.

As I mentioned before, these changes are being made to give South Australia Police the capacity to introduce these new mobile phone detection cameras. We all support additional efforts on road safety. I know the minister for road safety does. He is so keen to roll out road safety improvements that he has asked South Australians for their ideas. I, of course, am always interested to hear what the minister for road safety thinks about these things, but, notwithstanding that, I guess if we are going to hear what they are then we can hear from the people what their ideas are.

One area that the minister has jumped on early is the opportunity to hand out an extra 35,000-odd fines each year to South Australian motorists. If that is representative of what SAPOL thinks is the level of offending, then clearly we should be doing something about it. Having 35,000 people a year on their mobile phones being pinched by their cameras is nearly 100 people a day.

Even on South Australia's extensive road network—we are not going to have a camera on every corner, of course, but there is likely to be a handful of these cameras, maybe half a dozen or maybe a dozen; the government's budget for this is \$19 million—that investment will pay itself back every 15 months or so because the government estimates that they will be raising something in the order of about \$14 million or \$15 million a year in fines for this. In fact, over the first three years, 100,000 fines is what the government estimates they will be able to hand out, with 37,000 in the first year, 35,000 in the second year and 28,000 in the third year.

Clearly we are all concerned about people using mobile phones while they should be driving. For those of us who drive ourselves in to this place, we would be horrified to see people staring down at their laps or not paying attention to the road, otherwise using their mobile phones, even those people who think they are being safe by slowing down in the middle of traffic, perhaps believing they

will give themselves the extra buffer while they send out that last tweet or get off that last text message while they are driving.

That is incredibly dangerous, let alone what you often see, which is motorists who start veering out of their lane or even veering towards oncoming traffic. It is extremely dangerous driving. Of course, we shudder to think of drivers who do that when they have other people in the car as well. We support cracking down on that sort of behaviour.

If we are going to start handing out fines, you would like to think that it will have a significant improvement to road safety outcomes, a significant deterrent effect. Over a three-year period, a drop from 35,000 fines to 28,000 fines still means that on average SAPOL must be expecting about 80 per cent of people to continue doing the wrong thing or the hit rate to be at least 80 per cent of what it was when these cameras first came in.

This is no \$170 fine. This fine is more than \$500. In fact, it is more than that because it is \$500 plus the victims of crime levy, which is now more than \$90. So the total fine is \$646, which is extraordinary. That is a big fine in anyone's language. What I also found interesting is that, if you are handing out 100,000 fines over three years and each fine is \$646, when you do the sums that must be about \$64 million in revenue that is being raised. But the government's figures estimate that only \$46 million will be raised, some \$18 million less than what that calculation would suggest.

What was the Treasurer's explanation to the *Adelaide Advertiser* when they asked about that discrepancy? 'We don't expect everyone is going to be able to pay the fines, and so that's how much revenue we are banking on coming in.' An \$18 million shortfall on what would otherwise be a \$64 million increase in traffic fines is extraordinary. It is largely not a deterrent for the behaviour, judging by the figures that we have seen, and the fines are so substantial that a lot of people are not going to be able to pay them. It is a remarkable road safety policy.

One thing we are looking forward to hearing from the government is—if the deterrent impact of having these cameras and the level of the fine that would be handed out to a motorist caught by these cameras is not what the government hopes, if it is not having that deterrent effect, that it is not like it is 35,000 in the first year and perhaps that is halved over the course of three years—what other efforts the government is rolling out, given that they are making such an enormous amount of money each year from these additional fines.

Is there a commensurate amount of expenditure that the government is committing to in advertising about these cameras, or not even about the cameras but advertising about road safety and the dangers of using mobile phones? Will there be some sort of awareness campaign as these cameras are about to be introduced that people should have another go at doing the right thing when they are behind the wheel and put their phones away, ignore them, put them into the centre console, put them in a cubbyhole in the dashboard or in the glove box, just get them out of eyesight or even out of their mind's eye so they can focus on the task at hand?

I could probably answer that question now because in the Budget Measures Statement there does not seem to be a commensurate increase in road safety expenditure and there do not seem to be additional campaigns to try to get motorists to do the right thing. We now have a continuation of what we have had for the last couple of years, where we have had some sort of combination between SA Police and the Department for Transport trying to determine themselves what will be the most effective road safety message, or they look at what other centrally funded, independent road safety organisations in other jurisdictions, either around Australia or New Zealand, are rolling out for their road safety advertising campaigns and just borrow those ads and put them on South Australian TV and so on.

I have to say that I had a period of time when I was not road safety minister but I did attend some road safety functions, principally those days leading up to a long weekend or school holiday period or a summer holiday or Christmas holiday period. A minister would stand with road safety organisations, SA Police, maybe even someone from Transport or a paramedic or an SES crew—those first responders who have the very unfortunate role of having to respond to road accidents—and make it clear across all the TV news programs that people needed to be careful over that long weekend or holiday period.

It has happened on rare occasions under this government, but I have to say that it does not happen as often now as it used to. Fair enough, we have gone through periods when, during some

long weekend periods or even school holiday periods, we have not been able to travel around South Australia like we used to, but we have had periods when the level of travel around South Australia has been much higher than it has been previously. As international borders have been closed, we have had periods when tourism-related travel around regional South Australia has increased. There has been an opportunity for the government to do more in this space.

The government comes up with the completely disingenuous and deliberately misleading claim that the former government 'sold the MAC'. That is absolutely not true, and they know it is not true. They know it is a deliberate misrepresentation of what happened. Yes, the South Australian Motor Accident Commission is no longer responsible for writing compulsory third-party insurance policies. Yes, that did change under the former Labor government and, yes, as a result motorists are paying on average \$100 a year less in CTP premiums.

Yes, all those things are true, but it was this government, led by this Premier and this Treasurer, that got rid of the Motor Accident Commission and its motor accident-related functions of research, investigation and promulgation of road safety activities, including advertising to the public of South Australia.

Perhaps the road safety minister might see a couple of submissions to his public plea for ideas around road safety that it is time to consider independent research about what messaging works best for South Australians because in the first full year of this government, the road toll absolutely escalated. I am not saying that it is solely because of removing a central motor accident authority, such as the Motor Accident Commission, but that does not help.

When the road toll is increasing, when the number of people dying on our roads or suffering casualty crashes on our roads is escalating, that is the time to put more effort into this and not less, as we saw under this government. You do not need to take my word for it—you can speak to the former independent chair of the Motor Accident Commission, Mr Roger Cook.

He dedicated a lot of his adult life to pursuing better road safety outcomes because of the tragic loss his family suffered due to a motor vehicle accident. It does not bother him who he is speaking to—a Labor or a Liberal politician, a Labor or a Liberal supporter, or a supporter of another brand of politics—he will deliver exactly the same message; that is, these sorts of organisations are important for ensuring better road safety outcomes.

Mr Cook was frank and fearless in his advice. He enjoyed putting controversial suggestions to governments to try to push them into action on improving road safety. The one that springs to my mind was cutting down large trees on the side of rural roads. If you ever want to start a public debate, that is the way to do it. There are not too many people in the middle of that conversation: it is one side or the other, and they are very firm in their views. Those are the sorts of efforts that need to go into road safety.

We support going after motorists who are using mobile phones, but I have to say that, on the figures presented to the opposition, this looks more like revenue raising than delivering road safety outcomes. Perhaps we all, including SAPOL, will be proved wrong. Maybe these cameras will have a far greater deterrent effect than the numbers Treasury have provided to us.

Maybe people will be put off reaching for their mobile phones, particularly when they are stationary at intersections, when they know that cameras can look down through the windscreen or side windows of a car and see people doodling away on their mobile phones and give them a fine accordingly. I hope they are right; I hope it does have a big deterrent effect but, if it has only a modest impact on the level of offending, then it does look like revenue raising.

The other thing I will say on this is that, when it comes to revenue raising from motorists, this government have turned it into an absolute art form. They have done it particularly since that same budget I mentioned before, when the land tax changes were first announced since the 2019 budget. This government came after motorists in a way we have never seen.

Registration fees were increased significantly above the regular level of indexation, and that was aimed purely to raise revenue—more than \$12 million a year—tweaking up the level of car registration fees across the board. It did not matter whether it was four cylinders or less, or bigger engine capacities. The real sleeper was the administration fee we see on our motor vehicle

registration bills—increasing that by up to 30 per cent; in fact, I think it was more than 30 per cent. I think it went from \$7 to \$10, and even up to \$30 for some transactions with Service SA. If an extra \$12 million of motor vehicle registration fees is a lot, this was actually designed to raise an extra \$24 million per year on top of that.

Poor old member for Mawson, who represents Kangaroo Island, his constituents, as well as constituents in Roxby Downs, represented by the member for Giles, I am told—I was erroneously going to say the member for Stuart.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The minister does do a lot of good work for people in Roxby. He is changing the royalty regime for them in this same bill. They lose their outer areas concession for motor vehicle registrations. People who live in those areas—Coober Pedy, Roxby Downs, Kangaroo Island and I think the unincorporated areas of South Australia—were getting a 50 per cent discount on their registration. I am not quite sure of the historical reason why. I suspect that if you took a straw poll amongst the recipients of that concession, it might say something like they are not convinced the quality of the roads they get to enjoy is the same as what a lot of other South Australians enjoy and so perhaps that is why they had a discount. Anyway, they lost that discount.

It is not a huge number of motorists, but it is a significant discount for them. Many of them by necessity drive vehicles with large engine displacements, given the work that they have to do around their properties, and in many instances losing that concession costs them a couple of hundred dollars per year.

Of course, in that same budget in 2019, we had a go at increasing fines for some traffic offences. What the government assured us was that it was no problem, just like they assured us the land tax changes were no problem, massively increasing the corporate fee that could be paid by organisations in lieu of nominating a driver where a vehicle registered to that organisation had been detected committing a traffic offence. No problem.

Basically, the words from the Treasurer were that organisations had made a fine art of cheating this scheme so the drivers were not getting demerit points if they were in a company vehicle and that this now would either force them to pay the corporate fee if they were not going to declare which driver was driving their vehicle or they could finger the driver who was driving the vehicle and they would get the demerit points, if it was one of the offences that attracted demerit points. Off the top of my head, I think the corporate fee went up to \$1,800.

I know that not everyone has direct experience in an organisation that runs fleets, but there are a lot of them. You only need to think of firms with multiple trade vans, electrical or plumbing firms, that sort of thing, where drivers are not only out and about the whole day, running to and from and in between jobs, but they are also not in the same vehicle each day. The response from the government was, 'That's their fault. They should have better driver-tracking systems for which driver is in which vehicle at what point in time.' It is just revenue raising.

There was one instance where a corporate fee was justified at being increased, and indeed I was the former transport minister who did it, and that was for trucking companies coming down the South Eastern Freeway, driving contrary to the Road Rules, either speeding or using their brakes rather than using engine braking and risking the truck careening out of control, and that sort of thing. But just blindly applying it across the community in an effort to raise additional revenue was extraordinary. That was an extra nearly over \$14 million this year.

Last year's budget had another go at hitting motorists. We saw a 50 per cent increase in the victims of crime levy. It is now more than \$90. I can remember when it was \$30, when a speeding fine used to be something in the order of \$120 or \$150 and the victims of crime levy was \$30. Now we are talking about fines of over \$500 and a victims of crime levy of more than \$90. Is the victims of crime levy actually raising revenue to go to victims? Well, largely not; that has not changed.

What this government did in its earliest days in an effort to manufacture a surplus in its first year was prepay \$146 million out of the Victims of Crime Fund to the South Australian Government Financing Authority to try to settle claims from people who had been abused in state institutions. As noble and wholly supported as compensating those victims is, of that \$146 million, only \$12 million has been run down, effectively, so there is still \$134 million in that scheme.

Even though that nearly \$150 million has been taken out of the Victims of Crime Fund, it continues to increase each year. It is not as though that money will compensate victims. You only have to watch the news or read the *Adelaide Advertiser* to see case after case of a person or a family appearing before the state's courts seeking justice for themselves as the victims of some sort of crime. Largely, the amount that goes to victims is not changing.

Altogether, with the increase in registration fees, the increase in the administration fee, the abolition of the outer areas concession, the increase in expiations for some traffic offences and the massive escalation of the corporate fee, the increasing of the victims of crime levy and now this new mobile phone detection camera, motorists in the first year of all of those initiatives running together will be more than \$80 million a year worse off—\$80 million a year worse off. That is how this government has come after motorists. It is absolutely extraordinary.

Then, of course, we have the government's proposed new electric vehicle tax. That basically wipes out the savings to motorists from the former Labor government's changes to the compulsory third-party scheme in South Australia, the \$100 or so a vehicle on average that is being saved as a result of the former Labor government's changes to the CTP scheme, which I notice this government try to claim as their own initiative now.

Along with the \$1 saving that the Minister for Energy has achieved from the reference price in electricity prices, this government have tried to pump that up with a couple of hundred dollars for a dual-car family because of the former Labor government's CTP changes. No-one is buying what they are selling. People see through that sort of disingenuousness pretty clearly, and it is absolutely clear that, despite all the effort undertaken by the former Labor government to bring down the cost of motoring in South Australia, the government have put it straight back up.

The last measure is a change to the Payroll Tax Act. This seems to be a really curious one as well. I think either the Cannes or the Venice film festival is on at the moment. I know that the member for Playford would have been looking for the reviews of the new version of *Dune* that Denis Villeneuve has produced. He looks forward to the film being released, presumably sooner than the latest James Bond film.

It is regrettable that South Australia will not be able to submit a sequel to *Mortal Kombat* to the latest European film festival. It was to be a large production in South Australia. It involved a large production crew and some well-known Australian actors coming to South Australia. Josh Lawson was one of the key actors, with a very memorable appearance on Channel 10's *Have You Been Paying Attention* to spruik *Mortal Kombat II*. For those of you who might be inclined to YouTube, his appearance on *Have You Been Paying Attention* to talk about that is well worth a look.

Not only that, there was a large production crew, a lot of Australian actors and some international actors and of course extras. They could not get the member for Unley away from the set. It did not matter how many cameras on lights they erected around the set to warn off people who might be interrupting filming, he was there with bells on—wild horses could not have dragged him away. Not only was he an apprentice but he was a thespian as well, we are now led to believe.

It was a big production, and it goes to show that, despite all the criticisms we had from the member for Dunstan, from the member for Bragg and even from the member for Unley himself about the former Labor government's \$50 million investment in the Glenside film studios, this can facilitate a burgeoning industry, that this is an industry worth supporting.

It is important to try to actively support this industry because, particularly in the last 18 months, Australia has become a sought-out location to film screen productions. If any of you have been subjected to *Nine Perfect Strangers* in the evenings as I have, you will have seen a large and extensive Hollywood cast being filmed in Australia for those sorts of TV productions. Whether it is Queensland or New South Wales and, to a lesser extent South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia, those states continue to do what they can to attract these film productions.

We have had a longstanding payroll tax exemption here for wages paid in respect of these productions, and the change is now being made in this budget measures bill to abolish that payroll tax exemption and replace it with just a grant fund. The explanation from the government is that our payroll tax exemption for these screen productions was too narrow and too tight and was not giving South Australia the fullest opportunity to bid for screen productions here in South Australia.

So when people were contemplating which Australian jurisdiction they might go to, to film or produce something, if they were comparing the taxation treatments jurisdiction against jurisdiction they might find that South Australia had an overly restrictive taxation treatment and they might think that they have to pay less tax in Queensland or New South Wales or Victoria, so they will go elsewhere.

That made me think, 'Well, wouldn't we make a virtue of changing our payroll tax exemption? Wouldn't we change the Payroll Tax Act to significantly broaden it?' Rather than doing that, we are just abolishing the exemption, full stop, and saying that we will have a grant fund. I am told that in recent years the grant fund has spent on average about \$1.6 million on attracting film productions to South Australia—almost the security bill on the *Mortal Kombat* site to try to keep the member from Unley away from the camera, I am told. It did not seem like a large amount of money to me.

I would have thought that the government's necessary, secret subsidy in *Mortal Kombat* was likely to be significantly more than \$1.6 million. Clearly, I am not as practised in this area as the member for Unley or perhaps even the Premier, but I am not quite sure that removing a payroll tax exemption altogether and just having a fund—which may or may not be available for a particular production—was going to put us on the most level playing field with those jurisdictions interstate. Perhaps I am wrong.

It would be great to get some information about how much money has been paid out in recent years to try to support these screen productions and even to whom it has gone. We know from public reports in the media that Queensland and New South Wales are spending tens of millions of dollars a year to attract these productions. I would hate to think that, even though he campaigned against it for a long time, the member for Unley is now celebrating the Glenside film studios but under-resourcing our state's capacity to attract these productions here to South Australia.

I guess the other point is: what will be the guidelines that will provide some sort of direction to a minister or to a government about providing grant funds to these sorts of productions in the future? That is something that we will be particularly interested in when it comes to the committee stage of the bill. I suspect \$1.6 million is only a small proportion of the South Australian Film Corporation's budget as well. So, if we are going to go after these productions, if Australia is indeed the place the world wants to film their productions at the moment, are we the most competitive or has the former Labor government made the right investment and the right start at making us competitive in this place but we are now not seeing what we can from these efforts?

I am also aware that the government has placed some amendments on file. They have some modest changes they want to make to some of the wording of the bill, which to me seem reasonable, although of course we will check and we will ask during the committee stage of the debate about what the government hope to achieve by those amendments. But they are not alone in amendments. I have placed on file amendments from the opposition—very reasonable amendments—seeking to mirror the arrangements which the parliament and political parties had access to in the lead-up to the last election. That is to include an additional budget measure which requires the government of the day to establish a parliamentary budget advisory service.

This was something that was sought in the wake of the 2014 state election when the member for Frome committed to supporting Labor to form government. He thought it was reasonable that all members of parliament, and indeed major political parties, had access to an independent costing service, funded by the government but independent of the executive of the day, to provide some confidential advice to members of parliament and political parties about proposals that they wish to take to the next election.

This is entirely reasonable and healthy for our democracy. It was a shame, I think, that the Liberal government refused to use the Parliamentary Budget Advisory Service in the lead up to the last election because I suspect, as a state, we would have ended up with far better outcomes than what we have seen to date, for example. The government had the opportunity, of course, to take some of their key election commitments to try to get some robust costings around them.

Basically, the way it works is that the Treasurer is required to establish an attached office to one of the administrative units that he is responsible for. It is most likely to be the Department of Treasury and Finance and that would be resourced and staffed by seconded members of that relevant agency to provide confidential advice to members. In the past, for example, a member of

parliament had made an inquiry about how much it would cost to deliver a particular kind of transport project.

So the staff within that advisory service would go, on a confidential basis again, to the relevant department—in that case, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport—ask for a costing about something and they would cost it up, again on a confidential basis, and that would be given back to the person who requested it, and it worked.

I know that some of the crossbench MPs in the other place, members of the Greens, used it and they proposed several election policies based on that, including one that the government itself had promulgated and that was delivering a right-hand turn of the tram onto North Terrace, something that had been strongly advised to me by the transport department—not as being something that could not be afforded but that was quite simply undeliverable with the tram stock that we used. That did not stop the Liberal Party of the day going out and committing to it, which became the first but definitely not the last of their broken election commitments.

They could have used it, for example, for the GlobeLink policy which was a centrepiece policy for the member for Dunstan, now Premier, in the lead-up to the last election. In fact, frontbenchers, shadow ministers, committed on the record that that project would definitely happen—their words not mine—in the lead-up to the last election.

What happened after the election? Of course, they would have got their blue book from Treasury and from their relevant departments showing that it simply could not be justified on a public investment basis. There was no demand for a freight airport at Monarto because apparently the Premier and the member for Unley, who announced this policy, did not realise that planes carrying passengers also carry freight and, without a combination of those two, a freight-only airport and freight-only flights being run exclusively from that airport are not economic.

They also disbelieved the work that the former assistant minister for infrastructure and former member for Mayo Jamie Briggs put together and that was an independent study on taking the rail line around the back of the Adelaide Hills. That was costed in that report at that time at \$2.6 billion. I think that report was dated about 2012, so you can imagine what the cost of that would have been in 2018 dollars, and you can imagine what it would be even now with some of the price escalations we are seeing around the country for infrastructure projects.

You could also imagine the benefit that it would have provided to the Liberal Party had they received a robust costing for the Port Wakefield overpass. We were assured by the Liberals in the lead-up to the last election that this would only cost \$24 million, and we knew that because they had taken advice from a former chief executive of the transport department who said, 'Yes, I built the one at McLaren Vale, and in my view it would be exactly the same, and I am pretty confident that that would be \$24 million.'

You would know, sir, as would the member for Stuart, perhaps better than most members of parliament, that the size of the trucks which use Port Wakefield and would avail themselves of an overpass to get to and from Yorke Peninsula, for example, tend to be a little larger than those that run up and down the main street of McLaren Vale. In fact, I have not checked the transport department's RAVnet site recently, but I think they can now run A-doubles throughout Yorke Peninsula so that necessitates a much larger and much greater scale of road infrastructure in order to use that sort of overpass.

So we have a cursory look at the budget papers and the Port Wakefield overpass has gone from \$24 million, as committed by the Liberals at the last election, to \$124 million—just a small increase there. This is the sort of thing which would be fixed by a parliamentary budget advisory service, being able to get a robust costing as a political party is putting their ideas together.

Of course, it is not the only significant increase in costs we have had since the change of government. The Festival Plaza project has had well over \$30 million injected into it. Even those of us who are fortunate enough to have a car park in there, it is the only undercover car park I have been in where you need to carry a broly around, despite the extra \$30 million that has been contributed to it.

Springbank Road, which we had the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport spruiking today, I think is most recently a \$61 million project. Of course, the proposal to upgrade that into a single intersection was something which had been proposed by former member for Waite the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith. I think more than \$20 million had been set aside in the 2017 budget by the member for West Torrens when he was Treasurer.

We had the then Minister for Transport come and say, 'No, not a single intersection solution—that's crazy. What people really want is a two-intersection dogleg solution. People know instinctively as motorists that rather than go through a single set of traffic lights, they would much rather go through two sets of traffic lights to get where they are going.' I have to say that did not quite strike a chord with me or the other members of the opposition.

Despite whatever bogus traffic data or modelling the then minister put, we had month after month after month go by, we had a change in the design back to a single intersection, and costs escalated from \$26 million to \$41 million to \$60 million. So there is a real benefit in helping political parties get their costings right. It is good for public debate. It is good for democracy.

If the public can be assured when the leader of a political party comes out and promises a \$5 billion to \$10 billion infrastructure solution like GlobeLink that it has been thoroughly thought through, that the costings themselves have been looked at by the experts within government and provided some level of assurance, then the public can take it on face value and they can make a judgement whether, in their view, it is a good idea or a good use of taxpayers' money or, in their view, it is not a good idea and that they think that money should either not be spent or spent in another area of priority.

I cannot understand why this government seems to be cool on the idea of a parliamentary budget advisory service. In a media article over the weekend, the Treasurer's rationale was that he thinks it would cost \$1.5 million, which I have to say seems like a fair amount of money. He said we should be spending that on hospitals, not spending it on a PBAS. If he feels that way about \$1½ million spent on that, imagine how he feels about \$662 million being spent on a basketball stadium that no-one has asked for and that no-one can seem to justify. It is extraordinary.

Of course, the PBAS is not a solution to any harebrained schemes being promulgated by members of parliament. The basketball stadium clearly makes that argument itself. We are still liable for politicians from time to time, even in government, coming up with ideas about how to spend money that are completely out of step with that of the community. But it will make an important difference.

If the government, under the stewardship of housing minister Michelle Lensink, says, 'This is the Liberals' policy when it comes to housing at the 2022 election,' and if the Labor Party says, 'This is our policy when it comes to housing at the 2022 election,' and the Greens party says, 'Here is our policy at the 2022 election about housing,' well, why should voters not have the capacity to think that all three of these different proposals have had the ruler run over them by experts within government?

If somebody has access to an advisory service like this, a well-resourced, independent and expert advisory service available to all MPs and registered political parties, and then somebody announces an election proposal, policy or initiative that has not gone through this process, the community will quite rightly ask, 'Why haven't you had the ruler run over it? How can we be confident, given what we've seen at the last state election and what we've seen in the years since, that this idea makes sense?'

The Treasurer says, 'Oh, well, political parties should do what I had to do when I was in opposition.' It is not my fault that the Treasurer in the other place spent 27 years in opposition doing those hard yards and coming up with those election policies, but the demands of the community and the demands of public debate are now higher. People expect more and people expect a better standard when it comes to these matters than they did previously.

At the last state election, the Treasurer announced his costings, and it was basically a two or three-page press release. About a third of it was saying that he was not going to do what Labor was going to do and another third of it was, 'And I can tell you from responses to questions on notice and information I have received that all our proposals are affordable within the context of the state budget.' That was it.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's now the standard.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's now the standard. However, it is not unreasonable to amend the budget measures bill to require another bill, another act, to be amended so that the parliament can have access to this sort of service.

I look forward to the debate—and not only on those four areas of change the government is seeking to make in the passage of the unamended bill—and the questions we have about each of those different areas, which I outlined in my comments before. Of course, we will also ask the government, just for the sake of the record, what they are hoping to get out of their own amendments. I am also looking forward to the discussion we are going to have in the committee stage, if and when we get to it, about the proposal put by the Leader of the Opposition. With those ever so brief remarks, I conclude.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, I may have been remiss in reminding you to indicate that you were the lead speaker—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am making a fairly big assumption here, member for Lee, but I take it that you were.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I did that. I did indicate that, sir.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (17:22): I rise to add my own contribution to this bill and in the first instance would like to focus on the changes proposed in here to the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act, which were covered in some detail by the member for Lee. I have a few perspectives of my own I would like to share, as the shadow minister for education as well, in what are incredibly important areas of public policy.

It is fair to say that this is probably the most significant part of the bill. In fact, when passed, it will provide the legislative basis needed by SA Police to commence the operation of these new mobile phone detection cameras, of which we have heard so much over the last few months. The bill also makes amendments to the Road Traffic Act 1971 to allow for the detection of offences involving the use of mobile phones in vehicles.

In practice, these detection cameras will be installed at high-risk metropolitan sites, and the high definition cameras that will form this new set-up will target drivers who are illegally using a phone while they are supposed to be in charge of a motor vehicle. This technology may sound new to us here in South Australia, but it has already been trialled in Victoria, just across the border, and I understand that it is currently being used in New South Wales and Queensland as well.

A three-month trial was conducted in Victoria using some of these high-resolution mobile phone detection cameras at some locations. It ran for about three months, I understand. In that three-month trial, it found that, of a total of 679,438 vehicles that went past these cameras, one in 42 drivers were detected illegally using a mobile phone behind the wheel.

That might sound like a lot, and I think it is, but I understand that the authorities in charge of conducting the trial in Victoria suspect that the rate is actually much higher than one in 42 because the trial occurred during stage 4 COVID restrictions that were then in place in Victoria. That rightly limited the mobility of people to move around metropolitan areas and, indeed, the state.

That would therefore suggest that, of the almost 680,000 vehicles that passed the cameras involved in that trial, it would have been a far greater number had stage 4 COVID restrictions not been in place. Nonetheless, I think we can all agree that when you consider the amount of traffic on our roads on a daily basis, with one in 42 drivers being detected illegally using a mobile phone whilst they are supposed to be in charge of a motor vehicle, it is a very serious issue indeed.

The way that the technology works, as I understand it, is that it actually uses artificial intelligence to enable high-res cameras to catch images of passing vehicles. Incredibly, not only is this technology amazing, in the sense that the AI component of it can pick up what is potentially a mobile phone, as opposed to something else that the driver could be using in the car, but it is capable of doing this in all traffic and weather conditions. Rain, hail or shine, these cameras are capable of detecting motorists who are using mobile phones when they ought not to be.

I want to say from the outset that this initiative does have the support of the opposition, as the previous speaker, the member for Lee, just outlined. There is absolutely no doubt that driver distraction and driver inattention for all reasons, but particularly as caused by the use of mobile phones behind the wheel, are a scourge in our society at the moment. There is no doubt about that. If you take the time to speak to any of the first responders who might attend traffic accidents—whether they be SAPOL, MFS, CFS or the SES—they will reinforce to you, as they have done to me, that we have an epidemic of people using mobile phones whilst they should be concentrating on the road.

I should add here that, having this in my mind and being someone in a job that necessitates a lot of electronic communication, I have had cause to contemplate doing this myself when parked at intersections in my community. At a red light for a significant period of time, I have sometimes scanned those vehicles around me, and on more than one occasion I have seen that every driver behind the wheel at that intersection—and we could be talking six or eight cars I could see from my vantage point—was using their mobile phone while waiting at the lights. It is quite remarkable. With that in our mind, it is incumbent upon us as lawmakers, as parliamentarians, to do something about it.

The road crash data of course reinforces just how dangerous this inattentive and distracted driving is. It reinforces just how dangerous using a mobile phone whilst being behind the wheel is. In fact, between 2015 and 2019 distraction or inattentive driving was listed as a key contributing factor in 43 per cent, or 193 individual cases, of all fatalities, and 48 per cent, or 1,396 individual cases, of all serious injury collisions. They are remarkable numbers.

In 2020, inattention or distraction was attributed as a contributing factor in 56 per cent of crashes involving a loss of life. I will say that again: last year, inattention or distraction whilst behind the wheel—and the majority of those cases I think we can probably safely assume was due to the use of a mobile phone—was a contributing factor in 56 per cent of crashes involving the loss of life. They are staggering figures when you consider that this is not poor road conditions, poor weather conditions, medical incidents or dangerous driving by other vehicles on the road that may have contributed to the loss of that person's life: 56 per cent is due to distraction and inattention. It is fair to say that it is at epidemic levels and that we certainly need to do something about it.

As one who is mildly obsessed by cars, as I think it is safe to say the member for Lee is, and as one who spends a lot of time reading about new motor vehicles and the amazing gadgets and technology they put in them now, I often pause to reflect upon what these statistics might look like, given the incredibly high levels of inattention and distraction, if the vehicles these distracted and inattentive drivers were driving did not have the most amazing modern safety features they now have.

Some of the stuff that I have in my humble Ford Mondeo—which is perhaps not the most salubrious vehicle, I agree, but I am very fond of it—is technology that keeps me and my family safe and was the stuff of science fiction when I was a kid, and that was not so long ago. We have things now that we take for granted in quite affordable vehicles, such as auto emergency brake, blind spot monitoring, rear cross traffic alert and lane assist, and those are just a few. That is on top of things like airbags.

I remember the first vehicle that my family had that had ABS and an airbag was a 1993 Ford Futura. It had an airbag for the driver—bad luck if you were the passenger or the kids in the back—and an anti-lock braking system, and we thought that was incredible. We thought that we had really made it and that it was a flash vehicle.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

Mr BOYER: Yes, it had sport mode and all that kind of stuff as well. It was really flash. It gives me reason to think now that in these vehicles that do not have one airbag—some have more than 12—if we had people using mobile phones in those older vehicles we used to drive in the way they do in today's modern vehicles, the level of road trauma we would be experiencing on our roads would be absolutely out of control.

We have technology now that makes up for some of this woeful distracted and inattentive driving, technology such as auto emergency brake that at relatively low speeds will apply the brakes in a situation where the car is about to collide with another vehicle or a pedestrian—often because

of course the driver is on their mobile phone. If we had the kind of problem we are dealing with now 20 years ago in vehicles that had none of that technology, I think we would see the levels of road trauma far above those we see now.

In many respects, we are made a little more immune from the effects of this distracted and inattentive driving than we would be if it were not for the amazing technology that we all take for granted and that we have in our motor vehicles on a daily basis.

I should add here that in my capacity as the shadow minister for education, and as someone who tries to drop his three daughters off to school as often as I can, I know that members of this place will agree with me when I say that we also have a growing problem across the metropolitan area with overcrowded kiss and drops at our schools, mostly at primary schools, where kids are still driven to school by their parents or carers.

Those kiss and drop zones at schools are becoming increasingly busy and overcrowded. In many cases, they are landlocked by the size of the school and not able to grow with the number of parents who have started to drop kids off. There is another whole issue there that we could discuss about kids not walking to school or riding their pushbikes to school but, that aside, schools and their kiss and drops have become more dangerous places as well. I think the potential for a catastrophic incident at a school due to inattentive and distracted driving from parents has only grown.

With all those things taken into account, I would like to reinforce that the opposition supports these mobile phone detection cameras. In what is an incredibly long segue, I would like to also add that, as the member for Lee touched upon, we are looking at an expiation fee for this offence now of something like \$646, including the Victims of Crime Fund component.

I understand that this probably has us in line with similar use of mobile phone offences that we apply. It may also be in line with what is charged in other jurisdictions interstate. Nonetheless, at some point we need to grapple with the issue that these fines have grown to such a magnitude that they run the risk of imposing incredible financial hardship upon the offender, resulting in some very unfortunate and unintended consequences for the individual or their family.

I completely accept that using one's mobile phone while at the wheel is a very dangerous practice. I accept that using one's mobile phone behind the wheel could result in the death of not just you but also another driver, passengers, other motorists or pedestrians. As elected members of the South Australian state parliament, we are in a privileged position to grapple with the difficult issues. My question is: where is the tipping point in terms of mandating an expiation fee that serves the very important purpose of acting as a big disincentive for motorists to reoffend, that goes well past the point of acting as a very strong and powerful disincentive and, in addition, imposes a catastrophic financial penalty on some South Australia families?

I also accept that the levels of these fines have been rising for a number of years. My concern is that a fine of \$646 could have a lasting financial impact on low-income South Australians. We need to remember that the point of expiations is, yes, to get the offender to pay a financial penalty for their act, whether it is using a mobile phone whilst driving, speeding, failing to give way, or whatever it might be, and also to act, therefore, as a deterrent to stop that person from committing such an act again. The point is not to financially penalise someone to the point that not only can they not afford to pay the fine but also they cannot afford basic necessities for themselves or their dependents.

I have to say that these stories are real and I have seen them in my community. I have spoken with people in my community who have been subjected to an expiation fine of this kind of magnitude for their one and only traffic offence. An older resident made a mistake and was very remorseful about their behaviour. They acknowledged that their behaviour could have resulted in the death of someone else or, at the very least, a very serious traffic accident. They had never done it before and were very unlikely to do it again. They were left with no choice but to visit a payday lender to get the money they needed to pay the \$600-odd. I do not think that is necessarily the area we want to be in.

It is not always the case. I acknowledge that, but I think we need to grapple with what is a very real situation, where some South Australians suffer such financial hardship, due to some of these larger traffic fines, that they resort to cutting down on necessities or visiting some of these more dubious kinds of payday lenders to get the money in time to pay the fine before paying any

additional late fees that might be added. I must say, too, that in some cases it could lead to some kind of petty crime in order to find the money to pay it, and that would certainly undermine the entire regime here.

As the member for Lee noted—and I think this goes some way to proving my point about the number of South Australians who will have difficulties such a large fine—that the 100,000 fines forecast under this budget across the three-year period at the \$646 level, including the victims of crime of course, would come to \$64 million.

But, interestingly, the government is forecasting \$46 million, and I am reliably informed by the work the member for Lee has done that the Treasurer's response to that is that they do not anticipate that all motorists will be able to pay the fine. Now, does that not speak volumes? Of the \$64 million that could be recouped, we are talking about potentially \$18 million here that the government is already forecasting may not come into their coffers.

I completely accept that in some cases it will be people who certainly do have the means to pay the fine and are simply recalcitrant and choose not to. But I think we can safely assume that somewhere in that \$18 million of forgone revenue that would otherwise be coming into the government coffers in these fines, there are some people who simply cannot pay the amount.

For that reason alone, I think it is incumbent upon us to take action and look at this to see if we can do a bit more research into finding a sweeter spot, I guess for lack of a better phrase, in terms of finding that balance between a deterrent, a financial penalty, but not imposing such financial hardship on low-income South Australians that they have to make choices between basics and necessities or paying their expiation notice.

I would also like to touch briefly in the time I have remaining on changes to the Land Tax Act. The member for Lee again covered this in good detail. I think it should be noted that the opposition understands all too well that there is a crisis out there in terms of rental availability and rental affordability. I note that the origin of this land tax incentive to offer a discount on eligible new build-to-rent properties is designed to stimulate or incentivise or encourage developers or landowners to build properties which are then available in the rental market, hopefully increasing supply and reducing the cost—and that is indeed a noble pursuit.

I think when we look in a little more detail at what is forecast here by the government in terms of what this discount and land tax will actually cost to the budget, it is only expected to cost \$50,000 in the 2023-24 financial year and then \$100,000 in the 2024-25 financial year. So given the limited amount of revenue the Treasury is actually forecasting here—or the limited amount of revenue that Treasury is forecasting to be forgone here I guess I should be saying—I think the estimate is only a very small number of these build-to-rent properties are actually going to be created or incentivised by this discount and most likely will be a drop in the ocean.

In the short time I have left, I also want to reiterate the words of the member for Lee in terms of the changes to payroll tax insofar as they will affect incentivising films and TV shows to be shot here in South Australia. I am quite passionate on this topic. I think we have a very rich history in South Australia. I was going through before some of the amazing films shot here like *Rabbit-Proof Fence*, *Gallipoli*, *Picnic at Hanging Rock*, *Shine*, *Look Both Ways*, *Wolf Creek*, and *The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert*. We have a very rich history.

I very much hope that the work the previous Labor government did to bring us into line with other jurisdictions Australia wide and internationally to make us more competitive does not result in us being able to not being able to produce some of the fantastic classic Australian films we have produced in the past.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (17:43): I rise to make a very brief contribution to the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill. As has been noted, this bill makes amendments to various acts—Land Tax Act, Mining Act, Payroll Tax Act—but my focus will be, as was the member for Wright's, on the changes to the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act.

I want to speak primarily about those changes and put them in the context of the road safety measures taken, or not taken as the case may be, by this government. It has been an area of policy which has seen a series of delays and inaction on various measures which the experts tell us could have significantly decreased road trauma and road death in our state. It has seen two successive ministers who have refused to take action in a timely way. I think that is a great shame and that we

could do better. I will get to this, but the Road Safety Strategy to 2031 has been released at last with some positive measures in it, and I look forward to discussing them as they come up.

But the most significant part of this bill, certainly in my view as the shadow minister for road safety, are the amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act, which provide the legislative basis for the implementation of these mobile phone detection cameras, these artificial intelligence-run cameras which are based on algorithms which observe behaviour and then make assessments on the basis of that observed behaviour.

First, this bill makes amendments to the Road Traffic Act to allow for the use of these artificial intelligence-based cameras, which use images taken by high definition cameras which are then used by artificial intelligence to identify whether or not a driver is using a mobile phone as defined by the law.

The intention is that these cameras will be placed in high-risk metropolitan sites, although, under questioning in the estimates process, the minister could not identify where those sites would be. It will be interesting to see what methodology is used to identify what those sites should be, where they should go, whether they will move around from time to time and how mobile these mobile phone detection cameras will be.

The bill also makes amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act to ensure consistency of definitions resulting from the changes to the Road Traffic Act. I will get to the technology soon, and there is some apprehension felt by members of the community, including myself and others on this side of the house, about the use of this technology. That is not to say we are opposed to the technology, but there is a certain amount of apprehension when you start using this type of technology. I will get to that soon.

First of all, I want to talk very briefly about road safety generally and the need for us to be vigilant in this area because, these concerns notwithstanding, we do support these measures. We do not oppose the measures outlined in this bill. I sincerely hope that the government are in fact wrong in their projections, that these measures do act as a deterrent to certain types of behaviour and that we see the road toll, road trauma and road death statistics go down as a result.

The police talk of the fatal five offences that are the cause of a significant proportion of road deaths and road trauma. These focus on the road user rather than on the road system, and we will get to systems later. The fatal five offences include drink and drug driving, speeding, seatbelts, dangerous road users and distraction.

It is increasingly clear to all of us, even before we look at the stats, that distraction caused by mobile phones is growing exponentially as a problem, probably across the world but certainly within our own state and our own country. Our phones are all consuming. We conduct so much of our business and so much of our social lives on the phone that it is very easy to inevitably be pulled into a phone as we drive. We need to be constantly vigilant that we are not doing that and that we are creating a society where that is not acceptable behaviour.

As the shadow treasurer said, road crash data collected over the last five years shows that distraction is a key contributing factor to 43 per cent of all fatalities and 48 per cent of all serious injury collisions. In 2020, inattention or distraction was shown to be a contributing factor to 56 per cent of crashes involving the loss of life.

I think these figures speak for themselves, but I also think they are almost certainly understating the problem. These observations have been made before, but anyone who looks around them while they are driving can see the problem. Anyone who sits at a traffic light and sees a person in front of them with their head stuck determinedly down while the traffic lights turn green can see the problem.

It is not a surprise that policymakers are desperate to combat this, whether it is through fines—and I take on board the concerns of the member for Wright about fines generally and these particularly high fines specifically—or demerit points, or by the addition of the sort of technology we are discussing here through this bill. That said, though, the shadow treasurer can be forgiven by having some misgivings about the motivation for this measure at this time.

The fines for this offence are now \$646; that is \$554 plus \$92 for the victims of crime levy. That is a lot of money. It is not as much as in Queensland. I know that when the government introduced these new fines quietly two or three years ago there was some commentary that the government may indeed follow the lead of Queensland and drastically increase the fines for these offences to \$1,000. The \$646, as it is now, indexed, was a 60 per cent increase, which is far enough, but to increase it to \$1,000 would have been a bridge too far, and that idea quietly died.

These fines were increased two or three years ago and it is pretty clear again, looking at what the shadow treasurer has been able to draw out of the government, that these artificial intelligence cameras will turbocharge the revenue-raising effect of these drastically increased fines. As I said, the shadow treasurer has done his homework. The government's own figures seem to reveal that the government is happy to accept that the deterrent effect of these cameras is minimal—and I hope they are wrong—and that these cameras may just be part of the state government's treatment of most motorists as a reliable form of ever-increasing revenue.

Again, on the government's own estimates these increases mean that next year motorists will be paying an extra \$15 million in mobile phone fines, \$10 million in higher victims of crime levies, \$14 million in higher speeding fines, \$2.9 million in higher registration costs just in outback areas, \$24 million in higher admin fees on rego bills and transport transactions, and \$12.7 million in higher registration costs. As the member for Lee points out, this is even before we start talking about the electric vehicles tax.

I am keen to impress upon the house, as others have, that the opposition is not opposed to this bill. We will not be opposing the measures in this bill. Indeed, I think everyone here knows that I take road safety very seriously and that I would argue very strongly for any measure which would demonstrably reduce the level of road trauma and deaths on South Australian roads. That is why we in the opposition were so angered that, in the first budget of the Marshall government, the government axed the Motor Accident Commission.

The Motor Accident Commission was an independently constituted body, which provided advice to the government, which provided promotional activity based on that advice and was very successful and internationally recognised as an important factor in reducing the road toll over the previous 10 years in South Australia. Following the decision to axe the Motor Accident Commission, we saw an enormous spike in road trauma and in driver death. Indeed, not only was it the highest spike in more than a decade but it was the highest figure for driver deaths in more than a decade.

These figures continued to remain high until COVID hit and changed all our road traffic movements and driver behaviours and so on. Even with COVID and all that it entails, the statistics remain grim. Total fatalities this year stand at 66. This is, of course, far better than the peak in 2019, but it is still much higher than the average and higher than this time last year. Clearly, whatever the government claims it is doing about road safety simply is not working.

We have been assured by the government time and time again that the money allocated previously to the Motor Accident Commission in its role as an independent advisor, some \$12 million per year, will be ring-fenced and allocated to road safety. I have to take the government's word on that, yet through various budget estimates processes it is still unclear exactly where that money is being spent.

We do know that SAPOL has taken a lot of the promotional work, and of course SAPOL continue to do the very good work that they do in responding to road trauma, as indeed do other agencies, such as the CFS, the SES, the MFS and so on. SAPOL continue to do that work despite the fact that they are significantly stretched in their resources by the COVID response.

We have also been told that that the research and advisory functions previously conducted by the Motor Accident Commission have been passed on to a road safety advisory group. But, two or three years later, it still remains unclear to me exactly what this group does. We have heard nothing from them. I have not seen a media release. I have not seen the minister stand up beside them and announce what their advice is, what their activities have been or how they have contributed to the road safety effort in this state, if anything. I hope they have; I hope they have been beavering away behind the scenes, really working on some significant changes later on, but I have not seen any evidence of it.

On this side of the house, we still think it was a mistake to axe the Motor Accident Commission. It was an independently constituted body, it provided good advice, research-based advice to the government, and out of that research we had some very good promotional activity that worked—and that was recognised nationally and internationally as having worked.

After 3½ years of this from the Marshall government, our roads are as unsafe as ever. On 15 July this year, the Liberals released their draft Road Safety Strategy to 2031. While this document did contain some good things—and I will get to those—it did serve to highlight the Marshall government's shocking record on roads since it took office in 2018.

The figures are absolutely clear. Under the Liberals, the previous downward trend in deaths on our roads has—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Do not get me started on Kalangadoo—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ODENWALDER: Do not get me started on the problems—

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Chaffey! The member for Elizabeth will not respond to interjections.

Mr ODENWALDER: As I said—

Mr McBride interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop!

Mr ODENWALDER: I am easily distracted, that's right—lucky it is only artificial intelligence on that side of the house. As I said before, in 2019, after 10 years of downward trend, there was a 42 per cent increase in the number of deaths on our roads from 2018. In 2020, again despite the significant reduction in traffic movements as a result of COVID, there was a 16 per cent increase on the 2018 figure. So far this year, 66 lives have been lost on the state's roads; that is an increase of more than 12 per cent on the same period last year. March this year was our deadliest month in nearly four years.

Clearly, since coming to government the Marshall government are not doing enough in terms of road safety. Not only have they abolished the Motor Accident Commission but they have also delayed recommendations from the experts on motorcycle licensing, entirely refused to reconvene the Motorcycle Reference Group and are now even looking at significantly increasing fees for government-operated motorcycle licence training under the name RiderSafe.

Comparatively, under the former Labor government the number of deaths on our roads was steadily trending down over the last 10 years of the Rann/Weatherill governments. In government, Labor funded the Motor Accident Commission to promote road safety and provide evidence-based advice to government. They increased penalties and fines for dangerous driving, passed new laws to impound and crush the vehicles of hoon drivers, introduced stricter graduated licensing for learner and probationary drivers, reduced the legal blood alcohol limit for drivers from .08 to .05 and, of course, introduced roadside drug testing.

The work the Marshall government has done, such as it is—and as is the case in so many areas of policy for the Marshall government—is simply to tinker on the edges of work already done by the previous government except, of course, supporting the Motor Accident Commission.

The draft Road Safety Strategy was released in July. I think it was full of some pretty laudable aspirations. I was particularly pleased that there seemed to be an implicit commitment to look at safe systems. That is, you take the approach that you accept that road use is an inherently risky activity, you accept that human beings are flawed and they make mistakes and that sometimes they behave in ways contrary to their own best interests.

The Safe System approach recognises human failing and instead focuses on the environment we operate in as road users. In the words of its proponents, it seeks to create a 'forgiving

road system'. There are four areas that the Safe System addresses, and I read directly from the Road Safety Strategy:

1. People make predictable mistakes that can lead to road crashes.
2. The human body has a limited physical ability to tolerate crash forces before harm occurs.
3. A shared responsibility exists amongst those who plan, design, build, manage and use roads and vehicles to prevent crashes resulting in serious injury or death.
4. All parts of the system must be strengthened to multiply their effects; and if one part fails, road users are still protected.

This is a system that, rather than punish the mistakes or stupidity of people, designs a system that accommodates those people and makes them safer.

The road traffic system is not something we thought of yesterday; it is something that has evolved over 100 years, along with modes of transport evolving over 100 years. We have arrived at a system where, as much as we can retrofit safety around it, it is not a system you can imagine would pass any test were it introduced wholesale into society today. It is incumbent upon us now, as the inheritors of this system, to seek a safer approach.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30.

Mr ODENWALDER: In the time remaining, I want to reiterate that ultimately we on this side of the house will be voting for this measure, and I will be voting for this measure because we certainly do need to address the problem of mobile phone distraction. It is a massive problem. The problem it represents is almost certainly under-represented in all the data, but that does not mean that this measure sits entirely easily with me and with others in my community.

We are talking of a very serious step here. As far as I am aware, this is the first time that we are allowing artificial intelligence, a very sophisticated computer program, to make findings—at least, preliminary findings—about the criminality or otherwise of certain behaviour. I am not saying that this is something we need to fear unnecessarily, and I am not scared of technology, but it is worth inquiring as to exactly what the procedures and checks and balances will be around the use of these machines. This apprehension is being expressed by ordinary members in my community.

Rowan is a constituent of mine. He is also a former CFS volunteer of more than 12 years and, as such, he has attended many road crashes in his time. He is not someone who would normally object to a road safety measure, but it is worth reading into *Hansard* some of his concerns about this technology and the way it has been used elsewhere. He starts:

Dear minister—

which is a good start—

I'm writing you this email this evening to express my concerns about Premier Marshall's Government directive to the Police Commissioner to research and implement Mobile Phone detection cameras onto South Australian roads...From the [outset] I am NOT against the use of mobile detection cameras—

and he reiterates the fact that he is a member of the One Tree Hill Country Fire Service, and has been for over 12 years, and has attended many road crash rescues. He reiterates that he has seen the end results of distracted driving, being either death or devastation to the other driver through acquiring serious lifelong injuries. The email continues:

The issues I fear are more to do with a) the technology itself and b) the systems/processes of recourse for accused offenders due to the potential failure of the Artificial Intelligence/Camera technology.

I am originally from NSW and all my family still reside there. NSW have rolled out these Mobile Phone Detection cameras across the state in either a fixed or mobile capacity, the mobile cameras look like typical road construction light trailers, instead they have two cameras on movable poles that sit over the lanes of traffic...The cameras are connected to an Artificial Intelligence software system that Automatically assesses any photograph that is taken to verify whether or not a defined Mobile phone offence has been committed and if an infringement needs to be issued.

This is where the system is flawed, there have been quite a few cases that have gone through the courts in NSW where the Cameras have taken photographs of a purported offence, but in actual fact the picture taken was not of a mobile phone, but rather another object such as a can of drink or in one case a black plastic box with a clear lid that 'looked' like a mobile phone. The reflection of a streetlight which gave the impression to the Artificial Intelligence software that there was a phone in the drivers centre cup holder/console when there wasn't and ended up [being used as] an infringement, this I feel would put the alleged offender at an immediate disadvantage.

This is where the issue regarding systems/processes of recourse for alleged offenders comes into question.

He goes on to say:

This bureaucracy...can cause issues for the alleged offender as the process of reviewing can take anywhere over a week or longer meaning that for a driver that may have three points or less left, or is on a 'good behaviour' agreement with the magistrate with one point, would potentially end up having their licence unfairly either suspended or cancelled because of the flaw in the Artificial Intelligence/Camera system...

Without reading the rest, in the time available I want to say that we support this measure. There are concerns within the community about the creep of artificial intelligence into the job of the police. I do not necessarily resist that, but I do think it is something we need to interrogate properly and I intend to during the committee stage.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (19:35): I rise tonight to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill 2021. This is a bill to amend the Land Tax Act 1936, the Mining Act 1971, the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Payroll Tax Act 2009 and the Road Traffic Act 1961. Let me start by talking about the land tax amendment. The amendment to the Land Tax Act will reduce land tax assessments by 50 per cent, where a building is constructed after 1 July 2021 and is used for a build-to-rent property.

When I started to write some comments about this, I thought it would be important to understand what is exactly meant by build-to-rent. Build-to-rent, referred to as multi-family housing, is a relatively new model of urban housing development. Build-to-rent apartment complexes are designed and constructed by a developer who retains ownership of the building when it is complete. The apartments are then rented out to tenants by the developer, which also manages and maintains the complex. Often, developments have the backing of an institutional investor, like a superannuation fund.

It goes on to say that build-to-rent is a long-established phenomenon in Europe, where it made up nearly one-fifth of the entire commercial market as early as 2020. In Australia, the sector is still relatively small but looks set to grow in the years to come. They say that there are about 10,000 build-to-rent apartments currently in the pipeline in Australia. There are some benefits for it in the fact that you can have longer terms with different renewal conditions, lower no rental bonds and ownership of things like pets and decorating.

I find that this is a very interesting ambition. I know that the Property Council raised this with the Economic and Finance Committee. We support this amendment to the budget measures bill; however, it is important to consider this amendment as part of the government's housing policy. It is to provide incentives for developers to build more rental properties, and it is particularly important, given the current housing crisis here in South Australia. We should be in no doubt that we are in the midst of a housing crisis. In some ways, it is a perfect storm, some of the government's own making and a misfortune of timing and events.

COVID has seen many people return from interstate and overseas to South Australia as flexible working arrangements and remote working become the new normal. With housing prices at a record high, many private investors are taking the opportunity to sell their rental properties whilst the going is good. My electorate office has heard from many tenants, some who have rented property for more than a decade, suddenly having their leases not renewed because the owner plans to sell and, all of a sudden, they need to find alternative housing. The private rental market is currently so competitive that couples who are both working full time are struggling to secure a home.

Whilst continuing to sell off old public housing stock, the government is not investing anywhere near enough to rebuild new stock to replace it, so we are also facing a massive public housing shortage. All measures to improve housing stock and ease pressure on the private and public rental market are positive steps but, when we consider the bill, the guidelines defining what criteria a build-to-rent property would look like are yet to be drafted.

The bill notes the following. There are a minimum number of build-to-rent dwellings or units within a property, and if you look at the New South Wales build-to-rent, that says you must have 50 units to participate in build-to-rent. That is very concerning to me because those who represent regional areas know that it is probably unlikely that you would have an apartment building with 50 apartments.

It seems to me that this is very focused around the CBD of Adelaide and I am concerned that that will limit the number of people who will access it. The minimum lease conditions that must be offered to tenants of the build-to-rent property are unclear and yet to be drafted. There is a lack of detail regarding the nature of ownership and management of the building and the land on which the building is situated.

Any undertakings that the owner may be required to give in relation to the building and the land on which the building is situated needs to be clarified and, within that, consideration of the development of affordable housing. Where does this fit in to build-to-rent? I do not think that the government thinks this is going to take off in any great way because they have only put aside \$50,000 in 2023-24 for this land tax rebate and \$100,000 in 2024-25. So while we welcome it, and look forward to further details, it is something that is done with little enthusiasm. It is a bit disappointing.

As you can appreciate, Mr Speaker, this gives the Treasurer a very broad remit of terms of what might fall under the category of build-to-rent. Whilst the 50 per cent reduction in land tax is a decent incentive, with such vagueness around which properties will be eligible to apply it is difficult to see how this legislation will have any meaningful impact on the current housing crisis.

Let me now turn to the Mining Act amendment. This amendment seeks to close a loophole in the existing act that allowed tenement holders to pay lower royalties by contracting at less than market value. The amendment will mean that the value of minerals will be market value at the time of sale, regardless of whether they are purchased direct or via a contractor. I understand that there are no examples of this happening to date in South Australia, although there have been examples interstate, and this amendment may be preventative in nature rather than addressing any current concern.

Let me now turn to the payroll tax amendment. The 2021-22 budget announced the government's intention to abolish the film production payroll tax exemption, an ex gratia scheme, and redirect the average annual cost of those schemes to the South Australian Film Corporation's Screen Production Fund. South Australia has a proud history of film production and in recent years has attracted international productions including *Hotel Mumbai*, *Storm Boy*, and *Mortal Kombat*, a movie we have heard about a lot in this house.

Historically, the payroll tax exemption and ex gratia schemes have cost \$1.6 million in total per annum, with the breakdown between the cost of the two individual arrangements varying by year. This measure represents a significant shift in film funding, pivoting to resourcing the South Australian Film Corporation to invest in local film production. With international borders closed, there is some rationale for returning to locally produced content. However, it would be a real shame, once we emerge from restrictions and international travel resumes, if the removal of this incentive results in other states or territories attracting international film production instead of South Australia.

The government's own Growth State agenda knows that South Australia is internationally renowned as a premier destination for quality film production. Filmmakers are drawn to the state for multiple reasons: world-class crews; purpose-built, state-of-the-art production facilities at the Adelaide studios; Australia's most competitive suite of government screen incentives and rebates, which can be coupled with Australia's commonwealth incentives; and easy access to diverse and stunning locations.

From blockbuster movies and hit TV shows to apps and console games, screen content produced in South Australia are watched, played and purchased by audiences around the world. The bang for buck generated in terms of jobs, industry development and skills retention by international blockbusters is something we should be striving to retain. While we will support this amendment to this bill, I think we should be willing and ready and agile to move when those borders open again.

I turn now to motor vehicles and the Road Traffic Act amendments. This provides the legislative basis for South Australia Police to roll out new mobile phone detection cameras by making amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to ensure consistency of definitions resulting from amendments to the Road Traffic Act 1961 to implement the mobile phone cameras initiative.

The bill also makes amendments to the Road Traffic Act 1961 to allow for the detection of offences that involve use of mobile phone devices while driving using safety cameras which will be installed at high-risk metropolitan sites. These high definition cameras will target drivers illegally using a mobile. Distraction, especially due to using a mobile phone, is one of the key causes of

fatalities and serious injuries on our roads. Using a mobile phone while driving can significantly impair a driver's reaction time, visual search patterns, ability to maintain speed and position on the road, and the ability to judge safe gaps in the traffic. It also impacts general awareness of other road users.

We know that research shows that using a mobile phone while driving increases the risk of crashing by at least four times. In 2020, inattention or distraction was attributed as a contributing factor to 56 per cent of crashes involving the loss of life. There is no doubt at all that the opposition supports this amendment. We understand that we must continually raise awareness about distractions that prevent us from driving safely that can impact our own lives and the lives of others.

However, we do note that this is a significant revenue raising opportunity and the question is always: is this balanced equally as a road safety measure or should road safety be the main emphasis of why we introduce new rules? We know that expiations alone do not significantly reduce dangerous behaviours like driving whilst distracted on our roads. I would encourage the government to continue with education and marketing campaigns. We know that there are various ways of educating young people. If I remember, there is the RAP program that goes into schools for year 11s and 12s. I think when we introduce something as significant as this, it must be also together with increased marketing and education.

Of course, we raise the issue of it being a revenue raising opportunity, and this government has form in regard to increasing costs for South Australian motorists. In addition to reaping \$15 million in mobile phone fines, they have also slugged taxpayers with \$10 million in higher victims of crime levies, \$14 million in higher speeding fines, \$2.9 million in higher registration costs in outback areas like KI and Roxby Downs, and \$24 million in higher administration fees on rego bills and transport transactions. In addition, we have had a \$12.7 million increase in higher registration costs. This is all before the government's proposed new highly unpopular electric vehicle tax. Promising lower costs and better services for South Australians at the last election, this government has proven these are hollow words, and broken promises have been shown over successive budgets.

It is anticipated that the South Australian government will ping more than 100,000 motorists between 2022 and 2025 with this new ability, using artificial intelligence. Let us just go through what that means. The current expiation fee for using a mobile phone while driving is \$554 plus a \$92 victim of crime levy. Therefore, if there are 100,000 drivers at \$646, that is about \$64.6 million in revenue. However, the budget estimates only forecast \$46 million.

When the Treasurer was asked to provide an explanation, he said that some people would struggle to pay. It is worth considering, if this is what we have at the outset, whether it is a good economic practice to write off nearly a quarter of estimated revenue that is generated by an expiation, based on the assumption that many people will be unable to pay. If the Treasurer believes the expiations are too expensive for a third of drivers who are going to be pinged, it brings into focus a question around what behavioural impact the government believes these expiations are actually going to have.

Increasing fees and charges are a blunt instrument in tackling an important road safety challenge in relation to driving while distracted. All of us are increasingly reliant on mobile phones for everything in our lives, including banking, conferencing, retrieving documents, diary management and more, meaning that this dependence is ever increasing. We know the temptation to access your mobile whilst driving also increases. Financial penalties via expiations do have an impact but they are the bluntest instrument possible. For those who simply cannot pay them, they probably do little to deter risky behaviour.

Let us remind ourselves how using a mobile phone while driving distracts you in many ways. It is a physical distraction, handling the phone while driving, taking your hand off the steering wheel to dial a phone number or to answer or end a call. It is a visual distraction, taking your eyes off the road, and it is a cognitive mental distraction by doing two mental tasks at the same time, like having a conversation and driving.

The Towards Zero Together website is a great resource of information about the hazards of dialling and talking on a mobile phone. It talks about riskier decision-making. Deciding whether it is safe to turn in traffic is a complex task. Using a mobile phone while driving affects judgement and concentration and you may fail to choose a safe gap. When making a decision to turn across

oncoming traffic, you also tend not to consider the environmental conditions such as when it is raining or the roads are slippery. If you do not make safe turns, you could crash.

There are slower reactions. You generally react more slowly when using a mobile phone, particularly when you are deep in conversation. You may take longer to respond to traffic signals or completely miss them. There is also slower and less controlled braking. During a mobile phone call, your brake reaction time is slower and you brake with more force and less control, which results in shorter stopping distances available between you and the car in front. Wandering out of your lane easily happens if you are on a mobile phone and you are not being alert to your surroundings. You spend less time checking your mirrors and what is going on around you. This affects your ability to monitor and negotiate traffic safely.

This budget measures bill covers a diverse range of topics: land tax, build-to-rent, the Mining Act, the increasing use of artificial intelligence and the increasing of fines. It also has payroll tax and Road Traffic Act implications. We will be supporting this amendment bill, but tonight we raise certain concerns. Build-to-rent seems to be something we are doing but not with much enthusiasm.

Of course, we will raise our concerns on the side of road safety, concerns about the fact that we are already going out saying that potentially up to a third of people cannot pay. It is incredibly concerning and not necessarily the right balance to have in public policy. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (19:55): I rise to speak in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill. As keen followers of parliament would know, for every budget there is an associated Appropriation Bill and also a budget measures bill, where various amendments to different pieces of legislation are included. This is where the government of the day often seeks to make particular changes to implement their vision for the budget of that year and the changes they want to see as part of that appropriation.

Consistent with the pretty lacklustre approach we have seen from the state budget this year, this is also a relatively lacklustre budget measures bill. As I have noted in the parliament before, this is the last budget, thankfully, for the Hon. Rob Lucas, who was elected to parliament slightly before I was born and who has been Treasurer in the 1990s and now in the 2020s.

We can really see that this is a budget that is just going through the motions. I have to say that if the member for Bragg had been the Treasurer—as she has apparently mooted her desire to be if the Liberals are re-elected—I am sure there would have been some of her noted social reforms in this budget measures bill. This is not something we see significant reforms in; this is a pretty lacklustre set of measures the government is promoting.

There is one area, though, where I will make significant comments and that is in relation to road safety. This is an area in which I, and I am sure many other members, are passionate that we need to improve our performance in South Australia. I am sure that any of us who represent communities across the state will have met with family members who have been devastated by the loss of loved ones in road fatalities but also—which cannot be forgotten—of people who have sustained serious and lifelong injuries in road crashes across the state.

Those crashes can really upturn people's lives, even if they are not included in the most common road toll statistics. Those crashes are often not reported in the media, but they can have devastating consequences for people. Sadly, I have met many of those families in my electorate and I know the devastating impact it has had on them. With that in mind it is important that we do everything possible to improve road safety.

Just before the last election I was lucky enough and honoured to be road safety minister for the last six months of the previous government. It was an honour because it really is an important area of public policy. It is an intersection of a whole range of areas to make sure that we can improve safety for people on our roads.

Unfortunately, we have seen a significant reduction of that effort under this government since they were elected. It started from day one, when the position of road safety minister was abolished. There is no road safety minister anymore. There are shared responsibilities across a number of ministers who look after road safety issues, but we no longer have a minister dedicated to the task.

That was an important role because you got to sit down with the key agencies—SA Police, the Department for Transport, as well as the Motor Accident Commission, which, when I was minister, had a key role in providing road safety policy as well as road safety promotional campaigns—to work through those issues. There would be different perspectives, there would be debates, you would listen to outside experts and have discussions with the community about how we could lower the road toll, lower the impact of fatalities and serious injuries across our state.

I think abolishing that ministry position has been a retrograde step. I think that it is absolutely important that that should be a ministry in the future. I know that from our team the member for Elizabeth has been doing excellent work in this area, and it is something that we want to see really brought up and improved upon.

Another area where I am significantly concerned by what we have seen is in relation to one of those agencies I would deal with and meet: the Motor Accident Commission. The Motor Accident Commission was an agency up until this government was elected. It was an important agency which provided policy advice and campaigns—independently and with its own independent board and, I think importantly, separately from the police and the transport department—and which could focus on how we could improve road safety as its number one mission.

This gave them a level of independence that I think was very important. I think that they put up campaigns that were very innovative and ones that a normal government agency might have scoffed at and said, 'Maybe we shouldn't have this sort of campaign.' They used the best advertising and research evidence to come up with the best possible campaigns. They also had the ability to draw the best possible evidence from Australia and around the world in terms of road safety and put that in front of the minister with that level of independence that was provided to them from not being the police, from not being the Department for Transport and from having an independent board that was in place.

Unfortunately, one of the previous budget measures bills, I believe, abolished that office and we no longer have that independent role. Those responsibilities have been shuffled between the Department for Transport and the South Australian police. In particular, I do want to shout out to the South Australian police, who play an incredible role in our state, as I have noted many times before, and in particular in road safety. I would like to thank those hardworking officers on the frontline who are the ones who have to deal with the consequences of these fatalities, these crashes on our roads, which in many instances are an absolutely harrowing experience for them.

When I was the minister, I was lucky to go and meet with our police who are dedicated to traffic offences and also the police who investigate road crashes. They do an absolutely fantastic job. I believe very strongly it was a role for an outside agency to provide that different independent advice in relation to the campaigns that we would run.

I think that we saw a significantly greater focus under the previous government in relation to promoting those campaigns, making sure, as the member for Lee noted before, that as we led into public holidays and the like there would be a huge emphasis and a decision to ensure that all the media and all the airwaves were bombarded with messages about road safety. Unfortunately, ministers in the current government have not had that focus, and I think we have seen road safety take a step backwards over the past three years.

Where they have taken a step forward is in relation to what they are charging motorists in terms of fees and charges. That has been the one area in which they have gone further. It has been a Treasury-led exercise and they have been able to say that of course that helps to be a deterrent, but this is also an opportunity for the Treasurer to raise additional revenue, as we are seeing through this budget measures bill. It is important to recollect that this government were elected on a platform of lower costs to South Australians, and we have seen the exact opposite upon their election. This legislation is yet another measure that is breaking that promise.

What we have in this legislation is to increase very substantially what they are going to be charging South Australians in terms of fees for people using mobile phones while they are driving. This is obviously something that is a significant factor in terms of road safety and it is obviously a concern to everybody, the distraction we see on our roads that can lead to very significant

consequences. From that measure, it is to be welcomed, but the only measure they are taking is in relation to where they can charge people more.

So people will be aware that this government have already previously increased the charges for fees in relation to using a mobile phone while driving a vehicle—that is now up to \$554—plus they have also increased the victims of crime levy, and that is now up to \$92. The fine in place for this offence is now \$646. What this legislation does is allow an additional measure to be used for mobile phone detection cameras, which will essentially allow a very significant increase in the number of people who are caught doing the wrong thing.

This is really an area where the government have set a clear target, and their budget is reliant upon reaching that target of catching a certain number of people. This is not, 'We are doing this for road safety and maybe no-one extra will be caught.' We know very clearly how many extra people they think they are going to catch.

In 2022-23, they think they are going to catch 35,000 people, and that is going to rake in an additional \$15.688 million from South Australians. Then that increases the next year to 37,230 additional people and the government will rake in \$17.1 million of additional revenue. Then in 2024-25, 28,100 additional expiations will raise an additional \$13.2 million. So this is very clearly the government setting a target of how much additional revenue they are aiming to raise through the adoption of these measures.

The figures provided by the Treasurer's office to the shadow treasurer show that across those three years it expects there to be 100,000 fines issued across those years. The total amount of those fines to be issued would be \$46 million from South Australians across those three years. Of course, if you add up the \$646 from the 100,000 fines across the three years, that would be in the order of \$64 million extra.

Apparently, the difference between those is that government do not anticipate that all motorists will be able to pay those fines. There will be a significant difference between those fines and what they are actually going to raise in revenue. We know there is little deterrent effect from these fines because in the third year of operations there are still over 28,000 fines being handed out. So they are projecting a very small decrease over the course of this measure from when it is being implemented.

This is just one of many measures the government have brought in where they are increasing fines and charges for South Australians. In this current year, across the 2019-20 state budget and the 2020-21 state budget, they are increasing motor vehicle registration above indexation, \$12.2 million; Motor Vehicles Act administration fees, \$23.2 million; the outer areas concession for motor vehicle registration, \$2.8 million; increases in expiations for high-risk offences, \$14.1 million; and the victims of crime levy, \$9.1 million. That is just this year, and then add these additional fines onto next year and you have very significant increases in fines and charges that this government are collecting from the motorists of South Australia.

We are very concerned as well that some of the measures in relation to road safety that were underway under the previous government have stalled and been delayed under this government. None of those is a greater issue than the huge delay we have seen in implementing a graduated licensing scheme for motorcycle riders in getting their licence. When I was the minister we sat down with the motorcycle riders groups, the Motorcycle Reference Group—all the various different groups: SAPOL, MAC, the department, the riders groups—and we sought and reached agreement on the need for change in this area.

That change was drafted. It was put out for public consultation before the election and then it was delayed year upon year, with no implementation under this government until just very recently. Sadly, I think that delay has had an impact in terms of very significantly delaying those changes that are needed because we know that there are very long lead times in making sure that if we pass something in this parliament for it to have an actual impact on the ground is going to take years and years. Those delays that this government had upon their election have had an impact and we are sadly seeing the effect now.

I was just looking at the statistics in terms of fatalities on South Australian roads at the moment, and they paint a worrying picture of an increase in fatalities that we have seen. Already this year, sadly, 66 people have lost their lives on South Australian roads, whether as drivers,

passengers, motorcycle riders or pedestrians. At the same time last year, there were 61, so we have seen a significant increase since then.

If you compare that with 2018, there were 49 at the same time of the year. There has been a significant increase between 2018 and 2021 on our roads. At the same time, you could argue that, particularly with various restrictions, there has probably been a reduction in the amount of traffic on our roads over that time. None of that has pointed out even more than when you look at the fact that last year, in 2020, there was a 16 per cent higher fatality rate on our roads compared with 2018. Even when you account for the fact that the traffic on our roads was significantly down last year because of the impact of COVID-19, restricting travel and restricting movement through much of the course of last year, you would have expected fatalities to go down but, rather, they went up compared with 2018.

We have not seen enough action on this issue. This government has not taken this issue seriously enough, except where it has involved a measure led by Treasury with very specific targets about how much additional revenue they can get to prop up the budget. This needs to be a comprehensive approach across all areas of government, across all policy levers, not just using this one lever to achieve the outcome, because the government's approach so far has not been working.

Lastly, I would like to speak in support of the proposed amendments that have been tabled by the member for Lee in relation to establishing a parliamentary budget advisory service. This is now in place in many states and territories across Australia and the commonwealth government, as well as in many countries around the world. It is for the betterment of government, and it is for the betterment of our system of government and democracy to have the best possible costed policies and to have the best possible debate about what those policies should be, no matter who is in government or who is in opposition in the future.

This is something that we are proposing the parliament should adopt to make sure that in the future, not just this election but the election after that and 10 elections down the track, we have the best possible policies that are costed in the best way to make sure that when people are elected we do not see the sort of thing that happened when this government was elected, where they promised a right-hand turn of a tram costing in the tens of millions of dollars, and that figure ended up being a nine-digit figure once the proper costings of that measure came out, as to what a right-hand turn of the tram just out the front of this building would cost.

Those are the sorts of things that can be avoided if proper information is provided across not just the government and opposition but minor parties and Independents as well to make sure that there is a grounding and a common understanding of what the costs of different measures are. Then we can have the debate and we can have the proper discourse of ideas but not end up with what happened last time, when this government were elected—their costings were way out on a number of projects and things had to be cancelled or significantly changed or costs blew out.

We do not want to see that happen again. This will be a long-term improvement for the state of democracy and for voters, ultimately, in having the ability to make their decisions on all the different policies: government, opposition but also, importantly, minor parties and Independents. If you are Independent, you have essentially got very few resources to be able to undertake this work. If this policy is adopted—if the parliament adopts this—it will make sure that resources are available for them for the best possible debate of ideas.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (20:15): I will be providing a contribution to the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill. This bill makes amendments to the Land Tax Act 1936, the Mining Act 1971, the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Road Traffic Act 1961 and the Payroll Tax Act 2009.

Just briefly, the Land Tax Act changes relate to a new scheme where developers or homebuilders can benefit, if they build homes for rental purposes. Of course, in this environment we welcome anything that is going to provide more housing, but this is a very tiny measure. There is a tiny measure: a provision for a land tax discount in this case. In the second half of 2019 it is worth remembering that parliament considered changes relating to their Land Tax 1936.

There was a degree of surprise regarding the proposed changes and, while the changes hoped to raise an additional \$40 million, with further investigation it was understood that over

\$100 million a year would be the result of the proposal, so there was a commitment to other measures to offset this proposal, which was set, really, to impact property owners and many who do not have the disposable income that would be able to pay for this.

Indeed, those few individuals with property having in excess of \$1 million of taxable land were at the end of significant tax cuts, and, as you would expect, of course, the larger volume of the residential and commercial property owners were on the other end and required a much larger outlay of money—seriously.

We see the member for Dunstan fails to remain committed to the promises made in the election period of the 2018 election to lower costs, particularly in this regard. In order to gain the support of the crossbench, commitments were made regarding public housing and the reduction of power bills by introducing more energy efficient technologies and other initiatives. The ABC reported on that deal with the Greens at the time:

It includes more than \$7 million a year for maintenance and upgrades to existing public housing, \$2 million a year for emergency accommodation and transitional housing for people in need and a five-year trial of land tax exemptions for private houses rented as affordable housing.

The Greens also secured solar panels to be installed on 75 per cent of all existing public housing, and solar panels and batteries to be installed on at least 75 per cent of new public housing.

That is public housing new builds. When you go to the Greens website, they provide the following claims:

1. An additional \$7.5 million per annum from 2020/21 for upgrades and improvements to existing public housing stock;
2. An additional \$2 million per annum from 2020/21 to increase the provision of emergency accommodation and transitional housing for people in need. This includes women and children affected by family violence and people experiencing homelessness;
3. A 5 year trial for a scheme to provide a land tax exemption for private houses that are rented as affordable housing while they are managed by a community housing provider (c.\$400K pa for 5 years);

Then there was:

4. Mandating 'universal design' as a building and design standard for 75% of all new public housing.

Then there is:

5. Installing solar panels on a minimum of 75% of all suitable existing public housing;
6. Installing batteries together with solar panels in a minimum of 75% of new public housing;
7. Legislating that land subject to heritage agreements under the Native Vegetation Act is exempt from Land Tax.

What we need to remember is that this government has made an art form of stuffing up the spin and substance of their housing policies. When there are claims that an extra \$7.5 million per year for upgrades and maintenance is happening, you have to remember that the minister claimed that maintenance spending was \$130 million per year when they tendered the new contracts earlier this year, but in a press release \$115 million was the quoted number just months earlier.

If you look in the annual report, which was signed off by the chair of the Housing Authority and the chief executive, you find that the actual spending as audited by the external agencies is closer to \$105 million. Where is the truth? We have \$130 million, \$115 million and \$105 million. This is not like *Pick a Box*; this is what we should be telling people as truth about the expenditure.

When the minister is questioned on this, the answers would make our greatest Olympic gymnast proud—'Go for gold.' In fact, when I listened to some of the commentary around housing, I think Roy and HG would have a good time. You would have the 'battered sav' and the 'hello boys' and all those different routines that they like to commentate on at the Olympics in some sort of parody. That is what we see sometimes here. We are seeing such confusion.

When you go back to what I spoke about before on point 1, this additional \$7.5 million per annum, they are already wobbly on this. This is wobbly. The alleged \$2 million per year extra for emergency accommodation is another furphy. The motel budget has been demand driven for years. If people need a roof over their head, they have to get it, and that is the way it is, but the measure has blown out completely over the past two or three years. It has gone from \$15,000 in the nineties—

so 25 years ago—to \$7.5 million and more now. This last year, I am sure our eyes are going to water, and of course it is COVID driven to some degree.

The five-year land tax exemption for private owners who allow their properties to be used as community housing just gives the owners the same benefit that already applies to community housing. There is really nothing extra here at all. The mandate for 75 per cent of new public housing to meet universal design criteria has been part of the Housing Trust guidelines for more than a decade. When Labor was in power, the actual rate delivered was often closer to 90 per cent. If this government only achieves the 75 per cent, it is actually a step backwards.

When we talk about solar panels on 75 per cent of existing public housing, it has a huge caveat. The government has to deem it suitable. It does not have listed public criteria. There is no apparent audit or accountability being applied to this, it just has to deem that it is suitable. I know the Greens did mean well, and many of these measures, if they were actual truth, would be good, but I think, sadly, they were served up a game of smoke and mirrors and they swallowed it whole.

When the Liberals talk housing stimulus, they mean a shell game with a couple of \$2 coins under cups. When Labor does a housing stimulus, it means hundreds of millions in new investment. The last Labor stimulus gave us the UNO apartments, and that included Youth110 homelessness services, which was really important.

But what is really important now? What needs to be addressed? Let's talk about the housing affordability impact, which is what is supposedly being addressed in part by this measure. Build-to-rent projects commenced from 1 July 2021, and there is an introduction of a 50 per cent land tax discount for eligible new build-to-rent properties. So we are talking about a tiny stimulus and revenue measure from a government that is celebrating dropping numbers on Housing Trust waiting lists to 16,000.

How did that number drop so quickly? You look at the numbers that have dropped and you look in the RoGS and we have serviced fewer people. It does not match up. We are helping fewer people get into houses, but we have had a massive drop in people on the waiting list; it does not make sense. There is a rental crisis, with tens of thousands of South Australians desperately searching for private rental properties. In this measure, in the first year the government committed \$50,000, which is almost laughable. In the years following it is \$100,000—it is a blip.

For those trying to find a home to rent, which is a considerable issue, how many properties will this equate to? It is fundamentally contentious, enough for a media release but nothing more. The government has made more pirouettes and twists in housing than you would find in the *Nutcracker Suite*. You have seen flipping and flopping, as I discussed before, that Roy and HG would be proud of. We have fewer staff, fewer homes and fewer customers, but extra executives.

While we have a dire need for public and community housing, a demand for affordable rental properties well outstripping current availability, will this build-to-rent actually do anything? Will this stimulus inspire developers? Will the scheme be used? Will it make a difference? What we want to avoid is the current government's notion of an upgrade to a property—and let me tell you about that. No-one would deny the need for upgrades in some of our public housing properties. For example, I visited several times a woman in Seaton whose Housing Trust property was falling apart around her. The termites had done such terrible damage that the door frames had fallen off. She was told not to go outside because it was dangerous, as a tree was going to fall down on her.

But the maintenance concerns finally were aired and they were ventilated in the media. We appealed to the minister on her behalf, and this woman is getting a transfer and will be moving into a brand-new home. That is a fantastic outcome for someone who has battled all her life and, through no fault of her own, has found herself in a property that is falling down around her ears.

It would be encouraging also to see the minister commit to a real increase in actual stock numbers, rather than celebrating the loss of properties and leaving residents to live in properties that are falling down around them. But the real damage is done to the community when the minister commits to upgrading areas, literally across the road from this woman, where 35 properties are turned into 105. Whilst that is a good thing in theory, the Housing SA properties are not being replaced at the same rate.

Of the 30-plus Housing Trust properties—and I believe the member for Lee might have spoken about this, as he is really fired up about it—the best the minister could do with the land was to replace it with four public housing properties, 12 community housing properties and 51 affordable housing properties. We are not sure to whom, but I can point out that, in the glossy brochure that has been marketed for Seaton, they were kind enough to show these people seeking accommodation in affordable housing cars that were completely unaffordable. There was a Porsche and a Range Rover SUV in the brochure. I get aspiration, but that is ridiculous. Not just in that neighbourhood but in most neighbourhoods in most parts of Adelaide, that is not an affordable vehicle.

Also the brochure was kind enough to point out that there will be parking on only one side of the street, so a yellow line was painted down the brochure on one side and a white line on the other, just to point out how particularly narrow the streets are, because there is no chance that you will be able to park on both sides and get a car through—such awesome attention to detail. We have numbers all over the place, we have prestige vehicles, and we have parking control. The government's priorities are all wrong.

Given the limited commitment to revenue by Treasury, only a small number of properties will benefit from that measure, only a small number of people. I think it speaks again to the public housing program that the Treasurer oversaw in his previous iteration. I want to unpack the Liberals delivering the biggest ever cut to social housing, because I am sick to death of hearing this 'Labor flogged off public housing' thing. I will explain the numbers that are given.

The elections were held on 11 December 1993 and then on 9 February 2002. At 30 June 1993, several months before the election, total public housing was 63,014. At 30 June 2002, several months after the election, total public housing was 49,543. That is a reduction in nine years, by the Liberals in their previous iteration, of 13,471. In eight years and two months, 13,000 gone. Even if we take the starting point in 1994, which was seven months after the election, the stock was 62,322, so we saw the reduction be 12,779 over eight years. That is 1,500 fewer homes per year on average, with a whopping 2,991 between 1999 and 2000. The Liberals flogged off public housing at triple the rate, and would have continued.

During Labor's term in office, Labor established the Nunga loan to boost Aboriginal home ownership. The Liberals promised to bring it back, but broke the promise. Labor secured more than \$290 million for remote Aboriginal housing and delivered hundreds of new and upgraded homes in what an independent report labelled as 'the best value for money in Australia'. Labor secured more than \$430 million in Nation Building Economic Stimulus funding that delivered more than 1,000 new homes and even provided for the purchase of land.

The majority of these homes were transferred to community housing providers or used for special programs like mental health housing. In contrast, the Liberals are building homes, 1,000 of them, on public land and then selling them off for profit, while they have \$900-odd million in the bank, mind you, that they are not spending, that they can access. All the while, they are calling these houses affordable. These homes are not going to the community sector either.

Labor delivered the Affordable Housing Innovation Fund. It delivered hundreds of new homes under a partnership with the community sector. We delivered the equity start home loan. It helped 1,500 social housing tenants provide their homes. And do you know what? Those 1,500 homes are counted in the numbers that the Liberals bleat about getting flogged off by Labor. That is nearly a quarter of them. It is ridiculous.

We introduced the first ever inclusionary zoning in Australia for affordable housing. In contrast, in their last term of government the Liberals trashed public housing at a rate never seen before. Thank goodness they were kicked out. We need to do the same, otherwise they are going to do it again. The numbers are so rubbery it is hard to know what to think.

The Liberal government speaks of a neighbourhood renewal initiative, but it uses a starting figure of 101 properties in Felixstow, Blair Athol, Woodville Gardens and Seaton. What it denies is there were actually houses there that were knocked down some four years ago, ready for a building program. They do not even talk about the correct base number. They fudge the numbers using a crazy marker, and they hope no-one thinks to ask how they arrived at the number zero as a starting point.

I asked questions. Of course, 'Labor, Labor, Labor'. You can google the word through the speeches, but you cannot proudly boast about the input of 101 properties to have an outcome of 146 properties and use this maths for an example when you ignore the fact that there were dozens and dozens of public homes on another piece of land within the same bunch of developments.

Given the limited commitment to the revenue by Treasury, only a tiny number of properties are going to benefit from this tax exemption on the build-to-rent program: 50,000 one year, 100,000 the next, hardly anything. I only hope that the Liberals have considered that they will need materials to build these homes. Mind you, I have to say it is not quite as bad as another party that has committed to 40,000 public homes over four years or something. I do not know if you have done the maths on that or tried to find the wood.

With that, we have questions on the other components of the bill, but close to my heart and important is pointing out the reality of the challenges of housing and social housing. With that, I commend the bill to the house and look forward to questions in the committee stage.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (20:35): This is my 23rd budget measures bill and can I say it is probably the most underwhelming I have seen. Budget measures bills are a great way to measure a government's ambition, to measure a confident government, a timid government, a government that is seeking re-election, a government that is outward looking and is confident about its future, but I look at this budget measures bill and I see a government that quite frankly is not quite sure why it exists.

They are making some amendments to the Mining Act and some sensible amendments to the Road Traffic Act; they are making some sensible amendments to the Land Tax Act and the Payroll Tax Act, even after they have done extraordinary damage to the Payroll Tax Act over the last four years, but, unfortunately, here we are with an underwhelming, boring budget measures bill that really should be about the next four years rather than the last four years.

One reform that I am interested in is the amendment to the Mining Tax Act. The bill introduces an amendment to the Mining Act to allow the use of what is called an observable market index price. It is set to take effect from 1 July 2021, and I am not quite sure why there is no retrospectivity to this measure given that I imagine the argument is that if this has occurred in South Australia—and I understand there is no evidence of it having occurred in South Australia—it is a measure that is designed to pick up any activity that may occur in the future but that is not currently occurring. It will be very interesting to know when we get to the committee stage if this is actually factoring in any extra revenue given that the department has told us that there is no record of this activity occurring.

I also want to talk briefly about the Parliamentary Budget Advisory Service. The member for Lee is moving an amendment to introduce a legislative scheme to allow for accurate Treasury advice on the basis of the costing of policies. This measure is a sensible move. We did this at the last election as a result of the agreement with the member for Frome on entering government. Treasury would offer independent parliamentary budget advice to political parties on a confidential basis to allow them to cost their policies accurately.

The Parliamentary Budget Office is a service that, for example, is an operation in a different form in our nation's parliament in Canberra. This service has given Australia exceptionally good service because the government is only as good as the advice it receives, and oppositions are no different. Why would anyone stand between an independent service which allows parliamentarians when going to an election to receive costings for their policies so as not to unnecessarily make pronouncements about cuts or increases in taxes, or cuts or increases in services, but which enables them to accurately plan for policy and measures over the next four, eight or 12 years? The only reason I can think that the government would be opposing this measure is purely partisan, purely political, because they think there is some mileage in their ability to come out and attack the costings of the opposition.

We saw a bit of that today, when the energy minister attempted to discredit the opposition's hydrogen energy plan—in a disorderly breach of standing orders, quite clearly for anyone paying attention, debating an answer four times in a row. The opposition needed no point of order to prove a couple of points: one that the government behave disorderly all the time in the parliament in question time and they are never called up, but, surprisingly, in the opposition if someone coughs

they are expelled for 15 minutes. That is not to reflect on the Speaker because he is suffering now and I do not want to make it any worse for him.

But I will say this: the PBAS initiative is a measure that will serve the parliament for generations. The examples that the shadow treasurer gave I think are poignant. The current government claimed that they could build their Yorke Peninsula bypass for about \$25 million. They also claimed they could do a right-hand turn for their tram. They also claimed that their tax cuts will create a certain number of jobs, and they also claimed that there would only be a certain level of debt incurred over the forward estimates. Every single prediction they made from the last election has been incorrect in terms of economic outcome, job creation, debt levels and capital costs—all wrong, all of it.

A PBAS, where Treasury can politely, constructively inform the opposition or the government or a crossbench member or whoever has a balance of power the true cost to the taxpayer and the budget of the measures that they wish to legislate, implement or champion, can only give the public a better outcome policy-wise. There is no real argument against it other than the partisan one, which is this attempt at gotcha politics which, quite frankly, does not work. We saw it on Sunday.

The government go away and they use either the department or the minister and his staff to come up and claim that Labor has got its costings wrong on the hydrogen policy. We use the same economics agency, modelling firm, that Angus Taylor uses, that AEMO uses, that the Australian Energy Regulator uses, and that the New South Wales government uses, to come up with an alternative position, and the government achieved no political benefit whatsoever other than pleasing themselves that they were able to get a 'he said, she said' story in the paper. Does that really serve the taxpayer?

What really serves the taxpayer is the ability of parliamentarians, who have a constitutional responsibility either to be shadow ministers or ministers, to get accurate costings for their policies. How could that possibly not be in the public interest? How could that possibly do any harm to our democratic process? We are not talking about a PBAS for political use, where we can have a Treasurer say something in a budget speech and then go to the independent PBAS agency and get a costing and get a different number so we can embarrass the government.

What we are after is a system that we implemented, where that information could not be used in a partisan way. The PBAS would not be operational for the entire time of the parliament—just the last six to eight months of the term—to allow a conscientious, diligent parliamentarian to get accurate costings from our independent Public Service about the true cost of their policy positions.

I have been here since 1997. The first time I was here, it was a minority parliament; the crossbench had the balance of power. From 2002 to 2006, the crossbench had the balance of power. From 2006 to 2010, it was a majority government—one term of the three I have been here. Minority government, minority government, and now the current government is a minority again.

Majority government in South Australia is not the norm; it is the exception. So, given that we have crossbench members who hold the fate of the treasury bench in their hands, why would we not give them the tools to make responsible commitments? Why not? What is the public harm, other than an insecure, childish government that is fearful of parliamentarians having information.

As I said, this is my 23rd budget measures bill. It is timid, it is fearful and it is a government that is attempting to be a small target but cannot help making itself a large target—a government that won a clear majority at the election and now is in a minority. Staggering stuff, yet here we are and the best it can come up with for an agenda over the next four years is a land tax amendment, a mining tax amendment for something that does not occur and probably will not occur, sensible changes to the Motor Vehicles Act and sensible changes to the Payroll Tax Act.

This is rats and mice reform. Important, yes, it is, but hardly something carving out an agenda for the next four years. In fact, when you look at the budget measures bill you ask yourself: what is the agenda? What is the plan for the next four years? What is the plan post COVID? What is it? If it is simply addressing road traffic congestion, okay, sure, that is the business of government.

What is the new agenda? We want to tax electric vehicles—that is apparently one new agenda that has come out of the budget process. Other than that, I cannot think of much more that the government is doing. It concerns me that when sensible amendments are put up to the government to try to assist members of parliament who might have a vision for the next four years,

who might have a vision to try to generationally change South Australia for the betterment of the state, the government wants to take away the tools that empower those parliamentarians to come up with that policy position. That is just a frightened, inward-looking government looking backwards, rather than a government that is looking forwards.

Minority government can have its benefits. It is not my preferred option for governance. I think a majority government often does work better, but I do remember former Premier Rann saying that when, in minority government between 2002 and 2006, Karlene Maywald and Rory McEwen joined, it was like having guests over: you are always on your best behaviour.

Minority governments with minority members in the cabinet often bring out the very best in governments, and it was indeed a very good government, but it was not timid and it was not inward looking. It was adventurous and it had an agenda and it attempted to change the state. One of those things that it attempted to change the state was with mining. It had a very aggressive agenda to try to grow mining and build a third tier of the economy for South Australia to try to create some resilience rather than being solely reliant on agriculture and manufacturing.

The catchphrase today is 'sovereign capability'. In this budget measures bill, a budget that is spending \$21 billion of our money, I see nothing that builds our sovereign capability to produce more vaccines, to do more investment in machine learning, to invest in new technologies, to create new fields of endeavour, or to invest in our universities and our schools. All I am seeing from this government is the same old tired rhetoric that is, quite frankly, devoid of any vision.

Giving land tax discounts for new eligible build-to-rent properties is not an initiative the government came up with because it believes it is important. It is an initiative it came up with because it is bleeding with a certain constituency because it made land tax changes and because it cut revenue so dramatically when it came to office that Treasury advised it on how to make up some of that lost revenue. So it brought in aggregation laws that the former Labor government, when I was Treasurer, knocked back eight times.

At every budget, at every Mid-Year Budget Review, my response was, 'Don't be stupid.' Like Graham Richardson said of our opponents in 1993, 'They were stupid and stupid often.' Well, we will see if that motto grows again. As to the Mining Act changes, the government is arguing against itself telling us, 'This doesn't happen now. We don't think it's going to happen. We're changing it just in case it does.' Okay, fair enough, we will support that, sure—just in case it does.

The motor vehicles changes are a good and sensible piece of legislation we support. Thank goodness for our South Australian police. Haven't they served us exceptionally well over the last 18 months during the pandemic? Where would we have been without the leadership of Grant Stevens and his over 4,000 sworn officers who, quite frankly, have shown that they are the very best of us? They deserve our support and they deserve our thanks and gratitude.

As we go on through this inspiring budget measures bill, set to inspire people in the lead-up to the election, there is payroll tax. They want to abolish the film production payroll tax exemption and ex gratia scheme and redirect the average annual cost of those schemes to a South Australian Film Corporation Screen Production Fund, so moving around money for themselves to try to incentivise more production work here.

This has always been something I have struggled to come to grips with. I remember the detailed cabinet discussions we had about the incentives we offered on the basis of film production in South Australia, and it was almost a legislated entitlement: the more you spent, the bigger the discount was. It seems to me now the government is legislating to enshrine those changes, rather than form a policy. I would love to see the Treasury advice on that, but of course we never will.

Again, the idea that we should be incentivising film is a good idea. It is a good idea to try to get production internationally here in South Australia, but it is also a good idea to encourage local entrepreneurship and local filmmakers. We have a rich tradition of that here in South Australia. Some of the greatest Australian movies ever made were filmed here in South Australia—*Mad Max*, *Breaker Morant*, *Storm Boy*. Those movies were made in South Australia without largesse, and some of them were Australian made, and they were excellent productions and encouraged young Australian talent.

What I fear the government is doing is entrenching the idea of importing talent, subsidising their work here, then they leave, rather than promoting our own talent to try to get a head start. But I am sure that it will help in some way promote the local industry because, of all the industries that have been affected most by COVID, hospitality has been one of the hardest hit.

The arts community, which actually contributes a lot to the economic development of this state, which is why the former government put the arts department into state development because we believed so passionately that the arts sector is actually an economic driver and not just about artistic pursuit. I am not seeing much in this government to try to encourage more economic development in the arts sector.

Again, going through these changes, I cannot see much of an agenda, other than catching a mining company that might be inappropriately valuing the value of their mineral sale price when they sell minerals to themselves to try to minimise the taxes that they pay. I do point out that I understand that SIMEC does sell iron ore to itself at international prices, even though they get it out of the ground at a discount, and then do not pay a royalty on whatever feedstock they put into the steelworks at Whyalla. Transportation costs are lower, production costs are lower, yet the steelworks pays an international price for the iron ore it uses in its feedstock to build steel.

I wonder whether the government or the mining agency has considered that inequity to try to create and keep Australian jobs here. When we are compelling the steelworks to buy its iron ore from an iron ore mine just down the road at an international price as if it had been mined in Brazil or Western Australia and pay the same fees as it would be if it was coming from there, we should start questioning ourselves about whether or not we are truly supporting South Australian steel jobs. With those few casual remarks, and the enjoyment I have had watching you wince, sitting in your chair, from neck pain, I commend the bill—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He is alright, he is tough, he can take it. I commend the bill to the house and look forward to coming up with some questions that will have Greg Raymond rushing through the budget papers trying to find an answer.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (20:55): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I wish you well and hope you are travelling nicely, as do we all on this side of the chamber, I am sure. Evening sessions can be quite interesting and entertaining, can't they?

In talking about this bill, I would like to start where the excellent speech the member for West Torrens just gave touched on many times, this question of agenda. I believe we are in politics for such a short time—slightly longer when you are the member for West Torrens, but for most of us a relatively short time—and every day is precious, every budget is precious, every piece of legislation, because they slip through our fingers and then we are gone. That is true of every piece of legislation that comes here and that is true every year.

However, we are now in a time of extraordinary pressure on the certainty and confidence we have in our future. I was at a dinner just last night with various businesspeople from around Adelaide. They heard from the guest speaker and were very interested, and then one by one the questions came: what is it we can tell our young people about their future? These are well-heeled people. Their individual children will be financially okay, but their anxiety is for their children, their children's friends and their children's generation being able to feel confident about where South Australia is going.

There are many reasons that young people lack that confidence, lack that sense of, 'Yes, things are difficult but we are going to make it through. We've got the right skills, we've got the right ingredients, we can see a pathway.' There are many reasons. Some of them affect all the world and some of them are more concentrated in Australia.

Of course the pandemic has put particular pressure on us and made us anxious about the health of older and more vulnerable Australians, in particular, but actually about the health of everyone. It has made us anxious about the security of our economy, particularly the visitor, tourism and arts elements of our economy, anything to do with international engagement, including getting people who traditionally come from overseas to work in businesses. All that has put tremendous pressure on people's sense of being able to reliably predict what is to come.

On top of that, and separate to it, we have this big pressure of the planet being under strain. Climate change is bearing down on us, no longer in the future but here, and there is biodiversity loss, which we think about intermittently, often when a particular species is being discussed or there is a big fire and we see the loss of wildlife in that area.

Actually, it is not unrelated to the pandemic. One day maybe we will find out exactly where this particular one came from, but we do know that as we encroach more and more into wilderness, as we take wild animals and bring them into captivity, eat them, use their materials, we expose ourselves more and more to the risk of diseases that jump species. Those big pressures of climate change, of biodiversity loss, also press down and make us question what our future is going to be.

In Australia, we have a not unique but a particularly evident problem of an economy that is far too exposed on low complexity, high-carbon commodities, far too dependent on big coal exports from the Eastern States, far too exposed on growing things and digging things out of the ground and not value-adding, shipping them overseas.

You cannot afford to be that economy in this century. You cannot afford to be that economy that is high-carbon exposed, of course, but you also cannot afford to be an economy that is not complex, that is not doing value-adding. As we lose China and increasingly struggle to maintain China as our trade partner, as the recipient of so many of those commodities, and as we see the global economy contracting and going into a perilous stage through the experience of the pandemic and through global warming impacts, we see an economy that has had it good for a long time due to the very hard work of many Australians, but that has not transformed itself into the modern advanced industrial economy that it could easily have been and can still be and must be.

The lack of investment in this nation, in people, is what has let us down. We have coasted on good commodity prices for too long and chosen not to invest properly in education, early childhood, and every schoolchild—not just those who are well off—having a quality education. Crucially, with our further education and our higher education, we have pulled apart the training system, commercialised it and reduced its funding and we have made our universities go around the world trying to attract students in order to fund research that would make this country rich. When that tap got turned off with COVID, we have seen the struggles the universities have been going through, we have seen how they have shed staff, we have seen how they are contracting in research.

All of this is an act of choice by various governments over many years. Not every government has always done the wrong thing, and I say that because I am Labor and I am going to claim that we did a little bit better than the other side, but that is not the purpose of what I am talking about. Every government in Australia, to a lesser or greater extent, has failed to make this transition. They are big concepts and they are the ones that we should be grappling with as politicians in Canberra and in every state and territory jurisdiction. They should be the focus that we have for our future.

We have this budget measures bill. We have an opportunity to do things. We have an opportunity as we try to find what the post COVID or the 'living with COVID without many people dying' world looks like, what a nation that has warmed over a degree already looks like, what a nation that is struggling with its relationship with China looks like, but it is a wasted opportunity. I can criticise or question some of the elements in it—and I will—but more important than anything is that it is a document that does little, sitting alongside a budget that did little, sitting alongside now four years of budgets that have been timid when what is required right now is boldness and some degree of confidence in shaping the future.

We cannot keep pretending that everything is normal and fine and it just needs a little tweaking. This piece of legislation does exactly that and it is a piece with the attitude generally, I have found, of this government. There are four areas in this piece of legislation, and there are two that are worthy of a bit of discussion.

One is about the treatment of land tax to encourage developers to build for rental purposes. If you did not know the history, it looks a little odd. It looks okay, 'Yes, well, we certainly need more housing for people to rent,' and this is a way for government to use its controls to do something about that, but it is costing something like \$100,000 in 2024-25. It is not doing very much, and it is not having much impact. So what is it doing here?

If you take the context that we all remember well of the extraordinary exhibition that was the land tax debate, that went from raising money to costing money to a pathway that managed to land a bill that had support from people in the upper house but still managed to make a lot of people who do development very angry, you find that there are all sorts of funny little efforts to make it look like the government is doing something on affordable housing and on social housing, and this appears to be one of those.

I noted earlier that the member for Hurtle Vale talked about what the Greens deal was to land, as the ABC reported, the land tax deal. It seems that they were convinced by this government that there would be an effort made to improve the quality of housing as well as the quantity of housing available.

I have a list from the Greens website: an additional \$7.5 million per annum from 2020-21 for upgrades and improvements to existing housing stock; an additional \$2 million per annum from 2020-21 to increase the provision of emergency accommodation and transitional housing for people in need; a five-year trial for a scheme to provide a land tax exemption for private houses that are rented as affordable housing while they are managed by a community housing provider; mandating 'universal design' as a building and design standard for 75 per cent of all new public housing; installing solar panels on a minimum of 75 per cent of all suitable existing public housing; installing batteries together with solar panels in a minimum of 75 per cent of new public housing; and also legislating that land subject to heritage agreements under the Native Vegetation Act is exempt from land tax.

That is a nice little bit that brings us back to the Greens' core, original purpose. In fairness, they have grown far beyond that original purpose in defending the natural environment. So all of those sound like something that ought to be done and that the government have agreed to do, but in this particular bill what they have done is say that they will bring in this land tax exemption—a discount, a 50 per cent discount for build-to-rent properties—not spend much money on it and not describe in this legislation what the criteria will be, how this will actually work.

There is no estimate in the bill—because the bill would not contain an estimate—on how many are expected, and there are concerns that we are hearing from some people who might be interested in availing themselves of this about whether it will be capped and how real it is. So there will be many questions, I think, that will be worthy of consideration when we reach the committee stage on this bill and I am sure that the member for Hurtle Vale, as well as the shadow treasurer, will be very interested to ask those questions.

A second element that is worthy of some note is this question of the facility to raise more money from people using their mobile phones while driving. As has been said by many people on this side, who could disagree that we should be discouraging people from using mobile phones while driving? Of course we should be discouraging them, but there are some elements of this that worry me or at least make me think that we ought to have a wider debate before we settle on one or a number of measures to address this concern.

One is whether we are seeking to be overly reliant on the deterrent that is represented by fines. The money being raised from this is not slated to go down over time so, if we were regarding it as a useful deterrent, we ought to expect that we would over time get less income from it; otherwise, it would not be working. It would just be another source of revenue. It reminds me of the dramatic increase, the 40 per cent increase, on the solid waste levy for materials that really ought to be recycled, that if they go to landfill you pay more money.

Labor did this in government as well, although we did not do this latest escalation of a 40 per cent increase that came after the local governments had already set their budgets, which was extraordinary. That is just a clumsy implementation in some ways, but you would think that there would be an expectation that, 'If we increase the cost by this much then we will see this drop-off in waste going to landfill.'

When I asked first of all in the estimates process, there had not been that sort of assessment. It really looked like it was just a way of funding, moving sand around on the beaches, which as we all know my electorate is not happy about and I am sure there is a better way that can make all electorates along the coastline happy.

With the waste levy there was an expected drop-off we found in the budget papers, an anticipated drop-off of 4,000 tonnes, so a reduction of 4,000 tonnes driven by this increase in the waste levy, but in fact it went up by 37,000 tonnes. There is a gap of 41,000. It went up 37,000 on the year before instead of down 4,000, so everyone paid a lot more both because they were charged more per tonne and because they threw away more. That is money in. That is not trying to change behaviour.

I worry that there is a trap in overemphasising fines for people using mobile phones and for other vehicle misdemeanours that actually becomes not about stopping it happening; it is about having money. What else could you do? You can educate people to behave differently. We all know that in June 2019 the MAC was discontinued. I looked it up on the website earlier and it just said it closed on 30 June 2019.

It has been brought into the police, as I understand it, and there is some effort done and you do see some billboards but I think everyone can agree how good some of those advertisements were when the MAC was a properly operating independent agency and how important it is that that effort is not just regarded as set and forget but is constantly being worked on, constantly seen as the newer generation comes through and start to get their driver's licence, what they need to hear, what they will respond to and by what method you can communicate with them.

That seems to me to be at least as worthy of serious consideration as, 'Let's just put up the mobile phone charges.' There is, of course, another problem with the mobile phone charges, as there are with any really steep fines, which is that the impact is disproportionate. It is not disproportionate for people who deserve to pay more. It is not like it goes up because you have done it more than once—although maybe it does. I do not know much about the fines, maybe you do get double the fine the second time, but I believe it is just a standard \$646 for breaking the law. It is disproportionate because some people simply cannot afford that.

Much as you might say, 'Just don't break the law,' what about the kids in that family? A \$646 bill suddenly arriving in many households—20 per cent, 30 per cent, possibly 40 per cent of South Australians would find that hugely challenging for their family budget. It would add pressure to the family and it would mean that choices will be made to pay that and to go without, or to pay for food, clothing and education needs. That is a huge fine for people.

I think we can very easily forget because we are so well rewarded for the work that we do, and we should be so grateful that the people of South Australia choose to pay us well to do this, but so many South Australians would find that a crippling bill to get, and it is not expected to go down. We are expecting to just keep raking it in, and that troubles me.

We do not oppose it, we want to dissuade people from using their mobile phones, but we are concerned—I am concerned—that we ought to be having that kind of debate as parliamentarians about how best to deal with the problem that is caused by mobile phones. I understand that something like nearly 50 per cent of deaths and nearly 50 per cent of serious injury cases involve distraction, much of which is caused by mobile phones.

I will just conclude with a reference to the PBAS, as it is called—the service that would help with costing. I cannot understand why everyone would not want that. People on that side are going to be on this side. We were on that side once. We came over here; we will go back. Independents will always exist. We are not going to not have Independents in this chamber, I would suspect, forever. Why would we not want everyone to at least have the same information, the same capacity to know a single point of truth for what things really cost? With that, I conclude my remarks.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (21:15): This Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill makes amendments to the Land Tax Act 1936, the Mining Act 1971, the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Road Traffic Act 1961 and the Payroll Tax Act 2009. In rising this evening to speak to this bill, I will deal with the proposed amendments to a number of the acts. I start with the proposed amendments to the Land Tax Act 1936 and, in doing so, highlight the total and utter inadequacy of this bill to in any way address the current pressing housing crisis impacting so many South Australian women, children and families.

It is of great, deep concern that every week and often multiple times per week I have community members approach my office, desperately worried about their inability to continue to have

a place to call home and about the fact that there are so few affordable rental properties available and so very many people attending inspections and applying for those that are indeed available. On top of this, we also have many community members approach my office completely unable to afford private rental and desperately needing to secure a Housing SA property before they experience homelessness.

My heart goes out to each of these people and their families who find themselves in such desperately worrying circumstances. I thank them for so bravely sharing their stories with me and for asking me to advocate with and for them. What they are going through is utterly unacceptable. Having and being able to afford and rely on a safe place to call home is a fundamental human right. I greatly worry about those who struggle so hard to do so, and I deeply worry about the many women who come to my office who want to flee or who have fled domestic violence.

As they forge a new, safer pathway, free from violence, they absolutely need that safe place to call home. Too many of them have limited choices in terms of access to secure housing. Way too many question their ability to access a secure home as they contemplate their future. Sadly, this worry and questioning impact their decision. We know that economic security is imperative for women who seek to leave a violent partner or ex partner behind.

I am constantly frustrated that women continue to bear the brunt of men's violence and constantly frustrated and angry, as are many South Australians, that this government has failed to adequately invest in domestic violence prevention and early intervention to stop violence before it starts. It just has not. In terms of its failure to address the growing housing shortage, it has also abandoned those women who find themselves in crisis, desperately seeking a safe haven to rebuild their life.

In the government's recent Women's Leadership and Economic Security Strategy 2021-2024 it was absolutely disappointing that there were no clear actions to address women's economic inequality, and it was absolutely devastating that the statement failed to go anywhere near addressing nor to adequately address in any way the number of women engaged in insecure work and who, as a result of being engaged in insecure work, are experiencing economic inequality.

The utterly tiny proposed changes in this bill for eligible new build-to-rent properties are entirely inadequate. They are minuscule. I am sure it is not just the lateness of the hour that means you could miss them if you blinked. They are small, they are not visionary or courageous and they go nowhere near positively addressing the rental housing crisis our community continues to confront.

By Treasury's own estimate, this measure will impact only a small number of properties. Again, they do next to nothing to increase supply and ease the rental crisis. That is because this bill is all about the Treasurer trying to mend the fences with industry and with the many families that he simply disregarded with this government's strange approach and changes to South Australia's land tax regime. There are many, many South Australians and organisations that will never forget this government's changes to aggregated land holdings and to land held in trusts as part of its 2019-20 state budget.

Those opposite introduced these ill thought-out changes without knowing how many properties would be impacted. They introduced them without consideration of how much revenue would be raised. They introduced them without knowledge nor a plan of how the changes would be implemented. They introduced them without having any regard whatsoever to the individuals and the families impacted, to the individuals and families who packed out forums across the state, expressing their utter bewilderment at what was being proposed.

On this side of the house, we listened to those people: those opposite did not. In refusing to listen, they managed to get many of their own supporters offside and left others utterly perplexed by their disastrous approach. It was such a strange decision, one that delivered a regressive, retrospective tax on these community members—a spectacular own goal if we have ever seen one.

As mentioned, at the time, we on this side of the house listened to the many people who were rightly aggrieved by this government's decision-making and perplexed by its motivations—the mums and dads, the grandparents, the self-employed and the retirees, moderate investors targeted by the so-called reforms for the benefit of the big end of town. What about these families, the families and small and medium-size businesses that were targeted by this cruel cash grab? This deal was

focused on being a revenue raiser for this government, a deal which ended up costing the budget millions in the years after their wheeling and dealing was complete.

Also giving rise to questions about this bill are the proposed Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and Road Traffic Act 1961 amendments, which will enable SA Police to roll out new mobile phone detection cameras. Measures to detect mobile phone usage whilst driving are supported by the opposition, as distraction on our roads, especially through the use of a mobile telephone whilst driving, is tragically one of the leading causes of fatalities and serious injury accidents on our South Australian roads.

We wholeheartedly agree that driving whilst talking or texting on a handheld mobile telephone and the resultant risk from doing so is absolutely unacceptable. We agree that measures must be taken to prevent and end such behaviour. A range of thoroughly thought through measures that keep people safe must be fully considered. These amendments, however, are not thoroughly thought out. They are not inclusive of a vital education component.

These amendments, however, are projected to take \$46 million out of the pockets of South Australian motorists over the coming three years. These changes were announced in last year's budget, but the draft legislation we understand was not readied so as to be included in last year's budget measures bill. Just like the 2019 land tax changes, these measures were inserted into the budget to generate more revenue for a government simply drowning in debt. There is little evidence of the deterrent effect of these changes, given the evidence of the number of fines the government anticipates will be handed out over the first three years of these cameras operating.

Given these startling numbers, it will be very difficult to convince the public that this is anything more than a revenue-raising exercise from a government that has plunged South Australia into record levels of debt, indeed a debt that will haunt future generations of South Australians and one that this government has absolutely no plan to pay down, a huge debt racked up by a party who liked to view themselves as economic managers but who have delivered record debt, service cuts and rampant privatisations.

Budgets offer governments an opportunity to express their values and their priorities, and this budget showed exactly what and who this government values and what and who this government does not value. The centrepiece of this government's \$1.8 billion deficit 2020-21 state budget was a \$662 million city basketball stadium. Meanwhile, the budget included a cruel \$274 million in cuts to health funding by 2023, meaning 371 health jobs will simply be lost, and the new Women's and Children's Hospital will be delayed until at least 2027.

There was nothing in that budget to address gender inequality and to prevent the scourge of domestic violence. There were cuts to sporting grants and a redirection of funds that should have been directed to community clubs and sporting organisations, a redirection to private companies. There was little to address economic inequality, little to create jobs and little to support our desperately struggling arts events and hospitality sectors. The Treasurer's explanation that he does not anticipate that all motorists will be able to pay the fines is a remarkable concession and remark from a government that pays scant attention to detail, or who in so many instances is 'just not across the detail'.

So if we are not significantly decreasing the number of mobile telephones used whilst driving, then this measure must simply be about revenue raising. This government has made a habit of treating South Australian motorists as revenue raisers, despite their nonstop hollow slogans pre the last state election, loosely promising lower prices and better services, that clearly would do no such thing—very hollow promises that do not stack up at all when considering increases flagged for next year, including motorists paying an extra \$15 million in mobile telephone fines, \$10 million in higher victims of crime levies, \$14 million in higher speeding fines, \$2.9 million in higher registration costs in regional areas, \$24 million in higher administrative fees on registration bills and transport transactions, and \$12.7 million in higher registration costs.

All of this is before the government's new electric vehicle tax is rolled out—a tax which has the potential to deter motorists from changing to hybrid and electric vehicles. Everything that can possibly be done must be done to address the horrific prevalence of injuries and fatalities caused through motor vehicle accidents, accidents that tear families and communities apart, accidents that

our incredible South Australian police and South Australian ambulance officers courageously deal with day in and day out, and I wholeheartedly thank them for that.

In this term of this government, we have seen funding for the Motor Accident Commission, an organisation that provided such valuable education and awareness-raising programs to deter people from doing the wrong thing, simply slashed. As the member for Port Adelaide pointed out in her words earlier, the MAC website now simply says that it closed in 2019.

As the member for Kurna pointed out, we no longer have a dedicated road safety minister. Communities across the state, including those in the member for Mawson's electorate, have been crying out desperately for road upgrades, including on the treacherous southern stretch of Main South Road. Increased fines and fees for motorists, coupled with these cuts to funding and a lack of action on key areas, are not commensurate with doing everything that must be done for the sake of the safety of South Australian families and communities.

I now turn briefly to the amendments focused on changes to the Payroll Tax Act of 1936. As this house is aware, in its most recent budget this government announced its intention to abolish the film production payroll tax exemption and ex gratia scheme and direct the average yearly costs of those measures to the South Australian Film Corporation's Screen Production Fund. It is understood that revenue that may be raised as a result of this amendment, and the cessation of associated relief provided on a case-by-case basis for film productions that do not meet the criteria of the exemption in the Payroll Tax Act 1936 may possibly be used to increase the Screen Production Fund administered by the South Australian Film Corporation.

The Screen Production Fund enables the production of screen content for commercial release via theatrical, broadcast or digital content platforms that generate positive significant economic outcomes for the South Australian industry, with funded projects expected to be substantially produced in South Australia. To date, the payroll tax exemption and ex gratia schemes have cost approximately \$1.6 million in total per annum, with the breakdown between the cost of the two individual arrangements changing year in and year out.

What is not clear is how any films or any screen content that may now be invested in will be selected. What criteria will be used? Is this a function that the minister for the arts will play a role in? Will the Minister for Innovation and Skills have a say in which films, which screen content and which companies are selected? These questions must be answered. Our arts community is already deeply frustrated that government leadership in the South Australian arts is diluted, with various aspects of it spread across departments and ministers.

As we continue to confront the pandemic and its ongoing impact, we need strong leadership that contemplates the entirety of the arts ecosystem, and we need to clearly understand how beneficiaries of this new arrangement will be selected and using what criteria. As the member for West Torrens said, the arts, hospitality and events sectors have been deeply hit by this pandemic. They need visionary government leadership. They need a government that understands the contribution of the arts to our community, to our economy and to our wellbeing.

In closing, I turn to the member for Lee's proposed amendments to this budget measures bill, and I commend him for bringing them to the house. Having a parliamentary budget advisory service has been adopted in various forms across the country and indeed in other parts of the world. It has been adopted elsewhere because communities are demanding that the information they receive prior to their participation in the electoral process is robust. Parliaments are responding to that call by setting up processes and services that provide independent and consistent costings and analyses of promises and policies that communities can consider prior to exercising their democratic rights.

The South Australian community want clear information that they can rely on. That is exactly what the member for Lee proposes to give them through his set of amendments, and they deserve it. As the member for West Torrens spoke about, they also deserve a government that is brave and prepared to support the setting up of this service. I thank the member for Lee for bringing these amendments to the house and I look forward to our debate upon them.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(21:35): I thank all those who have made contributions to this budget measures bill. I will be very brief. Let me say that I have heard a lot of things this evening, some of which I think is reasonable

and much of which I think is unreasonable, but this is the parliament and everybody gets to put their view forward.

I have also heard a lot of repetition this evening—people coming down with essentially speech after speech, which are all quite similar, and that is everybody's option and everybody's right as well. I believe that we will be going into committee on this bill now, and I commend the bill to the house on behalf of the Treasurer.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (21:36): I move:

That it be an instruction to the committee of the whole house on the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill that it have the power to consider a new clause relating to an amendment of the Public Finance and Audit Act.

As I foreshadowed in my second reading contribution, the opposition has filed an amendment to require the budget measures bill to include an amendment to the Public Finance and Audit Act and that is, essentially, to establish a parliamentary budget advisory service. This is the same regime that was established before the last state election, and one which served the parliament and the people of South Australia quite well. This is a similar regime to what occurs with the commonwealth parliament and also the Victorian parliament.

It is of course in the public's interest that an independent service is available to all MPs and to all registered political parties so that in the formulation of policies, initiatives, programs and commitments that have been made in an election period, the public can have some assurance that they have had the ruler run over them by an independent service that has all the resources available at its fingertips of the Treasury department and other agencies with which the Treasury department might consult in assessing those initiatives. This is a reasonable initiative.

At the moment, this parliament has an almost unprecedented number of Independent and crossbench MPs. At the moment, we have five here in the house and, of course, we have our usual complement—if I can refer to them like that—in the other place. We have six crossbench MPs. We have a situation in this place where even the Liberal Party does not have a majority at the moment on the floor of the house and has to rely on commitments from Independents in order to maintain the confidence of the house, and that is likely to be the case as we head towards the election period.

It is not unreasonable that the government will facilitate what is required by the amendment that this motion foreshadows. I am advised that it is required to be moved in this manner because the long title of the current bill does not contemplate an amendment to the Public Finance and Audit Act.

What I am seeking to do is not have the amendment moved and considered by virtue of this motion but in a procedural sense to allow the committee, once we get to it—presumably, at some stage later this sitting week—to consider the amendment. Just to be clear for those members opposite and for those other members and people who might be listening in closely to this debate, a vote on this motion does not accept the amendment. A vote on this motion merely enables the committee to contemplate the amendment that the opposition has moved in this regard. I strongly encourage all members to support it.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (21:40): Certainly, the government opposes the motion, as it opposes the amendment that the motion precludes. We see no reason for this to happen, and there are quite a few reasons for that. If we get to debating the amendment itself, then we will go into that in a lot more detail. For now, suffice to say this is something that has been in place previously and, speaking from experience, was of no value, of no use to the opposition. This is not about the government trying to hold the opposition back, whether they be Labor Party members of the opposition or Independent members of the opposition, keeping in mind that, while there is that Labor and Independent distinction, they are collectively the opposition.

The budget measures bill has some very clear initiatives within it. We have heard for several hours today and this evening about those initiatives, so I will not go back over them. That is the government's agenda within the budget measures bill. Of course, the budget has a lot more in it than

that. To try to bring in the Public Finance and Audit Act as part of the budget measures bill is an opportunity that is open to the opposition, but the reason for doing so, in my view and in the government's view, is entirely inappropriate, unnecessary and unproductive, so the government opposes this contingent motion.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 17
Noes 18
Majority 1

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Bell, T.S.	Pederick, A.S.	Brock, G.G.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Gee, J.P.	Luethen, P.
Piccolo, A.	Power, C.	Szakacs, J.K.
Cowdrey, M.J.		

Motion thus negated.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The CHAIR: I thank the minister's advisers, who have had a particularly long day waiting for this very special moment. We have 14 clauses to deal with and a title, and there are two amendments on file which seek to amend clause 2. Are there any questions on clause 1? There are no questions on clause 1.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The CHAIR: The Minister for Energy and Mining has two amendments in his name. Would you like to move them concurrently?

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

Amendment No 1 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 2, line 9 [clause 2(3)]—Delete 'and Part 5 are' and substitute 'is'

Amendment No 2 [EnergyMin-1]—

Page 2, after line 9—Insert:

(3a) Part 5 comes into operation on 1 July 2022.

I hope this is pretty straightforward. There was going to be the adjustment with regard to payroll tax and then the money essentially provided to do similar work but in a different way. The timing has not been quite in kilter so the impact or the implementation of the payroll tax deduction being removed is delayed, but the implementation of the provision of the money towards the screen production work in the other way remains, so essentially there is a one-year slippage from the government's perspective but that seems to be quite appropriate from an industry perspective.

The CHAIR: The minister has moved amendments Nos 1 and 2 in his name. Does anyone else wish to speak to that?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps not speak to it but perhaps ask questions. In effect, this changes the commencement arrangements for different elements of the bill, if I understand the minister's explanation.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Just one element.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Just one element, which is for the mining royalties and payroll tax; is that correct?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Just the payroll tax.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It seems that the bill was worded in the event that it might be passed and assented to before 1 July. So the practical effect of amendment No. 1 is that it comes into effect from the date on which it is assented to; is that correct?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will try to deal with both things at once. The first amendment means that only part 3 comes in on 1 July this year, and the second amendment means that part 5 comes in on 1 July next year. Essentially it is saying that there were two things that were expected to happen simultaneously. It has not been possible and, in the bluntest of terms, the benefit of the payroll tax deduction will continue for an extra year but the benefit of the additional funding that was going to come in on 1 July this year will still come into effect from 1 July this year.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: So payroll tax will essentially be in effect from 1 July this year, or the other way around—mining royalties?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No change to payroll tax until next year. It was certainly intended to be 1 July this year but that was not possible, so it has been delayed until next year.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My only other question on the amendment is: have any applications been made to the government or any agreements been entered into regarding those payroll tax arrangements for screen productions from 1 July that would otherwise have benefited from the change in legislation?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If I understand your question, everything is as we would both expect it to be. The \$1.6 million has been moved to be provided with effect from 1 July this year for the Screen Production Fund. The money that would have come from the increase in payroll tax has still flowed through.

The reduction in payroll tax remains, and I am advised that nobody has been inadvertently harmed with regard to missing out on the 50 per cent reduction in payroll tax that they would normally have expected the bill was going to put into place from 1 July this year but that will now be 1 July next year.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No applications or similar approaches to government have been made since 1 July until now?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that whether there have been any particular applications that might have been dealt with outside of the way this amendment would suggest they be dealt with needs to be taken on notice, but we do not think so. As you would understand, different companies pay payroll tax in different ways, but essentially there is a monthly assessment for most, and I am advised that we believe payroll tax has been paid as it would appropriately be under the amendment, because that is exactly the same as it would have been

without this bill at all. Until this bill passes both houses of parliament, there would not actually be a change in the way that RevenueSA goes about things.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Does the government have a date by which it hopes the proclamation may occur for subclause (4)?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: September 2022.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: New section 7A(1)(c) talks about the commissioner being satisfied that the building is being used for a build-to-rent property in accordance with the guidelines approved by the Treasurer, and in paragraph (d) that 'an application for the reduction is made in accordance with this section'.

Can the minister provide to the house an explanation about, firstly, how an application would be made by somebody seeking to avail themselves of this regime and, secondly, how the commissioner would be satisfied that the building is actually being used for that purpose. So what form must the application take and how will it be assessed, and once the building is built how does the commissioner go about making sure that it is being used as it was promised?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Member for Lee, I will not be able to give you the information that you are seeking at the moment, but it is already known that the Treasurer's guidelines are yet to be determined and shared. No doubt the Treasurer knows exactly what he wants to do with regard to this, and so there is an opportunity perhaps to seek more information between the houses or perhaps in debate in the other chamber.

The simple answer to your question is that the Treasurer will provide his guidelines. The specific answer to your question is that the commissioner will make assessments on the two things that you have asked in line with those guidelines.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, minister, for providing that information. When I was briefed, I was advised that the basis for guidelines to be developed would be the New South Wales build-to-rent guidelines, which I understand have been in effect for some time. My question is to the Treasurer: in developing those guidelines, are they to go out and be consulted on for feedback from industry and the community or are they just to be developed, effectively, internally and then promulgated?

When this scheme is in operation and the commissioner seeks to be assured that properties are actually being used for what they were promised to be used for, what actual effort is being planned for the commissioner to undertake that sort of compliance activity? Are there additional staff or resources that are being provided to RevenueSA?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: With regard to the Treasurer's guidelines, it will be up to the Treasurer, as you would understand, to determine exactly what they are. I am advised that normal practice includes consultation. I am not in a position to make a commitment one way or the other on behalf of the Treasurer, but it is normal practice that consultation would be included.

With regard to the commissioner's resources, that will be a matter to be discussed between the commissioner and the Treasurer. It is expected that the commissioner's existing resources will be more than sufficient to undertake the work that is required, but if that turns out not to be the case—if the commissioner hypothetically decides that he has a different view—he is probably better placed than most to engage with the Treasurer to seek additional resources, if they are necessary.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If a developer successfully avails themselves of this scheme and they manage to come up with a development that satisfies the guidelines that will apply to the scheme—the minimum number of dwellings, for example, and an appropriate rental rate, for example, and the fact that it will be rented—does the scheme continue to apply? Does the land tax discount continue to apply to that property if transfer of the ownership occurs yet all the other criteria

continue to be met? Can a developer develop one of these properties and then sell it on but on the basis that the new owner still maintains it as a build-to-rent property?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It is expected that the guidelines will include a requirement for a reassessment to be made if a property is transferred. Certainly, the commissioner would assess the circumstances under new ownership, the circumstances in their entirety under new ownership. It is anticipated that the guidelines will include a requirement that if a property owner who has met all those requirements you described sells it on to another owner, then at that point in time an assessment or perhaps a reassessment will be made.

The CHAIR: I will allow one more question.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you. New section 7A(2)(a)(ii) talks about minimum lease conditions. Has the government considered yet what sort of range of rent would be considered appropriate for this scheme?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that the Treasurer's guidelines will include that sort of information, but it is certainly anticipated that they will be very clear with regard to whether minimum tenure is offered to qualify, whether potentially, hypothetically, percentages of market rent are included. Those are just hypothetical examples, but it is very clearly expected that the Treasurer's guidelines will make those minimum lease conditions very clear.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sir, I understood that I might have a colleague that had an interest in this particular area, so I draw your attention to the state of the house.

The CHAIR: My attention has been drawn to the state of the house. I am counting and noting that a quorum is not present, so please ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The CHAIR: We have questions on clause 5.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It seems I have been left at the altar, so to speak, Mr Chair.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! That's of no matter.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Always the bridesmaid I am, sir. With regard to part 3, clause 5, I asked a couple of questions during the briefing that officers were good enough to provide to me about why this amendment is being sought. The advice provided to me was that there had not been a problem with this or there was not any concern about this, so I guess for the benefit of the house and also to hear from the minister himself, could he explain why we are pursuing this change if there has not been a problem in this area to date?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The fact that this has not been a problem in the past is not a reason not to look for improvements where we can find them. The current situation is that royalties would be based on contract prices. In an ideal world contract prices will be 100 per cent reflective of the market, but we do not live in an ideal world, and we know that contract prices could be arranged so that they are different from the market, particularly when you have companies that potentially have both vertical and horizontal integration.

In fact, I am advised that it was industry that came to the government and said, 'Look, we understand a contract price, so if I were to inflate or deflate my contract price with a willing partner, whether that partner was a brother/sister company or whether it was a more arms-length relationship but with a very positive working relationship, we could adjust the price upon which you would base the royalties?' The answer, of course, was yes. So it was industry that came looking for that clarification.

What we are doing is taking this opportunity to make it very clear that, if ever there is a situation where a contract price does not accurately reflect the true market price at the time, then

from a royalty calculation perspective it will be the true market price at the time that determines the royalties rather than the contract price.

Let me just finish by saying we would all be aware of companies that are broken up into various divisions, and they have their internal transfer pricing, and sometimes it is even external transfer pricing but between two closely related organisations. They might have perfectly sensible and perfectly legal reasons for setting the transfer price for the product between those two different organisations at something other than the market price. They might have a very good, sensible, legal and aboveboard reason for doing that, but we want to make sure that the royalties that we charge are at the market price, not the contract price, if ever there is a difference between the contract price and the market price.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am grateful for the minister's advice that it was not necessarily a greedy government chasing down extra revenue. It was, in fact, perhaps something that can restore our faith in what can be sometimes the darkest habits of capitalism—that in this case the company has approached the government and said, 'Do you know, I have been tossing and turning in bed at night. It's worrying me that I'm not paying my full tax obligations to the state government, and I really think you should change legislation to make sure that, in the event that there might be an arrangement that I currently have, you are extracting the greatest amount of royalties from me and the minerals that I uncover.' I have to say that that is heartening to hear.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Good government.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is not expected. The minister might be right: it might be reflective of a good government that a company would come and do that. Can I ask which company it was?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Let me start at the end: no, I am not going to disclose the companies, but for the benefit of the house and that of the member for Lee let me also share the very real possibility that it is not actually about a company offering to pay more royalties. It could potentially be about any company that for its own reasons, perfectly legal, perfectly aboveboard, has a desire to sell raw material from one of its arms to another one of its arms, perhaps at a higher price, and does not want to be caught paying royalties on a higher-priced contract which it may have for some reason or other. So it is not necessarily a low contract and offering to pay more royalties. It might actually be a high contract and seeking to pay lower, market-based royalties.

But let us put all those hypotheticals aside. My suggestion to the house is that we agree that the market price is the price upon which royalties should be paid, and if a company has a sensible, aboveboard, legal reason to enter into contracts different from market price—and there are good reasons why a company might choose to do that—that is their business. If they choose to do that, though, we will charge royalties based on the fair market price.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am grateful to the minister even more for his response, because, rather than a company willing to come to the government and fess up that they are not paying enough tax, what actually might be the case, based on the minister's response, is that a company might be locked into a contractual arrangement, where it might be selling the minerals that it has mined at a high contract price, but the actual market price, daily price or an ongoing price for that mineral might be lower. That means that, if they did not have that high contract price that would attract a high royalty rate, if they have perhaps a floating price or a fluctuating market price, they will pay a lower royalty.

A company might say, 'Despite me having contracted a higher price, which is quite lucrative for my company, I would like the opportunity to pay a lesser tax rate on the daily market basis of that.' I think that is probably closer to the mark of what the incentive behind this is, but I live in hope that the previous answer was in fact the correct one and that we are entering into a new age where companies may be willing to prostrate themselves to the government and cough up as much revenue as they could possibly imagine.

When it comes to assessing the difference between a company's contracted price for the sale of its minerals and the daily market price, who in the department will be making that regular, perhaps even daily, assessment for the royalties? What level of resourcing is going into that?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: There are a couple of things in the member's statements and questions. Most recently, he has tried to say that this is mischievous because people

might pay not enough royalties. He has tried to say it is potentially mischievous because they might pay too much royalties. What I am saying very clearly is, whether it might, because of a contract, be too little or whether it might, because of a contract, be too much, our government intends it to be the market price. Regardless of all of those hypotheticals, we think that that is the right place for it to be.

With regard to the question about how the market price is set, that is something that the Treasurer and the Department of Treasury and Finance would do. But I have extraordinarily high confidence in the key people in the Department for Energy and Mining who would give advice to the Treasurer with regard to what the fair market price might be, if the Treasurer sought that advice or if they thought it was important to provide it regardless. The Department for Energy and Mining has a great deal of information about this and would support the Treasurer in any way possible.

I have also been given a very good example by my adviser: it is no different to stamp duty on property. The principle of what we are doing is no different to stamp duty on property. There might be reasons why somebody might contract a price away from the market price, but at the end of the day, if it is deemed that the stamp duty applicable on the contract price is not appropriate because the market price of that property is different to the contract price, then the stamp duty applies to what is deemed to be the fair market price of the property. It is exactly the same principle here with the minerals.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I guess, just to almost re-put my previous question—

The CHAIR: A point of clarification.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: A point of clarification—I am grateful for your wise counsel as always, sir. My previous question was about how the assessment will be made between what a contract arrangement is and the royalty rate that should apply to those contractual arrangements and the market price.

Your response was that the Treasurer will determine what the market price is. Usually the market would do that and it would get published in some sort of journal, like the *Financial Review*, or whatever the mining equivalent of that is, but nonetheless the Treasurer, as omnipotent as he is in this government, will set the market price or determine what he believes to be the market price, but who will assess the difference between the market price and the contracted price to which royalties are applied, assess whether or not there is a difference and take some corrective action?

My question was about resourcing. Who is doing that task and what level of resourcing is there to undertake that task?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I have been provided with some very thorough information to share with the committee and the member opposite. With regard to identification of market pricing, the Treasurer has recognised the following mineral markets for the purpose of that section of the bill:

- the London Metal Exchange, as a recognised market for the purpose of determining the market value of copper, aluminium, zinc, lead, nickel, tin, steel and cobalt;
- the London Bullion Market Association, as a recognised market for the purpose of determining the market value of gold and silver;
- the Platts Daily Iron Ore Assessments, as set out in the publication titled *SBB Steel Markets Daily*, published by S&P Global Platts, as a recognised market for the purpose of determining the market value of iron ore; and
- the prices as published by independent market consultants UxC and TradeTech, as a recognised market for the purpose of determining the market value of uranium.

In answer to the second part of the question from the member, which was who will look deeply into these things in addition to being able to assess the public indices that are available: no different from what happens currently. Royalty management administration is undertaken by the Department for Energy and Mining royalty team, and none of the changes will increase any work level activities for the proactive management of royalties for the state.

It was the proactive work of this team that has led to the changes that close out and ensure that royalties paid to the state are fair and based on market prices at the time of the sale. The royalty team is made up of a team of three auditors/compliance people, one market analyst, systems and forecasting specialists, two accountants, who administer the payment processing and all follow-up activities regarding returns and payments, and one director leading that team—a total of 6.5 FTEs, who managed this year a record of \$323 million in royalties from approximately 320 royalty payers over approximately 1,500 tenements.

This is a professional team of accountants and economists focused on the fair and correct receipt of royalties for the state. Compliance is a focus of the team, and on average between 45 and 60 audits are undertaken each year. Over the last five years, the audit program has recovered over \$10 million in royalty recoveries from the audit program.

An important and constant focus of the team is monitoring the commodity prices, exchange rates, company announcements and production information for the producers in SA. This is important as the royalty team of the Department for Energy and Mining prepares and undertakes the royalty forecasts for the state as part of the budget papers. The amendments being proposed will help to ensure that the focus on the recovery of the fair and correct royalty payments for the state is maintained and that any identified loopholes or opportunities to minimise market price declarations, and hence royalties, are minimised.

I have to say that in my short, but not brief, 3½ years roughly as Minister for Energy and Mining I cannot speak highly enough of that team of people. They do an extremely good job. They work very closely with Treasury with regard to their forecasts. They are very proactive as well with regard to their engagement with royalty payers and coming up with some very smart, very clever and very flexible and productive ways that those royalty payers can work with the state government.

They do that because they know that these royalties, the royalties paid by these mining companies to the state, actually go towards the building of hospitals, the building of roads, the building of schools, the provision of disability services, police, nurses, teachers, on and on. I hope that is enough detail for the member opposite. Let me just say again: that team that does that work is well resourced, that team that does that work does not expect to require any further additional resources because of these proposed changes and that team does an outstanding job.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Mr Chair, I draw your attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think we established via the government's amendments that the mining changes in the budget measures bill will come into effect from 1 July next year.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Sorry, is that a question?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, it was a statement preceding a question, but if I have that wrong I am happy to be corrected.

The CHAIR: No, I think we dealt with that in relation to the amendment.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Just for clarification, it was the adjustment to the stamp duty deduction that was delayed a year. The changes to the mining royalties are not delayed.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: With regard to clause 7 and transitional provisions, this will in effect apply from 1 July this year, from 2021. The transitional provision in subclause (2) talks about 'a recognition or declaration of the Treasurer made by notice in the *Gazette*' under a particular section of the Mining Act. Could the minister walk me through that process and what it refers to?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: What I would like to do is take that question on notice and provide an answer to the opposition between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This might be easily clarified, but we are now into the changes to the Motor Vehicles Act for the purpose of, I understand, rolling out the mobile detection cameras. Can I ask what the purpose is of the additional definition of 'series of photographs'? Is that not currently contemplated by other traffic camera-related legislative provisions that we have?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that this is about trying to be sure that this definition provides flexibility with regard to what is admissible as evidence, given that this is new technology and, in fact, potentially evolving technology. We would all understand that different types of cameras and things like that get better and better and can do more and more things over time. The choice of definition of 'series of photographs', which includes 'film, video or other continuous visual recording', is essentially a bit of a bit of a catch-all so that as the types of equipment that take these recordings improve, the recordings they provide can still be admissible as evidence.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: On my reading, and I am happy to be corrected, it seems that we are seeking to change some wording of the existing act to move away from a singular photograph to what might be a series of, presumably, sequential photographs. Can I ask why that is necessary?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that the answer to this question is very similar to the answer to the previous question. Accepting the fact that the technology and equipment used will almost certainly evolve over time, we want to be sure that whatever that evolving technology produces is useful and is captured under these proposed changes. Whether it is a still shot, a series of still shots or some other type of ongoing digital technology, whatever that might be, whatever the continuously improving technology for this purpose can produce, it should be useful and productive in this context.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It might strike you, Chair, and you, minister, that the question I am about to ask is a bit odd. As members of parliament, we all from time to time get aggrieved motorists writing to us with some sense of frustration seeking to overturn a traffic infringement, sometimes one which has been issued after photographic evidence, or not. There are all sorts of circumstances in which entreaties are made that, in the constituent's mind, should perhaps mean that they should not receive a fine or penalty for their driving behaviour.

Perhaps the member for Bragg will remember this better than the rest of us: when speed cameras were introduced, there was a long debate around what 'sufficient' evidence was in order to ensure that somebody had been detected speeding, breaking the speed limit, and there were all sorts of additional provisions which were placed I think at the insistence of the late Hon. Mr Such to ensure that cameras were calibrated, etc.

Rather than have a singular piece of evidence which shows that somebody is contravening the law in this case—i.e. using their mobile phone when they should not be—we are talking about a series of photos, according to the wording here, which together and collectively might demonstrate that somebody is breaking the law, but if one was selected, or even a number were selected, out of sequence or out of the total but non-sequentially, it might not demonstrate it.

Has the government thought through how wording this provision in this way, using a series of photographs taken to be together, is sufficient in order to demonstrate proof of the offence and will not in fact provide grounds for a clever appellant, if I can put it like that, a motorist, to get out of the fine or the charge, given the lengthy history that many of us in the courts have had with people successfully challenging these sorts of matters?

The CHAIR: It is quite a long question, member for Lee. Can I summarise it by saying that you are asking whether a series of photographs will be accepted as proof?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think that is what the clause is saying. My question was: if a series of photographs is now able to be used to demonstrate proof of the offence, must the whole series demonstrate the offence, or will the police or other authority try to rely on samples of the series,

or will the fact that we are now talking about a series enable the flipside, where the defence can try to say the government is unable to prove which singular piece of evidence demonstrates the offence?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for your clarification of the question as well. It will be no surprise to the member for Lee that I, as the member for Stuart, am familiar with the people who come to me regularly, being such a large electorate with a wide range of people, some of whom are commuting to Adelaide from Kapunda every day for work and others who are travelling hundreds of thousands of kilometres around the Far North of the state on a regular basis.

I do take the member's question very seriously, it is an issue and, yes, I was in parliament with the late Dr Bob Such as well, so I am familiar with those types of challenges. The advice that I have been given, I suppose, is in three parts, to answer the question. One is, similarly to what I said before, we want a definition that can cover as many possibilities of where the technology can go so that when a new type of camera is invented we do not have to come back and create another definition.

The next part is that we expect that the technology that will be available, or that will actually be used for this, will be in a series of photos rather than just one photo. Then the third part is with regard to the very fair question about whether this is going to be robust enough to hopefully make sure that people who are captured through this actually were committing an offence and there are not legal loopholes and all that sort of thing.

So the advice on that third part is that to the very best of not only the drafters but the key people who have been developing this legislation, to the very best of their ability, it does capture that. But the tail end of that third part of the answer to the question is that, while the government and everybody believe that it does it as well as possible, it does have to be said that you never know for sure until somebody tries.

So we do not want to remove the ability of somebody who believes that they have been caught unfairly in this type of situation to be able to claim their innocence. We do not want to remove that. That is a very important foundation for us. We believe that this captures it as well as it possibly can, but it will not be until we have it tested in real life that we will know for sure.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I understand these cameras have recently come into use in other jurisdictions. Is this how provisions are worded in those jurisdictions?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that the specifics of how this provision is worded in other states is something that we would be very happy to provide between the houses. But perhaps, more importantly, exactly which cameras will be used here in South Australia has not been determined yet. Other states, as the member quite rightly says, are using a range of different cameras and they are using them in a range of different ways.

It is not right to say that exactly what is happening in other states is exactly what will happen in South Australia. Exactly what cameras, what equipment, and exactly how they will be operated is still being determined. First of all, I am happy to get all the definitions and the similarities or otherwise from other states for the member between the houses. Secondly, whether they are exactly the same or whether they are different is not necessarily relevant because we have not determined exactly which cameras we will use in South Australia.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 14) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(22:51): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (BUSHFIRES) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE (EXPIRY) (NO 3) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

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

No. 1. New clause, page 2, after line 5—Insert:

1A—Commencement

- (1) Subject to subsection (2), this Act comes into operation on the day on which it is assented to by the Governor.
- (2) Section 3A is taken to have come into operation on 2 September 2021 (immediately after the expiry of sections 8, 9 and 10 of the *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020* pursuant to the *COVID-19 Emergency Response Residential Tenancies, Residential Parks and Supported Residential Facilities Expiry Notice 2021* (see Gazette 20 May 2021 p.1434)).

No. 2. Clause 3, page 2, after line 11—Insert:

- (1) Section 6(1)(a)(i)—after 'Part 2' insert:
(other than sections 8, 9 and 10)

No. 3. New clause, page 2, after line 13—Insert:

3A—Reinsertion of expired sections

After the heading to Part 2 insert:

8—Provisions applying to residential tenancies

- (1) Subject to this section, the operation of the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* is modified as follows:
 - (a) the terms of any residential tenancy agreement will be taken to be modified to such extent necessary to give effect to the modifications made by this section;
 - (b) the landlord must not increase the rent payable under a residential tenancy agreement (whether under section 55 of that Act or otherwise) if the tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
 - (c) despite any other provision of that Act, or any other Act or law, an act or omission of the tenant required under the laws of the State in response to the COVID-19 pandemic will be taken not to amount to a breach of a residential tenancy agreement or otherwise amount to grounds for termination of the agreement;
 - (d) a tenant may have repairs carried out on the premises (in accordance with any agreement with the landlord relating to such repairs) without seeking prior approval (and section 68(3)(e) and (5) of that Act will be taken to apply to costs or compensation incurred by or owing to the tenant accordingly);
 - (e) section 78A of that Act will be taken not to apply in respect of—
 - (i) a breach of a residential tenancy agreement consisting of a failure to pay rent where the tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic; or

- (ii) any act or omission of the tenant required under the laws of the State in response to the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (f) a residential tenancy cannot be terminated under that Act solely on the grounds of a breach of a residential tenancy agreement consisting of a failure to pay rent where the tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (g) the Tribunal cannot terminate a residential tenancy or make an order for possession of the premises in respect of a breach of a residential tenancy agreement consisting of a failure to pay rent where the tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (h) on an application under section 89 of that Act relating to financial hardship suffered as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Tribunal may, instead of or in addition to an order terminating the agreement, make such orders as the Tribunal thinks fit;
- (i) on an application under section 89 of that Act, as modified by paragraph (h), the Tribunal must have particular regard to the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic (including the need to ameliorate the effects of the pandemic in the State and the need to avoid homelessness during such a public health emergency);
- (j) despite any other Act or law, the Tribunal may, on application or otherwise in proceedings under that Act, make any order it considers appropriate in the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic (including an order that specified costs associated with the termination of a residential tenancy agreement be reduced or waived);
- (k) the Tribunal, on an application under section 93 of that Act (whether the application was made before or after the commencement of this section)—
 - (i) must have regard to the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic (including the need to ameliorate the effects of the pandemic in the State and the need to avoid homelessness during such a public health emergency); and
 - (ii) may, in a case where a tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, despite section 93(4)(a), suspend the operation of an order under that section for such period, and on such conditions, as the Tribunal thinks fit; and
 - (iii) may, in a case where a tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, despite section 93(4a), modify a residential tenancy agreement during such a period of suspended operation so as to reduce the tenant's immediate financial obligations under the agreement;
- (l) the Tribunal may, in relation to an order made under section 93(4)(a) of that Act before the commencement of this section, on an application by a tenant or landlord, further suspend the operation of the order for possession if the tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (m) the preceding paragraphs will be taken to apply in relation to a rooming house agreement under that Act (where a reference in a preceding paragraph to a provision of that Act will be taken to be a reference to a provision of a corresponding kind under Part 7 of that Act);
- (n) despite any other Act or law, the Tribunal must not make an order requiring interest to be paid on an amount payable by a tenant under a residential tenancy agreement;

- (o) despite a provision of any other Act or law, an order of the Tribunal contemplated by a preceding paragraph may have retrospective effect;
 - (p) section 99(4) of that Act does not apply in circumstances where the tenant, or another person lawfully residing in the premises, is self-isolating because they have, or may have, COVID-19;
 - (q) section 115 of that Act will be taken not to apply to an agreement or arrangement required by this section or otherwise required to give effect to this section;
 - (r) the following matters must not be recorded on a residential tenancies database:
 - (i) a matter consisting of, or relating to, a failure to pay rent due where the tenant is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
 - (ii) any other matter that the Tribunal orders not to be so recorded;
 - (iii) any other matter prescribed by the regulations.
- (2) A purported termination or other action in contravention of the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* (as modified by this section) will be taken to be void and of no effect.
- (3) A provision of the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* not referred to in a preceding subsection will be taken to be modified to the extent necessary to give effect to the modifications set out in this section.
- (4) The Tribunal may, on application by a landlord or tenant under a residential tenancy agreement (whether or not the agreement is still in force), make such of the following orders as the Tribunal thinks fit:
- (a) an order modifying or suspending any prescribed order of the Tribunal made during the prescribed period in relation to a residential tenancy period;
 - (b) an order confirming, varying or quashing any prescribed action done, or purportedly done, by a landlord under the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* in respect of a residential tenancy agreement during the prescribed period;
 - (c) any other order the Tribunal thinks appropriate to address the consequences of the retrospective commencement of this section.
- (5) An application under subsection (4) must be made within 28 days after the commencement of this section (or such longer period as the Tribunal may allow).
- (6) In making orders under this section, the Tribunal must have regard to the intended effect of the operation of this section as it relates to matters of the relevant kind.
- (7) Section 111 of the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* applies in relation to orders under this section.
- (8) To avoid doubt, the jurisdiction conferred by this section comes within the original jurisdiction of the Tribunal.
- (9) Subject to any regulations under section 20, an order of the Tribunal under this section will be taken to be revoked on the day on which this section expires.
- (10) In this section, a reference to the payment of rent will be taken to include a reference to the payment of an amount relating to water supply and usage.
- (11) A term or phrase used in this section will, unless the contrary intention appears, have the same meaning as in the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995*.

(12) In this section—

prescribed action, by a landlord, means an action taken by the landlord that would, if it occurred after the commencement of this section, contravene the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* (as modified by this section);

prescribed order means an order of the Tribunal made, or having effect, during the prescribed period;

prescribed period means the period commencing on 30 March 2020 and ending on 9 April 2020.

9—Provisions applying to residential parks

- (1) The operation of the *Residential Parks Act 2007* is modified such that the modifications made by section 8 to the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* (including, to avoid doubt, the provisions of section 8 relating to the Tribunal) apply in relation to the *Residential Parks Act 2007* as if a reference in that section to a residential tenancy agreement were a reference to a residential park tenancy agreement, residential park site agreement or residential park agreement (as the case requires).
- (2) A purported termination or other action in contravention of the *Residential Parks Act 2007* (as modified by this section) will be taken to be void and of no effect.
- (3) A term or phrase used in this section will, unless the contrary intention appears, have the same meaning as in the *Residential Parks Act 2007*.

10—Provisions applying to supported residential facilities

- (1) Subject to this section, the operation of the *Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992* is modified as follows:
 - (a) a proprietor cannot take any other action under that Act for the purpose of terminating a resident contract, where—
 - (i) the grounds for termination are a failure of the resident to pay fees and charges under the resident contract; and
 - (ii) the resident is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
 - (b) a proprietor cannot increase fees and charges payable in relation to a resident contract;
 - (c) a resident will be taken not to have breached a term of a resident contract or other agreement by complying with a direction or law relating to the COVID-19 pandemic that applies to or regulates residents of supported residential facilities;
 - (d) a proprietor must not give a notice to a resident under section 39 of that Act that purports to be notice of a proposed termination on grounds of failure to pay fees or charges if the resident is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
 - (e) a proprietor cannot make an application under section 43 of that Act in relation to a dispute consisting of a failure to pay fees and charges if the resident is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic (and, to avoid doubt, a licensing authority cannot make orders under that section on an application relating to any other kind of dispute that purports to terminate a resident contract or otherwise require payment of fees and charges in relation to such a resident);
 - (f) the Tribunal must not, on a review under section 44 of that Act, make an order that purports to terminate a resident contract or otherwise require a resident to pay fees and charges to the proprietor if the resident is suffering financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic;
 - (g) the operation of section 47 of that Act is modified such that—

- (i) a visit or attendance by a person will only fall within the ambit of that section if it complies with any direction or law applying to or regulating such visits or attendances; and
 - (ii) a person does not commit an offence under section 47(2) if the person is acting in accordance with a direction or law referred to in subparagraph (i);
 - (h) section 50 of that Act will be taken not to apply to an agreement or arrangement required by this section or otherwise required to give effect to this section;
 - (j) a proprietor will be taken not to commit an offence against that Act, or breach a term of a licence or resident contract or other agreement, to the extent that an act or omission of the proprietor is reasonably required to give effect to the modification made by this section, or by any direction or law relating to the COVID-19 pandemic that applies to or regulates supported residential facilities;
 - (k) the Tribunal or a licensing authority, in performing a function or exercising a power under that Act, must have regard to the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic (including the need to ameliorate the effects of the pandemic in the State and the need to avoid homelessness during such a public health emergency).
- (2) For the purposes of this section, a reference to fees and charges payable in relation to a resident contract will be taken to include a reference to any costs (however described) payable by a resident under the resident contract (whether for accommodation, personal care services or otherwise).
- (3) A term or phrase used in this section will, unless the contrary intention appears, have the same meaning as in the *Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992*.

No. 4. Clause 4, page 3, after line 9 [clause 4, inserted section 25A]—After subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) The regional representative must be a person who has knowledge of, and interest in, matters affecting communities located close to the South Australian border.

No. 5. Clause 4, page 3, after line 24 [clause 4, inserted section 25A]—After subsection (3) insert:

- (4) The committee referred to in subsection (1) must ensure that minutes of any meeting of the committee are provided to the COVID-19 Response Committee of the Legislative Council within 10 days after the meeting.

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that the government accepts amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 as provided by the Legislative Council and indicates that, in short, the provisions are, from the Hon. Robert Simms, amendments to accommodate a continuation of protections for residential tenancies until later in the year and, importantly, that those extensions also apply to residential parks and those in supported residential facilities.

Secondly, from the Hon. Tammy Franks, they are specificity in relation to the regional representative on the Transition Committee and, furthermore, a request now endorsed in amendment No. 5 that that committee provide to the COVID-19 Response Committee of the Legislative Council within 10 days after each meeting a copy of the minutes of those meetings. Those matters are agreed to.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2021*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 August 2021.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (22:57): I am continuing my remarks from 26 August 2021 and start by confirming that today I have tabled the corrigendum to the correct page 14 of the tabled version of the Electoral Commission of South Australia. I refer to that to remind members that the replacing paragraph now reads:

South Australians responded positively to ECSA's calls for enrolment with approximately 25,000 enrolment and updates effected in the month leading up to the close of rolls. During the six days from the issue of the writs to the close of the rolls there were approximately 11,900 enrolments and updates to the electoral roll, representing a decrease of 20.6 per cent from the same period in 2014.

I referred to the relevance of this when I addressed the parliament on 26 August this year, so I will not repeat it, but I do highlight a reference to the decrease in the number of enrolments in that last period of six days from the 2014 election—and I will refer to that in a moment—remembering that, for the purposes of elections, between 2014 and 2015 the total population of voters who enrolled to vote was 1,142,419 enrolled in the 2014 election and another 60,000-odd voters in the 2018 election, to 1,201,775. Again, I will refer to that later.

I also read to the house a letter I have now received from the Australian Electoral Commission, Mr Tom Rogers, to Mr Mick Sherry, the Electoral Commissioner here in the Electoral Commission of SA. It reads:

Dear Mr Sherry

Implications of potential 'enrolment on the day'

As discussed in our phone calls late last week, I am aware the South Australian Government is considering potential amendments to South Australian electoral legislation with the intent of enabling citizens to 'enrol on the day' for state elections. As you and I both discussed, similar provisions apply to some, but not all, other Australian state jurisdictions; nor is this facility available for federal elections.

The level of cooperation between our two agencies is excellent, and so it pains me to inform you I have grave doubts about our ability to support the implementation of this measure in time for your next state election in March 2022.

The AEC is already fully committed to the planning and conduct of the next federal election which can be called any time between now and late May 2022. The substantial complexity of preparing a federal election with a COVID overlay, recent significant legislative change, and implementation of redistributions in two states, have created the conditions for the most complex election in our history. Adding additional complexity without sufficient time for adequate planning and resourcing introduces a serious risk of electoral failure.

Such provisions are technically possible, and when implemented with adequate planning can further extend the franchise. However, given how deep we mutually are in the SA and federal electoral cycles I am unable to guarantee sufficient support in the days following your election to guarantee all 'on the day enrolment' would be finalised in time for those votes to be included in your count. This is particularly the case given the state and federal events may be temporally close.

Of course, were this measure to be implemented for future elections, we would be happy to work with you on implementation, costs, and risk mitigation.

I am happy to discuss this matter with you further.

Yours sincerely

Tom Rogers

7 September 2021

I indicated when last contributing in this debate the cost and complexity of dealing with what is effectively recommendation 1 of the Electoral Commissioner's report back in 2019. This letter simply

confirms the fact that we are in a pandemic, that we are in a circumstance where there has been major reform in this bill and at the national level, the redistributions referred to here and the incapacity for there to be any assurance for there to be an effective enrolment up to polling day by the AEC.

That is just not a practical matter to consider, and whilst the members on the other side have presented some argument that this somehow or other is evidence of a conspiracy of some voter suppression of the youth vote, the reality is that this is the practical situation that we are in. I bring this matter to the attention of the house because the Electoral Commissioner here has advised me of the conversations he has had with Mr Rogers. He has now confirmed that in writing and has provided me with that letter. That is the position. We cannot—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member interjects to complain about the timing. This legislation was brought in a year ago and the member might recall that they voted it down.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: So we are actually back here for a second tranche to try to have the recommendations of the commissioner introduced. There was an opportunity for the opposition to support a number of these matters and to raise these issues before—no, they decided they were just going to vote it down. Well, that is the way they did it. I cannot undo that, but do not come and complain to this house that there has been a failure to expedite this matter during the course of this debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Attorney just told the house that this legislation is identical to previous legislation considered by this house and rejected in the same session.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I did not say that at all.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I can get the *Hansard* if you like.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Attorney-General just told the house, responding to an interjection, that this legislation had been considered by the house and rejected a year ago. They were her comments. If that is true, this legislation cannot be considered again by the house.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I listened carefully to the Deputy Premier's remarks. They did not accord directly with those attributed by the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As the member for Kaurna at least understands, there has been a process where a bill has been presented to this house previously. We have been through all the issues relating to optional preferential voting being an aspect of that, corflutes now being the subject of another bill, and the matters relating to the recommendations of the Electoral Commissioner are now back again from that bill in this bill.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not know how clear I can be about it.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In any event, the members decide they want to continue to interject.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, thank you, sir. In the meantime, in this debate, there has been correspondence received by me—and I understand to the opposition—from the Commissioner for Children and Young People. Her letter to me is dated 18 August 2021. I firstly want to thank the commissioner for her correspondence and the opportunity to meet with her in respect of this correspondence.

In short, the commissioner expresses her concerns in some aspects in relation to this bill. The concerns that she has highlighted relate to the amendments to the change of date for the close of rolls, her preference for enrolment up to polling day and the concern about the removal of the mandatory obligation to advertise in newspapers in the circumstance that that might, in some way or other, make it more difficult for youth voters.

I have addressed these in some detail but, in short, for the purposes of this submission, the date of the close of rolls is a complete red herring. The six days to two days, coupled with the announcement by the commissioner—the electoral commissioner that is—that he will indeed be taking his advertising campaign forward to 22 January instead of 26 January, enables there to continue to be exactly the same time frame of an advertising campaign as the last election, for which there was nearly \$500,000 to deal with that issue. So there will be that provision of alert to the population to ensure that there is every opportunity to encourage people to vote. That is the first thing.

The second is the preference for enrolment up to polling day. I do not know how much clearer the letter from the Australian Electoral Commission would make it, but that is not a practical aspect for this forthcoming election. Again, if the member for West Torrens had been listening to the debate he would have said that is not a matter that cannot be considered on another occasion and, to use my exact words on this so that he is absolutely clear about this, I had said on the 26 August that we have not dismissed recommendation 1.

The commissioner then raises her concern about the level of knowledge and awareness that young people have about electoral processes and time lines. I have passed this information on to the Electoral Commissioner who has the responsibility under the Electoral Act to inform the public of their democratic rights and obligations, and I am sure he will work on the feedback that the commissioner has obtained from young people on these issues.

The Electoral Commission set out the approach it took to its advertising campaign in the last election in chapter 3 of the election report, which is appropriately titled 'Getting the message out'. The advertising occurred across a wide range of platforms including television, radio, digital channels, social media, posters and billboards, in addition to the Electoral Commissioner's website and printed materials. The Electoral Commission worked closely with the government media agency to ensure the placement strategy targeted audiences that had been underrepresented in the past state elections, including young people.

In addition to that, in a meeting I had with the Commissioner for Children and Young People, she confirmed that she had written to the commissioner herself in April this year suggesting a number of possible opportunities to work together to increase enrolment and voter turnout for young people. She had outlined in her meeting with me that prior to the 2018 election she had worked with young people to try to ensure that there was even a mock election and the opportunity to be able to learn the processes in relation to voting, and suggested that a 'youth in a booth' campaign was worthy of consideration of continuing, and that there be a contemporary reward system for first-time voters and a combined birthday card for 18 year olds to encourage them to enrol.

Of course, these are matters for the independent Electoral Commissioner to take up if he thinks they are appropriate. I am advised by the Commissioner for Children that the Electoral Commissioner replied in May this year. He supported it in principle and invited there be conversations, and I understand, again from the Commissioner for Children, that she was referred to a person within the Electoral Commission to continue to have discussions with to assist in that regard. In anticipation of that, I thank her in advance for doing that.

The information on the feedback on the electoral bill really was a little unclear in the letter, so I asked the commissioner to outline the particulars of the reference in her letter which reads:

To inform my response to the bill I asked a group of young South Australians aged 15 to 22 year olds their thoughts on the barriers to enrolment and voting for young people and how the proposed amendment might impact young people.

I am satisfied on the information that she has provided that she sought feedback on 13 August for closure of that on 18 August, so she gave them five days to actually provide the feedback, but she surveyed 15 policy advocates and she had nine responses. She sent out a questionnaire to these policy advocates. I am not sure whether they are individuals or organisations but in any event these were the questions:

1. How important do you think it is for young people to vote? Why?
2. One of the proposed changes to the Electoral Act would reduce the amount of time people have to enrol to vote. How do you think this will impact young people?
3. What do you think governments need to consider to make it easier for young people to enrol to vote?
4. What do you think are the barriers to voting?
5. Is there anything you would like to add on this topic?

This was, she says, to inform her response to the draft bill and 'the commissioner wants to hear your thoughts about voting'. Of the nine responses she has advised me of quotes from the survey—there were nine of these. In particular, in response to question 3, which I remind members was, 'What do you think governments need to consider to make it easier for young people to enrol to vote?' these were the answers:

1. I think that including a crash course on voting program or some form of educational program to teach young people about our voting processes would make engaging in democracy more accessible to young people.
2. Allow people from the age of 16 to vote but it is compulsory from 18. Educating people in schools about the importance of voting.
3. The government should look at online voting as well as having polling booths in youth organisations to ensure that it is accessible and easy. Additionally, it may be a good idea for governments to contact young people and let them know how to enrol and why it is important.
4. Target younger people as a target audience. Their voices are just as important as anyone's, more important even as in the future generations.
5. Having it open for a period of time closer to the election.
6. Get kids to enrol at school when they turn 16.
7. Media advertisements targeted towards younger people should incorporate knowledge on how to vote and how to enrol, also easily online accessible requires schools to also mention enrolling in years 11 and 12.
8. I think making the information about enrolling to vote more accessible will make it easier for young people to enrol to vote. This includes to provide brochures in schools and easily accessible information on social media.

I thank the commissioner for providing this information. Items 5, 6 and 7 of those quotes were referred to in her letter but none of the others. I must say I found it a little unusual that a 15 year old or someone between 15 and 22 would have actually answered in this way. It sounds to me like someone is writing as an adult what they think young people need to do, but I may be wrong. None of it is in the first person; it is all in reference to things oriented towards younger people rather than actually to me as the survey filler. Nevertheless, that is information that is helpful and can be passed on to the commission.

Interestingly, when I met with the commissioner she provided me with the envelope in which she raised this survey. That is that for the last year or so—in fact, four years, it seems—she has been working on a democracy project, and within that envelope she has been looking at voting for youth and encouraging civics amongst youth. That is admirable and I think it is a matter where, as I have said previously in this debate, it is important for all of us to ensure that we encourage people who have the opportunity to have a voice and a vote to enrol and do so. It is clearly democracy in action.

One matter that she has raised with me as important for the civics education of children has been the publication only a couple of months ago, in May of this year, of a teacher's handbook, which is described as South Australia's first curriculum aligned, project-based, action civics resource for

primary and secondary educators. It is a compendium which is also available online, I am advised. She tells me that 60 schools have signed up to receive this information and obviously develop this and have it available as a resource to teachers within those schools.

This is an important document because it is important that we do, of course, encourage these activities in schools. I am advised, however, by the education department, that they do have a civics program, just for those of you who might be wondering whether that is still happening in our schools. I am advised that it certainly is. It is a program which is—let me just find it. I cannot readily find it, so I will refer to it shortly.

In relation to the booklet itself, I note that this is a document, as I say, published by the Commissioner for Children and Young People. It is under her copyright with all rights reserved, and she acknowledged in it—in this compendium available to schools—a thankyou to a Mr Scott Warren and the team at Generation Citizen for their action civics knowledge and advice from another continent. I was not familiar with Generation Citizen. It is an American company, which was run at the time, as I understand it, although he has since resigned in I think the year 2000, by Mr Scott Warren, who has been the CEO of this organisation and I think co-founder.

It is an organisation, which members might be interested to know, that is committed obviously to the civics education of young people. Again, that is most admirable. I noted on its website it also has a policy position of 16 year olds having a vote. Again, people are entitled to have that position—for example, the Hon. Mark Parnell, formerly of the other place, was a strong advocate for 16 year olds having the vote.

I also note that it is an organisation which has produced and prepared a manual for the purposes of assisting teachers in schools of how they might operate an action civics resource for primary and secondary schools. It has lesson plans in parts 2, 3, 4 and 5, as set out in the document that I was provided, and it has plans that are able to assist the teacher to write that.

It has an extraordinary likeness to the document prepared by the company Generation Citizen in the United States. Again, I do not think any member of this house would have issue with the importance of everyone having an opportunity to vote and enrolling to vote to enable them to do that, because it is not an automatic process. You do have to actually enrol, even though you can do it online. You have to go through that process.

But it is concerning to me that, after all the speeches I have heard in this house about the American politics style that we are supposed to be reflecting in this government as some kind of suppression of the youth vote, the very group they go to to espouse the argument for civics action of children is from the United States. In any event, I thank the commissioner for coming in to see me and providing this information to enable me to indicate some reliability of the matters raised.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurua!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The final thing she does raise as a concern in her letter relates to the removal of the requirement to advertise in print media. I had a discussion with the commissioner about this because I do not know a lot of young people who actually read newspapers or even country newspapers. Nevertheless, I am certainly one who likes to read real paper papers and not just online versions, so I am one of the generation who is very happy to support the purchase of country newspapers, which I regularly do in whatever district I attend.

She was not able to illuminate for me circumstances in which she was aware that children had requested that there be some access to printed newspapers, rather than digital access. She did refer me to a paper she had done, titled My Digital Life report, which relates to the poverty difference of children who do not have access to digital opportunities. They can be certainly not treated equitably in access to information generally and obviously as an instrument to assist their education. It is quite an interesting and important report with important aspects.

It underpins, of course, the importance of our public education system having these services available to children, complemented by our libraries. With that, I thank members for their contribution and look forward to further matters being raised in committee.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 18
 Noes 16
 Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Cowdrey, M.J.	Piccolo, A.	Luethen, P.
Gee, J.P.	Marshall, S.S.	Szakacs, J.K.
Pederick, A.S.	Brock, G.G.	Power, C.
Bell, T.S.		

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The CHAIR: There are 40 clauses, numerous amendments and a title. There is a question on clause 1. The member for Kaurna is poised.

Mr PICTON: That was quite an exceptional summing-up that we just had from the Deputy Premier, where she outlined a number of different letters, instructions and recommendations that she has had from both the state Electoral Commissioner and the federal Electoral Commissioner. To my knowledge, these documents, letters and information have not been provided to the opposition and have not been provided to other members of parliament. I think that it is very important when we are dealing with legislation such as this that we get a proper ability to dissect that information, to read that information and to be briefed on that information before we debate it in this parliament. That has not happened on this occasion. We are having to rely upon the Attorney-General's word for what these documents say rather than being able to see them ourselves.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr PICTON: We need to make sure that appropriate information is provided to all members of parliament so all members of parliament can get the information that the Attorney-General has referred to in her summing-up speech from independent officials, the Electoral Commissioner at a state level and the Electoral Commissioner at the federal level.

That has not happened. No briefing has been provided. No information has been sent to the opposition. Therefore, I recommend that we need to adjourn this debate to make sure that there can be a proper briefing. Hence, I move:

That progress be reported.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 16
 Noes 19
 Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Brock, G.G.	Pederick, A.S.	Gee, J.P.
Luethen, P.	Piccolo, A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Szakacs, J.K.	Marshall, S.S.	

Motion thus negatived.

The CHAIR: We shall return to clause 1.

Mr PICTON: In regard to the timing of this legislation, there has been some discussion already through the second reading debate, but it seems very clear that the recommendations from the Electoral Commissioner were given to the Attorney-General two years ago. Now we are here, on the eve of the election, and the Attorney-General is trying to change the rules of the election. So why has it taken the Attorney-General two years to get to the point of debating these recommendations in the parliament?

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Because you have been filibustering when everything else has come before it.

The CHAIR: Order, minister!

Mr PICTON: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your protection from the withering attacks from the Minister for Energy and Mining.

The CHAIR: I am sure you can soldier on, but I remind members that interjections are out of order.

Mr PICTON: This is a report that was presented way back in 2018. The Attorney's defence seems to be, 'We had the previous legislation in the past year.' That does not explain why there was such a lengthy delay to look at it. Obviously, that legislation included her own special spices and

flavours that she added to the mix, which made it completely unpalatable for the parliament to pass. Why has it taken the Attorney so long to act on these recommendations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think I made that answer very clear during my presentation.

The CHAIR: So you are referring to your closing remarks and the second reading?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: During the debate and the closing remarks.

Mr PICTON: Very clearly, this debate was happening in the shadow of the next election. Many concerns have been raised by members throughout the debate. The Attorney herself has now introduced a new discussion point from the Electoral Commissioner at the federal level, raising the spectre that, for the amendments moved by this parliament, it may be too late for proper cooperation between the federal and state electoral commissioners in the lead-up to the next state and federal elections.

Why is the Attorney-General proposing changes with such little time between now and the next election? Are there risks that any element of what is currently being proposed in the Attorney's bill will be unable to be implemented in time for the next election?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The matters in the bill are able to be advanced, and they come as a consistent recommendation from the Electoral Commissioner. As I have indicated throughout this debate, they are both achievable and provided for. In relation to the matter of allowing enrolment up to and/or on election day—there is another considered amendment coming in at two weeks or something—that has clearly not been achievable. I will just explain to the committee that the AEC is the body that receives the enrolments and they then provide them to the state. That is why that process is there.

I have asked the Electoral Commissioner in South Australia to obtain confirmation in writing from the Electoral Commissioner, from whom he receives advice as to the technical impasse in relation to the opposition's amendment. That letter is dated today, and I provided it to the parliament today to confirm the position that has been advised to me—that is, that the amendment the opposition wishes to pursue is not achievable for the purpose of the next election.

Mr PICTON: Why has the Attorney up until now not provided copies of all those elements of correspondence to the opposition? Presuming we are finishing soon tonight, will she commit to providing to the opposition, before the debate tomorrow, all elements of the correspondence she has received from both the state and the federal electoral commissioners with regard to this legislation and also the opportunity for a briefing to take place with the state Electoral Commissioner about this new information that she has provided to the parliament at the last minute?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Firstly, in relation to the electoral bills, there has been a consistent offer of briefings. Briefings have been provided, but the Electoral Commissioner has also made himself available. The deputy, Mr Gully, has also been available. My recollection is that the last meeting I had was with Mr Reggie Martin—the secretary of the Australian Labor Party—and Mr Gully and advisers. He asked a number of questions about funding reforms. So he has availed himself—

Mr Picton: It's a separate bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just indicating that, in relation to all the electoral bills, but in relation to that one particularly, all were present. I think that Mr Gully on that occasion was available on the phone because we were in the middle of a COVID situation, but in any event we were all there to discuss matters.

In relation to the correspondence we received today, which I have read in, I am happy to provide a copy of that to the opposition. In relation to the matter I otherwise read in, I have already tabled that in the parliament today. That is the erratum I referred to on the last occasion, which has now been tabled to correct the error in relation to the commissioner's report. I simply read that out today so that is available for anyone to inspect.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is usual practice in the house that, if a minister is quoting from a document for the ability of the committee to understand the amendment, the entire document

be tabled and I would ask you to instruct the Attorney-General to table the documents, rather than making them just available generally to members, and make them a permanent part of the record.

The CHAIR: Attorney, are you happy to table those documents? It is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to table the letter. It is not actually a schedule, but it is a letter that I read out.

The CHAIR: Is that what you are looking for, member for West Torrens, the two documents?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Attorney-General quoted from a number of documents in her second reading contribution. I would like those documents tabled.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have quoted from two documents today. I have read out the letter from the Australian Electoral Commission, which is dated today and which was received, and I am happy to make that available. I have also referred to the page that was already tabled just before question time today.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If it has already been tabled, that is fine.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I just said that.

The CHAIR: I missed that, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: He said if it has already been tabled, it is fine.

The CHAIR: My understanding is that the Attorney is prepared to table the second document and is indicating that the first document—I am putting them in that order at least—was tabled at question time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand the Attorney-General read out and quoted from other documents as well from the consultation and I would like her to table those—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Chaffey!

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! We are nearly to midnight.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Chaffey! The member for Chaffey is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think he needs a moment, sir.

The CHAIR: He does. I was not in the chair, so I am unsure how many other documents the Attorney referred to.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In her closing remarks, the Attorney was quoting from documents—not just the AEC document she has tabled now but other documents as well—and I ask her to table those as well.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There are some other notes here. If the member has anything extra he particularly wants to know about, I am happy to have a look for it. I have a lot of notes here, some of which are not appropriate to table because they are notes to me and my notes in relation to the submission I have presented. I have made available the full letter, which I have read out in full, and that is all I have to table.

The CHAIR: My understanding is that documents are different from a member's notes. The documents have been tabled. If there are any further documents, as opposed to notes, then the Attorney might consider tabling them. If there are not any other documents as such, then that is it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just for clarification, I am not sure what she was quoting from.

The CHAIR: Nor am I, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not saying that they were her notes, but I take her word if the Attorney said it was her notes, but the Attorney-General was quoting from a series of documents. Just for the benefit of the committee, she could table them. If they are notes, I accept that they should not be tabled, but if they are documents that the Attorney was quoting from they should be tabled in their entirety.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not think I have quoted from any others. I have referred to a document, which is the materials teacher's handbook, if the member would like to have a look at it. It is available online, but if he would like to have a look at my copy, he is welcome to it.

The CHAIR: We are spending a fair bit of time on this. The Attorney has during question time and just a moment ago tabled two documents that she quoted from during her contributions. She has also referred to a teacher's handbook that is publicly available and my understanding is that, aside from that, they are simply notes that the Attorney was referring to. Let's move on. Any further questions on clause 1?

Mr BROWN: The Attorney has now tabled a letter purporting to be from Mr Tom Rogers from the AEC regarding a phone conversation that he had with Mr Mick Sherry.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The member for Chaffey is warned.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BROWN: Sorry, I am just enjoying the show up here.

The CHAIR: Let's see if we can get through this last 10 minutes without too much trouble.

Mr BROWN: My question to the Attorney is this: is the Attorney able to provide the house with anything from Mr Sherry outlining what exactly was the nature of his phone conversation with the AEC, and what he put to the AEC as his understanding of the amendments that were being foreshadowed for this legislation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have had conversations with the Electoral Commissioner, Mr Sherry, when he raised concerns about the capacity to effect the foreshadowed amendment of the member for Kaurua. In those, he explained to me that it is the AEC that actually receives the material and they need to be able to implement the processing of the application for registration on the poll.

I asked him again today whether he could provide me with something in writing to provide to the house as to the particulars of that incapacity, and he has done so, and I have provided it. I will just repeat that there have been at all times briefings available and the commissioner himself and/or his deputy have made themselves available for briefings. I do not know how many have taken that up. I know of one because I was in it, but that is something that is available at all times.

Mr BROWN: I have a question of clarification for the Attorney. Is the Attorney now saying that she is unable to provide to the house any information from the state Electoral Commissioner, rather than the commonwealth, outlining what exactly was the nature of the discussions that he had with the commonwealth regarding this foreshadowed amendment, which was interpreted by him, and he gave his interpretation to the commonwealth, and they then gave him advice?

Can we get something from the state Electoral Commissioner letting us know what the nature of his conversations were? The Attorney has told the house that she has requested such a document from the Electoral Commissioner and yet she has been unable to provide it. This is a letter from the AEC, not from the state Electoral Commissioner.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Throughout the debate on this matter and in fact even the development of the bill, we have had conversations with the Electoral Commissioner. Simply a letter from him saying that it is not practical for us to be able to do this did not, in my view, translate to an adequate explanation to the house from the party that is responsible for doing the job of receiving and processing enrolments for voting. That is the AEC, so I particularly asked Commissioner Sherry here to provide me with something from the AEC because they are the party that actually do the job.

I did not cross-examine him as to exactly what questions he had put to the AEC to make that inquiry, but I think you will see from the tenor of the response from the AEC that they have a close working relationship—he was complimentary of it, I think, in that letter—and so I had no reason to suggest that there was something inappropriate by the commissioner here in South Australia. He acceded to that request, having indicated to me that he had had discussions verbally with him but that he would get that information. He has provided it and I have no reason to doubt that, and I reconfirm that it is open to the opposition to contact the commissioner. He has made himself available and will do so.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I was wondering whether the Attorney could advise the committee on whether or not she is aware that the state Electoral Commissioner contacted the Australian Electoral Commission via any written correspondence, or to the best of her knowledge was that all done verbally?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: To the best of my knowledge that was all done verbally, and that is why I had asked that there be something in writing.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Given the nature of the information in the correspondence between the Australian Electoral Commission and the South Australian Electoral Commissioner and the specific reference to the fact that it is technically possible to implement the proposed later enrolment mechanism, as evidenced by the fact that it does exist in other jurisdictions around the country, at any point did the government have a conversation with the Electoral Commission of South Australia regarding the provision of additional resources to facilitate the implementation of this amendment, given it is technically possible?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There has been discussion of resources, and I have referred to it in the debate. If the Leader of the Opposition might like to have a look at my earlier contribution, it will indicate that there are a number of areas of reform that were going to cost money, and there were also the COVID circumstances to be considered, and that would cost extra money. In fact, I think I even advised the house, on rereading my notes from 26 August of the *Hansard*, that there is a mid-year budget proposal for some extra funding. So some of these already cost money, and they are in the process of occurring.

Recommendation 1, which is the basis of the amendment that has been proposed by the member for Kaurana, is, Leader of the Opposition, your amendment, not the government's amendment. Of course, if they would have inquired of either the Electoral Commissioner here and/or the AEC as to whether it was possible to pursue that amendment, then that is really a matter for you.

I made that inquiry to be satisfied whether there was any impasse or incapacity on behalf of the government, and I have provided that information to the house. This is not a proposal of the government: this is a foreshadowed amendment of the opposition, so I would have thought you would have at least had the courtesy to ensure that the member for Kaurana contacted the AEC to find out if it is practical.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am grateful to the Attorney for providing the committee with a copy of correspondence to her from a statutory officer, on which she is basing her position on a government amendment. Of course, in the past we have not been so lucky to be furnished with copies of correspondence to the Attorney-General regarding bills that have come to this house. Of course, I am specifically referring to correspondence from the Chief Justice about the establishment of a Full Court in South Australia, where the Attorney kept her own counsel very, very close to her own chest on that to make sure she gave herself the maximum opportunity of ramming that through the parliament and not hearing any voices to the contrary, let alone that of the Chief Justice. But what would he know? What would the Chief Justice know over the opinion of the Attorney-General?

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, I am just going to bring to your attention the time of evening. Following your question, we will report progress.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps I can leave the Attorney with this question, and she can ruminate over it until we return on this at some point tomorrow: it is curious, is it not, Attorney, that despite the opposition moving more than 50 amendments, you would only think to pick up the phone and, in your own words, have a verbal conversation with the Electoral Commission, asking them for specific advice about why it would be too hard and too expensive to implement the opposition's amendment with regard to enrolment on the day. Why did you not ask for his view on

any of the other proposals which were put in this bill, whether it be by the government or by the opposition?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Clearly the member was not listening because that is precisely what I have done.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 23:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 8 September 2021 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***SWITCH FOR SOLAR**

533 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (23 June 2021). How was it decided which suburbs would be chosen to participate in and have access to the Switch for Solar Scheme?

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

I am advised by the Department for Energy and Mining (the department) that the suburbs chosen to participate in and have access to the Switch for Solar scheme were selected by the department based on the number of eligible concession holders living in the region and the region's capacity to host additional rooftop solar systems. The department consulted with SA Power Networks to identify suburbs that were best able to accommodate additional solar capacity to ensure participants are able to receive the maximum benefits from the trial.

Suburbs selected for this trial include Hope Valley, Banksia Park, Tea Tree Gully, Vista, Modbury, Modbury Heights, Modbury North, Felixstow, Campbelltown, Newton, Paradise, Athelstone, Dernancourt, Holden Hill, Highbury, Redwood Park and Ridgehaven, and Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island in regional South Australia.

Subject to the success of the trial, the state government hopes to roll out the program more widely.

*Estimates Replies***LE CORNU SITE**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The Department for Education has not received any correspondence from community members in Forestville or Ashford in relation to the possibility of building a school on the old Le Cornu site in Forestville.

RICHMOND PRIMARY SCHOOL, STAFF PARKING

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

Richmond Primary School is located on a constrained parcel of land and, as a result, there is a deficiency in onsite staff carparking. Given the restricted size of the school site, it is not appropriate to establish additional onsite parking at the school.

Some school staff who drive to school are required to park in the surrounding streets. In 2020 the school approached the Department for Education with concerns about the parking time limits in the surrounding streets, which were resulting in staff members receiving parking fines for exceeding the time limits.

My department liaised with the City of West Torrens and following consultation with residents, council agreed to increase the time limits for the on-street parking in the area.

EDWARDSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL, ROAD SAFETY

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The Department for Education has not been contacted by Edwardstown Primary School or the City of Mitcham in relation to road safety issues on streets surrounding Edwardstown Primary School.

Concerns regarding car parking and traffic management are experienced by school sites from time to time. The local council, in conjunction with SAPOL, is responsible for safety and traffic management on public roads as the Department for Education's legal jurisdiction in respect of these issues does not extend beyond the boundaries of the school site.

Notwithstanding this, the Department for Education is willing to liaise with the council on these issues if required.

PLYMPTON INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE, ROAD SAFETY

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

Schools are planned as safe places for children and an important element of this is minimising the movement of vehicles within school sites. For this reason, car parking is only provided within the boundaries of school sites for staff and visitors.

Parking areas for parents to drop off and collect students, including kiss-and-drop zones, are more appropriately provided on the public roads surrounding school sites to enable the local council and South Australia Police to monitor driver behaviour and enforce parking controls.

In this respect, I understand that the City of West Torrens has allocated funding in its 2021/22 budget for the construction of a new indented kiss and drop zone on Errington Street, Plympton.

PASSIVE ALERT DETECTION DOGS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The schools that are possible candidates for future passive alert drug detection dog operations first expressed an interest in information in 2020.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised of the following:

During the assessment phase, applications under the School Loans Scheme are to be managed in accordance with standard confidentiality provisions.

AUTOMOTIVE EQUIPMENT

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The provider is the Motor Trade Association.

TRAINING HOURS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

Overall recorded training hours completed amounted to 11.4 million for the financial year ended 30 June 2021 compare to 10.2 million for the previous year.

This included 6.8 million of government subsidised training hours completed for the financial year ended 30 June 2021. This represents a 27% increase compared to the same period last year of 5.4 million.

A further 0.7 million training hours were delivered to regional communities, prisoners and metropolitan cohorts compared to 0.9 million for the same period last year.

Fee for service comprise the balance of the training hours completed and activity for the year ended 30 June 2021 was consistent with the prior year.

SCHOOLS, DEMOUNTABLE FACILITIES

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

Twenty-two 'modular' buildings have been funded, which include:

- 51 general learning areas, specialised laboratories, and workshops
- teacher preparation rooms
- meeting rooms and storerooms
- ambulant and access toilets
- ramps, decking and covered outdoor learning areas
- furniture allowance; and
- associated site works including site plan updates.

The overall cost per unit will be dependent on site-specific requirements which can include:

- transport costs (ie Greater Adelaide vs rural regions)
- nearby existing infrastructure which may result in more challenging crane operations, relocation of existing services
- requirement for demolition of existing infrastructure
- local topography; and
- state or local heritage listings.

SCHOOLS, MODULAR BUILDING MANUFACTURERS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The modular buildings were procured by competitive tender or Request for Quote process to the Modular Education Facilities Panel, which was established in September 2019. The panel comprises South Australian and interstate suppliers, and in total there are 15 suppliers on the panel:

- ATCO Structures and Logistics
- Ausco Modular Pty Ltd
- Birubi Australia Pty Ltd
- Centina Group Pty
- Fleetwood Pty Ltd
- Fusco Constructions Pty Ltd
- Grove (Aust) Pty Ltd
- KL Modular Systems (Aust) Pty Ltd
- Modscape Commercial Pty Ltd
- Murray River North Pty Ltd
- Oneconstruct Pty Ltd
- Sarah Construction
- Sensum Group Pty Ltd
- Spotless Facility Services Pty Ltd
- Swanbuild Pty Ltd

The overall cost per unit will be dependent on site-specific requirements which can include:

- transport costs (ie Greater Adelaide vs rural regions)
- nearby existing infrastructure which may result in more challenging crange operations, relocation of existing services
- requirement for demolition of existing infrastructure
- local topography; and
- state or local heritage listings.

Of the 22 modular buildings built, 20 were manufactured in South Australia. Two buildings were manufactured in Victoria and transported to South Australia to meet urgent timeframes.

SCHOOLS, MODULAR BUILDING MANUFACTURERS

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The modular buildings were procured by competitive tender or Request for Quote process to the Modular Education Facilities Panel, which was established in September 2019. The panel comprises South Australian and interstate suppliers, and in total there are 15 suppliers on the panel:

- ATCO Structures and Logistics
- Ausco Modular Pty Ltd
- Birubi Australia Pty Ltd
- Centina Group Pty
- Fleetwood Pty Ltd
- Fusco Constructions Pty Ltd
- Grove (Aust) Pty Ltd
- KL Modular Systems (Aust) Pty Ltd

- Modscape Commercial Pty Ltd
- Murray River North Pty Ltd
- Oneconstruct Pty Ltd
- Sarah Construction
- Sensum Group Pty Ltd
- Spotless Facility Services Pty Ltd
- Swanbuild Pty Ltd

The overall cost per unit will be dependent on site-specific requirements which can include:

- transport costs (ie Greater Adelaide vs rural regions)
- nearby existing infrastructure which may result in more challenging crane operations, relocation of existing services
- requirement for demolition of existing infrastructure
- local topography; and
- state or local heritage listings.

Of the 22 modular buildings built, 20 were manufactured in South Australia. Two buildings were manufactured in Victoria and transported to South Australia to meet urgent timeframes.

SCHOOL GRANTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The state government capital grants distribution model to independent non-government schools utilises an index score determined by a measure of the school community's capacity to contribute as informed by their direct measure of income (DMI) score and the schools' enrolment data.

The index score for each school is calculated by dividing total enrolments for the school by the capacity to contribute (DMI) score. The index scores are grouped into discrete funding bands with each band including a distinction between small and large schools.

Special schools and special assistance schools receive a fixed per-school allocation irrespective of complexity and disadvantage.

CARRYOVER EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

For the Department of Human Services, the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2021-22 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	62,546	57,866	55,163	54,492	55,884

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost for these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$13,510,585
The Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission	\$4,025,189
Programmed Health Professionals	\$2,821,512
Hays Specialist Recruitment Job Employment Agency	\$2,611,637
Drake International Recruitment	\$2,461,234
Data 3	\$2,444,817

Supplier	Total Value
Pop-Up Community Care	\$2,265,126
Zen Energy Retail Pty Ltd	\$1,618,494
Objective Corporation	\$1,233,990
Facilities First Australia	\$1,173,154

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the description of these goods and services is as follows:

Supplier	Description
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	Office accommodation, rental, maintenance for breakdown and preventative measures, minor works
The Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission	Crimtrac history check fees
Programmed Health Professionals	Agency Staffing
Hays Specialist Recruitment Job Employment Agency	Agency Staffing
Drake International Recruitment	Agency Staffing
Data 3	Microsoft related product changes
Pop-Up Community Care	Agency Staffing
Zen Energy Retail Pty Ltd	Electricity supply charges
Objective Corporation	Upgrade, maintenance patches, access to workflow libraries and support of DHS' Records Management System
Facilities First	General cleaning for office locations

For SA Housing Authority, the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2021-22 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	236,017	240,741	212,644	207,737	n/a

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost for these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value
Programmed Facility Management	\$34,810,055
Lake Maintenance	\$32,918,885
SA Water	\$32,008,270
RTC Facilities Maintenance	\$17,174,817
Mordangood Maintenance	\$12,376,631
Bettio Constructions	\$6,685,328
Furnell Plumbing	\$6,149,420
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	\$4,663,204
Urban Environs Group	\$4,569,149
City of Playford	\$4,561,632

The top ten providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the description of these goods and services is as follows:

Supplier	Description
Programmed Facility Management	Property Maintenance
Lake Maintenance	Property Maintenance
SA Water	Water Utilities
RTC Facilities Maintenance	Property Maintenance
Mordangood Maintenance	Property Maintenance
Bettio Constructions	Property Maintenance
Furnell Plumbing	Property Maintenance
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	Local Government
Urban Environs Group	Property Maintenance
City of Playford	Local Government

Reporting is unavailable on the value of goods and services supplied to the authority by South Australian suppliers.

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were five roles abolished within the Department of Human Services.

Title	Classification
Director Business Commercialisation	SAES1
Director, NDIS Implementation	SAES1
Executive Director, NDIS Reform and Services	SAES2
Executive Director, Youth Justice	SAES2
Deputy Chief Executive	SAES2

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were four roles created within the Department of Human Services.

Title	Classification
Executive Director, Strategic Policy and Reform	SAES2
Executive Director, Community Investment and Support	SAES2
Director, Governance	SAES1
Director, Safer Family Services	SAES1

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were 17 roles abolished within the SA Housing Authority.

Title	Classification
Development Manager	ASO8
Director Customer Service Reform	SAES1
Manager Conveyancing	ASO8
Manager Housing Assets	URA6
Manager Maintenance Operations	ASO8
Manager Sales & Acquisitions	ASO8

Title	Classification
Manager Technical Services	ASO8
Manager, Maintenance Contracts	ASO7
Manager, Workforce Health Safety	ASO8
Principal Management Accountant	ASO7
Principal Project Manager	ASO8
Senior Environmental Officer	PO3
Senior Manager Contact & Operation	MAS3
Senior Program Manager (ROSAS)	ASO8
Senior Strategy Project Officer	ASO7
Strategy Rent Reform Project Officer	ASO7
Senior Project Manager	ASO7

The total annual employment cost for these appointments is \$2,028,927.00 (excluding on costs).

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were 14 roles created within the SA Housing Authority.

Title	Classification
Team Leader, Investigations	ASO7
Project Officer – Holbrooks	ASO7
Affordable House Capital Project Manager	ASO7
Partnerships Project Manager	ASO7
Senior Development Manager	ASO8
Land Development Manager	ASO8
Land Development Manager	ASO8
Manager Affordable House Capital Program	ASO8
Manager Affordable House Capital Program Governance	ASO8
Manager Maintenance & Renovations	MAS3
Manager, Construction	MAS3
Director, Organisational Resilience and Response	SAES1
Head Of Aboriginal Housing	SAES1
Director, Capital Programs	SAES1

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

Table 1 shows the Department of Human Services (DHS) and South Australian Housing Authority (SAHA) total FTE, actual and budgeted, to provide communication and promotion activities for the period 2020-21 to 2024-25:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Communications & Engagement		2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Budget	2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget
DHS	FTE	12.9	12.8	12.8	9.8	9.8
DHS	\$m	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.4
SAHA	FTE	12.8	10	9	8	8
SAHA	\$m	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.0	0.9

As an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

The following relates to attraction/retention allowances paid in the Department of Human Services

Classification	Branch	Allowance Type	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
MAS3	Strategic Policy and Reform	Retention	\$1,476
MAS3	COVID-19 Response Team	Retention	\$6,004
AHP5	Safer Family Services	Retention	\$2,817
MAS3	Strategic Policy and Reform	Retention	\$4,156
MAS3	Finance	Retention	\$977
MAS3	Youth Justice	Retention	\$7,093
ASO6	Business Improvement and Technology	Attraction	\$14,298
MAS3	Community and Services Development	Retention	\$24,016
OPS4	Community and Services Development	Retention	\$3,462
ASO7	Business Improvement and Technology	Attraction	\$11,398
MAS3	Finance	Retention	\$978
MAS3	Community Youth Justice	Attraction	\$7,093
MAS3	Finance	Retention	\$978
MAS3	Youth Justice	Retention	\$767
MAS3	Youth Justice	Retention	\$4,716
MAS3	Domiciliary Care Services	Retention	\$6,871
MAS3	Finance	Retention	\$3,048
ASO5	Community and Services Development	Retention	\$8,961
OPS4	Community and Services Development	Retention	\$7,069
MAS3	Strategic Policy and Reform	Retention	\$462

Further, between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, \$1,308 of non-salary benefits were paid to public servants. This figure relates exclusively to the part payment of individual membership fees for a professional body or association.

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Occupational Therapist	AHP203	Membership	\$439
Occupational Therapist	AHP206	Membership	\$519
Occupational Therapist	AHP103	New Graduate Year 1, Membership	\$350

The following relates to attraction/retention allowances paid in the SA Housing Authority

Classification	Branch	Allowance Type	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
ASO8	Customer & Services	Attraction Allowance	\$11,841.30
ASO7	Customer & Services	Attraction Allowance	\$22,021.40
MAS3	Customer & Services	Attraction Allowance	\$24,093.40
ASO4	Customer & Services	Attraction Allowance	\$11,342.40
MAS3	Office of Homelessness Sector Integration	Retention Allowance	\$12,046.70
MAS3	People and Safety	Attraction Allowance	\$12,047.00
ASO8	People and Safety	Retention Allowance	\$23,682.60
ASO8	People and Safety	Retention Allowance	\$23,683.00
ASO8	People and Safety	Retention Allowance	\$23,682.60
ASO8	Portfolio Planning & Asset Management	Attraction Allowance	\$23,682.60
MAS3	Portfolio Planning & Asset Management	Retention Allowance	\$6,587.00
MAS3	Portfolio Planning & Asset Management	Retention Allowance	\$24,093.40
ASO8	Portfolio Planning & Asset Management	Retention Allowance	\$23,682.60
MAS3	Portfolio Planning & Asset Management	Attraction Allowance	\$24,533.00

Further, between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, \$16,174 of non-salary benefits were paid to public servants.

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Chief Executive	EXEC	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Chief Financial Officer	SAES	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Executive Director	SAES	Professional Membership	\$775.95
Financial Policy & Compliance Officer	ASO7	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Legal Officer	LE02	Professional Membership	\$747.00
Legal Officer	LE02	Professional Membership	\$811.00
Manager Finance Account—BST Program	ASO8	Professional Membership	\$677.20
Manager Procurement	ASO8	Professional Membership	\$269.69
Manager, Corporate Financial Management	ASO8	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Manager, Finance Business Partnerships	ASO7	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Manager, Financial Reporting	ASO7	Professional Membership	\$735.00
Managing Solicitor	LE05	Professional Membership	\$747.00
Managing Solicitor	LE05	Professional Membership	\$811.00
Principal Financial Analyst	ASO7	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Senior Finance Business Partner	ASO6	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Senior Finance Business Partner	ASO6	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Senior Finance Business Partner	ASO6	Professional Membership	\$720.00
Senior Finance Business Partner	ASO6	Professional Membership	\$360.00

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Senior Manager Urban Renewal	MAS3	Professional Membership	\$775.95
Senior Project Accountant	ASO5	Professional Membership	\$360.00
Senior Project Officer	ASO6	Professional Membership	\$360.23
Senior Quantity Surveyor	PO3	Professional Membership	\$572.00
Senior Quantity Surveyor	PO3	Professional Membership	\$577.50
Surveyor	PO3	Professional Membership	\$754.54
Team Leader, Capital Projects	ASO6	Professional Membership	\$360.00

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the *Government Gazette* on 22 July 2021.

The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2021.

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
Office Manager	ASO704	NIL
MLO—Housing	ASO704	NIL
MLO—Disabilities	ASO704	NIL
MLO—Human Services	ASO603	NIL
Executive Assistant to Minister	ASO603	NIL
Receptionist/ Administration Officer	ASO203	NIL

No staff were seconded from the department to my office as at 30 June 2021.

TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

One executive employment termination payment was made to the total of \$163,067 (excluding on-costs and the value of accrued leave entitlements).

No executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2020 for SA Housing Authority.

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

Since 1 July 2020 the following new executive appointments were made within the Department of Human Services (DHS) and SA Housing Authority (SAHA). Some appointments were made to existing vacated roles.

Agency	Role Title	SAES Level
DHS	Director, Safer Family Services	1
DHS	Director, Office of the Chief Executive	1
DHS	Director, Communications and Engagement	1
DHS	Executive Director, People and Performance	2
DHS	Director, Concessions and Support Services	1
DHS	Director, Procurement	1

Agency	Role Title	SAES Level
DHS	Director, Business Improvement and Technology	1
DHS	Director, Office for Women	1
SAHA	Director, Capital Programs	1
SAHA	Director, Organisational Resilience & Response	1
SAHA	Executive Director Customers & Services	2
SAHA	Head of Aboriginal Housing	1

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

The above table excludes short-term executive appointments.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): In response to Questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

Department of Human Services

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Human Services—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual \$0001	2021-22 Budget \$0002	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Communities						
Community and Family 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.	71,150	63,826	62,816	64,094	65,615
Community Support Services	Program promotes opportunity and affordability for vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians through a range of state government concessions.	635	1,977	2,062	2,113	2,165
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.	6,085	6,868	2,590	2,655	2,720
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.	604	644	696	713	731

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual \$0001	2021-22 Budget \$0002	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Disability						
Disability Inclusion	Provides case management, allied health and therapy, and specialist early intervention services for adults and children with disability, including accommodation services	359	180	-	-	-
Total		78,834	73,495	68,164	69,575	71,231

1. As per submitted data to the Auditor-General on 12 August 2021 (not finalised / subject to change)
2. Refer 2021-22 Agency Statements (total of grants and subsidies and intra-government transfers expense lines)

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Human Services—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Budget \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Charitable and Social Welfare Fund	Established to provide small one-off grants to a wide range of community organisations and service providers	3,654	3,858	3,858	3,800	3,800
Community Service Obligations	Water and sewerage rate concessions for exempt properties	20,319	18,281	18,910	19,568	20,248
Consumer Advocacy and Research Fund	South Australian Council of Social Services Research and Advocacy Project	129	-	-	-	-
Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund	Services and projects to minimise or address problem gambling	5,442	7,585	7,417	7,433	7,447
Total		29,544	29,724	30,185	30,801	31,495

DHS Controlled Items—Payments to Non-Government Organisations (NGO's) in 2020-21

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Aboriginal Family Support Services	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	83,376.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	166,752.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	93,376.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Koonibba Aboriginal Community Council	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	52,110.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Money Mob Talkabout Limited	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	245,936.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Women's Council	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,377,268.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Plaza Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	83,376.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Raukkan Community Council Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	83,376.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	The Trustee for the Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	83,376.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Uniting Care Wesley	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	108,376.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	West Coast Youth & Community and Community Support Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	83,376.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yalata Community Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	52,110.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Adults With Chronic Conditions	Royal District Nursing Service	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	5,577,840.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Aboriginal Family Support Services	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	2,219,945.50
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	480,184.50
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Anglicare SA Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,749,653.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Australian Centre for Social Innovation Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,898,500.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Catholic Church Endowment Society Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	4,695,673.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Centacare Catholic Country SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,615,492.50

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Centre For Evidence And Implementation	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	60,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Grandparents For Grandchildren SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	150,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Junction Australia Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	75,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,123,950.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Playgroup SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	129,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Relationships Australia SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	180,500.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	SAHMRI	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	150,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	South Australian Rainbow Advocacy Alliance	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	50,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Tauondi Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	150,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	The Trustee for the Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	198,363.50
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	Uniting Care Wesley	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,450,507.50
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child And Family Support Grants	West Coast Youth & Community and Community Support Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	174,047.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Adelaide Oval	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	80,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Autism Association Of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	386,336.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Barossa Village Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	50,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Boandik Lodge Incorporated	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	50,000.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Community Business Bureau Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	258,622.80
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	National Disability Services Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	231,028.46
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	962,135.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Anglicare SA Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	895,244.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Australian Refugee Association	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	107,140.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Carers Association Of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	121,301.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Catholic Family Services	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	292,352.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Centacare Catholic Country SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	234,217.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Centacare Catholic Family Services	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	164,016.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Child And Family Welfare Association	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	144,238.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Community Centres SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	189,253.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Community House Port Lincoln	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	92,054.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Community Hubs Australia	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	70,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Eastwood Community Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	88,830.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Grandparents For Grandchildren SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	126,075.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Junction Australia Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	146,049.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Junction Community Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	146,317.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	132,041.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Lutheran Community Care	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	225,915.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Marra Murrangga Kumangka Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	99,197.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Midway Road Community House	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	80,884.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Milang & District Community Association	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	95,107.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Multicultural Youth South Australia Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	497,458.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	North East Community House Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	126,977.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Northern Area Community & Youth Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	586,278.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Plaza Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	232,874.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	117,707.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	SA Council of Social Service Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	477,035.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Survivors Of Torture	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	84,945.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	The Food Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	109,864.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	The Hut Community Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	241,400.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	The South Australian Financial Counsellors Association Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	171,835.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Uniting Care Wesley	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,245,361.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Uniting Care Wesley Bowden Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	964,429.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Uniting Care Wesley Pt Adelaide	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,297,049.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	653,741.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	Vietnamese Community In Australia / SA Chapter Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	113,016.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family And Community Development	West Coast Youth & Community Support Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	116,505.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	313,285.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Anglicare SA Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	855,555.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Australian Migrant Resource Centre	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	140,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Australian Refugee Association	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	72,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	96,988.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Centacare Catholic Country SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	454,867.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Foodbank Of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	370,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Good Shepherd Microfinance	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,276,999.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	149,722.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Lutheran Community Care	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,017,627.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Money Mob Talkabout Limited	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	110,936.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Oz Harvest Limited	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	100,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Secondbite	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	100,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	The South Australian Financial Counsellors Association Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	100,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	The Trustee For The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	266,120.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Uniting Care Wesley	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	281,589.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Uniting Care Wesley Bowden Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,401,867.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,617,821.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Financial Hardship Programs	Welcoming Australia Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	98,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Adelaide Day Centre For Homeless Persons Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	128,592.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Aged Care & Housing Group Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	272,358.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Anglican Community Care Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	88,953.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Anglicare SA Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	330,357.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	224,646.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	780,247.32
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	543,374.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Calvary Home Care Services	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	90,909.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Carer Support & Respite Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	764,620.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Carers Association of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	701,647.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Carers Link Barossa	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	526,766.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Centacare Catholic Country SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	122,688.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Centacare Catholic Country SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	96,891.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Centacare Catholic Family Services	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	1,065,252.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Community Centres SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	316,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Country Home Advocacy	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	52,110.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Country North Community Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	130,202.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Dementia Australia Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	150,469.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Elderly Citizens Homes Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	118,671.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Greek Orthodox Archdiocese Of Australia Consolidated Trust	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	83,679.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Helping Hand Aged Care	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	389,928.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Hutt St Centre Ltd	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	367,306.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Italian Home Delivered Meals and Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	52,583.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Kura Yerlo Council Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	100,640.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Lutheran Community Care	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	68,836.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Meals On Wheels Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	226,005.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Mental Illness Fellowship of SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	315,191.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Multicultural Communities	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	299,260.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Pika Wiya Health Service Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	146,996.60
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Relationships Australia SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	560,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Royal District Nursing Service	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	104,256.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	SA Council of Social Service Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	180,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	St John Ambulance Australia SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	114,610.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Tailem Bend Community Centre	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	180,002.76
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	245,314.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Vietnamese Community In Australia / SA Chapter Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	68,892.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	West Coast Community Services Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	66,796.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Yadu Health Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	72,800.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	YMCA of South Australia Youth	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	262,686.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Yorke Peninsula Community Transport Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	217,548.95
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Incompro Aboriginal Association Incorporated	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	406,342.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home And Community Care/Community Connections	Save the Children	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	250,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Other	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	158,371.75
Communities—Community and Family Services—Other	Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	350,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Other	Volunteering SA & NT Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	540,780.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Youth Portfolio	Australian Centre for Social Innovation Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	50,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Youth Portfolio	Australian Red Cross Society	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	410,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Youth Portfolio	Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	125,064.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Youth Portfolio	The Trustee For The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	152,124.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Youth Portfolio	Working Women's Centre SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	120,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Youth Portfolio	YMCA Of South Australia Youth	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	50,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Youth Portfolio	Youth Affairs Council Of SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	534,774.00
Communities—Community Support Services—Other	OPSM	Refer to Table A—Community Support Services	356,011.58
Disability—Disability Inclusion—Disability Grants	Uniting Communities Inc	Refer to Table A—Disability Inclusion	300,000.00
Disability—Disability Inclusion—Information, Linkages And Capacity Building	Community Business Bureau Inc	Refer to Table A—Disability Inclusion	59,250.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Aboriginal Family Support Services	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	62,500.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Baptist Care (SA) Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	300,000.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Centacare Catholic Family Services	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	50,000.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Community Transitions	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	625,312.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	212,368.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Neami Ltd	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	438,400.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Power Community Ltd	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	50,000.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Relationships Australia SA	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	220,000.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Women's Safety Services SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	970,620.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Working Women's Centre SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	100,000.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Zahra Foundation Australia Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	150,000.00
Status of Women—Other	Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	110,600.00
Status of Women—Other	Women's Emergency Services	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	148,200.00
Status of Women—Other	Women's Safety Services SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	1,259,145.00
Status of Women—Other	Working Women's Centre SA Inc	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	475,600.00
Youth Justice—Other	Service To Youth Council Inc	Refer to Table A—Youth Justice	151,868.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Payments < \$50,000			1,738,723.80
Total			67,523,803.52

DHS Controlled Items—Payments to other organisation types (non-NGO's) in 2020-21

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child and Family Support Grants	University of Adelaide	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	200,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child and Family Support Grants	Murdoch Children's Research	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	110,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Child and Family Support Grants	The Flinders University of SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	70,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	858,333.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Corporation of The City Of Adelaide	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	150,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	The Barossa Council	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	100,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Disability Grants	Town of Gawler	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	100,000.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family and Community Development	City of Onkaparinga	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	626,500.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family and Community Development	City of Marion	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	271,560.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family and Community Development	City of Salisbury	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	240,378.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family and Community Development	City of Tea Tree Gully	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	208,811.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family and Community Development	University of SA	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	78,000.00

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value
Communities—Community and Family Services—Family and Community Development	Corporation of City of Unley	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	51,381.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	2,119,153.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	SA Health	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	700,119.75
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Onkaparinga	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	529,966.54
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Playford	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	356,639.69
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Marion	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	303,195.17
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	District Council of Mount Barker	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	262,185.39
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Yorke and Northern Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	206,069.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	District Council of Mt Remarkable	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	201,522.83
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Holdfast Bay	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	199,515.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Pt Adelaide Enfield	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	173,956.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	173,771.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Limestone Coast Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	172,478.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Victor Harbor	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	157,560.13
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	The Barossa Council	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	153,835.52

Grant Program/Fund Name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Eyre & Far North Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	150,908.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	145,632.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Salisbury	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	141,450.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Clare & Gilbert Valleys	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	120,622.88
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	District Council of Yorke	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	83,136.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Charles Sturt	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	65,892.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	Alexandrina Council	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	59,793.00
Communities—Community and Family Services—Home and Community Care/Community Connections	City of Tea Tree Gully	Refer to Table A—Community and Family Services	58,570.00
Status of Women—Covid-19 Domestic Violence Support	Legal Services Commission	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	84,380.00
Status of Women—COVID-19 Domestic Violence Support	Womens & Children's Health Network	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	67,500.00
Status of Women—Other	Department of Social Services	Refer to Table A—Status of Women	760,730.00
Youth Justice—Other	Department of Education	Refer to Table A—Youth Justice	403,000.00
Payments < \$50,000			393,603.00
Total			11,310,146.90

DHS Administered items—Payments in 2020-21

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Good Shepherd	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	843,751.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Local Government Association	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	550,000.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Second Chances SA	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	182,355.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Uniting Church In Australia	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	66,695.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Pinnaroo Community Inc	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	50,000.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	The Barossa Council	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	50,000.00
Charitable Social Welfare Fund	Milang & District Community Association	Refer to Table B—Charitable Social Welfare Fund	50,000.00
Community Services Obligations	SA Water Corporation	Refer to Table B—Community Services Obligations	20,319,000.00
Consumer Advocacy and Research Fund	SA Council of Social Service Inc	Refer to Table B—Consumer Advocacy and Research Fund	129,096.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Relationships Australia SA	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	2,505,144.28
Gamblers Rehabilitation	UnitingCare Wesley SA Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	534,154.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Aboriginal Family Support Services	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	456,760.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	435,125.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	The Flinders University of SA	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	333,000.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Eastern Health	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	231,636.36

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (\$)
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services of SA Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	219,376.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	201,406.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Vietnamese Community In Australia/ South Australia Chapter Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	179,872.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Overseas Chinese Association of SA Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	148,250.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yadu Health Aboriginal Corporation	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	109,320.00
Gamblers Rehabilitation	UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	Refer to Table B—Gamblers Rehabilitation	90,000.00
Payments < \$50,000			1,859,251.54
Total			29,544,192.18

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 for the Department of Human Services:

Grant/program name	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000
National Partnership on COVID-19 Domestic and Family Violence Responses	-3,800	3,800

SA Housing Authority

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates SA Housing Authority—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$0001	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	To provide grant funding to Specialist Homelessness Service Providers.	70,665	71,083	70,766	73,110	74,771
Emergency Accommodation Assistance	To provide financial assistance into budget hotels or motels for people who need emergency accommodation,	9,250	6,293	4,356	4,465	4,577

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$0001	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
	often as a result of domestic abuse.					
National Rental Affordability Scheme	To provide an annual financial incentive to housing providers for up to ten years if eligibility requirements continue to be met.	6,928	6,818	5,886	3,828	1,321
Private Rental Assistance Program	To provide financial assistance to households experiencing difficulty establishing a tenancy in the private rental market.	6,832	11,086	11,364	11,649	11,940
COVID-19 Response—Rough Sleepers	Payments to provide homelessness support during the pandemic.	3,744	0	0	0	0
National Partnership on Remote Housing	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.	1,134	0	0	4,424	1,286
More Affordable Tenancies in Community Housing	Funding to CHPs to undertake small scale development. CHPs are required to invest an equivalent (or	556	0	0	0	0

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$0001	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
	greater) contribution to the project themselves.					
Holbrooks Independent Living Crisis Units—operating costs	To fund operating costs, onsite and outreach support at the Holbrooks public housing estate.	213	850	0	0	0
SA Government Infrastructure Campaign	Contribution to SA Government infrastructure advertising campaign.	132	0	0	0	0
APY Septic Tank Upgrades	Upgrade of domestic septic systems in Aboriginal communities and homelands.	56	1,000	0	0	0
Emergency Assistance Grants	Payments to individuals and families to provide assistance in response to natural disasters.	25	0	0	0	0
Homelessness Prevention Fund	Piloting homelessness prevention initiatives and new innovative housing models.	0	1,622	1,432	1,632	5,314
Other Grants & Subsidies	Minor grant payments.	14	69	71	730	749

1. 2020-21 actual includes accrual of expenses incurred but not paid as at 30 June 2021.

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Authority—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$0001	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Social Impact Bond (Aspire Adelaide)	Payment of financial return provided by government on social impact bond with Aspire Adelaide.	2,089	7,845	6,266	0	0

1. 2020-21 actual includes accrual of expenses incurred but not paid as at 30 June 2021.

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 or the authority:

Grant/program name	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000
National Partnership on Remote Housing	564	0
COVID-19 Response—Rough Sleepers ¹	-76	0
Emergency Assistance Grants	1,045	0
More Affordable Tenancies in Community Housing	670	0

1. Brought forward to 2019-20.

The authority commitments are listed as per below.

Program	Beneficiary	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Homelessness Prevention Fund	Kids Under Cover	\$795,600	\$795,600	\$795,450	\$0
Holbrooks Independent Living Crisis Units	Uniting Communities Incorporated	\$480,000	\$160,000	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Anglican Community Care Inc	\$3,132,400	\$3,154,900	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Anglicare SA Ltd	\$2,271,700	\$2,303,200	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Catholic Family Services	\$2,297,600	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Centacare Catholic Country SA Limited	\$19,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Community Housing Council of SA	\$585,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Community Transitions	\$114,165	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—	Department for Correctional Services	\$100,700	\$0	\$0	\$0

Program	Beneficiary	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Specialist Homelessness Services					
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	Housing Choices South Australia Limited	\$715,900	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	Lutheran Care	\$15,429,300	\$15,560,000	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	NPY Women's Council	\$560,100	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services of SA Inc	\$2,309,300	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	Relationships Australia SA Health Promotion Services	\$1,399,700	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	SYC Ltd	\$1,503,900	1,091,100	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	The Corporation of the City of Adelaide	\$42,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Communities Incorporated	\$5,805,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting Country SA Ltd	\$6,144,200	6,188,000	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement— Specialist Homelessness Services	Uniting SA Ltd	\$12,175,300	\$12,262,200	\$0	\$0

Program	Beneficiary	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Homelessness Services					
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Unity Housing Company Ltd	\$458,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Women's Safety Services SA Inc.	\$15,692,158	\$15,185,600	\$0	\$0
National Housing & Homelessness Agreement—Specialist Homelessness Services	Yarredi Services Inc.	\$28,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Partnership on Remote Housing (NPRH)—Employment Housing	Healthy Dreaming	\$13,636	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Partnership on Remote Housing (NPRH)—Employment Housing	Uniting Country SA Ltd	\$22,727	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Partnership on Remote Housing (NPRH)—Employment Housing	Uniting SA Ltd	\$22,727	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Partnership on Remote Housing (NPRH)—Tika Tirka	Aboriginal Community Housing Ltd	\$386,900	\$417,000	\$416,100	\$0
National Partnership on Remote Housing (NPRH)—Oak Valley Replacement Houses	Oak Valley Aboriginal Community	\$313,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

The government has provided a list of grant programs administered by the Department of Human Services and SA Housing Authority during 2020-21 in Omnibus Question 14.

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT CHANGES

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

Since 1 July 2020, there have been no costs incurred by either the Department of Human Services or SA Housing Authority in relation to Machinery of Government changes.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (30 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised the following:

Section 4 of DPC Circular 13 – Annual Reporting details the use of the annual report template. The template includes sections for an organisational structure and changes to the agency to be included by each agency.

I refer the member to the annual reports which have been published for each of the agencies for which I am responsible.

AYERS HOUSE

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

The funding breakdown for restoration works at Ayers House is as follows:

Building/heritage conservation works (including mandatory disability access works)	\$4.28m
Other building services and maintenance	\$1.02m
Asbestos removal	\$0.32m
Airconditioning	\$0.95m
TOTAL	\$6.57m