

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4 September 2018

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

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

Ministerial Statement

TAFE SA

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: TAFE SA has a proud history of delivering quality vocational education and training to help South Australians gain the skills they need to embark on a new career. Equally important has been TAFE SA's role in helping South Australian businesses and industries to fill their skills and workforce needs in order for them to prosper. Recent years have seen significant and well-documented difficulties, highlighted by the Skills for All blowout and last year's ASQA audit turmoil. Traineeship and apprenticeship numbers have dramatically declined, and confidence in quality needs to be restored.

There is a clear need for reform in the vocational education and training system in which TAFE SA has a critical role to play alongside other quality providers. The Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA) findings in 2017 highlighted problems of quality at educational program level and were the catalyst for an independent quality review and a strategic capability review. The findings of both the quality review and the strategic capability review, commissioned by the former government, clearly document a downturn in performance and emphasise the need for organisation-wide reform.

Both reviews highlight serious concerns around quality, leadership and strategic direction. Expectations of quality training fell short in a number of fields. The strategic direction of the organisation was not aligned to South Australia's training needs. TAFE SA's leadership and the former government's oversight failed staff, students and the people of South Australia. The strategic capability review concluded that 'the last four years have been a lost opportunity for TAFE SA and for South Australia as a whole'.

Today, I will table the reports of both the strategic capability review and the quality review and, importantly, I also present to the house the government's plans for the transformation of TAFE SA that will enable the organisation to regain the confidence of the public and industry and be sustainable into the future. The Marshall Liberal government is delivering a fresh start for TAFE SA, focused on meeting the needs of South Australians seeking the skills with which they can build their careers and South Australian businesses and industry seeking a skilled workforce in order to grow and prosper.

The VET market of the future will be based on contestability, access and choice. The Department for Industry and Skills, as the purchaser of training, will drive the development of this market, aligning public funding to industry sector analysis and making funding available to non-government providers as well as TAFE SA. The market will take time to develop. It cannot simply be fixed overnight with a shift of funding. The capacity and capability of non-government providers will need to grow in a number of ways at the same time as TAFE SA transitions into an environment where it will compete.

A new funding model will be introduced from 1 July 2019 for the VET market in South Australia. This will provide transparency and include clear arrangements for how TAFE SA will be appropriately resourced in order to deliver the social obligations we expect of our public provider. The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies has been commissioned to provide some further

advice to inform the extent of the social obligations that TAFE SA should be funded to deliver. This body of work was suggested by the Strategic Capability Review and will inform the new funding model for TAFE SA.

The government is committed to TAFE SA's role as a quality provider in a contestable market and is providing a rescue package to ensure that TAFE SA can not only overcome the position in which it was left by the former government but transform and flourish in the VET market of the future. For TAFE SA to become efficient and effective within the market will require some internal changes.

There will need to be changes to the TAFE SA training profile and greater alignment with community and industry needs. At the same time, course fee structures will be reviewed to ensure that fees are appropriate to the market. There will need to be changes to delivery methodologies and more innovative practices, such as partnerships and collaborations with community, industry, employers, schools and universities. TAFE SA's extensive infrastructure must be utilised to its fullest extent to support the skilling of local communities.

In the current TAFE SA system, the majority of the training is delivered in the classroom. As TAFE SA responds to the needs of industry, enterprises and learners, the amount of training delivered in the workplace will increase, as will the use of technology. A number of TAFE SA campuses are expensive to run, are not fit for purpose and are not well utilised. Part of its efficiency drive sees a review of the use of facilities in order to deliver courses in the most effective manner possible.

There will be some impacts on some campuses where courses will be offered in a different way rather than within expensive underutilised facilities. This will enable TAFE SA to deliver courses more effectively, which is important, given both the significant investment needed from South Australian taxpayers to rescue TAFE SA and the fact that the organisation was left with millions of dollars in efficiency dividends by the former government in their last Mid-Year Budget Review.

Critically, these reforms will enable more students to receive training in a manner that more closely aligns with industry need. TAFE SA will operate with a clear understanding of its cost structure to ensure viability and prevent budget shortfalls and reliance on government and will also attract other sources of revenue from fee for service and international students.

Whilst the market will allow for choice of training providers for businesses and students, TAFE SA must have the dexterity to respond swiftly to industry and student needs through increased staffing flexibility and accessibility. As the public provider, TAFE SA will set the benchmark for quality. It will be recognised by its peers, by industry, by business and by the public at large as the government's own brand, synonymous with reliability, professionalism and high standards.

I am pleased to inform the house that in recent months, TAFE SA has already commenced a range of measures to address quality issues. A new academic board is being established. TAFE SA has recruited an executive director of quality teaching and learning and internal audit quality processes have been ramped up. Transformation will mark a new era of governance and leadership. I thank the current interim board and the interim chief executive, Alex Reid, for their hard work in getting us this far.

The recruitment process for the new TAFE SA board has commenced and will be finalised in the coming months. Once a new board has been confirmed, the final recruitment of the chief executive will be finalised. The board and chief executive will be charged with the recovery and redesign of the organisation to address capability and capacity shortfalls. We will expect them to continue to strengthen educational leadership and financial capability without compromising the delivery of quality training.

There will be appropriate strategies to support organisational change: a renewed commitment to professional development, performance management and succession planning to improve organisational capacity. I look forward to approving a revitalised strategic plan for TAFE SA. The ministerial charter and performance agreement for TAFE SA are being updated and strengthened, with regular monitoring in place. The government will maintain appropriate oversight over the transformation of TAFE SA and we have put in place resources within the Department for Education for this prudential oversight.

The transformation plan for TAFE SA is designed to restore the confidence of students, businesses and taxpayers, whilst establishing TAFE SA as a principal contributor to the skilling of the state. I table the TAFE SA Strategic Capability Review 2018 and the Quality Review of TAFE SA.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call on the business of the day, I welcome to parliament today Mr Russell Bryant, chair of the Yalata community, Mima Smart, board member of the Yalata community, and Desley Culpin, CEO of the Yalata community, guests of the Premier and also the member for Flinders. Welcome to parliament, and I hope you enjoy your stay here today.

Bills

**NATIONAL REDRESS SCHEME FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE
(COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 July 2018.)

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:10): I rise to support the implementation of the National Redress Scheme for victims of institutional child sexual abuse bill 2018. The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse was established by state and federal governments in November 2012 and commenced hearings in 2013. Our government is implementing the recommendations in relation to the establishment, funding and operation of a single National Redress Scheme because we care so deeply about the appalling experience of the survivors of institutional abuse.

I think it is always important to share at least a few words from one of those survivors in this house so that we feel the gravity of what has taken place:

It affects your whole life for the rest of your life. It doesn't go away, you never really forget it. It's part of everything you do, but you don't realise it half the time.

This is from a survivor of institutional abuse who was raped in the institution he was in, who escaped the abuse three times, but could not tell what was going on and was sent back.

Since late 2016, officials from the commonwealth and all state and territory governments have worked together to design the scheme, consistent with recommendations of the royal commission, so as to encourage the maximum possible participation by government and non-government institutions.

On 29 May 2018, the new Liberal Premier and Attorney-General formally opted in to the National Redress Scheme on behalf of South Australia. To make the scheme operational, South Australia must now adopt the commonwealth legislation, which sets up the scheme. The commonwealth Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse recommended the establishment of the national scheme. In the course of its inquiry, the commission found that, for many survivors, existing civil litigation systems and past and current redress processes have not provided the justice people were looking for.

The Marshall government believes that joining the national scheme is the best means of providing a measure of justice for victims of institutional child sexual abuse in South Australia. The royal commission revealed thousands of appalling cases of institutional abuse of children that requires both a compassionate response and sweeping reform of how we protect our society's most vulnerable members from this inexcusable abuse.

The stories presented to the commission opened our eyes to the prevalence of institutional and sexual abuse, the failure of institutions to respond and the lifelong impact that this brings to bear on people, on our fellow community members. The findings and recommendations of the royal commission are powerful and far reaching and will hopefully lead to safer communities across

Australia. The crimes committed against innocent children cannot be undone, but it is critical that the legacy of child sexual abuse is addressed.

The Marshall government has also introduced new laws in state parliament to remove time limits for victims of child sexual abuse to seek compensation for civil claims. This will remove the injustice that prevented victims of child sexual abuse seeking compensation after the age of 21. I can tell the house that most victims I have met have been way past their 21st birthday before they talk about the abuse they suffered either in an institution or in the family. Our state government will assume funder of last resort responsibilities where the institutions have closed or are unable to fund the compensation payments.

In summary, this bill allows for the application of the scheme in South Australia. The commonwealth does not have constitutional legislative power to impose the scheme on states in the absence of this. It ensures that once state legislation is passed and has commenced, government and NGIs in that state can apply to the federal minister to have institutions declared and therefore included on the declaration list. It is only once an institution is declared as a participating institution that applications for redress in relation to the institution can be progressed by the scheme operator.

The scheme has become established in response to the royal commission recommendations and aims to provide acknowledgement and ongoing support to people who experienced institutional child sexual abuse. It is intended to offer an alternative pathway to seeking compensation via a civil claim in courts or via a claim for victims of crime compensation. It will be up to an applicant to determine, when they receive an offer of redress under the scheme, whether to accept that offer or reject it on the basis that a civil action might suit them better as an individual.

The scheme will run for 10 years from 1 July 2018. States will get six-monthly statistical reports relating to the scheme operation; whether these are made public will be up to the federal minister, noting that the federal minister recently issued a press release providing statistics for the first month of operation of the scheme. Annual reports by the scheme operator are required and these are proposed be made public. Redress available under the scheme comes in three forms:

- access to counselling, which will either be access to services provided directly by the state or territory or a payment of between \$1,250 and \$5,000 to access services of choice, depending on where the person lives (for South Australian residents the payment option will apply);
- a payment between \$10,000 and \$150,000, as determined by an independent decision-maker in accordance with the assessment framework; and
- a direct personal response from a responsible institution in accordance with the DPR framework. This is voluntary for an eligible applicant and intended to be designed and delivered around their suitability and readiness.

In terms of scheme costs for South Australia, modelling commissioned by the federal government has estimated that about 3,000 claims might be expected in relation to South Australian institutions, about half of which relate to South Australian government institutions. The South Australian government has set aside funding from the existing Victims of Crime Fund to support the scheme based on this modelling (about \$146 million). There are some restrictions on eligibility. A person can apply if:

- they experienced sexual abuse as a child; and
- an institution was responsible for the abuser having contact with the person; and
- the abuse occurred before 1 July 2018; and
- the person will turn 18 before the scheme closes on 30 June 2028; and
- the person is an Australian citizen or permanent resident.

Applications will require special assessment processes if the persons are currently in gaol, have previously been sentenced to five years' or more imprisonment, and/or have already received a court order judgement in a civil claim against relevant institutions in respect of the abuse. Such applicants are not eligible to also seek redress under the scheme.

As Liberals, we believe good governments care for and support those who need help to get back on their feet and live the best life possible. I will work tirelessly with my colleagues to help people to live their best life possible. I will work tirelessly with my colleagues to create a safer South Australia for children to grow up in.

I thank the people in King and people from across Australia who have taken the time to share their difficult childhood experiences with me. These open honest discussions we are now having in the community and in parliament on your behalf are creating a new culture and new hope for the future. I am inspired by and commend the strength, bravery and hope of every survivor who has shared their story with me. Violence costs our community billions of dollars and so much pain and sadness and it robs people of the chance to live their best life possible. It is time for change, and that time is now.

In terms of the next steps in South Australia, the South Australian government is working towards having the scheme fully implemented and operating, in respect of South Australian institutions, in early 2019. This includes passage of the bill in South Australia, the drafting and introduction of regulations under the South Australian bill, preparing to respond to the requests for information from the scheme operator in relation to applications and preparing to provide direct personal response to eligible applicants.

I have personally received feedback on the application process being very time consuming and intensive, and I have spoken to the Attorney-General about this. I have been told that, if a person is struggling with the process, they should contact the Attorney-General's office.

Members, this is National Child Protection Week. Our focus is on safe children and stronger communities. I thank the Premier and the Deputy Premier for this bill and for caring so deeply about these survivors. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 June 2018.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:23): I rise to speak to the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018 and to indicate the opposition's general support for the bill. Indeed, it reflects—

The SPEAKER: Are you the lead speaker, member for Elizabeth?

Mr ODENWALDER: I indicate that I am the lead speaker. The bill reflects some of the priorities of the previous government, the previous minister, previous ministers and, of course, it is in general aimed at reducing the threat and problem of drugs in prison. It reflects a commitment by the Liberal Party to try to stamp out drugs in prison as part of their broader war on drugs, and we will see how that goes.

In terms of the bill, we support it as far as it goes. It reflects a small part of a much larger body of work that was in train last year but, as I said, we do support the general aims of this bill and the general aim to reduce drugs in prison. I think we all agree on that. It is a matter of occ health and safety for staff in prisons. It is a matter of safety and health for the prisoners themselves, and no-one could argue with the intent of this bill.

The bill does three general things. Firstly, it allows for the testing of prison officers, which formed part of the previous government's bill. It provides for the testing of visitors to the prisons, and we will explore that more in the committee stage. It also focuses quite a bit on the threat of outlaw motorcycle gangs in prisons in particular and not just outlaw motorcycle gangs but any organised criminal element involved in taking drugs into prisons.

As I said, we support the general thrust of this bill, shorter as it is than the bill put forward by the previous minister in the previous government. The previous bill, the 2017 amendment bill, did a

number of things, including some of those outlined in the current bill. I have foreshadowed that I intend to move certain amendments to this bill, not because I think that there is anything wrong with this bill but because it does not go far enough. In our previous bill, there were several measures, including an inspectorate of prisoners, which are not addressed by this bill.

I have focused on four elements of the previous bill that I think could very easily be incorporated into this bill without troubling the house at all. I have chosen them deliberately for that. I do not want to hold up this bill; I think that it is important and that the safety of prisoners and prison staff is of paramount importance. I have met with the PSA and groups of corrections officers about this. They are very much in favour of drug testing both prison officers and visitors to prisons.

I have some general questions about how far the provision goes in terms of visitors. I understand that it is targeted at tradespeople and those kinds of people who visit prisons from time to time who may be in a position to take drugs into prisons. Unlike the previous bill of last year, it does not address the problem of drones, unmanned aircraft and that sort of smuggling into prison, but I have left that alone in this instance. I have focused on four amendments, which I will move in the correct form at some point. In brief, these amendments are simple enough and coherent enough with the current bill not to trouble the house too much further.

The first is the introduction of buffer zones around prisons regarding the possession and trafficking of drugs under the Controlled Substances Act. At present, there are various offences. We have just been through a debate about the penalties for the possession, trafficking, etc., of different drugs. My amendment intends to do what the provision in last year's bill intended to do, which is to create an area around a prison where the penalties for possession and/or trafficking is significantly increased to reflect the fact that drugs near prisons are more dangerous than drugs farther away from prisons. They are more of a threat to the prisoners and the prison staff than they would be if there were farther away, so the introduction of buffer zones is the first very simple amendment I would make to this legislation.

The second is the prevention of automatic parole for offences of dealing or trafficking drugs. Currently, prisoners who are sentenced to less than five years' imprisonment for offences of dealing or trafficking drugs are eligible for automatic parole. This provision would reverse that. Again, it is aimed at discouraging the use and/or the trafficking of drugs into prisons. Another sensible measure, which I think would not trouble the house at all and would require minimal debate and minimal change to the act, is to prevent prisoners from contacting directly or indirectly any victim, alleged victim or persons associated with their offending.

At the moment, there are provisions around who prisoners can and cannot contact. The CE has a lot of discretion in this area, but this will make it absolutely clear that unless there are clear, extenuating circumstances—which, of course, sometimes there are with family members and so on, including spouses, children—and, again, the CE's discretion comes into this a lot, the general principle, the default position, would be that prisoners are prevented from contacting victims or persons associated with their offending. Of course, this also marries well with the focus on outlaw motorcycle gangs. The intention is to disrupt and break up gangs and make it more difficult for them to ply their business whether it is within or outside prisons.

The last amendment is not directly related to drugs in prison but again is a very simple amendment and one which was in the 2017 amendment bill. It is a very simple measure, but I think a very sensible measure and one which could hardly be argued against, to prevent people under 18 from visiting prisoners with any convictions for child sex offences whether those convictions are related to the imprisonment or not. The current legislation, rightly so, prevents people under 18 from visiting prisoners with a current conviction for child sex offences. So, if they are in prison for child sex offences, it prevents people under 18 from visiting them. It is a very simple amendment, which broadens that out. Anyone who has ever been convicted of child sex offences is prevented from having visitors under the age of 18.

Foreshadowing those amendments, I look forward to debating them and to hopefully seeing their very simple insertion into the bill. I foreshadow that we are also doing work on further enhancing the Correctional Services Act later on down the track, but we will see where these amendments land us and we will do that body of work at a later date. Pending my amendments, I support the bill and

indicate the opposition's support for the bill, and, even with my amendments, I look forward to its speedy passage through the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:32): I rise to support the bill. I am glad to hear the opposition is indicating its support, albeit possibly subject to moving certain amendments. The bill ought to be passed and passed efficiently by this house. It is yet another delivery on a Marshall Liberal government commitment. In a refrain that is becoming increasingly familiar to this house and this parliament, and indeed the community of this state, the Marshall Liberal government is a government that is delivering on its commitments. It is a theme that will resonate through the course of this very important week in this 54th parliament.

The Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018 delivers on a commitment. We have brought it forward with the intent to make sure that we do all we can to exclude drugs from our prisons. It is through a means of sensible testing processes that are to be introduced by the bill, and it ought to take strides in ensuring that we do all we can to make sure that officers, employees and applicants for such roles, and visitors to our correctional institutions, so far as we can control it, are doing so without being under the influence or bringing drugs with them.

As has been referred to already in the debate, the bill will introduce, importantly, a new part 7A to the Correctional Services Act 1982. That will provide for a new drug and alcohol testing scheme. Importantly, new part 7A sets out the structure within which regulations for the procedures and processes around testing will occur. Before addressing the elements of those processes to be the subject of regulation, I want to highlight that this is intended to serve the purpose for which it is intended and is not to be used for other broader purposes.

Section 81X(2) of the legislation within new part 7A makes clear that the results of these testing and analysis processes conducted under new part 7A, including any admission or statement by a person that relates to that process, are not admissible in any proceedings outside disciplinary proceedings under the Public Sector Act 2009. So it ought to be understood very clearly that what is going on in terms of this testing regime is targeted at ensuring that there are means at the disposal of those administering our correctional facilities to ensure that they can achieve a practical testing process in the interests of ensuring that our correctional facilities are free from drug and alcohol but that it is not going to operate as a de facto means of acquiring incriminating evidence for other purposes.

As I referred to earlier, there will be a new and thoroughgoing regime. The regulations pursuant to new part 7A will contemplate the procedures for the testing. They will, again without limiting the generality of the regulations that may be put in place pursuant to section 81W, provide for the process of authorisation of persons who will conduct drug and alcohol testing and operate the necessary equipment for that purpose. They will contemplate the way in which the collection of biological samples is done: how they are taken from people, the analysis of those samples and test results, the approval of devices for the purpose of conducting those tests and the use of the results of testing in those circumstances.

To refer once again to my remarks in relation to section 81X(2), they will contemplate prescription for the circumstances that will amount to a defence to disciplinary proceedings under the Public Sector Act 2009 relating to those procedures and any proceedings for breach of the regulations that might ensue, and evidentiary provisions to facilitate the proof of matters in those particular circumstances. Further, and unsurprisingly, it is contemplated that those regulations will provide for the confidentiality of test results, the destruction of biological samples and for the protection of those involved in taking and in conducting the tests and liability for their actions and omissions.

The new part 7A regime is, again, typical of the reforms that this new government is bringing to this house, is legislating for without delay and is typical of other measures in the government's program directed towards practical outcomes. It is directed towards improving the circumstances in which those who serve in our correctional facilities are working and operating. It is directed to ensuring the practical outcome of the reduction of alcohol and drugs and, dare I say, working towards the eradication altogether of those influences in our correctional facilities and it is doing so in a

practical and stepwise manner. This is not aspiration based on inputs with who knows what result; this is a manual for practical outcome.

I am sure that, in line with what this bill will set out to achieve, we will look at the practical outcomes, the practical improvements that flow from its implementation, and encourage honourable members on all sides to do the same. We are endeavouring to ensure that we achieve better results within our Correctional Services institutions and that is what this bill endeavours to do.

The bill also provides for the exclusion of persons from correctional institutions. It makes sure that there are powers introduced to ensure that those who are found to be bringing such items into our correctional institutions may be excluded from a specified correctional institution, all correctional institutions of a particular class or, indeed, all correctional institutions, either for a specified period of time or until further order. Again, with a view to a practical outcome, it is true to the government's objective to allow for no tolerance whatsoever to drugs in our prisons .

More than that, it is a practical action to make sure that those who would attend and be a bad influence within our correctional institutions will no longer have the opportunity to do so. Prohibiting visitation with prisoners will, for example, prevent members of gangs and other associates from seeking to participate in an enterprise associated with these things. That is obvious enough, and it would certainly do that. It would also ensure that all those related and flow-on vices that are associated with the distribution of contraband to prisoners will also be hindered.

We are all aware that our prisons serve the purpose to confine and deprive liberty from some of the most difficult and challenging members of our community. We confine people in correctional institutions because of that fact. The legislation sees the introduction of a series of practical measures to make sure that we take steps to increase safety, security and integrity in the prison system to the greatest extent that we practicably can. I look forward to the implementation of this legislation, along with so many other measures designed for practical, on-the-ground improvement. This is one such example. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:48): I rise to speak on the bill to amend the Correctional Services Act. The bill essentially makes provision for the undertaking of drug testing in respect of the workforce in our prisons and, importantly, to provide for the enforcement to restrict visitation by way of prohibition to those who may be associated with serious and organised crime. These are important initiatives. They are consistent with an election commitment of the government. I commend both speakers and, in particular, the minister for promptly bringing this matter before the house so that it can be advanced.

Recently, I had the privilege to be the acting Minister for Police and Correctional Services. During that time, I attended Fort Largs Police Academy for a graduation ceremony of the next class of correctional officers. It was a terrific day, and I complimented the South Australia Police for making available the facilities to enable the training of our next generation of correctional officers. They are a very diverse group and they are very enthusiastic.

As I happened to be the acting police minister on the same day, I thank myself for that purpose. It is a privilege to be given an insight into the extraordinary work that our minister has to do in ensuring that our prisons provide for both the safety and security of the community and also the rehabilitation of those who are incarcerated.

One aspect that is very important in ensuring the rehabilitation of those who are in prison is to ensure that the working relationship between the correctional officers and those who are incarcerated is operable. To that extent, I mean the significance of protecting correctional officers in respect of the prisoners themselves having sufficient activity to ensure that they are not a problem other than for the pure security of the prison.

Drugs in that environment can clearly impede the capacity of a correctional officer. They are illegal and of course, if transferred to a resident at the prison, can make it more difficult, not only by perpetuating any habit they may have but obviously in their conduct of the consequence. It raises to a volatile and potentially very dangerous level the relationship within the community in the detention or prison facility, in addition, of course, to being completely illegal.

It is an important initiative. I want to thank the correctional officers themselves and their union representatives, who worked towards stepping up to support this initiative and also followed in the footsteps of the South Australian police, again working with their association to say, 'We are ready to have this reform, to be part of a program that is going to make it safer for us and better for those who are incarcerated.'

In the course of the brief period as acting minister, I was able to meet with Mr Brown, the chief executive of Correctional Services in South Australia. Through other forums I meet with him and the minister for corrections, and he has continued an impressive leadership in this difficult area. He knows my view on two things. One is that obviously we as a government need to work with Corrections to try to restore the provision of services for newborns to women prisoners. I will continue to advocate for that in this house and, as we are now in government, to advance that. I know the minister is sympathetic to the restoration of that service, which has been cruelly cut out by the previous Labor administration, but we will work assiduously to remedy that.

My second area of concern is that we make sure that we provide rehabilitation and opportunity for those in custody to be skilled in the workforce. In that regard, we have national parks and public areas that need maintenance and servicing, including, for example, animal enclosures in Cleland Park, in my electorate, one of the biggest municipal parks in metropolitan Adelaide, which tourists and local people flock to.

We need to make sure pests in those parks, including olives and others that infest our public areas, are kept under control. Mr Brown knows very clearly my view, and I am pleased that he has warmly received a request to look at how we may better utilise and provide for skills advancement of those resident in prison so that they can visit these areas and make a constructive contribution, not only to the community but also to their own skilling and to their own pride in making a contribution in this area. He has been very receptive to that. I have, via the Minister for Environment, also met with the acting head of the environment department, Mr Schutz, and he, too, has indicated that he is willing to work with the new government to see how we might advance the opportunities for those prisoners.

I was very sad to read this week, initially in the media, reports of a prisoner who was allowed to escape a custodial sentence, partly based on the fact that a counselling service to help remediate his anger and unacceptable behaviour was not available until late 2019. It is just so inappropriate that we would incarcerate people and not be able to provide them with exactly the service they need to make them a decent citizen to go back into the community.

These are all areas that I know our minister is very mindful of in trying to advance for the benefit, not just the protection, of South Australians, and in making sure that when our custodial residents in our facilities do ultimately come back into the community after being released from a secure facility they are good, decent citizens who are able to constructively contribute back into the community when they come to live next door to you or me. I commend the bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:56): I rise to speak to the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018. Obviously, I speak as the member for Hammond, and we have Mobilong Prison in my electorate, which has a long history spanning three decades. It was originally built for 160 inmates and now has room for over 460.

Occasionally, some people say to me, 'Do we have a prison in Murray Bridge?' It is a good thing that people can have that conversation, not knowing that just out the back, north-west of the main town, a prison is operating, offering lots of employment for local prison officers and also keeping our community safe.

I have made many visits to the prison—as a volunteer, I must stress. I have seen a lot of the Kairos ministry meetings held there and I have been there for several events. I must say that I have had some interesting conversations with some of the inmates. The thing we need to do is make sure that people are rehabilitated appropriately in our prisons and, obviously, Mobilong is part of that process.

This bill is another Marshall Liberal government promise that we are delivering on, another election commitment to introduce legislation in this place within the first 100 days. This bill

demonstrates the government's zero tolerance for drugs in prisons by seeking to stop drugs entering prisons from the outset by limiting the power and control of not only members of outlaw motorcycle gangs but also their associates.

Over time, traditionally prisons have been a location for members of gangs to recruit new members. These same groups may also attempt to continue their criminal activities and associations whilst in custody. It is now necessary that we obstruct the influence of organised crime groups such as outlaw motorcycle gangs. Not only will prohibiting visitation with prisoners stop gang members from seeking to profit from the introduction and distribution of contraband to prisoners but it will also hinder their criminal interests and enterprises through witness manipulation and intimidation.

Prisons by their nature confine the most complex, challenging and dangerous members of our community, and this bill seeks to increase the safety, security and integrity of the prison system. As I indicated, this is vitally important in my area, around Murray Bridge. The bill will enable the Department for Correctional Services to work closely with South Australia Police to limit the power and control of organised crime groups and sever links between prisoners and their associates.

The bill also introduces drug and alcohol testing for Correctional Services staff, including when there is a suspicion they are under the influence of drugs, when they are an applicant for certain positions in Correctional Services and also on a random basis. The bill applies to all staff and employees of the Department for Correctional Services and G4S officers working at Mount Gambier Prison. It also includes contractors working at a correctional facility—for example, as has recently happened at Mobilong with the expansion, people undertaking maintenance and/or building works at a prison. Similar to testing undertaken at mine sites, if a contractor attending a prison site to undertake works at the prison is requested to undergo a drug and alcohol test, they can refuse but then they must leave the site at once.

This government does not want anyone on our prison sites who may be under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol. This is a good thing to help make our community safe, especially those of us who have prisons in our community, such as the member for Flinders and the member for Stuart (Port Lincoln and Port Augusta), the member for Mount Gambier (Mount Gambier), me as the member for Hammond and those prisons in urban seats throughout Adelaide. We need to show the community that we are keeping them safe whilst maintaining law and order in the prisons themselves. I think this is excellent legislation and I commend the bill.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:02): I would like to thank all the members who made a contribution today: the member for Elizabeth, the member for Heysen, the Deputy Premier and the member for Hammond. They are all passionate people who are very focused on our prisons, and I commend them for it. We are making sure that we have the best prison system not only in the nation but also in the world. That is what we want to be shooting for here.

As many members would be aware, the act provides for the establishment and management of correctional institutions and regulates how prisoners are to be treated. This is one of the Marshall Liberal team's 100-day commitments, and I am very pleased to be delivering on this here today. The government's bill amends the act to deliver on the election commitment to stamp out drugs in prisons. The bill achieves this through two changes that modify how prisons operate and who can enter our state's prisons.

Firstly, the bill provides the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services with the power to prevent a member of a criminal organisation, or a person who associates or has associated with a member of a criminal organisation, from visiting a prisoner in prison. This power is provided to the chief executive to stop the influence of organised crime and their associates in our prisons. Secondly, the bill provides the power to test an officer or employee of the department or any other person who enters a correctional institution for drugs or alcohol. This procedure, and particulars of that testing regime, will be provided for in the regulations which will be prepared in due course.

I note that the shadow minister did point out a few amendments. Whilst we agree with some of them in principle, we will deal with those when we reopen this bill at a date down the track and look forward to working with the opposition to make our prisons as safe as possible. I note that this bill is part of the Marshall Liberal team's 100-day plan, focused on the two points I have already

mentioned, namely, to keep outlaw motorcycle gangs and their associates out of prisons and to perform drug tests on people who enter prisons, in order to keep drugs out of prisons. We know that drugs in prisons are a scourge, and we want to do everything in our power to remove them. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:05): By leave, I move my contingent notice of motion in an amended form so that it reads:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House that it have power to consider amendments relating to prisoners' mail.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 21
 Noes 25
 Majority 4

AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E.
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Rau, J.R.
Stinson, J.M.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.

NOES

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

Motion thus negatived.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr ODENWALDER: Minister, could I ask you to go through what consultation you went through regarding this new amendment bill?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, of course. The PSA were consulted. We spoke with Nev Kitchin, who is in charge at the PSA. We probably need to note that there were elements of this bill in the last term of government, but the government did not manage to get it progressed, so there was a lot of consultation done back then as well. Without speaking for my opposite number, there are a lot of elements of this that we fundamentally agree with. The elements that came out of that—and I take from the member for Elizabeth's speech as well that he agrees with the principle of what we are doing here and the bill itself. I note that a few amendments were put forward by the member that were just voted down. Again, I said in my final speech that—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think it was the motion. We voted down the motion, so it was all of them.

The CHAIR: Get back on track, minister, please. Answer the question. Do not be caught up in the interjections.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I was just trying to clarify the point. The point is that there were amendments and we did vote them down, but I did say that in principle there were some that I do agree with. I am happy to work with the member for Elizabeth when we reopen this bill, and it is my intention to do so, to make some more changes to the Correctional Services Act because there are some more things that need to happen. These amendments we are making here today, that we are putting through, were the priorities that the Marshall Liberal government took to the election.

We made it very clear when we went to the election that we wanted to deliver on those, first and foremost, to the people of South Australia to show that we will do what we say we will do. Those two key points obviously were to keep outlaw motorcycle gangs and their associates out of prisons, to prevent drugs coming into prisons, because we know they are a source, and also to drug test people who come into prisons. The department consulted very heavily and I personally have spoken to the PSA and obviously other key stakeholders in this bill.

Mr ODENWALDER: Were SAPOL consulted?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I know when I first came to government that we ran through all the commitments we made at the election. I will have to go back and get 100 per cent clarification, but I am very confident that all of these were discussed. At what depth, I cannot tell the member, to be honest, because I know that I personally had that discussion with SAPOL. They were consulted very heavily in the previous bill, so they are very much in agreeance. Fundamentally, yes, we had conversations with SAPOL about this bill. They were supportive of the bill and are very happy to see it through.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

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

Amendment No 1 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 4, after line 18—Insert:

- (1) Section 34(4)(d)—delete 'if any part of the imprisonment for which the prisoner was sentenced is in relation to a child sexual offence' and substitute:
if the prisoner has ever been found guilty of a child sexual offence

I thank the shadow minister, the member for Elizabeth, for his indulgence on this. We have also had conversations offline about this. This is very much about semantics. This is very similar to the amendment he wanted to move, which we fundamentally supported. There is a slight change in the wording. As I said, I did have a chat to the member about this. The use of the words 'convicted of' we thought were not strong enough. I will quote what we are trying to do here for the *Hansard*:

...'if any part of the imprisonment for which the prisoner was sentenced is in relation to a child sexual offence'...

We want to substitute the word 'convicted' of child sexual offence with 'guilty' of child sexual offence. I think the member was in agreeance on this one. If someone is 'found guilty of' and not 'convicted', they would still be caught under this amendment. We think it is a very slight alteration to what the member opposite was putting forward, and we move that the amendment be accepted.

The CHAIR: The term you are proposing in that amendment is 'found guilty'?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, 'found guilty of'.

The CHAIR: Can the member for Elizabeth indicate whether you would be agreeable to that?

Mr ODENWALDER: I take the minister's word for the subtle difference in meaning of the terms. I accept the amendment. I am glad that I prompted him to make this important change.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clauses 7A and 7B.

Mr ODENWALDER: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Odenwalder-1]—

Page 4, after line 23—Insert:

7A—Amendment of section 51—Offences by persons other than prisoners

Section 51—after subsection (1) insert:

(2) A person who, without the permission of the CE or without lawful excuse, has possession of a controlled drug (within the meaning of the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*) in a correctional institution buffer zone is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 5 years.

(3) The Minister may, by notice published in the Gazette, declare an area surrounding the boundary of a correctional institution to be the correctional institution buffer zone for the correctional institution.

(4) The Minister may, by notice published in the Gazette, revoke or vary a declaration under subsection (3).

(5) In this section—

correctional institution buffer zone means an area declared by the Minister under subsection (3) to be a correctional institution buffer zone.

7B—Amendment of section 66—Automatic release on parole for certain prisoners

Section 66(2)—after paragraph (ab) insert:

(aba) a prisoner if any part of the imprisonment for which the prisoner was sentenced is in respect of a serious drug offence (within the meaning of Part 3 Division 4 of the *Sentencing Act 2017*); or

As the minister is aware, in the 2017 iteration of the bill there was a clause that created a buffer zone around prisons, which has the effect of amplifying certain drug offences, possession and trafficking offences, which is essentially a tool to help the police in policing around prisons and preventing contraband from entering prisons. It could also feed into other provisions of the 2017 bill, provisions around drones and other methods of getting drugs into prisons other than by human carrier. I think this is a sensible change to establish buffer zones. It is a change we can make today. It would not impede the passage of the bill one moment longer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for the question. I have had a look at this. Whilst in principle I agree with what he is trying to do, I am still waiting on a bit of information to come back to see what the history is of these drones being caught in this space and what the actual best outcome might be for this. I can understand some of the points in principle. One thing I have been exploring is around the term 'or has possession of in', which is included to prevent a person who introduces an item passing to another person who has possession but did not introduce. So a little bit of a technicality, but who has possession of the substance when it is actually on the drone or in the air? Is it the person who is actually delivering or the person receiving it?

There were a few questions around this that I was looking to explore. Not the drones—this is between two people. I apologise. I am skipping forward to the wrong spot. The problem with this is the actual permission and I am seeking some clarification on this. Again, I say to the shadow minister that I am very happy to support in principle. We will not support the motion as it stands, but I am happy to discuss with the member between the houses and maybe look to make some more appropriate amendments. Given the boundary around the correctional institution and the buffer zone that he is talking about, we want more clarification on that point, if that is possible.

Mr ODENWALDER: I think what the minister is indicating is that he does not accept the amendment, but I am not entirely clear why. Sorry, I do not follow your argument. All this does is

change the Controlled Substances Act to establish a zone around a prison where certain offences would become amplified, or whatever the legal term is, or the penalties would be expanded. I am happy to accept that you do not accept the amendment, but if you can offer an explanation as to why, I would like to understand why.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: This amendment decreases the maximum penalty from 10 years, proposed in the 2017 bill, to five years. The 2017 amendment included an additional clause that provided for penalties for possession of prohibited items, that is, in particular, mobile phones, but also any other prohibited items. So the introduction of prison buffer zones that aim to prevent the introduction of contraband into prisons currently, and the point where a person becomes guilty of an offence, is when the contraband is already inside the prison.

Just clarifying how someone is guilty of having contraband when it is outside the prison, at what point does it actually end up inside the prison? We just want to get a little bit of clarification. I am happy to work with the member on this, but we will not support this amendment as it stands, but I am happy to work with him to finalise that finer detail between the houses and potentially come back and make a slightly better worded amendment to cover that position.

The committee divided on the new clauses:

Ayes 20
Noes 26
Majority 6

AYES

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

NOES

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

New clauses thus negated.

Clause 8.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can the minister clarify that the testing scheme, as it relates to employees of the department, is the same scheme as that adopted by SAPOL?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his question on this important part of the legislation. It will be very similar to SAPOL's approach as far as staff testing is concerned. The provisions will fundamentally mirror what SAPOL does, so the short answer is yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: It also relates to visitors to the prison. I think I understand what that means, but could the minister outline the parameters of that definition? Who is subject to the testing regime when they are visiting prisons?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I appreciate the question. As we have said, it will be done in a similar manner to SAPOL. We do not want anyone in our prisons under the influence of drugs or alcohol, as the member will understand. The person may be required to submit to a drug and alcohol test, with their consent. If they do not consent the CE has the right to refuse entry to that person.

This section ensures that other people who attend correctional institutions—such as staff employed by other government departments, maybe the health service or any persons working at a correctional facility, be it a tradesperson undertaking maintenance or building work or doing any works on the prison site, contractors who might undertake jobs such as delivering produce or materials—do not attend correctional institutions under the influence. The CE has the right to refuse entry. I am led to believe it will be put in the regulations as to how that procedure will work, but fundamentally the CE of corrections will have coverage of that.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand the CE will have control of this, but in practical terms who will be subject to this regime and who will make that decision on the ground?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To cover it—and if I miss anything I will get some pointers from the department—as I said, the CE can make a determination on anyone who comes through the prison. It is determined by the CE. Regulations will be put in place to administer that, as I said. So, if tradespeople come in, if someone is doing deliveries, or a worker from outside is coming through, if they are required to take a test, the CE can determine that and it will happen that way.

Fundamentally, it will be on suspicion, I suppose. If you stagger in, or if there is reason to believe that the person has an association with someone who has a history of drugs, intelligence will be used to make a determination and therefore that person might be picked out to take a test. There will probably be random tests as well. I would imagine the CE will have the discretion to do a random test.

You have to remember that the key focus is to keep drugs out of prison, so if there is information or a suspicion that someone might be doing that then they can be asked to take a test. They can decline and they will be asked to leave. What we want to do is get drugs out of prison, so if there is some intelligence that there is an association, or there is a concern that drugs might be brought into the prison, then that person will be asked to take a test.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can I continue?

The CHAIR: I will allow one more question.

Mr ODENWALDER: You can restrict me to three—

The CHAIR: We have had three questions, member for Elizabeth.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 and 10) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank the member for Elizabeth for his indulgence and support and look forward to continuing to work with him. My apologies for clause 7. There were two parts to that and I think we discussed two parts in one, but I am happy to continue to work with the member for Elizabeth on improving Corrections here in South Australia.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**NATIONAL REDRESS SCHEME FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE
(COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:38): I rise to speak on the National Redress Scheme for victims of institutional child sexual abuse bill 2018. I commend both the Premier and the Attorney-General for formally opting in to the National Redress Scheme on behalf of South Australia in May of this year.

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse heard from thousands of sexual abuse survivors across Australia. Each of those were at one time children—often vulnerable members of the community—placed into the trust of institutions and sexually abused by the very people charged with their care and protection. The stories given by those survivors during the royal commission exposed us to the prevalence of institutional sex abuse, the failure of those caring for them to respond and the devastating impacts such abuse has had on the lives of the survivors.

In addition, the commission found that many survivors have not realised justice through traditional civil litigation systems. The commonwealth government, through the establishment of the National Redress Scheme, acknowledges that sexual abuse suffered by children in institutional settings was wrong. It was a shocking breach of trust. It should never have happened. This government, by opting in to the scheme, also acknowledges these facts.

Over the 16 years of the former Labor government, there have been a number of royal commissions and inquests: the Layton child protection review in 2003, two Mullighan inquiries in 2008, the DeBelle inquiry in 2014 and, most recently, the Nyland royal commission. Each of these addressed in one shape or form sexual abuse in the South Australian child protection system. It was not until this government was elected in March this year, however, that South Australia had a dedicated child protection minister.

My sole focus is on improving the lives of our most vulnerable children in this state, 3,680 of whom are in out-of-home care. I am committed to protecting those children and improving their lives. Having met with a number of survivors, I am too familiar with the devastating lifelong consequences sexual abuse can have on a child or young person, and I am aware of how long it can take for a survivor to have the capacity and strength to disclose abuse that they have suffered.

The National Redress Scheme will operate for 10 years. The scheme will be operated by the commonwealth government. The majority of the large faith-based institutions, along with other large non-government institutions who are providing services for children in South Australia, such as Scouts, YMCA and the Salvation Army, have opted in. With these large institutions showing their commitment to opt in to the scheme and more non-government institutions from South Australia to opt in with this bill's passing, it is estimated that the scheme will provide an opportunity for over 90 per cent of survivors of institutional child sexual abuse to seek redress.

The scheme will provide survivors with three elements of redress, comprising a monetary payment of up to \$150,000, access to counselling or psychological services and a personal response from the responsible institutions. This third element, if the survivor wishes for such contact acknowledges not only abuse and its impacts but also the steps taken to prevent it from happening again. Due to the limits of legislative powers under the Commonwealth Constitution, the passing of this bill is necessary in order for the relevant commonwealth legislation to be adopted and for the National Redress Scheme to become operational here in South Australia.

It is necessary, as it is one of a number of significant steps our government is taking to protect children from institutional sexual abuse, to hold perpetrators to account and to provide support and justice for survivors. The National Redress Scheme will forge a pathway allowing survivors to hold institutions to account without having to pursue an often brutal and complex litigious pathway, a mechanism which often leads to retrauma for survivors. I commend this bill to the house to ensure South Australia's expedient involvement in the National Redress Scheme for all those survivors of abuse in this state.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:43): I rise to speak on the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill. I am the lead speaker for the opposition. As many in the house would know, this is referral legislation, which means that it largely and simply enables the state of South Australia to join the National Redress Scheme. While this side of the house takes issue with some elements of the National Redress Scheme itself, which of course are in the federal act and which I will raise in detail later, we certainly will not be moving amendments to this bill, the referral legislation.

I think that will come as a comfort to the victims and organisations that will be seeking to join the National Redress Scheme and provide them with some certainty from this point on that it will, in fact, become the case in South Australia that the National Redress Scheme will be available to victims here, hopefully at the earliest possible opportunity. We do support the scheme and we also support the upcoming federal apology. We welcome that and we applaud those efforts.

The bill continues the journey of working with survivors of institutional child sexual assault towards bringing about justice and acknowledging the harm caused to them through no fault of their own. The National Redress Scheme is a result of the federal government's Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Labor has a record of not shying away from this truly horrifying history but of doing all it can to expose, heal and remedy such abuse. Of course, under Labor we saw several inquiries and royal commissions into abuses that children have suffered in the past. I was privileged to be part of moving the motion for the 10th anniversary of what is commonly known as the Mullighan inquiry.

It was great to be able to spend some time with survivors, to hear their stories and, of course, to recommit, not just as a party but as a state, to do all we can to try to remedy some of the wrongs of the past and make sure that they do not happen again in future. It is a pretty painful experience—a very painful experience—to have such inquiries and royal commissions. Certainly, I was involved on several different levels: as a journalist, covering the happenings of our court system and social justice system, and also later on, more recently, as the chair of the Victim Support Service, which was responsible for providing counselling services to those who participated in the state inquiries and also the more recent federal inquiry.

Through that, I heard hundreds of stories from people who were victims, people who were survivors, family members of those who are still with us and, very sadly, from some family members of victims who are no longer with us, at least in part because of the abuse they suffered at the hands of people who should have been caring for them. I am also acutely aware that all these inquiries and royal commissions at a state and federal level, whilst important for us to go through for victims, for organisations and for us as a community, also do retraumatise people.

It is very tough for people to have to dredge up those experiences and relive them. I really do thank all the victims and their families who came forward to share their stories, as it is only because of them that our community is enlightened as to what happened many years ago and, unfortunately, what continues to happen. But, by knowing those stories, we can start to make some change in our community. I applaud them for that, and to successive governments, I hope, for listening to the issues that they raise and answering their pleas.

This legislation is referral legislation, as I mentioned, and gives effect to the National Redress Scheme. The National Redress Scheme has been established through the commonwealth's National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse Act 2018. Clause 4 of the South Australian bill adopts the wording from the commonwealth act. New South Wales and Victoria have already passed this legislation, and there is currently a bill similar to ours before the Queensland parliament. The scheme will operate for 10 years, and payments of up to \$150,000 will be made to survivors. The Attorney-General's Department has advised us that modelling suggests that the average payment will be approximately \$76,000 and that the scheme is likely to cost the state government about \$147 million.

Under the National Redress Scheme, South Australia would be a limited funder of last resort and would only provide compensation where a private organisation is no longer in existence and where a state government institution is equally responsible for the abuse. There are a number of mechanisms built into the bill, including that, although the bill refers state powers to the

commonwealth, the federal parliament cannot make changes to the National Redress Scheme that would hinder the operation of a state redress scheme.

Non-government institutions such as churches and charities and non-government schools are not able to participate in the scheme until South Australia has signed up to the National Redress Scheme and the South Australian bill, this referral legislation, has passed the parliament. As I mentioned, with Labor's support that will provide some degree of certainty—although there is always the upper house—that that will go through.

Survivors of abuse that occurred in non-government institutions will only be able to apply for compensation under the scheme if that institution has signed up to the scheme. The Attorney-General's Department has advised us that it estimates that approximately 90 per cent of abuse survivors will be covered by the National Redress Scheme once the South Australian parliament has passed this bill and private institutions have signed up.

We understand these are pretty rough numbers, but there are expected to be approximately 3,000 applications in South Australia, split roughly fifty-fifty between state and non-government institutions. Further advice from the Attorney-General's Department—and we thank them for their work on the bill—indicates that survivors who have either received a payment under the Mullighan redress or ex gratia scheme or have had a civil claim settled could have their payment topped up through the National Redress Scheme. It is understood that previous payments will be indexed to bring them up to their present value.

Where an instance of abuse has been determined to warrant redress, a 7.5 per cent administrative charge will become payable to the commonwealth to sustain the scheme. Participating institutions will contribute \$1,000 per claim to the commonwealth government to help support legal support services. The Attorney-General's Department has also advised that there is no cap to legal support services.

During the 2018 election campaign, premier Weatherill announced that a re-elected Labor government would sign up to the National Redress Scheme, and I am pleased to stand here and affirm that commitment today. As I mentioned earlier, we do have some concerns with the scheme itself. I will raise these matters in an effort to enlighten not just the parliament but the community in general about Labor's views on this and maybe point towards some areas that we might either be able to address at a state level during the implementation of this or indeed that we may, with our federal counterparts, seek to remedy in future.

The time for acceptance: we believe that survivors should have sufficient time to decide whether to accept an offer of redress. The scheme gives applicants up to six months to make that decision, whereas the royal commission recommended a year. Six months may seem a long time, but for people dealing with complex trauma and trying to access legal and counselling services, six months indeed may not be enough. It is important that survivors have sufficient time to consider what is a very important decision, because only one application to the scheme is permitted.

The compensation amount: an upper limit of \$150,000 is placed on the amount of redress that would be available to any one survivor. The royal commission itself recommended that the payment should actually be \$200,000. Certainly the victims groups that I have spoken with in recent weeks and months obviously would like the payment to be \$200,000. It is not a huge amount of money and it is the amount of money that the royal commission recommended, so we of course would like to see that increased.

The issue of funder of last resort: under the National Redress Scheme, South Australia would be a limited funder of last resort and would only provide compensation where a private organisation is no longer in existence and where a state government institution is equally responsible for the abuse. If a private institution has not signed up to the Redress Scheme, no compensation will be provided through this scheme to relevant abuse survivors.

We would like to know from the Attorney-General whether there is any mechanism for abuse survivors to seek compensation if the responsible institution has not signed up. Indeed, we understand that the Mullighan ex gratia scheme will be wrapped up, which could cause some complications for those organisations that fall between the cracks.

Indexation: the national bill sets the rate of indexation, specifying that an earlier amount received as compensation will be multiplied by 1.019 for each full year since the receipt of the original amount. This could mean that someone who received a payment previously would not receive funding under the scheme. Once again, we would like to seek clarification from the Attorney-General on whether there is any mechanism for the indexation to be waived in special circumstances.

Criminal history: the bill requires that abuse survivors who have been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of five years or more must have special permission from the scheme operator to access the scheme. This requirement of course ignores the fact that people with a history of childhood abuse and trauma are more likely to be incarcerated later in life. I would like to seek clarity from the Attorney-General on whether there is a way of mitigating this requirement.

A further concern is the inability of prisoners to apply for the National Redress Scheme. Where an abuse survivor is in prison, that survivor is unable to apply to the scheme. For example, a prisoner who has been given a sentence of three years in the final two years of the scheme will be unable to apply. A commitment will be sought by us from the Attorney-General that she will seek a resolution from the Redress Scheme governance board for matters of special circumstance. There are prisoners who are serving terms who would otherwise, if they were not imprisoned, qualify to make an application under this scheme.

While we recognise that the scheme should not be brought into disrepute, we believe that there should be mechanisms for South Australians in that circumstance to be able to have their cases attended to, to have their circumstances examined, and a decision made about what is in not only their best interests but the best interests of our community. Certainly, federal Labor's position is that prisoners should be able to apply.

Limits on eligibility: the scheme also limits eligibility to the Redress Scheme to people who are Australian citizens or permanent Australian residents. We all know that abuse occurred in institutions that cared for child migrants, and there is a concern that some of these people will not be able to access the Redress Scheme if they have returned to their country of birth or are not citizens or permanent residents. We would like to seek some further advice from the Attorney-General about that matter as well.

Counselling: we think the counselling provided to survivors through the Redress Scheme may be inadequate. The royal commission recommended that recipients of redress be able to access counselling for the rest of their lives. The intergovernmental agreement on the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse provides for up to \$5,000, and that is on a sliding scale, for access to counselling. We would certainly like to see some attention paid to that issue.

Indeed, the victims organisations that I have spoken to would like to see no limit on counselling, in recognition of the fact that you really cannot put a price on how long it may take for someone to get the counselling support that they need. Considering that the state already funds organisations to provide free counselling—trauma-informed counselling which was recommended by the royal commission—we believe that the government should take a look at that and take advantage of that situation to enable victims to get the support that they need when they need it and for as long as they need it.

The issue of legal advice: conflicting advice has been provided to us regarding legal support services. We were advised by AGD initially that \$1,000 was being provided towards legal support for each claim but then more recently we have been advised that there is no cap to legal support services, so we would be seeking some further information about how that will operate.

Lastly, in regard to the concerns that we would like to raise at this stage, the organisation knowmore will be providing legal services but they do not currently have a South Australian presence. It would be great if they could set up a presence or some sort of constant face-to-face communication with victims who are here. We understand that there will be teleconferencing and phone calls available but, with matters as sensitive as this, I am sure that many victims would feel much more comforted and would be able to have their cases listened to in a more appropriate way if they had that face-to-face interaction with their legal advisers.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate Labor's support for the National Redress Scheme and this enabling legislation. While the Redress Scheme may not be perfect, we are committed to improving it in any way that we possibly can. It does move in the right direction to attempt at least to correct some of the harm committed by those who breached the trust that was put in them to care for our most vulnerable children.

We look forward to institutions joining the scheme and seeking to right the wrongs of the past. From my consultation, I understand that a large number of institutions will be signing up and, although this is certainly no silver bullet for victims, it does grant some justice to them and we welcome that. The National Redress Scheme and this legislation has Labor's support and we will be pleased to see it implemented in South Australia. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. V.A. Chapman.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

FARM DEBT MEDIATION BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

HEALTH CARE (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (RULES) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

EVIDENCE (JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2018

Message from Governor

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL*Message from Governor*

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

*Petitions***COUNTRY ARTS SA**

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell): Presented a petition signed by 7,370 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to ongoing funding and lease arrangements to ensure that Country Arts SA can continue to manage and operate the Hopgood Theatre in the long term for the benefit of our community.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today a delegation from Tonga. We have Lord Tu'ilakepa, Sione Vikilani and the Hon. Vevosa Taka MP. Welcome to you, gentlemen, and I hope you enjoy your time in South Australia.

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Report 4 of 2018 on the Adelaide Oval redevelopment pursuant to section 9 of the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Act 2011 for the designated period 1 January 2018 to 30 June 2018

1st Report of the Natural Resources Committee entitled Kangaroo Island Field Trip—24 and 25 June 2018 which has been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991

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

Gambling Regulation in South Australia, Administrative Review of—Report 9 December 2016

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

TAFE SA, Quality Review of—Report 4 April 2018
TAFE SA, Strategic Capability Review 2018—Report

*Question Time***PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES**

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:06): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Why has the government scrapped expansion of the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:09): We haven't. I thank the member for Wright for his question, but I think very clearly there was \$15 million dollars provided for in last year's budget for the provision for two park-and-rides. That money is still there. What we announced last week is that we are going to add to that money to provide \$18½ million towards the park-and-rides at Golden Grove and Paradise.

I think what we said very clearly is the fact that Paradise is the highest priority for creating park-and-rides along the O-Bahn network—a view, for instance, that the department shares, a view of anybody who has had to park along Darley Road over the past decade has shared. It is actually a view that the former government shared prior to 2014, but then, when its little car park tax went away, it felt that the priorities changed. Well, they didn't change. The people of Paradise and the surrounding areas still wanted their park-and-ride.

The Speaker has deftly since 2012 fought for the project, and now we are going to deliver it. It is a fantastic announcement by a government that actually keeps its promises, that takes the project to the election. It does not use excuses—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —about budget change to not deliver on its election promises.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It delivers on its election commitments. So we will do Paradise first as the highest priority. We will then move on to Golden Grove, and then we will move on to Klemzig and Tea Tree Plaza, and we will deliver these. But I will say that there has been a reordering of the priorities because, instead of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —using the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —poor residents of Paradise and the surrounding suburbs, who have been punished because the former government was playing politics with this, we are getting on with delivering this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and getting the job done. And what members opposite—and I don't want to spoil—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be heard in silence!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the Treasurer's speech, but this is going to become a recurring theme that we have delivered on our election commitments, and we will continue to deliver on them. I look forward to more questions from those opposite about how we are going to do exactly what we said we would do before the election.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Wright, I call to order the following members: the member for West Torrens, the Minister for Education and the member for Kaurna. The member for Wright.

PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:08): Supplementary to the Minister for Transport: if the expansion of the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride is a priority as the minister says it is, when will the expansion occur?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: In the fullness of time.

The SPEAKER: The member for Torrens has already been called to order. It would displease me greatly if he did not hear the honourable Treasurer's speech a bit later.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:09): It's a bit hard for him to be sitting on that side of the chamber. He has to listen rather than just speak. We will be delivering on all our election commitments. Also, we have committed that we are going to go through the process on these park-and-rides. Member for Wright, I would like to take the opportunity, though, to correct some of the incorrect statements that were made by the member for West Torrens in commentary post the press conference that we held last week.

The member for West Torrens tried to suggest to the South Australian people that contracts had been signed to construct the Klemzig and the TTP park-and-rides. That is not true. I'm being extremely careful because I know exactly what happened. There is a PTP Alliance, which is a procurement model that has been set up. It involves four or five different companies—including Arup, Mott MacDonald, McConnell Dowell, the department and I'm sure I'm forgetting somebody—as a procurement model to be able to deliver on public transport projects.

PTP Alliance is currently undertaking the Oaklands crossing project. That is a project for which the former government signed off on construction. PTP, in addition to designing and constructing projects, actually go through and do planning work. That is what the former government signed off on: a planning study, a concept plan and a business case development plan. That is what they signed off on. They didn't sign to construct anything. They did not sign off to construct anything. If anyone wants to say anything opposite and continue to repeat that outside, then they are welcome to do so, but once again I come back to the fact that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —we have been extremely explicit and clear about what it is that we are going to do. We have been continuously saying that Paradise is the highest priority and, as the Speaker bears down upon me, we dare not say anything else other than that.

The SPEAKER: Excellent.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But we then said that Golden Grove is the next priority, and after that we will deal with the Tea Tree Plaza and Klemzig park-and-rides. The commitments are still there. The money is still there inside the budget. We will work in an orderly process, step by step, using this procurement model, to make sure that we get the best and most efficient outcome for taxpayers' dollars, and we will do so in a way that we have outlined and will continue to outline if the house continues to ask.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:11): Supplementary: my question is perhaps again to the Minister for Transport. How many other pre-election promises made to the people of the north-east, particularly in Florey and Newland, will be reprioritised?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:11): I think I might take that on notice because it's reasonably broad and unspecific. The budget is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —going to come out in a few hours' time, and if there are some specific projects the member has that she would like a further update on, I am happy to provide her an update on that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: They have thrown you under the bus.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will not interject. Member for Waite.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the latest energy retail offers comparison report from the Essential Services Commission of South Australia?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the minister, I warn the member for West Torrens for a first time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting or he will be departing. Minister.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:12): Yes, I can update the house. Thank you very much to the member for Waite, who has an ongoing interest on behalf of his constituents in getting the price of electricity down. In fact, I remember him inviting me as a shadow minister to come to his electorate before the last election to talk about exactly this. I know that the most recent member for Waite before him certainly didn't do anything like that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: ESCOSA, on 31 August, released their report, a report that compared electricity and gas retail prices in South Australia for the most recent financial year, the 2017-18 financial year, to the previous financial year. It won't surprise anybody to know that those prices went up. They went up alarmingly. I will give some of the detail. For example, household electricity prices went up by between 14 and 18 per cent, which saw South Australian households paying between \$268 and \$405 more per year. Household gas customers were also penalised with higher prices, between 3 and 10 per cent higher, which meant between a \$30 and \$106 increase in their costs.

Small business electricity bills increased between 13 and 17 per cent, which equated to a \$516 to a \$750 per year annual increase. Small business gas customers similarly had between a 6 and 12 per cent increase, which equated to a between \$308 and \$717 increase for gas. ESCOSA quantified those numbers. They gave us the facts and the detail to essentially tell us what we all knew: that under the last Labor government, households and businesses were penalised by their energy policy—absolutely penalised.

What was even worse is that when this report came out, all the opposition could do was say that the government's policies are no good. The prices that were paid for the last financial year were a direct result of the former government's policies. They should be ashamed of themselves—absolutely ashamed of themselves. We have policies that will bring electricity prices down for all households and businesses in South Australia.

O-BAHN EXTENSION

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister update the house about when the feasibility study into extending the O-Bahn to Golden Grove will be finished?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:15): Well, I don't have an exact date on me. We have made our intentions extremely clear about Paradise, but it is fair to say that we are going to be working through this in a sequential manner, with Paradise coming first and Golden Grove coming second.

There is planning work that is currently being undertaken in relation to the business case and the concept plan development. It then moves into a design and construct phase and then, as the earlier parts of that come to a conclusion, they start to work on the next one. I do envisage that

it will happen over the course of this year and early next year, but as we have more information to hand, I am happy to provide that information to the house.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Don't worry, it's not like you've got a marginal seat or anything.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for West Torrens interjecting?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No, sir—a conversation.

The SPEAKER: Please do not. Member for Wright.

MODBURY VISTA SOCCER CLUB

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:16): My question is to the—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BOYER: —Minister for Recreation and Sport. When will the government deliver on its election promise to the Modbury Vista Soccer Club of \$1 million for a new synthetic pitch?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:16): I thank the member for his question. All our election commitments will be delivered and the budget will outline all of those. The one you are talking about I haven't seen any written documentation on, so if the member wants to provide it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —I would be happy to have a look.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. Can the minister please update the house—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mrs POWER: —on the state government's initiatives to make South Australia the start-up capital of Australia?

The SPEAKER: Before the minister speaks, the member for West Torrens is warned for a second and final time. Minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:17): Thank you, sir. I thank the member for Elder for her interest in innovation and South Australia's future. The Marshall Liberal government is building Australia's largest innovation incubator and start-up hub in the heritage buildings at Lot Fourteen, which is the former Royal Adelaide Hospital site.

This includes the University of Adelaide's Australian Institute of Machine Learning—the country's first institute of its kind—which will open its doors at Lot Fourteen later this year. We anticipate that around 2,000 people will be working in business at the hub by about this time next year. The centrepiece of the hub—the Chief Entrepreneur and the Entrepreneurship Advisory Board—will drive the state's entrepreneurship strategy.

Recently, former fighter jet pilot, Harvard graduate and defence company Nova Group chief executive, Jim Whalley, was appointed as South Australia's first Chief Entrepreneur. Mr Whalley is an outstanding businessperson with the right skills to help raise the profile of South Australia as the best state in the nation to start and grow successful businesses. He is passionate about helping shape a supportive and encouraging environment for entrepreneurs to flourish here in South Australia. It is an exciting time to be in South Australia. There is renewed optimism across the community and business sectors, particularly as we roll out our reforms around job creation, innovation and entrepreneurship.

Some of the key reforms include investing more than \$200 million over the next four years; increasing the number of apprentices and trainees by more than 20,000; introducing entrepreneurial education, including the establishment of four entrepreneurial high schools; designing and rolling out new flexible apprenticeship pathways, allowing young people to start their careers and gain their high school certificate while being paid a salary; and establishing a new technical college in the north-western suburbs of Adelaide, which will have a focus on preparing our workforce for the defence industry challenges ahead.

MODBURY VISTA SOCCER CLUB

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:19): My question is again to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Is the minister aware that the then chairman of Modbury Vista Soccer Club signed a statutory declaration confirming that the then Liberal candidate for the seat of Wright advised the club that an elected Liberal Marshall government would match any commitments made to the club?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:19): I thank the member for that question. I am happy to look into that document, and if he wants to present it I am happy to check it out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

IAWARDS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: Can the minister update the house on the Australian Information Industry Association 2018 iAwards and the success of South Australian innovators, including the work the state government is undertaking to grow innovation across our state?

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Minister for Industry and Skills, I call to order the member for Wright. Minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:20): Thank you, sir; I have never felt so in demand. I thank the member for Heysen for his interest in innovation, the work that the Marshall Liberal government is doing here in South Australia and the nationwide engagement that this government is engaging in.

I was pleased to attend the 2018 national iAwards last week in Melbourne. Congratulations to all award winners, especially the winners who represented our state after winning their categories at the South Australia and Northern Territory awards in Adelaide on 14 June. The AIIA Innovation of the Year, Business Service Markets was Larry, the Digital Analyst, by Complexica; Undergraduate Tertiary Students was Automated Hip Fracture Detection by the University of Adelaide; and Consumer Markets was VX1 3D Volumetric Display by Voxon Photonics. They were all winners in their categories.

Merit awards to South Australians included the Research and Development Project of the Year, won by Narrative Visualisation Project by Data to Decisions CRC; Artificial Intelligence or Machine Learning Innovation of the Year won by Larry, the Digital Analyst by Complexica; and Infrastructure and Platforms Innovation of the Year won by Self Serve 360° Virtual Tour Creation Platform by Augment Space.

For the past 25 years, the Australian Information Industry Association has been driving innovation throughout the nation through the iAwards program. It was terrific to be there to celebrate the 25th anniversary. The awards are held annually and are Australia's longest running and most widely scoped innovation recognition program. They have promoted excellence in the Australian digital ecosystem from the likes of Google Maps, Atlassian, Wotif and WiseTech Global.

The Marshall Liberal government is supporting our innovators here in South Australia. We are making South Australia the leader of innovation and the start-up capital of the nation. We are building Australia's largest innovation incubator and start-up hub at the heritage buildings at Lot Fourteen, which of course we know is the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. This includes the University of Adelaide's Australian Institute for Machine Learning—the country's first institute of its kind. We anticipate that by this time next year there will be around 2,000 people working on the innovation hub on the site.

Last week, I hosted a digital roundtable forum to discuss the future workforce needs of our digital and innovative industries, including space, health care, defence, mining, agriculture and cybersecurity. This was attended by about 30 of South Australia's leaders in the field. ICT skill requirements in these growing sectors are significant. The supply is about here, and up here is where the demand is. The Marshall Liberal government is supporting the information industry through our \$203 million investment and skills training to increase the number of apprentices and trainees by more than 20,000 over the next four years.

This government is also creating a digital apprenticeship pathway in line with industry requirements—so another pathway into the digital space to create more jobs and more opportunities in South Australia. We will be promoting these pathways in our schools to ensure the current skills shortage can be addressed.

PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Transport: why has the government made the decision not to proceed with the expansion of the much-needed Klemzig park-and-ride?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will be heard in silence; he has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:24): We haven't.

PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:24): My supplementary question to the minister is—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Supplementary. The member for Waite will not interject and is called to order.

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

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

Ms WORTLEY: When will the minister announce the timeliness for the Klemzig park-and-ride to be built? In fact, when will the Klemzig park-and-ride be built? Is there a time line in place at the moment?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:24): I thank the member for her question and say that, at this stage, the confirmed timing is up in the air, it's fair to say. As I have said previously, we are working in a sequential manner, dealing with the Paradise and the Golden Grove interchanges first. As I have more specific information in relation to the Klemzig park-and-ride, I am more than happy to come back to her and the house.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on the statewide consultation for the natural resources management reform and what local communities are saying through the process?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:25): I thank the member for Finniss for his question. I have been conducting statewide consultations, particularly in regional South Australia, over recent weeks in relation to this government's very substantial reforms to natural resources management.

Two things have become very apparent during those consultations: (1) that there are very significant problems with the NRM system as it currently stands and (2) that regional South Australia really doesn't have a lot of time for the Labor Party in South Australia and really lays a lot of blame for the problems with NRM, as it currently stands, directly at the feet of the previous government, who ignored regional South Australia and who have a huge amount to answer for when not giving regional communities the respect and support that they quite clearly deserve from an economic, social and environmental point of view over 16 long years of Labor.

It has been good to get out and about into regional communities. I note that many of the communities that I have visited in recent weeks have been subsequently visited by the Leader of the Opposition as part of his ongoing apology tour of regional South Australia. Thankfully, it's not an apology that I need to give regional South Australia; it's quite different. It's a message that we are here to listen to them in an authentic way and that we are going to rework the natural resources management system in a way that is simplified, that is accessible and that actually gets outcomes for regional communities.

Our regional tour in relation to natural resources management started off a few weeks ago in Port Lincoln. We held forums in Port Lincoln and Ceduna. I also was able to attend a forum in Port Augusta and then headed through to Victor Harbor, where the member for Finniss hosted me. I have also been to McLaren Vale and Murray Bridge, and of course there have been forums around other parts of the state as well. The message is very clear: people do want a system that heads back to basics, and that's what we have been talking about since we were in opposition—the need for an NRM system which is back to basics, focuses on good water management, soil quality programs and removing pests from the landscape.

If we do that and we do it well, we will create a landscape which is more resilient towards the impacts of climate change and can adapt more readily to that. Also, we will create a landscape which has biodiversity and places very significant value on sustaining biodiversity. Biodiversity and our natural landscape in South Australia is in a very bad place. It has declined year on year over many decades. One of the biggest threats to biodiversity is pests in the landscape, whether that be pest plants suffocating native vegetation or pest animals killing native wildlife.

To get back to basics will position us in a far better way to build a resilient landscape with regard to both climate change and biodiversity conservation. If we get those things right, if we get those things on point, we can then move towards a productive economic natural landscape as well—upholding the natural landscape for both our environment and the economic development of our state. It has been a pleasure to get out and about in regional South Australia over the last few weeks, and I look forward to continuing to update the house on this very sensible, very wide-reaching reform to natural resources management.

STRATHMONT POOL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Premier, why is the government closing the Strathmont swimming centre in January 2019?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29): I take this question on behalf of the members in the other place in relation to Strathmont and to provide the bit of detail that we have, and that is that the Hon. Michelle Lensink is working through what to do with the pool there that exists for the use of some local residents but also some people with some specific needs. She is still working through a process of how we transfer that across.

It is fair to say that this is a pool that isn't in great nick, that has not seen much reinvestment over a long period of time. I think it has been quite clear to say that this is a pool that has been going along and will be used up until the point at which it no longer becomes safe. There are a lot of other things that were being used on that site that are no longer on that site and, as the government, we then need to take some decisions about where to next from where. But this is a site that has been run down continually over the past 16 years. This is a pool that has been run down and has been slated that at some point it is no longer safe to use. We are fast approaching that time.

But for those people who use that pool, what we have is a government here that is listening, that is working with them, that is trying to find some alternative arrangements for them. I know that the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place is doing a fantastic job trying to find a very good and workable solution and certainly not to give in to the claims of hysteria that we saw on the television a month or so ago but actually trying to find a workable solution.

STRATHMONT POOL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:31): What action is the government taking—

The SPEAKER: Sorry, member for Torrens, who is the question to?

Ms WORTLEY: To the minister.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary?

Ms WORTLEY: Supplementary. What action is being taken to accommodate the 1,500 kids, people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Let's hear the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WORTLEY: Okay, I'll put it back to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens will be heard in silence.

Ms WORTLEY: I'm happy to address it to the Premier. So, Premier, what action are you taking to accommodate the 1,500 children, people with disabilities, students and others who use the Strathmont swimming centre every week, given that the surrounding hydrotherapy pools or nearby are at or near capacity?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:32): I heard that the question was particularly in relation to children and 15 schools, as I understand it, using the centre, the swimming pool in question. The education department has had on its radar for an extended period of time that there will be work required to be done to find alternative facilities, and that work is continuing.

CURTIS ROAD

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Transport. What measures are the government implementing to deliver on the Liberal candidate for Light's promise to ease traffic congestion on Curtis Road?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:32): I thank the member for Light for his question, and the answer is quite a lot. I was actually out visiting the Angle Vale-Curtis Road intersection, it would have to be four or five weeks ago now, and discussed with some local residents and the local residents associations the concerns that they have. If I'm talking about Curtis Road, there's a road. It's currently owned by the council. I think it's fair to say that the council wants us to own the road. I don't know how we feel about that yet. But there are also a number of intersections that are impacted on that road.

There's the Angle Vale Road-Curtis Road intersection that I went to visit. It does have some specific issues and we are seeking funding solutions for that. There is an infrastructure deed that's in place over that intersection. The cost of that intersection, as I understand it—and don't quote me on the exact figures—is somewhere between \$3 million and \$3.5 million. The money that's in the infrastructure deed is well short of that. There are also issues in relation to the Curtis Road and Womma Road intersection, which is the one a little bit further down.

An honourable member: Peachey.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Curtis and Peachey, that has also some specific issues. There are also some issues in relation to the Womma-Stebonheath intersection. All of these intersections have infrastructure deeds that previous governments put over them—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light, order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and we are working through how we deal with that. But can I say more broadly that there is an issue out into the north and I will present it in this way. There is a whole heap of land that was subdivided out in the north—heaps of it. What was happening at the time that this land was being rezoned and subdivided was that people were buying less housing in greenfield sites out in the north. When I say 'less', I don't mean less in absolute terms: I mean relative to infill.

What has happened is that we have two shifts. We have a lower population growth rate. We have a whole heap of land with myriad subdivisions and developments going on in the north and then people buying more infill development. So what happens is the infrastructure task gets more difficult because we have a very broad range of areas that are all asking for their infrastructure upgrades now, but the pace of development isn't there to support that.

We are working through what is a difficult issue and it's not a single issue. Curtis Road, sure, is one specific issue. We have actually reduced the speed limit on Angle Vale Road and we are working through those things one by one, but it is fair to say that we are dealing with some legacy issues out there left to us by the former government that are very difficult to deal with. I look forward to being able to come back to find those solutions about how we actually get the infrastructure developed at the right time.

I must admit that Mount Barker actually has the same issues in relation to infrastructure provision, where you have greenfield development sites and, again, it is a very difficult task that we have been left. It does seem to me that there wasn't the greatest coordinated approach to how land gets released and developed, but we are here to fix those problems. We don't shy away from those problems, but it is going to take some time to fix and I look forward to doing it.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today the member for Kiama from the New South Wales parliament. We hope you enjoy your stay in South Australia. The member for Light.

Question Time

CURTIS ROAD

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:36): Supplementary to the Minister for Transport: in his first comment in response, the minister said he been doing a lot with Curtis Road. Perhaps you could elaborate what you actually are doing with Curtis Road because you said nothing in your previous answer.

The SPEAKER: I will take out the expression from that question and allow the rest. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:36): I am trying to think of a new way to answer it because I was talking about Curtis Road.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Well, no, you weren't. You talked about other roads except Curtis Road.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Light, you will allow the minister to answer in silence.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Maybe he doesn't like the answer, but let me put it this way: we will do more for Curtis Road over the next four years than the former government did in the last 16 years.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister please advise the house on the progress of primary school children attending non-government schools in the electorate of Frome being able to get access to the state government school bus system? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: There have been occasions some families are experiencing where the child attending a public high school can access the government school bus system while their brother or sister, who may be attending a non-government primary school, cannot access the state government school bus system and has to follow in their parent's car.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:37): I thank the member for the question. This is, of course, an issue that has been raised in this parliament a number of times over the last nine years—or nearly—that I have been here, including many times in the last parliament of which the member was of course a minister and, as a member of cabinet, was unable to resolve this issue; however, I note his interest in it in an ongoing fashion.

The government took a commitment to the people of South Australia at the election that we would review these matters relating to school buses on a number of bases but particularly identifying concerns by non-government school parents in regional South Australia. There are a number of parents, school administrators and church hierarchy, particularly in the Clare area and in the member's electorate, who raise this on a regular basis. I have no doubt that they are in regular contact with the member's office.

The government will deliver on our commitment to have a review. There are officials working between the Treasury department, the transport department and the education department at the moment to get that review underway as soon as possible, and I look forward to that review being undertaken. It will not be the first review into school transport matters. The last one was about four years ago when the member was, of course, a member of the cabinet at the time.

That review paid scant regard to the needs of non-government school families. If the member read the review that I am sure went to his cabinet room, I think there was one page early on in the review that identified that it would be a costly measure and was not recommended. But the actual purpose of the review, as I understood at the time, was that the member had told his community he was going to do something for non-government school families.

This government, in establishing our review, will be seeking to get a better deal, a fair arrangement for non-government school families seeking to have access to transport services that in some cases go past the school on the way to the local public school. In some cases, this is easily done, and indeed the current arrangements do allow, where there is capacity in certain arrangements, for those students to potentially get on the bus. Whether it takes them to where they want to go is one question and whether they have security of being able to get on that bus is another thing. We ended up with entirely different circumstances confronting non-government school families in different areas, depending on issues that aren't in their control.

We understand the anxiety and we understand the concern. That's why we asked questions for 16 years of the former government, including in the last four years of the former government. That's why we took a commitment to the people of South Australia that we would have a review and we are doing just that.

ROAD UPGRADES

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Transport. When will works commence on the upgrade of the Main North, Dalkeith and Smith roads intersection, as funded in the Mid-Year Budget Review?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:40): I am more than happy to come back to the member for a more specific question. I do note we had a brief chat about this in the lounge earlier this morning. That money is still there. That project is very much still going ahead. It is part of a package of works in relation to a number of other intersections that are being upgraded as part of that same package of works. But in terms of a specific time line, I am more than happy to come back to the member.

GAWLER HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:41): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in this chamber. When will eight new vital sign monitors for critical care at the Gawler Health Service be installed, as promised by the Liberal candidate for Light?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:41): As has been said on numerous occasions, our government will fulfil all of our election commitments. We will all learn much more about this at 3 o'clock this afternoon, when the budget is handed down. We will deliver on our election commitments.

With regard to the specific question about those eight units, which the member asks about, if that question is not answered in the Treasurer's speech and/or in the documents that are handed out, then I will go to the health minister and get an answer and come back to him.

ALDINGA SOCCER CLUB

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. What has happened to the \$2 million allocated in last year's Mid-Year Budget Review for the Aldinga Soccer Club to build a soccer ground?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: We will hear it in the budget, no doubt.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:42): Thank you very much. Yes, all the details will be revealed in the budget. You know it too well, member for West Torrens. They will be outlined when the budget is handed down in a few moments' time. We have put a number of policies out there, in sport in particular. Last weekend, our grassroots and community sports program was very well received.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It has brought football, cricket and netball together—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —in the one program. They have actually put skin in the game on this as well, which is a really great win for all—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated for one moment. The member for Reynell is warned for a first time and the member for Badcoe is called to order. The minister will be heard in silence. Minister, please continue.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you very much. As I said, it has been very well received. Having all those three sports come together, and two of those sports put skin in the game with this program, with \$1 million each, is a really great win for South Australia.

ALDINGA SOCCER CLUB

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:43): Firstly, the question was about soccer and you talked about a program that has nothing to do with soccer—

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson will be seated. You are not to make a speech. You are here to ask questions. Member for Mawson, I am going to give someone else a go. I will come back to you because you well know what is required. The member for Florey has the call.

INDIGENOUS HEALTH SERVICES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:43): My question is to the Premier in his capacity as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Is the minister satisfied everything possible is being done to assist seriously ill Indigenous people forced to travel to Adelaide, often alone, to access health services, particularly with the provision of translators and liaison officers available 24 hours, seven days a week?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): It's a very broad question. If the member has anything specific that she would like to raise regarding people travelling from the APY lands down to Adelaide for treatment, then I am very happy to raise that issue with the relevant minister.

INDIGENOUS HEALTH SERVICES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:44): Supplementary to the Premier in his capacity as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs: is he satisfied that translators and liaison officers are available 24 hours, seven days a week?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): I will take that question on notice and come back to the member with an answer.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson.

Ms Bedford: Supplementary?

The SPEAKER: No. I have called the member for Mawson, member for Florey.

ALDINGA SOCCER CLUB

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:44): My question is a supplementary to the Minister for Recreation and Sport, and that is that—

The SPEAKER: Let's make it another question, member for Mawson.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Okay. Is it true that you and the Treasurer told the CEO and the mayor of Onkaparinga council that that \$2 million that was in last year's Mid-Year Budget Review for the Aldinga Soccer Club is no longer there?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:45): What I can tell the member—and again the budget will be handed down in a few moments' time and the detail will be given—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —is that we will be doing everything possible in this budget and beyond to fix the mess you left behind.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir. The question was very specific: did the member have a conversation with the chief executive and the mayor of the Onkaparinga—

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. What I will say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What I will say, though, is that the minister—quite respectfully, member for West Torrens—was being interjected by members on my left. I believe the minister has finished his answer, but I will keep an eye on future answers.

WINE INDUSTRY FUNDING

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. What is happening to the \$1.6 million annual funding for the wine sector to assist wineries to build or improve their cellar doors and to help our wine regions improve their regional offerings as well?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:46): I thank the member for his question. Yes, of course as he well knows, and as we all know as South Australians, the wine sector is probably one of the largest growth sectors here in South Australia. It's really important to note that there are a number of funds that were implemented by the previous government into the wine sector, and the \$1.6 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will cease interjecting.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —that was put into the cellar-door fund will continue. That has already had effect. It is supporting the wine sector and the cellar doors, and we will continue to support the wine industry. What I can tell the member is that, as he well knows and as I well know, living in a wine region with cellar doors as the entrance to their businesses, it is critically important that when government is allocating money to the wine sector through the cellar-door program that it is allocated with specific means.

It is also important to note that the wine sector will continue to receive above the \$1.6 million funding through our Regional Growth Fund, as well as other measures that could possibly be in today's budget.

MAIN SOUTH ROAD

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Transport. When will the duplication of Main South Road from Seaford to Sellicks be completed?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:47): I thank the member for his question, and I think that we will be delivering on the commitment. I don't want to preface what is said in the budget, but I have written letters to you and to the member for Kaurana, and to another member in this chamber, and I think that I have actually provided that answer in writing to you previously.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier, who has been patiently waiting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MENINGOCOCCAL B STRAIN VACCINATION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:48): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Can the minister update the house on the progress of the meningococcal B vaccine program?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:48): Yes—

Mr Picton: Don't mislead the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, no.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, I can. The meningococcal B vaccination program is very important, and it is no laughing matter. It is something that all members of this parliament were very interested in before the election. There was debate from both sides about whose policy was going to be best, and the reality is that the now Minister for Health, the Hon. Stephen Wade from the other place, said that he would undertake a thorough review of the best way to do it. Members opposite said that that was a delaying tactic, which of course it was not.

We all know that the health minister, the Hon. Stephen Wade, is an incredibly thorough person. He found out through that review by getting clinical advice from professionals with knowledge in the area—not from members of parliament but from people who could actually contribute to that review—that a targeted program was what was needed, that different support for different people from different age groups was probably one of the most important aspects. So he is delivering a program targeted to get the best benefit, and what is most important here, the best protection for people so that they hopefully will never contract meningococcal B.

Our government takes this work incredibly seriously, the Minister for Health takes this work incredibly seriously, and we are doing everything that we can do to prevent people from contracting meningococcal B, because we all know in this place what a dreadfully debilitating and quickly debilitating and incredibly hard to treat and hard to recover from disease it is. We will do the very best we can to stop people from being affected by it.

SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Minister, when will the government install the LED way-finding lights to increase the visibility for road users at the Happy Valley exit off the Southern Expressway, as promised during the election campaign by the Liberal candidate for Hurtle Vale?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:51): I thank the member for her question, and I think that the member has nine minutes to wait to be able to find out the answer to that.

The SPEAKER: A bit longer than that.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is 15 minutes to wait, sorry. I was getting excited. As I understand it there is budget detail provided. If that information is not there, I am happy to provide an answer to the member about that.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ELLIS: Can the minister update the house on the number of applications received through the competitive round of the Regional Growth Fund?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: You're falling apart.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport will cease interjecting, please. Minister.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:52): Thank you, sir, and I thank the member for Narungga for his keen interest in the Regional Growth Fund. I am sure that there are a number of his constituents who have applied for what is, I would say, a critical piece of funding to build and grow our regional sector.

I am very pleased to say that there has been an extremely high interest in the Regional Growth Fund. Applications for the \$5 million competitive grants closed on 31 August, and I can now announce that we have received 84 applications. I think that is an outstanding achievement, and it just goes to show that regional South Australia has been crying out for that accelerator funding for regional projects, infrastructure and community projects.

What it is showing me is that the previous government had a development fund for the regions. They were picking winners over and over again, so what it was doing in small communities was driving a wedge—one person next door to the other was given a competitive advantage over his competitive neighbour.

What we have done is we have opened up this competitive round that is specifically targeted for clustering, for collaboration, for regional communities, for businesses that will largely benefit in a collaborative way. It is about commodities benefiting rather than individuals, and so what we have seen is that this criteria that has been put in place will be independently assessed by that independent chair who will make recommendations to me as the minister to make sure that we get the best value for taxpayer spend in our regional centres.

Obviously this government has made a long-term commitment—10 years and \$150 million we have committed to the Regional Growth Fund—which is a commitment that the others on the other side could not give. We have given a long-term commitment so that regions can plan ahead. Of course, the \$5 million is bolstered by the \$10 million continual fund as part of the Regional Development Fund.

That \$10 million is put in place so that businesses, so that regional communities, can actually leverage other moneys, whether it is through the commonwealth government, whether it is through industry, whether it is through local government or whether it is through community clustering. That money will be best value for taxpayers.

I also remind everyone that that \$10 million, on top of the \$5 million, will be rigorously assessed as part of my portfolio. It won't just be given out willy-nilly. There will not be businesses that are given government money and then realise that they can't match the funding or they can't continue with that project. I think it's critically important that taxpayers' money is invested into our regions of South Australia wisely, and that will be taxpayers' money best spent.

ROAD UPGRADES

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Why, sir, have you scrapped the \$6 million upgrade to the Cheltenham Parade-Port Road intersection?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:55): I defer to the member for Cheltenham with his question to say that we haven't. This was actually something that was reported. It was the member for Lee who had a bit of a dig in the paper. I also noticed that the member for Lee had a bit of a dig on Twitter about the Henley Beach jetty in relation to the curved roof, which the member for Colton has been advocating very strongly on. It was actually him who made the decision, and now he is blaming me for the decision that he made.

In relation to this intersection, it's not that it has been scrapped: it's that it just got a whole lot more expensive. I think the former government may have known that. The project is still there; it is still sitting on the table. We are still keen to try to deliver it. It's just that the bucket of money—which, off the top of my head, is between \$5 million and \$6 million—doesn't touch the sides of what we are actually going to need to be able to deliver the project. Once again, there is a bit of mess that we are cleaning up. It is going to take us a little bit longer than the time we have had to be able to clean up the mess, but that project is still on the table. We are just working our way through what is the best way to deliver on that.

HOPGOOD THEATRE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:56): My question is to the Premier. How does the Premier respond to the 7,370 people who have signed a petition to save the Hopgood Theatre?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:56): It is extraordinary—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is extraordinary what's going on on that side. We will learn in a very short period of time how the former treasurer, the member for West Torrens, went into buckets all over the place looking for money that he could not continue funding that he could take out and stick into his little \$12 million surplus, the phony surplus that he told us we had before the election in the Mid-Year Budget Review, even though he was briefed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! Yes, we will hear more about the Hopgood Theatre. Minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —well before the election and well before making public comments about this wafer-thin—

Ms HILDYARD: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. There is a point of order. I take it the point of order is about standing order 98.

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Speaker, relevance.

The SPEAKER: Yes. Minister, could you please bring it back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Of course, it's very relevant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will cease interjecting.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —to the subject of the question. The facts are that there was no funding put into the forward estimates by the member for West Torrens. This is this perception, or this deception—'deception', I think, is a fairer word to the people of South Australia—this wafer-thin, phony \$12 million surplus. After he sold all the furniture and the silver, he then went to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —all the buckets of money around the place that were due for renewal of contracts. He didn't renew them, didn't fund them, so they could blame somebody else. But I am pleased to advise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the house that I have been advised by the Department for Industry and Skills. I met with Arts SA about this very matter. We are working with Country Arts to help identify a sustainable funding model for the ongoing operation of the Hopgood Theatre. We have found funding. It must have been hiding from the previous treasurer, this \$110,000. We found money for the 2018 financial year to give them time to explore alternative funding to continue the operation of the Hopgood Theatre.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will cease interjecting.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: My understanding, according to the briefing that was given to me by Country Arts, is that there is no other community theatre that is funded by state government contributions. It is a very unusual situation that has been going on for 10 years. My understanding is

that it was a temporary fix because the government at the time built the TAFE facility in the city for performing arts and it was no longer required by TAFE.

There is no rent paid by the Don Hopgood Theatre. It has a peppercorn rent of \$1 plus GST every year, but we are continuing the funding—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —for 12 months. We are working with the council to get a solution for this Labor-made problem. We are working with the council and other interested parties so that this theatre can continue to operate.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Reynell, I warn the member for Mawson for the first time and I call to order and warn the member for Badcoe. The member for Reynell has the call.

HOPGOOD THEATRE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:00): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is again to the Premier. What consultation did the government undertake before deciding to cut ongoing funding from the Hopgood Theatre?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (15:01): This is extraordinary; the member wasn't listening.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There was no money in the forward estimates.

Ms Stinson: I think you weren't listening to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I was listening.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There was no cut. If there was a cut, maybe she is confirming that it was the member for West Torrens who cut the budget prior to the Mid-Year Budget Review. The facts are—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —that the funding agreement, like so many other funding agreements, had come to an end. No negotiations were started by the mob on the other side there. 'Let's just kick the can along, get it over the election, and if we don't happen to get over the line it's something else we can blame the new government for,' that's the strategy of Labor. The facts are that the member for Reynell is being dishonest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —in suggesting that there was a cut. We have found funding for this year. We have found it: it has not been cut. The member for Reynell is being extremely 'cute', I think is the word, on this issue. She knows that the funding agreement wasn't renegotiated by the previous government. It was all part of putting together this wafer-thin perception of a surplus of the previous government, and now the people of the south are paying the price.

HOPGOOD THEATRE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:02): My question is again to the Premier. Will the Premier listen to community concerns and reinstate ongoing funding beyond one year for the Hopgood Theatre?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (15:03): We are working with Country Arts SA and we are working with the Onkaparinga council to come up with a long-term solution for the funding of the Don Hopgood Theatre. We have found the \$110,000 for the 2018-19 year so that we can work with those communities to deliver an outcome.

SPORTS FACILITIES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Will the minister, in association with the Minister for Education, work to allow future access to education department land so that it can be made available for community sporting club use, particularly after hours and on weekends?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:04): I thank the member for Florey for a very good question. The short answer is yes; I think that's a wonderful idea. The Minister for Education and I have spoken about this at length, and we will be very keen to work with sporting clubs and schools that want to engage to do that because you are right: getting people out, getting them active and getting them participating in sport is vital for our community to keep young people, in particular, healthy.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Florey.

SPORTS FACILITIES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:04): Will you then be able to visit, when you come out to the north-eastern suburbs, one of our local areas with a no longer used sporting oval attached to a soccer club where there's a lot of community use, where people are begging for extra pitches?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:04): The very, very short answer is yes.

HOPGOOD THEATRE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:04): My question is to the Premier. Premier, what analysis has been done by the government on the social and economic benefits of the Hopgood Theatre?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (15:05): It's like a broken record. The facts are that this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Any future for the Hopgood Theatre was supposed to be negotiated prior to the election. The facts are that we have extended—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the funding for the Hopgood Theatre because there was nothing put in place by this government. They kicked the can along.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: They kicked the can along for 12 months or more. Country Arts told me they were surprised and started to get concerned before the election because they hadn't had any interest from this government—this opposition, the Labor Party, the previous government—in looking at any extension or any new arrangement for funding. We are now left with a situation where we've got to fix Labor's mess, and we have found \$110-odd thousand to fund the 2018-19 year. We are continuing with the peppercorn rent of \$1.10 per year so that the theatre can remain on site. It is those opposite that have caused the embarrassment to the southern community, not the government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease interjecting.

Parliamentary Procedure

BUDGET PAPERS

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:06): I lay on the table the following 2018-19 budget papers:

Budget Overview—Budget Paper 1
 Budget Speech—Budget Paper 2
 Budget Statement—Budget Paper 3
 Agency Statements—Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4—Budget Paper 4
 Budget Measures Statement—Budget Paper 5

I move:

That the Budget Statement, Agency Statements and Budget Measures Statement be published.

Motion carried.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2018

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the year ending 30 June 2019 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier wish to seek leave to continue his remarks?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, sir.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Admit the honourable Treasurer.

The Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas) was admitted to the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the Treasurer begins, I respectfully ask members to respect the conventions of the house at this time. The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): Mr Speaker, it is nice to be back; it is a long time. I thank you for the honour of visiting and I can assure you, much as I enjoy your company, Mr Speaker, it will only be for a relatively brief period. I can assure you it will be solely for the purpose of presenting the second reading of the Appropriation Bill.

After 16 very long years, the people of South Australia on 17 March overwhelmingly elected a new Premier, and a new government pledged to implement a comprehensive reform agenda based on new priorities, projects and programs. This budget unashamedly is directed towards this reform agenda: to create jobs, lower costs for struggling families and provide better services for all South Australians. This budget will clean up Labor's financial mess, keep our election promises and establish a strong foundation for our state's future.

Some governments in the past—both state and federal, Labor and Liberal—have used the discovery of a financial mess or a financial black hole as an excuse not to keep their election promises. This government will not use the discovery of the extent of Labor's financial mess as an excuse not to keep our election promises.

This government's reform agenda, reflected in this budget, will help create jobs by lowering the costs of doing business for all businesses in the state, rather than relying on politicians and public servants trying to pick winners and giving handouts to a small number of lucky businesses. This budget will reduce the cost of living for struggling families by cutting wastes and taxes and charges, rather than relying on trying to introduce a new tax every budget, such as a bank tax, a car park tax or new betting and foreign investor taxes.

This budget will seek to provide better services by placing as much emphasis on productivity outcomes and outputs, rather than just relying on inputs and how much we spend on a service. This budget will acknowledge the critical importance of regional South Australia, rather than thinking the boundaries of our state end at the tollgate and Elizabeth. After 16 years, this budget will be a clear break from the past, with new priorities, projects and programs, which will mean that some of the priorities, projects and programs of the former Labor government will have to be cut or stopped.

The incoming government briefing folder prepared for the government by Treasury made it clear that there were very significant problems with the budget: budget blowouts; massive overspending; negligence; financial incompetence and deception, including a hidden contractual option to privatise the motor vehicles registry; a former government that had all the financial discipline of footballers on an end-of-season footy trip; and a former treasurer who spent \$2.7 million out of a slush fund, in the months leading up to the election, on a series of projects, with the priority of assisting Labor members and candidates. Reading this briefing folder was like the financial equivalent of reading a script for an episode of *Breaking Bad*: mayhem, deception and one atrocity after another.

The estimates included in the former Labor government's last budget and Mid-Year Budget Review were unsustainable. The former Labor government had used a series of one-off financial sugar hits from the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission, with dividends estimated to total \$1.7 billion over the eight years from 2014-15 to create artificial budget surpluses, which were unsustainable once the MAC dividends had been spent. For example, the Mid-Year Budget Review released in December 2017 claimed a \$12 million surplus for 2017-18, and the MAC dividends were now expected to be \$341.5 million in that year. The monthly financial monitoring report prepared by Treasury for January 2018—I remind members that that is just two months before the election—included the following summary, and I quote:

Projected total deterioration in the net operating budget of \$193.7 million means that the budget is clearly in deficit in 2017-18.

The new government, after the election, received the March 2018 quarterly monitoring report, which reported the budget operating deterioration for 2017-18 as \$187.9 million. The former Labor government, over many years, failed to manage persistent budget blowouts and overspending and consistently failed to deliver on budgeted savings targets. For example, in nearly every year, the health portfolio has failed to achieve the savings task allocated to it in that year's budget. During 2017-18, SA Health was given an extra \$65 million at the start of the year, \$132 million in December 2017 and then \$70 million at the end of the year (\$267 million in total) to compensate for budget blowouts or overspending.

In fact, in 2017-18, the Central Adelaide Local Health Network (CALHN) alone reported overspending of about \$250 million, coming after reported overspending over the previous four years ranging between \$58 million and \$146 million. In recent days, the government has received an interim update from external advisers Korda Mentha for CALHN for 2018-19 which indicates overspending continues and, in fact, may have worsened. It is clear now that urgent corrective action will need to be taken.

Budget blowouts and overspending are not limited just to the health portfolio but have also existed in a number of other portfolios, including child protection and TAFE SA. This year's budget has had to allocate an extra \$90 million over the forward estimates to help bail out TAFE SA from budget blowouts and an inability to meet revenue targets outlined in previous budgets. The former Labor government's record over many years shows that they either lacked the financial management competence or political will, or both, to deliver on the savings underpinning their budget forward estimates.

Over the forward estimates period outlined in the Mid-Year Budget Review, the former Labor government claimed future budget surpluses based on the assumption that very significant savings targets would be achieved. For example, their Mid-Year Budget Review assumed total Labor savings of \$248 million in 2018-19 increasing to \$715 million in 2021-22. These Labor savings targets included very significant and unrealistically high savings targets for the health portfolio. However, the former Labor government's record in failing to achieve savings targets meant the projected budget surpluses were fictional and highly unlikely ever to be achieved.

As a result, this year's budget has had to allocate an extra \$730 million over the forward estimates to try to ensure a sustainable health system. Even with these extra resources, health will still have significant savings targets left to it by the former Labor government. The result of these budget blowouts and overspending is that the former Labor government has left a massive budget deficit of \$397 million in 2017-18 rather than the claimed surplus of \$12 million. This deficit means that seven of the last 10 budgets of the former Labor government have resulted in budget deficits.

In addition to this massive deficit left by the former Labor government, they have also left the new government with a massive increase in the total non-financial public sector net debt. When the former Labor government was first elected, total net debt was \$3.2 billion and, based on projections from the last Mid-Year Budget Review, total net debt would have risen to \$15.5 billion by 30 June 2022. That is just a brief outline of the extent of the financial mess left by the former Labor government.

The one element of good budget news since the Mid-Year Budget Review has been the unexpected increases in estimated goods and services tax (GST) revenue of around \$300 million per annum, on average, from 2018-19. In broad terms, this is roughly equivalent to the modest package of election commitments made by the government during its election campaign period. What this means is the government is now left with having to achieve the significant Labor savings targets of up to \$715 million per year by 2021-22 outlined in the former Labor government's Mid-Year Budget Review as well as meet the cost pressures left unaddressed by the former government.

This budget not only meets that financial challenge but also outlines a framework for funding a significant number of new initiatives. This budget outlines modest budget surpluses for each year of the forward estimates ranging from \$48 million in 2018-19 up to \$211 million in 2021-22. The budget papers note that from 1 July next year a new Australian Accounting Standard (AASB1059)—I am sure all members will be familiar with that one—will require a different accounting treatment of the Land Services Commercialisation transaction, which may result in an improvement in the reported surplus of about \$38 million per year over the forward estimates.

Underlying these budget surpluses, the government has adopted a conservative budgeting approach by setting aside responsible contingencies in each year of the forward estimates. Due to the lateness of the budget and the inevitable delay in the implementation of some of the required savings strategies, the government has accepted that 2018-19 will be a transition year. The government will provide \$170 million in 2018-19 to fund centrally TVSPs for agencies. After 2018-19, agencies will be required to fund their own TVSPs.

One key priority of this budget has been to create the environment for jobs and economic growth. The government accepts that our small and medium-sized businesses must be nationally and internationally competitive and, for this to occur, the costs of doing business in South Australia have to be nationally and internationally competitive. This budget:

- abolishes payroll tax for all small businesses from 1 January 2019—businesses with payrolls up to \$1.5 million will be exempt from payroll tax and there is phased relief for businesses with payrolls up to \$1.7 million;
- provides land tax relief from 1 July 2020, with the tax-free threshold increased up to \$450,000 and the marginal tax rate for the current top land tax threshold up to \$5 million being reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent;
- supports electricity cost relief through a range of reforms, including support for a new interconnector between New South Wales and South Australia, \$150 million over four

years for grid scale and household battery storage systems and \$30 million over three years for demand management trials;

- provides \$202.6 million over four years for the Skilling South Australia initiative to create up to 20,800 additional apprenticeships and traineeships;
- provides \$21.5 million over four years to increase funding to attract major events and conventions to further drive visitor numbers and job creation; and
- provides \$12.8 million over four years to establish new trade and investment offices in China, USA, Japan, Malaysia and the United Arab Emirates to drive exports and job creation.

Supporting these initiatives is a radical new approach to providing industry support, with much less emphasis being placed on politicians and public servants 'picking winners' for the receipt of taxpayer-funded grants and loans. The government's recent audit of the former Labor government's industry assistance policy found that in 2017-18 alone there were 30 different programs, which involved \$260 million in grants and \$162 million in loans being given to businesses. In one case, one business was honest enough to say publicly that they would have come to South Australia even if they had not received the \$10 million grant and loan from the former Labor government.

The audit showed that, even when applications from businesses failed to meet the very flexible rules that were meant to apply to funding from the Future Jobs Fund, the former Labor government just ignored those rules. In fact, they offered \$29 million in grants and loans to seven businesses that Treasury said did not comply with the rules because of poor balance sheets, too high a cost per job, or where it was concluded to be 'too high a risk' to taxpayers. Some of these loans were interest free for more than 10 years and, in one case, the cost per job was \$385,000.

The only explanation for another case relating to a \$3 million loan to a business associated with a popular Adelaide restaurant that did not comply with the rules was it appeared that the former premier directed that a cabinet submission be prepared to have the \$3 million loan approved.

This budget winds up a large number of the former Labor government's programs and will concentrate its financial assistance through three key areas:

- a new Economic and Business Growth Fund, with \$100 million committed over four years;
- the Regional Growth Fund—\$60 million over four years; and
- the Research, Commercialisation and Start-Up Fund—\$27.9 million over four years.

Whilst direct financial assistance might still be offered in limited circumstances, the new emphasis will be on proposals that have broader benefits for an industry sector or a number of businesses. All due diligence and contract management for any grants or loans will be managed centrally by SAFA, which is located in Treasury.

This budget also introduces a series of measures to help reduce costs for all South Australians. Some of these include:

- reducing ESL bills by \$90 million per year from 1 July this year, which will result in a saving of more than 50 per cent, or around \$145 this year, on a \$470,000 property in metropolitan Adelaide;
- cutting up to \$306 per year for some public transport users who use the regular 28-day passes, with a total cost to budget of about \$15.4 million over four years;
- providing a \$100 sports voucher each year towards the cost of membership or registration fees for primary school-aged children participating in sport and recreation programs, at a total cost of \$29.7 million over four years;
- capping NRM levy increases from 1 July 2019 at a rate set by an independent body or according to the consumer price index;
- capping local government council rate increases;

- providing more affordable hospital car parking;
- commencing implementing our new energy solution to cut electricity costs; and
- abolishing the \$59.40 fee for volunteer screening checks for working with children and vulnerable people, at a total cost of \$4.9 million over four years.

The third priority of the government's reform agenda and this budget is the delivery of better services to all South Australians. The government accepts that, whilst dollars invested in services are one measure of a government's commitment to services, what is just as important is the quality of the services being delivered. This means that measures of quality such as outcomes and outputs are just as important as measures of inputs. For example, even with all the money invested in our health system, South Australia has the worst performance of any state in terms of the percentage of emergency department visits completed within four hours, with only 64 per cent seen in this time.

This government also accepts that our state's future and economic and job growth prospects are highly dependent on the quality of education and training provided by our schools, training institutions and universities. The recent NAPLAN results for numeracy, reading and spelling showed that our results remained the lowest or second to lowest of all states in 17 out of 20 domains. The importance of the government's new \$20.9 million Literacy Guarantee over four years, therefore, cannot be underestimated.

This Literacy Guarantee will include many initiatives, including phonics checks for all year 1 students, 13 literacy coaches to provide professional development for teachers and free dyslexia workshops for parents across South Australia. The guarantee will also require all new graduating teachers to have passed a literacy and numeracy test. This budget includes further initiatives including:

- \$27.7 million to commence work to move year 7 students into secondary schools;
- \$15.5 million for early intervention approaches, strategies and support to address bullying, truancy and substance abuse; and
- \$12.2 million for languages in schools programs.

This budget is also committing to a massive increase in funding to our schools. The total annual funding to education in 2021-22 will be \$515 million more than the total spending in the last year of the former Labor government (2017-18). This will be the largest investment in schools by any state government in the history of our state.

In addition to this massively increased investment in education, this budget allocates another \$110 million over five years to help TAFE SA meet the well-publicised challenges that confront that organisation. The government accepts that in the immediate future, TAFE SA's budget was unsustainable and in particular the targets for external revenue growth were unrealistic. This budget, however, still reflects the government's position that TAFE SA will reform its operation to be competitive with private sector training providers.

The budget also provides significant savings relief for health because the government believes that the savings targets it inherited from the former government were not realistic or achievable. This budget promises an extra \$800 million over five years to the health budget. In addition, the health budget provides funding for a range of new initiatives over the forward estimates, including the following:

- \$40 million to reduce elective surgery waiting lists;
- \$56 million as part of a \$140 million 10-year plan to improve country health facilities;
- \$30.7 million for a meningococcal B immunisation program for babies and young people;
- \$23 million to support the re-establishment of a four-bed high dependency unit at the Modbury Hospital;
- \$20 million for a rural health workforce strategy to address the shortage of health practitioners in rural areas;

- \$16 million for increased palliative care support for people in the final stages of their life;
- \$5.2 million for planning and design of a new Women's and Children's Hospital with the existing funding for the former government's women's hospital still held centrally by Treasury;
- \$10 million to strengthen cardiac services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital; and
- this one, I know, will be of great interest to the member for Mount Gambier: \$2.1 million to expand renal dialysis facilities at the Mount Gambier hospital.

Mr Bell, I am just a little sad that my mother did not live long enough to enjoy those wonderful new facilities that the government is going to provide. Protecting our children and our most vulnerable always remains a major priority for any government. This budget provides an extra \$30.9 million over two years to meet additional costs for children in care. An additional \$8.8 million is provided to extend foster and kinship support to carers of young people up to the age of 21 years.

An important step for any government in taking responsibility for and helping to heal the pain caused by sexual abuse of children in government institutions was to join the National Redress Scheme. However, the government discovered that not one dollar had been budgeted for by the former Labor government to meet the estimated costs of the scheme. This government took immediate action and quarantined \$146.4 million in a specific fund in SAFA to meet the total estimated cost of the Redress Scheme. Balances being held in the Victims of Crime Fund were used to provide this much-needed funding.

This budget also provides \$11.9 million to implement comprehensive programs to address domestic violence, including \$4 million in funding for 40 additional domestic and family violence crisis beds. This budget introduces practical environmental programs that build the resilience of our coasts, parks and communities, which when combined with the government's energy solution—which includes increasing battery and grid-scale storage—clearly demonstrate the government's commitment to reducing emissions and protecting our environment. As a result of amendments by the former Labor government to the Zero Waste Act, balances in the Green Industry Fund are being used to fund these battery programs and seagrass meadow restoration programs.

In addition, the government is committed to the \$390 million project that will see SA Water's electricity costs reduced to net zero by 2020 through increased use of renewable energy at a majority of their sites. A range of initiatives is included in this budget to tackle environmental issues, including:

- \$5.2 million to help protect our pristine coastline and beaches with funding for artificial reefs, sand replenishment and seagrass meadow restoration;
- \$7.5 million to employ an additional 20 park rangers;
- \$5 million to help open South Australia's reservoirs for recreational use; and
- \$10 million towards developing the new Glenthorne national park.

This budget provides significant additional resources and funding to allow the extension of opening hours at police stations at Henley Beach, Glenelg and Norwood through the use of a new staffing model. Significantly, these additional resources will allow the establishment of a new counterterrorism rapid response group, which will significantly enhance the ability of police to respond rapidly to higher risk incidents, including terrorist incidents.

The budget also provides \$14.5 million in additional resources to the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Office for Public Integrity. This budget will provide around \$773 million over five years to grow economic opportunities, as well as improve community infrastructure in regional communities.

The Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund has been established with a guaranteed funding source of 30 per cent of royalties and this will provide \$315 million over the next four years. Total funding over four years of \$82 million will also be provided for the Regional Growth Fund, mobile phone black spot funding and for Regional Development Australia boards.

Dry conditions have impacted significant farming production areas this year, but for many farmers the amount of rainfall over coming weeks will determine what type of season they will have. The government has established a Dry Conditions Working Group with farm representatives to monitor and plan if it does not rain. Significant support measures currently exist to assist South Australian farmers experiencing drought and financial hardship. Prudent management of the budget will enable the government to support communities affected by drought-like conditions if additional assistance measures are required.

The government understands the historical importance of public investment in infrastructure in terms of helping generate job growth and economic growth. Despite government assurances to the contrary, there have been some people seeking to cause alarm about a supposed 'valley of death' because the government was going to slash infrastructure spending. I am delighted to indicate that this budget includes a massive increase in infrastructure investment.

This budget commits to a total government investing program of \$11.3 billion over the forward estimates. In fact, the total government investing program this year will be \$3.15 billion or \$576 million higher than the \$2.57 billion program spent by the former Labor government last year. The average total government investing program over the forward estimates will be \$245 million higher than total government investing spent by the former Labor government last year.

Since the 2018-19 federal budget, the government has been negotiating with the commonwealth government to bring forward into the forward estimates funding for three major transport projects. As a result of the collaborative and productive working relationship with the commonwealth government, this budget now includes an additional \$395 million: \$125 million for the Regency Road to Pym Street upgrade, \$170 million for the Gawler rail electrification project and \$100 million for the Joy Baluch AM Bridge.

In addition to these three projects, the government has also successfully negotiated an extra \$70.8 million toward the construction of the overpass at the intersection of the Copper Coast Highway and Augusta Highway and for the widening of Augusta Highway at Port Wakefield. Some of the other major infrastructure spending over the forward estimates includes:

- \$169 million for 270 high-security beds at Yatala Labour Prison and 40 beds at Adelaide Women's Prison;
- \$109 million for the redevelopment of Lot Fourteen (formerly the Royal Adelaide Hospital site);
- \$688 million to upgrade schools, including increasing capacity to facilitate the transition of year 7 students to high school;
- \$361 million for two new reception to year 12 schools in the metropolitan area and a year 7-12 school in Whyalla;
- \$264 million for the Seaford to Aldinga Main South Road duplication out of a total project cost of \$305 million;
- \$578 million for the Gawler rail electrification project, with a total project cost of \$615 million;
- \$354 million for the Regency Road to Pym Street upgrade;
- \$91 million for the Modbury Hospital upgrade;
- \$272 million for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment;
- \$56 million for Country Health facilities;
- \$315 million for the Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund;
- \$89 million for the Port Wakefield project;
- \$15 million for the Penola bypass project; and
- \$15 million for safety screens, security and cameras on the Southern Expressway.

As a result of this massive increase in investment in productive infrastructure, total non-financial public sector net debt will rise from the \$15.5 billion estimated from the Labor government's Mid-Year Budget Review to \$16.9 billion in June 2022.

As outlined earlier, the former Labor government left the government with significant savings tasks to be achieved of up to \$715 million per year by 2021-22. Whilst this financial mess is not of our making, the government accepts the responsibility of cleaning up the mess. This budget adopts a completely new approach to expenditure restraint or responsibly achieving saving targets. There is no escaping the reality that meeting the former Labor government's savings task of \$715 million per year will require difficult decisions by government.

Agencies were advised that it was no longer acceptable to adopt only the 'salami slicing' approach to expenditure restraint by maintaining all existing programs and taking a small slice or efficiency dividend off every program. Agencies were directed to return to first principles and adopt a simplified version of zero-based budgeting by looking for wasteful or low-priority programs or projects that could be abolished.

Consistent with that directive, the following projects, programs, units and agencies have been discontinued or defunded. It should be noted that for some of these programs the former Labor government had already made the decision not to provide ongoing funding, e.g., for the Future Jobs Fund and the Retrenched Workers Program. I will now go through that list:

- Economic Development Board
- Independent Gambling Authority
- Laptops for students program
- Commissioner for Kangaroo Island
- Riverbank Authority
- Investment Attraction Advisory Board
- Health Industries Advisory Board and grants program
- TechInSA
- Fund My Neighbourhood program
- Northern Connections
- Southern Connections
- Unlocking Capital for Jobs fund

Honourable members: Shame!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You even said 'shame' to that—goodness. It only had one application.

An honourable member: Two.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Two, and one got knocked back.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Sorry, Mr Speaker. Continuing:

- Economic Investment Fund
- Small Business Development Fund
- Food parks tenant attraction grant program
- SA Early Commercialisation Fund
- Renewable Technology Industry Development Program

- Digital game development program
- Automotive Supplier Diversification Program
- Advanced Food Manufacturing program
- SA Premium Food and Wine Credentials Program
- Energy Productivity grants program from 2019-20
- Mining and Petroleum Centre of Excellence grant program
- Premier's Research and Industry Fund, which we transitioned into the Research, Commercialisation and Start-Up Fund
- Strategic Industry Development Fund, which will also be transitioned into the Research, Commercialisation and Start-Up Fund
- Future Jobs Fund
- Renewable Technology Fund
- Careers Services Program
- Dob in a Litterer program
- Regional Capability Community grant program
- Synthetic playing surface and women's sporting facilities fund, which will be replaced by a new program
- Retrenched Workers Program
- Jobs First Employment Projects fund
- Personal Support Program

In addition to these savings measures, the government has also kept its promise to cut spending on consultants, contractors, government advertising, ministerial staff and ministerial cars. This government, prior to the election, made specific commitments when asked to commit 'to not privatising, outsourcing or commercialising any public sector assets and services'. Our commitment was to not privatise SA Water, and the following response was issued to the Public Service Association and others:

There are many current examples (under the Labor government) where public services are being successfully delivered by private or non-government suppliers. We have a responsibility to consider such options where it is clearly in the public interest to do so.

This budget keeps that promise. This budget outlines that the operations of the Adelaide Remand Centre will be outsourced to a private provider. Staff will have the option of transferring to other public sector prison operations if they wish to take up that option. In health, in areas such as pathology services and imaging services, similar assessments will be made consistent with our promise. Efficiencies will be pursued in these areas consistent with the intent of delivering services consistent with interstate peers. If these efficiencies are not achieved, then the option of providing services from alternative providers will be pursued.

In considering the operation of a high-quality and efficient health system, the government acknowledges the critical role of all staff but especially our nurses and doctors. However, when considering options for achieving savings to meet the national efficient price, then all costs need to be assessed. Clinicians employed in public hospitals have rights of private practice, which allow them to generate additional personal income through treating private patients in public health facilities. Counting their public sector salary plus this private income, Health advises that there are currently 290 salaried medical officers who earned more than \$500,000 in 2017-18, with two salaried medical officers who earned more than \$1 million.

In South Australia, for rights of private practice entitlements clinicians pay the health system an administration fee of 9 per cent of private income, whereas in Queensland and Western Australia

the fee is up to 68 per cent and in New South Wales it is up to 90 per cent. The government will initiate a review as a priority and seek a more reasonable contribution to the costs of use of public health facilities to generate this private income. There are a range of other savings measures that are outlined in the budget papers, which include the following:

- closure of some TAFE campuses with low utilisation rates;
- closure of some Service SA centres;
- cutting some low patronage bus services routes;
- increasing some housing trust rents, with increases limited to \$10 per week for each scheduled rate change;
- increased cost recovery by the EPA for licensing facilities with underground petroleum storage systems and providing support for businesses for environmental regulations and community response;
- Arts SA's role will be refocused to one of provision of policy advice to government; and
- increasing liquor licensing fees informed by recommendations contained in the Anderson review into liquor regulation.

The former government's Mid-Year Budget Review, released in December 2017, estimated a reduction of 2,047 full-time equivalent employees in the general government sector between 30 June 2018 and 30 June 2021. Excluding NDIS related transfers, this budget estimates a reduction of 2,286 FTE employees between 30 June 2018 and 30 June 2022.

After the transfer of FTEs delivering disability services to the non-government sector, the reduction over the same period will be 4,013 FTEs. The budget papers note that these estimates are notional and actual changes may vary. As has occurred for many years, agencies have the flexibility to deliver the savings in the manner that best suits the needs of the agency.

As the budget papers reveal, total grants from the commonwealth account for more than 50 per cent of the state's total revenue, with GST being the biggest component. Therefore, a successful resolution to the current discussions over the GST and possible changes to the horizontal fiscal equalisation methodology are critical to the state's budget and economic future. Even though the commonwealth estimates their latest offer would lead to additional funding to South Australia in the later years of the forward estimates, they have not been included in this budget.

The government's position during these discussions remains that we will not support any changes that disadvantage South Australia. The government welcomes the optimistic signs for the South Australian economy evident in the job and economic growth estimates included in the budget. Job growth for 2018-19 is estimated to be 1.5 per cent compared to the 1.1 per cent estimate included in the former Labor government's December 2017 Mid-Year Budget Review. Similarly, state final demand (SFD) is now estimated to grow by 2.5 per cent in 2018-19 compared to the 2.25 per cent estimate included in the former Labor government's December 2017 Mid-Year Budget Review.

Many years ago, in 1994, a former Liberal government took a sensible long-term policy decision to fully fund the state's massive unfunded superannuation liabilities by 2034. At the time, I recall thinking 40 years was a very long time and wondered whether it would ever be achieved. I am pleased to report that 24 years later this budget commits another \$1.7 billion over the forward estimates and that we remain on track to meet that 40-year policy commitment.

This budget is based on similar long-term thinking and policy realignment. Any new government with a comprehensive reform agenda based on new policies, programs and priorities will have to take difficult decisions. This budget establishes a strong foundation for a sound financial future and, in doing so, some of the priorities of the former government have to be discarded. It is a time for change. The people of South Australia voted for change.

They made it clear that it was unacceptable for job growth in South Australia to be lower than the national job growth rate. They made it clear that it was unacceptable for our NAPLAN results to be the lowest or second lowest of all states in the nation. They made it clear that it was unacceptable

for our patients to wait longer for emergency treatment than anyone else. This government understands the challenge, and is directing extra resources and programs to tackling these issues in this budget. This budget delivers on our election promises to create jobs, lower costs for struggling families and provide better services for all South Australians.

I would like to thank all of my ministerial colleagues in particular for the cheerful and willing way they have participated in and supported the budget process. They have all assured me that they will be right behind me. I also place on the record my thanks to all the hardworking Treasury staff, who have worked long hours in the massive task of putting together a new budget for a new government.

Finally, I thank all the staff in my ministerial office, without whose hard work and commitment to this job we would never have met many of the deadlines required. I commend this budget to the house.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:51): I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2018. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

3—Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

4—Issue and application of money

This clause provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in Schedule 1 to the Bill. Subsection (2) makes it clear that the appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act* is superseded by this Bill.

5—Application of money if functions or duties of agency are transferred

This clause is designed to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency, the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

6—Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

This clause provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

7—Additional appropriation under other Acts

This clause makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament, except, of course, in the *Supply Act*.

8—Overdraft limit

This sets a limit of \$50 million on the amount which the Government may borrow by way of overdraft.

Schedule 1—Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 2019.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Ministerial Statement

GAMBLING REGULATION REVIEW

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:51): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: On 26 September 2016, the former government approved an administrative review of the regulations controlling commercial gambling in South Australia and the appointment of retired Supreme Court judge, Tim Anderson QC, to undertake the review. Today, I table that review in parliament. The review makes a number of conclusions regarding regulatory options for South Australia, the regulatory model, the oversight of commercial gambling and the not-for-profit sector.

Under initiatives announced in the state budget today, the government intends to dissolve the Independent Gambling Authority, with the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner to assume sole responsibility for the regulation of commercial gambling in South Australia. The changes are expected to come into effect on 1 December, and will also include the establishment of a new gambling advisory council, involving both government and stakeholders, who will work collaboratively to address critical gambling-related matters. These decisions have been informed by the conclusions of the review.

As the review contains portions of personally and commercially-sensitive information that were not relevant to the financial conclusions, that information has been redacted. Specifically, the review investigates the roles of the Independent Gambling Authority and Club One in terms of regulation and commercial gambling. The former government provided a copy of the review to the Independent Gambling Authority; however, they did not provide the same procedural fairness to Club One for consideration, which has since been rectified.

I would like to confirm that no action is currently being taken by the government in relation to the conclusions made by Mr Anderson in respect of Club One. The changes announced today, however, will deliver substantial and long-delayed reform to the administration of the gambling industry in South Australia in establishing a single regulator for the commercial gaming industry. I table the report.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:54): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction of a bill forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house is present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:54): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to make amendments to various acts, and to repeal various acts, for the purposes of the 2018 state budget. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The 2018-19 budget delivers on the government's election commitment to grow jobs, including through tax relief, improve services and invest in our future. It also recognises the need to make a range of savings and reforms to government services to address the financial position left by the former government, and ensure the state's finances are sustainable going forward. This bill contains measures relating to the government's 2018-19 budget.

It is proposed to consolidate the gambling regulatory regime in South Australia, removing the unnecessary regulatory burden on industry. The Independent Gambling Authority (IGA) will be consolidated within Consumer and Business Services, which will perform the regulatory functions of the IGA. The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, through Consumer and Business Services, will

become the sole regulator and assume the operational enforcement responsibilities currently undertaken by the IGA.

The IGA Act, Authorised Betting Operations Act, Casino Act, Gaming Machines Act, Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act, Liquor Licensing Act, Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act, Racing (Proprietary Business Licensing) Act and State Lotteries Act will be amended to remove the reference to the IGA and replace it with a reference to the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner.

The consolidation of operations into a single regulator is consistent with the recommendations of the Administrative Review of Gambling Regulation in South Australia by the Hon. Tim Anderson QC, which was initiated by the former government. The review determined that the simplest and most effective way of regulating commercial gambling in South Australia would be through a single regulator rather than the current confusing and competing duopoly.

It is proposed that the transfer of the IGA's existing powers and functions to the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner will take effect from 1 December 2018. The abolition of the IGA and the transfer of its functions to the Consumer and Business Services is expected to provide savings of approximately \$483,000 (indexed) per annum from 2019-20.

The 2018-19 budget includes additional revenue of \$3.16 million per annum (indexed) from 2019-20 from an increase in annual liquor licensing fees. The review of the South Australian Liquor Licensing Act by the Hon. Tim Anderson QC recommended increases in all annual liquor fees. The revised fee structure included in the budget reflects lower increases generally, with smaller increases for single-venue licensees and regional venues.

To effect this, Consumer and Business Services has developed a fee structure that provides discounts for certain licence holders within licence categories. A minor amendment is therefore proposed to the Liquor Licensing Act to clarify the extent of the regulation-making power in that act relating to fees, to make it clear that the discounted fees can be set by regulation.

This bill removes the royalty concession on new mines from 1 July 2020. The new mine concession was introduced in the Mining Act in January 2006. The 2 per cent new mine royalty rate provides a concession of 60 per cent compared to the applicable mineral royalty rate in South Australia of 5 per cent for ores and concentrates, and a 43 per cent concession compared to the 3.5 per cent royalty for refined metals or industrial minerals. Since its inception, a number of new mines have benefited from the reduced royalty rate. However, a number of marginal mines have received the new mine rate, with the mine closing shortly after the expiry of the five-year new mine rate royalty period.

To help with mine project planning, this bill provides fair and reasonable transitional arrangements. Any new mine approved prior to 1 July 2020 will continue to be eligible for the new mine rate concession up to five years after 1 July 2020 or 30 June 2026, whichever comes first. South Australia will continue to remain one of the most competitive jurisdictions in Australia to undertake mining activities.

The bill amends the Local Government Act so that, from 1 July 2019, the 52¢ per tonne royalty on extractive minerals recovered from council borrow pits will be abolished. This measure delivers on the government's election promise to remove the initiative introduced in July 2015 by the previous government. The government's removal of this royalty will help to reduce the financial and administrative burden on councils, particularly regional councils, when delivering and maintaining local roads for the benefit and safety of their communities.

The previous arrangement provided that a component of the royalty would be paid to the Local Government Association Research and Development Scheme. This will cease upon the royalties no longer being paid by councils. The measure will reduce revenue by over \$1 million per annum, with a net budget deterioration of \$231,000 per annum.

Consistent with our election commitment, the government will close the Office of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. As a result, the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island Act will be repealed. Kangaroo Island is an important South Australian region, and we will ensure our resources

are directed to support the island's economic growth and community services rather than supporting unnecessary bureaucracy.

The Stamp Duties Act 1923 will be amended to expand the current stamp duty exemption for family farm transfers to include those involving companies. Stamp duty is an impediment to family farm transfers involving companies, and we are therefore amending the Stamp Duties Act to ensure all genuine transfers of family farms are treated similarly and are exempt from stamp duty. This exemption is subject to all other criteria regarding family farm transfers being met, including that the land to which the transfer relates is used wholly or mainly for the business of primary production land and is not less than 0.8 hectares in area, that the sole or principal business of the transferral is the business for the primary production and that a business relationship has existed between the parties for a period of more than 12 months immediately before the relevant transfer.

The bill also includes an amendment to provide a stamp duty exemption on premiums paid in relation to multi-peril crop insurance policies entered into from 1 January 2018. Multi-peril crop insurance policies provide cover for crop loss resulting from a range of perils, including fire, frost, hail and drought. This exemption will reduce the cost to South Australian farmers who take out multi-peril crop insurance to manage risks and give them the confidence to plant more crops and target higher yields with the reassurance that they can be financially protected for their input costs in the event of a peril. It is estimated that this exemption will provide a benefit to around 100 insurance policies each year. These amendments commence retrospectively from 1 January 2018.

In addition, this bill also makes a number of minor amendments to the Stamp Duties Act to facilitate the collection of data as part of the commonwealth government's initiatives on third-party reporting and the national register of foreign ownership of land titles. Amendments to the Taxation Administration Act are also included in the bill to provide the Commissioner of State Taxation with the ability to collect and disclose the information required by the commonwealth government.

The budget bill includes amendments to give effect to our election commitment to provide land tax relief. The tax-free threshold will be increased, and we are introducing a new tax bracket and marginal tax rate from 1 July 2020. The tax-free threshold for land tax in 2020-21 will be \$450,000, compared with the current level of \$369,000. The top marginal tax rate will also be reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent for holdings currently valued at \$1.2 million up to \$5 million. The top threshold will become \$5 million in 2020-21, with an associated marginal tax rate of 3.7 per cent for land tax ownerships over this amount. All other marginal tax rates remain the same. This measure is estimated to benefit over 50,000 land tax ownerships, including around \$8,000 or no longer have a land tax liability.

Land tax thresholds will continue to be indexed up to and after these changes in line with average increases in site values as determined by the Valuer-General to limit the impact of bracket creep. The bill makes two technical amendments to the Payroll Tax Act 2009. The first amendment reinstates the policy intent on the introduction of the owner-driver exemption within the contract of provisions prior to the adverse decision in the New South Wales Supreme Court in the decision of *Smith's Snackfood Company Ltd v Chief Commissioner of State Revenue (NSW)* [2012] NSWSC 998.

In that matter, the court concluded that the owner-driver exemption provision can be apportioned into taxable and non-taxable services. The contracted provisions were not intended to apply to allow services provided under a contract to be apportioned between exempt and taxable services. They are intended to operate on the basis that the contract is either fully exempt because it falls within the relevant exemption or it is taxable because it does not fall within the relevant exemption.

The second amendment is required to reflect changes to income tax legislation relating to the exempt rate for motor vehicle allowances. The amendments reflect the fact that the Australian Taxation Office now allows for the use of a standard rate for all motor vehicles, which is 66¢ per kilometre for the 2016-17 income year, rather than being based on the car's engine size. These amendments take effect from 1 July 2016 to coincide with the change at the federal level. Taxpayers are aware of the proposal to backdate these changes, and they have been paying payroll tax in accordance with the proposed amendments.

The Environment Protection Act will be amended to require facilities with underground petroleum storage systems to hold an environmental authorisation. Commencing in 2019-20, this initiative will recover the costs associated with the regulation of issues such as soil vapour, groundwater contamination and odour. Approximately 60 per cent of contaminated sites regulated by the Environment Protection Act are petrol stations and other sites with underground storage tanks for petroleum.

The Real Property Regulations require transacting parties to pay a registration fee for the transfer of land. Unless an exception applies, the registration fee increases on a sliding scale, based on the consideration of the value as assessed under the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Currently, the Real Property Act and the Real Property Regulations only allow the Registrar-General to recalculate registration fees where the assessed value of the transferred land is increased by the Commissioner of State Taxation, pursuant to a reassessment of stamp duty.

The changes in the bill will prevent potential revenue loss for the state and enable the Registrar-General to recalculate registration fees for transferred land, based on the correct value of the land, including on land where stamp duty is not payable. In all cases where fees have initially been paid on a basis that does not accurately reflect the value of the land, the bill will also give the Registrar-General powers to secure a charge against the title for any unpaid registration fees. Currently, while the Registrar-General has the ability to recover any unpaid registration fees as a debt, he does not have the ability to secure the unpaid fees against the title.

The 2018-19 budget delivers on the election commitments of the government, focusing on creating more jobs, providing better services and lowering costs for families. This bill is consistent with the budget's principles to deliver the strong economic reform South Australia needs. I commend this bill to the house and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The amendments in this clause delete the definition of Authority, meaning the Independent Gambling Authority, a reference in the definition of *authorised officer* to members and staff of the Authority and the definition of *licensing authority*.

5—Amendment of section 6A—Codes of practice etc

The reference to the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* is replaced with the *Gambling Administration Act 1995*. The requirement for matters prescribed by the Commissioner to be subject to the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* is deleted.

6—Amendment of section 6B—Criminal intelligence

This amendment removes references to the Authority.

7—Amendment of section 12—Approved licensing agreements

These amendments remove the requirement for the approved licensing agreement to be approved by the Authority and substitute the reference to the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* with the *Gambling Administration Act 1995*.

8—Amendment of section 15—Approved licensing agreement to be tabled in Parliament

This clause recasts the section as a consequence of the removal of references to the requirement for the approved licensing agreement to be approved by the Authority.

9—Amendment of section 18—Other transactions under which outsiders may acquire control or influence

10—Amendment of section 23—Investigations

These amendments remove references to the Authority.

11—Amendment of section 24—Investigative powers

This amendment substitutes the reference to the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* with the *Gambling Administration Act 1995*.

12—Amendment of section 28—Licensee to supply Commissioner with copy of audited accounts

The reference to the Authority is substituted with Commissioner.

13—Amendment of section 29—Duty of auditor

The reference to the Commissioner is deleted. This clause needs to be read in conjunction with clause 35 (Other amendments of Act).

14—Amendment of section 34—Classes of licences

15—Amendment of section 36—Conditions of licences

16—Amendment of section 37—Application for grant or renewal, or variation of condition, of licence

17—Amendment of section 38—Determination of applications

These amendments remove references to the licensing authority and replace them with the Commissioner.

18—Amendment of section 40H—Regulations

19—Amendment of section 43—Prevention of betting by children

20—Amendment of section 60—Prevention of betting with children by bookmaker or agent

21—Amendment of section 62—Rules relating to bookmakers' operations

22—Amendment of section 62A—Prevention of betting by children

These amendments remove references to the Authority.

23—Amendment of section 62I—Prosecution requires Commissioner's consent

References to the Authority are substituted with Commissioner.

24—Amendment of section 63—Responsibility of the Commissioner

25—Amendment of section 64—Power to obtain information

These amendments remove references to the Authority.

26—Amendment of heading to Part 7

The heading is amended in connection with the other amendments to the Part.

27—Amendment of section 77—Review of Commissioner's decision

The Licensing Court of South Australia is to review decisions of the Commissioner (as a result of the abolition of the Authority).

28—Repeal of section 78

This amendment is consequential on the abolition of the Authority.

29—Amendment of section 85—Reasons for decision

This amendment is consequential on the other amendments to the Part.

30—Amendment of section 86—Power of Commissioner in relation to approvals

31—Amendment of section 87—Confidentiality of information provided by Commissioner of Police

32—Amendment of section 89—Evidence

These amendments remove references to the Authority.

33—Amendment of section 90—Annual report

The annual reporting provisions are amended as a result of the abolition of the Authority.

34—Amendment of section 91—Regulations

A reference to the Authority is removed. The power to make savings and transitional regulations is amended so that such regulations may be made in connection with the measure.

35—Other amendments of Act

The clause contains an amendment to delete all occurrences of 'Authority' and 'Authority's' in the Act and substitute in each case a reference to the Commissioner and Commissioner's (as the case requires).

36—Transitional provisions

This clause sets out transitional provisions consequent on the abolition of the Independent Gambling Authority.

Part 3—Amendment of *Casino Act 1997*

37—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The amendments in this clause delete the definition of Authority, meaning the Independent Gambling Authority, and a reference in the definition of *authorised officer* to members and staff of the Authority.

38—Amendment of section 9—Term and renewal of licence

These amendments remove the requirement for the approved licensing agreement to be approved by the Authority.

39—Amendment of section 14—Other transactions under which outsiders may acquire control or influence

The amendment in this clause removes a reference to the Authority.

40—Amendment of section 15—Surrender of licence

The amendment in this clause removes a reference to the Authority.

41—Amendment of section 16—Approved licensing agreement

These amendments remove the requirement for the approved licensing agreement to be approved by the Authority.

42—Amendment of section 18—Agreements to be tabled in Parliament

This clause recasts section 18(1) as a consequence of removal of references to the requirement for the approved licensing agreement to be approved by the Authority.

43—Amendment of section 23—Investigative powers

This clause substitutes the title of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* with the *Gambling Administration Act 1995*.

44—Amendment of section 41A—Codes of practice

Subclause (1) substitutes the title of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* with the *Gambling Administration Act 1995*. Subclause (2) removes the requirement for matters prescribed by the Commissioner to be subject to the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978*.

45—Amendment of section 47A—Requirement for Commissioner to consult licensee

This amendment is consequential on the amendment in section 46.

46—Repeal of section 47B

This amendment is consequential on the abolition of the Authority.

47—Amendment of section 50—Duty of auditor

This amendment is consequential on the abolition of the Authority.

48—Amendment of section 53—Responsibility of Commissioner

This amendment removes a reference to the Authority.

49—Amendment of section 54—Power to obtain information

This amendment removes a reference to the Authority.

50—Amendment of section 55—Powers of inspection

This amendment removes a reference to the Authority.

51—Amendment of heading to Part 8

This clause makes a consequential change to a heading.

52—Amendment of section 65—Review of decisions

The Licensing Court of South Australia is to review decisions of the Commissioner (as a result of the abolition of the Authority).

53—Repeal of section 66

This amendment is consequential on the abolition of the Authority.

54—Amendment of section 66A—Procedure in relation to criminal intelligence

This amendment is consequential on the other amendments to the Part.

55—Amendment of section 68—Reasons for decision

This amendment is consequential on the other amendments to the Part.

56—Repeal of section 68A

This clause repeals an obsolete section.

57—Amendment of section 69—Confidentiality of criminal intelligence and other information provided by Commissioner of Police

This amendment removes references to the Authority.

58—Amendment of section 70—Prohibition of gambling by Commissioner etc

The clause amends section 70 to extend a prohibition on gambling in the casino to staff of a class prescribed by the regulations.

59—Amendment of section 71—Annual report

The clause makes a number of amendments relating to the reporting requirements of the Commissioner under the Act that currently refer to the Authority.

60—Amendment of section 72—Regulations

The power to make savings and transitional regulations is inserted in connection with the measure.

61—Other amendments of Act

The clause contains an amendment to delete all occurrences of 'Authority' and 'Authority's' in the Act and substitute in each case a reference to the Commissioner and Commissioner's (as the case requires).

62—Transitional provisions

This clause sets out transitional provisions consequent on the abolition of the Independent Gambling Authority.

Part 4—Repeal of *Commissioner for Kangaroo Island Act 2014*

63—Repeal of Act

This clause repeals the Act.

Part 5—Amendment of *Environment Protection Act 1993*

64—Insertion of section 135A

This clause inserts new section 135A.

135A—Recovery of administrative and technical costs associated with action under Part 10A

This section enables the Authority to recover administrative and technical costs associated with action that it takes under Part 10A (relating to site contamination). Costs are recoverable from the person in respect of whom the action is taken under that Part.

65—Amendment of Schedule 1—Prescribed activities of environmental significance

This clause inserts a new prescribed activity of environmental significance in Schedule 1 of the principal Act, namely the conduct of a petrol station.

66—Transitional provisions

This clause deals with the transition of persons who will be required to hold licences to conduct petrol stations under Schedule 1 of the principal Act.

Part 6—Amendment of *Gaming Machines Act 1992*

67—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

One amendment in this clause deletes the definition of Authority (ie. the Independent Gambling Authority) and the other amendment is consequential.

68—Amendment of section 5—Commissioner responsible for scrutiny of operations under all licences

The amendment in this clause deletes a reference to the Independent Gambling Authority.

69—Amendment of heading to Part 2 Division 3

This clause substitutes a heading to remove a reference to the Independent Gambling Authority.

Division 3—Commissioner's power to prescribe, recognise and give directions

70—Amendment of section 10A—Certain matters prescribed by Commissioner

Subclause (1) amends section 10A to substitute a reference to the Authority with the Commissioner. Subclause (2) substitutes the title of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* with the *Gambling Administration Act 1995*. Subclause (3) removes the requirement for matters prescribed by the Commissioner to be subject to the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978*.

71—Amendment of section 10B—Recognitions

The amendments in this clause substitute references to the Authority with references to the Commissioner.

72—Amendment of section 11—Commissioner may give directions to licensees

The amendments in this clause substitute references to the Authority with references to the Commissioner, and make other consequential amendments.

73—Amendment of section 12—Criminal intelligence

The amendment in this clause removes a reference to the Authority.

74—Amendment of section 47—Offence of breach of mandatory provisions of codes

The amendment in this clause substitutes a reference to the Authority with a reference to the Commissioner.

75—Amendment of section 53A—Prohibition of certain gaming machines

The amendments in this clause remove references to the Authority.

76—Amendment of heading to Part 6

The heading is amended in connection with the other amendments to the Part.

77—Amendment of section 69—Right of review

The Licensing Court of South Australia is to review decisions of the Commissioner (as a result of the abolition of the Authority). Many of the amendments relate to aligning the provision with the *Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000* and *Casino Act 1997* (so that the provision refers to a review rather than an appeal).

78—Amendment of section 70—Operation of decisions pending review

These amendments are consequential on the other amendments to the Part.

79—Amendment of section 70A—Procedure in relation to criminal intelligence

The amendment in this clause removes a reference to the Authority.

80—Amendment of section 73BA—Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund

The amendment in this clause removes references in the section to the Authority.

81—Substitution of sections 74 and 74A

The clause deletes section 74A which is obsolete and substitutes section 74 as follows:

74—Annual report

The proposed section sets out the annual reporting requirements on the performance of the Commissioner's functions under the Act.

82—Amendment of section 76—Power to refuse to pay winnings

This amendment is consequential on the amendments to Part 6.

83—Amendment of section 82—Service

The amendment in this clause removes references in the section to the Authority.

84—Amendment of section 87—Regulations

The power to make savings and transitional regulations is inserted in connection with the measure. The other amendment in this clause removes a reference in the section to the Authority.

85—Transitional provisions

This clause sets out transitional provisions consequent on the abolition of the Independent Gambling Authority.

Part 7—Amendment of *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*

86—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title to reflect the proposed amendments.

87—Amendment of section 1—Short title

This clause amends the short title consequentially to the abolition of the Authority.

88—Insertion of section 2

This clause inserts a new provision setting out the purpose and objectives of the Act (as proposed to be amended).

89—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause deletes the definition of 'Authority' and inserts new definitions for the purposes of the proposed amendments.

90—Substitution of Part 2

This clause deletes the Part that established the Authority and substitutes a new Part as follows:

Part 2—Functions of Commissioner

4—Functions and powers of Commissioner

This section sets out the gambling-related functions and powers of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner. The *Liquor Licensing Act 1997* sets out other provisions (such as a power of delegation) relevant to the Commissioner.

Part 2A—Gambling Advisory Council

5—Establishment of Advisory Council

This clause establishes the Advisory Council and sets out its functions.

6—Proceedings

The Commissioner or the Advisory Council will determine the procedures of the Advisory Council.

7—Use of staff and facilities

The Advisory Council may (by agreement with a Minister) make use of the services of the staff, equipment or facilities of an administrative unit.

8—Committees

The Advisory Council may establish committees.

91—Substitution of heading to Part 3

This clause makes a minor change to a heading.

92—Repeal of section 12

This clause repeals a provision that related to the Authority and the manner in which it, as a body, conducted proceedings.

93—Amendment of section 13—Inquiries by Commissioner

94—Amendment of section 14—Powers and procedures of Commissioner

These clauses make consequential amendments deleting references to the Authority and replacing them with references to the Commissioner.

95—Amendment of section 15—Representation before Commissioner

This clause makes consequential amendments deleting references to the Authority and replacing them with references to the Commissioner and also provides for representation of the welfare agency (defined in proposed amendments to section 3) in proceedings before the Commissioner.

96—Amendment of section 15C—Barring orders

97—Amendment of section 15D—Variation or revocation of barring order

98—Amendment of section 15E—Notice of barring order etc

99—Amendment of section 15G—Review of barring order by gambling provider

100—Amendment of section 15H—Reconsideration of barring order by Commissioner

101—Amendment of sections 15L and 15M

102—Amendment of section 16—Participation in gambling

These clauses make consequential amendments deleting references to the Authority and replacing them with references to the Commissioner.

103—Amendment of section 17—Confidentiality

This clause amends the confidentiality provision to ensure it will capture the Commissioner and the Advisory Council as well persons who have, at any time, been engaged in the administration or enforcement of this Act or a prescribed Act and any other body or committee established, at any time, under the Act (including the former Independent Gambling Authority or a committee established by that Authority). The clause also deletes a reference to the Authority that will no longer be necessary.

104—Repeal of sections 18 and 19

This clause deletes provisions relating to the Authority that will no longer be necessary. The Commissioner is subject to the Ombudsman's jurisdiction and is required to produce an annual report under the *Public Sector Act 2009*.

105—Amendment of section 20—Regulations

This clause amends the regulation making power, in particular to allow regulations to include provisions of a saving or transitional nature.

106—Review

The Attorney-General is to undertake a review of the functions of the Commissioner and the Gambling Advisory Council with a view to achieving greater consistency in regulatory requirements and processes applicable to the gambling industry.

107—Transitional provisions

This clause sets out transitional provisions relating to the abolition of the Authority and the transfer of functions to the Commissioner.

Part 8—Amendment of *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009*

108—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *Commissioner* (being the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner).

109—Amendment of section 24—Problem gambling order

110—Amendment of section 27—Problem gambling orders

These clauses replace references to the Independent Gambling Authority with references to the Commissioner.

Part 9—Amendment of *Land Tax Act 1936*

111—Repeal of section 8

This clause deletes an obsolete section.

112—Amendment of section 8A—Scales of land tax

This clause amends section 8A to set new thresholds for land tax for the 2020/2021 financial year and subsequent financial years.

Part 10—Amendment of *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*

113—Amendment of section 9—Inspectors and other officers

This clause ensures that the language of section 9 is wide enough to reflect the fact that the Commissioner is exercising functions and powers under other legislation.

114—Amendment of section 10—Delegation

This clause makes a minor change to the delegation power to enable further delegation (consistently with other statutory delegation powers).

115—Amendment of section 138—Regulations

This clause clarifies the extent of the power to make regulations prescribing licence fees under the Act.

Part 11—Amendment of *Local Government Act 1999*

116—Amendment of section 294—Power to enter and occupy land in connection with an activity

The requirement on councils to pay royalty on extractive minerals recovered under section 294 is repealed. Other amendments are consequential on the repeal of that requirement.

117—Transitional provision

A transitional provision relating to the requirement to pay royalty on extractive minerals recovered under section 294 for the 2018/2019 financial year is provided for.

Part 12—Amendment of *Mining Act 1971*

118—Amendment of section 17A—Reduced royalty for new mines

Section 17A as amended by this clause will provide that an application under the section for declaration that a mine is a new mine cannot be made on or after 1 July 2020. A reduced royalty rate applying in relation to a mine that is declared to be a new mine on an application made before that date will cease to apply five years after the day on which the first royalty payment is due or on 30 June 2026, whichever occurs first.

Part 13—Amendment of *Payroll Tax Act 2009*

119—Amendment of section 29—Motor vehicle allowances

This clause makes amendments to section 29 of the *Payroll Tax Act 2009* to reflect changes to the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1997* of the Commonwealth regarding calculating deductions for motor vehicle expenses.

120—Amendment of section 32—What is a relevant contract?

This clause amends section 32 of the *Payroll Tax Act 2009* which defines *relevant contract*. The amendments address deficiencies in the owner-driver exemption which were identified in a 2012 New South Wales Supreme Court decision (*The Smith's Snackfood Company Limited v Chief Commissioner of State Revenue*).

121—Transitional provision

The transitional provision relates to the backdating of the amendments to section 32 to 1 July 2018.

Part 14—Amendment of *Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act 2004*

122—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause deletes the definition of *Authority* (being the IGA) and inserts a definition of *Commissioner* (being the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner).

123—Amendment of section 7—Complaints

This clause is consequential to the amendments proposed in relation to the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*.

124—Amendment of section 9—Making problem gambling family protection order in respondent's absence

This clause is consequential. The provision is unnecessary where there Commissioner is conducting the hearing instead of the IGA.

125—Substitution of section 11

This clause substitutes a new provision on conduct of proceedings which is framed appropriately for conduct of proceedings by an individual (the Commissioner) rather than a body (the Authority).

126—Amendment of section 13—Notification of orders by Commissioner

127—Amendment of section 15—Removal of respondent barred from certain premises

These clauses update references to the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* (consequentially to the proposed change to the short title of that Act).

128—Substitution of section 18

This clause deletes the current reporting provision (because the Commissioner is required to report on the Commissioner's operations in accordance with the *Public Sector Act 2009*) and inserts a regulation making power instead.

129—Other amendments of Act

This clause replaces references to the Authority with references to the Commissioner.

130—Transitional provision

This clause is a transitional provision.

Part 15—Repeal of *Racing (Proprietary Business Licensing) Act 2000*

131—Repeal of Act

This clause repeals the *Racing (Proprietary Business Licensing) Act 2000*.

Part 16—Amendment of *Real Property Act 1886*

132—Amendment of section 277—Regulations

This clause amends the regulation making power of the *Real Property Act 1886* so that the regulations can, in addition to prescribing fees, provide for the payment, recovery, waiver, reduction or refund of fees. Section 277 as amended by this clause will also provide that an unpaid fee or charge for registering a transfer of land is, until payment, a first charge in respect of the land.

Additionally, under the section as amended, a regulation prescribing fees or charges for registering a transfer of land will be able to provide that the Registrar-General may, after having regard to the capital value of land as determined by the Valuer-General or any other relevant information—

- recover an amount (including interest) as a debt if the Registrar-General determines that the value of the transferred land at the time of the transfer was higher than the value of the transferred land used as the basis for calculating the fee or charge; or
- refund an amount if the Registrar-General determines that the value of the transferred land at the time of the transfer was lower than the value of the transferred land used as the basis for calculating the fee or charge.

Part 17—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923* that takes effect on assent

133—Amendment of section 71CC—Interfamilial transfer of farming property

This clause amends section 71CC(1) of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* so as to extend the exemption that currently applies where land used for the business of primary production is transferred between family members (including trusts with beneficiaries who are family members) to include transfers involving companies where the shareholders of the company are family members and a family relationship exists between the transferor and transferee. For the exemption to apply, the sole or principal business of at least one shareholder of the company must be the business of primary production, and there must have been a business relationship between at least one of the shareholders and the other party for a period of 12 months with respect to the use of the property for the business of primary production.

134—Transitional provision

This clause provides that the amendments made to section 71CC of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* only apply in relation to instruments executed after the commencement of this Part.

Part 18—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923* taken to have effect from 1 January 2018

135—Amendment of section 32—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of 'multi-peril crop insurance', which is insurance covering the total or partial loss of crops resulting from drought (whether or not the policy under which the insurance is provided also covers loss resulting from other perils).

136—Amendment of section 36—Certain premiums exempt from duty

Section 36 as amended by this clause will provide an exemption from duty for any premium received or charged in respect of multi-peril crop insurance if the policy under which the premium is payable commenced on or after 1 January 2018.

Part 19—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923* that takes effect on day fixed by proclamation

137—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

This clause defines the proposed new stamp duty certificates and sets out the legal effect of such certificates.

138—Insertion of Part 1 Division 4

This clause inserts a new Division allowing the Commissioner to determine classes of instruments that may be the subject of an application for a stamp duty certificate and providing for the issue of such certificates.

139—Transitional provision

Section 2(13) of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923*, as in force immediately before the commencement of clause 137, will continue to apply in relation to dutiable instruments described in that provision that are executed before the commencement of clause 137.

Part 20—Amendment of *State Lotteries Act 1966*

140—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The definition of *Authority* is deleted in connection with the abolition of the Authority. A definition of *Liquor and Gambling Commissioner* is inserted (as that Commissioner is assuming the functions of the Authority under the measure).

141—Amendment of section 13B—Codes of practice etc

The title of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* is substituted with the *Gambling Administration Act 1995*. The requirement for matters prescribed by the Commissioner to be subject to the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* is deleted. References to the Authority are substituted with references to the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner.

142—Transitional provision

A transitional provision is inserted consequent on the abolition of the Independent Gambling Authority.

Part 21—Amendment of *Taxation Administration Act 1996*

143—Amendment of section 78—Permitted disclosure in particular circumstances or to particular persons

144—Amendment of section 80—Prohibition of disclosures by other persons

145—Amendment of section 81—Restriction on power of courts to require disclosure

These clauses make consequential amendments.

146—Insertion of Part 9 Division 4

This clause inserts a new Division as follows:

Division 4—Collection of information for disclosure to Commonwealth

81A—Interpretation

This section defines certain terms used in the proposed new Division, including the concept of 'reportable information'.

81B—Relationship with other laws

Other laws do not prevent the collection of information under the Division (and the Division does not prevent the collection of information under other laws). Reportable information may be collected under the Division for disclosure to the Commonwealth even if the information is not required for the purposes of any State law.

81C—Collection and disclosure of reportable information

The Commissioner or a public sector agency may collect reportable information. Where it is collected by a public sector agency, it may then be disclosed to the Commissioner. The Commissioner may disclose reportable information to the Commissioner of Taxation of the Commonwealth.

81D—Commissioner may direct agency to collect and disclose

The Commissioner may direct that reportable information be collected and disclosed by a public sector agency.

81E—How reportable information may be collected

Reportable information may be collected by requiring a person providing information for the purposes of a function carried out under a State law to provide the reportable information (for example, by requiring it to be provided in connection with the lodgment of an instrument, record or return, or the making of an application, under a State law).

81F—Enforcement

This section provides for the application of various enforcement powers in the *Taxation Administration Act 1996*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

*Resolutions***CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE**

The Legislative Council passed the following resolution to which it desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That the instruction to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, given on 26 July 2018, be amended to now require the committee to report on its inquiry into the Independent Commission Against Corruption (Investigation Powers) Amendment Bill no later than Thursday 20 September 2018.

*Adjournment Debate***MOUNT GAMBIER MIGRANT COMMUNITY**

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:07): I rise today to speak on behalf of Roland Kalamo, a Congolese man who has settled in Mount Gambier with his family since 2017 after living in Kenya in a refugee camp for four years. Roland learned English from reading a Bible at the refugee camp. At 30, he is fluent in seven languages and has worked as a newspaper, radio and television journalist in his country and is a strong advocate for social justice and human rights. He is a full-time volunteer, working at two Mount Gambier schools and working at the Red Cross to trace family members who have lost touch through war or displacement.

Roland came to talk to me, on behalf of the migrant population of Mount Gambier, about problems finding suitable housing and education, wanting to work independently of benefits, building a better life for his family and becoming part of our great community. He spoke strongly about being labelled a refugee and about the migrant community working together to achieve better outcomes in regional communities. Roland talked about becoming Australian, saying that he will never return home and that this country is now his home. I feel that his words are important, and I am going to quote them now. These are Roland's words, which I want recorded in *Hansard*:

Every human being wants to feel 'at home'. Everyone wants to feel accepted and have equal access to, and enjoy, the opportunities that society provides to be able to contribute to this beautiful country.

As one of the people living in Australia who recognises my history of immigration, I pay tribute to the native people of Australia. Jambo. Hello.

Being a recent migrant who is also still called a 'refugee', I thank the Government of Australia for their contribution to resettling people from refugee camps and giving them a chance to have a place to call home again.

While I feel safe here, I refuse to still be called a 'refugee'.

Being called this makes me feel isolated and that I don't belong. As well, I don't feel I am accepted or equal; it makes me see only limits in everything.

Even calling me a future Australian does not fully express who I am.

Becoming an Australian is the dream of the majority of people who have migrated here. Becoming Australian makes migrants feel at home, feel accepted and believe that they belong here.

Learning English, getting recognition for overseas qualifications and becoming educated will help migrants get citizenship, find jobs, and integrate into the Australian community.

Many institutions are working to help that transition but they are more focused on what they think migrants have to learn. They believe they know what migrants need and they decide without involving the migrant in the decision-making process. Many migrants have been learning English for more than two years and yet they can't speak good or useful English. Consequently, they will not even try to apply for citizenship and if they do apply without good English their application has a greater chance of being rejected; therefore they won't get employment or further their education.

When a migrant finishes the 500 hours of English language tuition they are sent to find jobs. The agencies who assist with employment send migrants to internet websites but without information and technology skills they cannot find jobs on websites.

I suggest that the Australian Government revisit the adult education system for migrants, especially the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP), to develop a process that allows migrant communities to be involved in curriculum design and teaching.

By doing that, the Australian Government will be helping migrants to learn what is important for them; that is, to learn what it means to be Australian, and then set about becoming one. This will result in migrant communities being

able to contribute to, and participate in, the Australian culture, making Australia a better place for migrants and for all Australians.

I am sure then migrants will start feeling at home and accepted and will be better able to focus on the opportunities that this beautiful country offers.

I want to thank members of the house for listening to Roland's words. I committed to Roland when he came into my office that I would get those on *Hansard*. He is a very intelligent, hardworking migrant in our community. As I have said before, he volunteers at two schools and with the Red Cross, helping the community and helping other Congolese families in our community. With those words, I thank the indulgence of the house.

PORT WAKEFIELD OVERPASS

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (16:12): I rise today to speak about the wonderful addition to the state budget this year that was the money allocated towards the Port Wakefield overpass. It is going to be a wonderful benefit to people not only within the electorate of Narungga but right around the state who travel upon that road regularly.

I do not think there would be anyone in this state, certainly not in this room, who has not seen the media footage of the long weekend over the last 20 years in which cars are banked up for 10 kilometres or more, bumper to bumper, at a near standstill, north of Port Wakefield, trying to get back home to Adelaide. The need for a solution at this intersection and throughout this town featured in my maiden speech, it featured in my predecessor, Steven Griffiths', maiden speech and it even featured in the maiden speech of his predecessor, John Meier, back in 1982, so this announcement that an overpass and dual lanes through the town are to be built to finally address Port Wakefield's traffic issues is massive news indeed.

I have been very fortunate to be in contact with a number of locals who have thrown their road engineer hats on and offered to me their advice about how best to solve the problem at this intersection. While the majority agrees with the solution, but not all, they are all happy and thrilled to see investment in this area to finally do away with the uncertainty that has plagued this issue for over 20 years.

It is not for small reason that the intersection, where the overpass is to be constructed over Highway 1 at the junction of Copper Coast Highway and the Port Augusta highway, has long been known as Crash Corner. On a normal day, this intersection is used by about 3,000 vehicles and during holiday weekends it soars to as many as 10,000, when it becomes a bottleneck, creating jams for as long as 10 kilometres, as vehicles travelling from Yorke Peninsula (YP) attempt to merge and travel south through Port Wakefield. The intersection has a long history of accidents resulting in fatal or serious injury, the most recent of which was a fatality last year of a young woman travelling back to Adelaide from the YP whose car collided with an oncoming truck.

The state government has committed \$18 million to the solution, and the federal government \$72 million, for which I am very grateful. I was pleased to be at Port Wakefield on 30 August for the announcement with Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Development, Michael McCormack; local Liberal member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey; and our very own state Minister for Infrastructure, Stephan Knoll.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the valiant efforts of Rowan Ramsey in advocating with previous members and me for the case to find the solution to this important problem and fix what is an important link between Adelaide and tourist and agricultural regions like Yorke Peninsula as well as being the gateway to the north, Darwin and Perth. Securing funding for this key infrastructure project is another example of the Marshall Liberal government's constructive and collaborative relationship with the federal Coalition government.

Even more pleasing is that the project delivered is a significant improvement on what we took to the state election last year. Not only will the overpass be built but also step 2, the vitally important lane duplication through the town will secure congestion reduction, cut travel times, improve route reliability and boost safety for all travelling in and out of the Narungga electorate. Advice I took from the residents was that you could not do one without the other. Post the

announcement of the overpass, it was clear to me that the expectation of the community was that both would be done concurrently, and I am pleased to have delivered that reality.

I also believe the investment will secure and increase Yorke Peninsula's tourism visitation and spend, with research showing that increasing numbers of holiday-makers visiting YP have been shortening their stay or, even worse, deciding not to come because of dreading the infamous extra hours stuck in traffic on the way home. The lane duplication will begin where the existing road duplication south of Port Wakefield ends and will continue to the Copper Coast Highway junction, which will have a wonderful new overpass built there.

There will be some compulsory acquisition required, and that detail is still to be done as part of the design works. As minister Knoll stated on announcement day, compared with some of the challenges we have widening roads in towns, this project looks like it will not be as disruptive as some. Such is its importance to the local community, personally, this project was a significant priority of mine when I nominated to represent the seat of Narungga at the last election. I was thrilled to secure funding from the state government early in the election campaign and even more so when the federal government decided to come on board and make this dream a reality.

I am thrilled that this budget includes that money to make this dream a reality and I look forward to seeing its production as we move forward through the forward estimates.

LIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:17): I would like to take this opportunity to highlight some key activities in my electorate and also the passing of a wonderful woman in the electorate as well. First of all, I would like to put on record my thanks to the Gawler Show Society for inviting me to officially open the 162nd anniversary show held a fortnight ago. Country shows like the Gawler Show have been a big part of the rural and regional communities' landscape from the first day of European settlement throughout Australia.

Agricultural shows, as they were then known, were a place where people throughout the district would meet with townspeople to celebrate the harvest and trade in various products produced in the area. They showcased the crops grown, sheep and cattle raised, new machinery and equipment, and produce and products made in the home. Horticulture and floriculture were added to shows in various areas.

While agriculture remains at the heart of the country shows, they have more recently added educational elements and a range of amusements. Foremost, they remain a community event, largely run by volunteers. Without volunteers, there would be no country shows. As the President of the Gawler Show Society has remarked in her message in this year's show guide, 'The role volunteers play in the success of the show is underestimated.' I would like to add my thanks to the work of the army volunteers who make this show and other shows across the state happen.

While the show remains a strong community event, it is now also a key tourism event for the town, in a good year attracting an attendance of 30,000-plus people with more than half being visitors to our town. The show of a couple of weekends ago was very successful. We were blessed with great weather for the weekend and so attracted a record crowd on the Saturday.

The success or, in some cases, the decline of country shows has mirrored the state of agriculture in their respective districts. The ongoing population shift to the bigger regional cities and metropolitan Adelaide has starved smaller communities of volunteers, and many country shows have closed down in the last few decades. There were only 47 country shows in South Australia during 2017. Unfortunately, when communities lose their shows they also lose another reason to meet and celebrate their towns and districts.

We are fortunate that the Gawler Show remains strong, and we owe its success to the band of volunteers who have worked tirelessly for some decades to make it happen. When you travel through the Gawler Show's history, a few key themes emerge. Some controversies reappear time and time again. The show has reflected the highs and lows of the town itself and become a source of innovation. In the few minutes I have, I would like to highlight a few stories that provide a flavour of the show's colourful history.

The show itself did not start without controversy, with two community and volunteer committees vying to run the first show. In 1851, a committee was chaired by Mr Sparshott, formed to establish a society for produce farmers, but was not proceeded with. A second attempt was made on 2 October 1854, when Dr Otto Schomburgk chaired a special public meeting convened at the Globe Hotel, which is now the Kingsford, in which the Gawler Agricultural and Horticultural Society was formed.

In October 1855, Dr Schomburgk was re-elected president at the show society's first AGM, James Martin, another well-known Gawlerite, was elected as a committee member, and the stage was set for first Gawler Show. On 19 February 1856, the show society held its first show under the grand title of Gawler Agricultural and Horticultural Society's First Annual Exhibition. I would like to put on the record that the Schomburgk family have made a huge contribution not only to the Gawler district but also to the state through botany and other community events. I think it is about time—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Light, if I can interrupt for a moment—and I will not keep you long—Schomburgk actually became the name of a variety of wheat that was broadly grown across South Australia as well.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That's right. The South Australian botanist was actually world famous, and he travelled overseas on his discoveries.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excellent. I will give you another 30 seconds, member for Light.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: You can add a minute, if you like—thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Schomburgks, I think, should be recognised in some way in my town of Gawler because they have not been recognised in the town.

Dr Harvey: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I agree. The *South Australian Register* records the first Gawler Show as follows:

Considering the recent date of the Society's establishment, and, considering that this was the first attempt at a produce show, we think the members have every reason to congratulate themselves upon its complete success. We never remember having seen so large a company, including so many ladies of respectability.

And so the Gawler Show was born. The show has been going for 162 years. The current president, Patricia Dent, and her band of volunteers and committee make sure that it is a great success.

Unfortunately, on a sad note, I would also like now to bring to the house's attention the passing of Mrs Betty Jacob. Those people who have lived in Gawler previously may remember Betty Jacob. Betty Jacob was a councillor, alderman and also a tireless community worker. Betty Roma Klopper, which was her maiden name, was born in Crystal Brook, South Australia, 90 years ago and was the youngest of five girls. Tragically, their mother died at the young age of 31 and Betty was only 19 months old at the time. She was later raised by her aunty in Snowtown, South Australia.

Betty attended school in Snowtown, where she became head prefect, and finished her secondary education at Adelaide High School in 1945. She then studied nursing and began training at the Gawler Hutchinson Hospital in 1948, when she was 20 years old. It happens to be same hospital my two sons were born in. During that time, she met Gordon Jacob, a local Gawler lad who just returned from serving in the navy after the war. He was to start a business called Jacob's Fashion Store.

Betty and Gordon fell in love and married in 1949 and, shortly after, began building their family home at Gawler East. During the fifties, Betty had three children, Susan, Peter and Michael. Betty helped out in the shop while raising the kids. Towards the end of their secondary schooling, she decided to go back to study and in 1970 obtained a first class honours degree in theology. This was then followed by a diploma in secondary education teaching in 1974.

She taught at Gawler High School, which is the school I attended. However, her teaching prospects were cut short when, in 1977, at the age of 49, she contracted breast cancer. She survived, probably through her sheer determination. After her recovery, Betty became actively involved in the outreach department for the Anti-Cancer Foundation. A few years later, Gordon unfortunately fell ill and died in 1983, when Betty was only 55. She then focused her efforts towards the local community.

In 1985, she was elected to the Gawler council, where she served two terms as a councillor and an alderman until 1993. That is where I met Betty. I was first elected to the Gawler council in 1985. It would be fair to say that Betty and I shared very few political philosophies and that often we did not agree on many things politically, but what I can say is that she was a tireless worker for the community and, for the time, she was a woman who made a huge contribution to our community. She was not backward in terms of explaining her views about matters. She encouraged a lot of other women to join the council.

During her six years in council, she was directly involved in helping reduce heavy traffic in Murray Street, improving the taxi service and introducing Neighbourhood Watch programs, and she was an advocate for implementing the Gawler bypass and even for bringing McDonald's to Gawler, although she did not think it was such a good idea.

Betty continued to live in the family home for the next 20 years, enjoying her own company. She travelled extensively in Europe and North America, tended to her garden and welcomed visits by her family and friends and a growing number of grandchildren. She passed away peacefully in her sleep on 9 August, a few weeks after her 90th birthday. I was fortunate enough to see her a few times at the Southern Cross nursing home prior to her death. Certainly, she was a woman who made a huge contribution to the town and also to her family and friends.

With the time I have left, I would also like to talk briefly about the more recent Northern Business Breakfast held on 22 August. This business breakfast is sponsored by the Rotary Club of Salisbury and the Rotary Club of Elizabeth. I have to declare my interest: I am a member of the Lions Club. With the support of a number of sponsors, it hosts a monthly meeting where they talk about issues that are of importance to small business in the north.

In August, I attended the event held at the impressive new Playford Bowling Club facilities. I must confess that the new bowling facility in Elizabeth is quite impressive, and I congratulate the Playford council on achieving that milestone. It is also the largest undercover bowling facility in the Southern Hemisphere. It is very impressive.

At the breakfast, we heard an industry presentation from PR consultant and university marketing lecturer Michelle Prak, who talked about how organisations should prepare for crisis management. The business breakfast is very useful for networking. It is very important to keep in touch with small business in the area, but you also hear a number of speakers who bring a lot of new ideas to the area. It is one of those breakfasts that is well supported, and I commend the organisers for holding those monthly events. At the next meeting, which I think is in September, a member from the other house will be a guest speaker.

At 16:28 the house adjourned until Wednesday 5 September 2018 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM**

103 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Aberfoyle Park High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a performing arts centre, new commercial kitchen and classroom refurbishments, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

104 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Adelaide Secondary School of English will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new teaching building, art facility and kitchen garden, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

105 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Aldinga Beach B-7 School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program, and be able to progress with plans to build new flexible learning environments and create new outdoor spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

106 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Ardtornish Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new learning areas and facilities, remove asbestos, make improvements to the administration area and upgrade disability access, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

107 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Australian Science and Mathematics School will receive \$3 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build an outdoor learning area, additional teacher preparation areas and a new natural sciences studio, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms

- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

108 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Balaklava High School will receive \$4 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new flexible learning areas, a new arts facility, improved change room facilities and better kitchen facilities for the home economics building, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

109 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Banksia Park International High School will receive \$9 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new performing arts facility, covered outdoor learning areas and an indoor/outdoor commercial kitchen and cafe, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

110 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Belair Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build an integrated STEM building, new learning areas for performing arts and upgrades to existing buildings and outdoor learning spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

111 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Black Forest Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to upgrade existing buildings, establish a science and technology learning area, extend the Keertaweeta Building, and refurbish administration and reception areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

112 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Blackwood High School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new building containing new learning areas, a commercial kitchen, canteen, conference room and change room facilities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed

under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

113 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Brighton Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a contemporary learning facility with a new courtyard, add new outdoor learning areas and extend the existing gymnasium, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

114 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Ceduna Area School will receive \$4 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to consolidate several buildings, remove transportable classrooms containing asbestos, improve indoor/outdoor connectivity, improve special needs facilities and create a new main entrance, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

115 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Charles Campbell College will receive \$11 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new flexible learning areas, relocating sports playing courts and trade training centre and replacing the administration block with a nature play area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

116 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Christies Beach High School will receive \$8 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to redevelop the school's main original two-storey building, new outdoor learning areas and a resurfaced playing court and contemporary visual arts space, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

117 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Clare High School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new learning areas, repurposed administration and resource centres, improved disability access and upgraded special education facilities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

118 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Craigmare High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build additional physical education spaces, refurbishing change rooms and aged toilet facilities, remove asbestos and improve outdoor amenities and landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

119 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Cummins Area School will receive \$4 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new art and technical studies building, expand new STEM facilities, refurbish the home economics area and improve landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms

- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

120 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that East Marden Primary School will receive \$7.5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new entry point, new general learning areas, and create a nature play space and outdoor learning area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

121 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Elizabeth North Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new and upgraded learning areas and multipurpose arts spaces and improving street presence, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

122 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Elizabeth Vale Primary School will receive \$7.5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new flexible learning spaces and special education spaces, and redevelop the administration area and school entrance, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

123 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Findon High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Program and be able to progress with plans to replace aged transportable spaces with new buildings, improve street presence and refurbish facilities and learning spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

124 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Fregon Anangu School will receive \$15.7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new buildings with flexible indoor/outdoor learning spaces to replace transportable spaces, consolidate existing storage sheds and upgrade landscaping and outdoor facilities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

125 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Gawler and District College B-12 will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a multipurpose assembly hall and gymnasium facility and refurbish the administration facility and classroom spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

126 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Glenelg Primary School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans for a new building consolidating existing administration and support services also adding new learning areas, as well as plans to refurbish facilities learning areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

127 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Glossop High School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program

and be able to progress with plans to consolidate their two school campuses into one, creating new specialised learning facilities and dedicated STEM facilities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

128 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Golden Grove High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new interconnected buildings, refurbish indoor/outdoor learning spaces and construct new performing arts studios, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

129 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Golden Grove Primary School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace existing transportable buildings with a new building and nature play area, extend the activity hall and canteen, and improve disability access, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

130 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Grange Primary School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new contemporary facilities and refurbish existing learning areas, upgrade toilets and air conditioning and improve fencing and landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

131 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Grant High School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a two-level building with gymnasium, performing arts facility and canteen, new student courtyard hub and outdoor area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

132 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Greenwith Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new amphitheatre, landscaping outdoor areas and replacing existing transportables with a two-level building containing six learning areas and performing arts facilities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

133 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Hallett Cove School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new contemporary facility replacing transportable buildings, refurbish classrooms and STEM learning areas, upgrade the food and hospitality centre and landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

134 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Hamilton Secondary College will receive \$9 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new multipurpose performing arts centre and new central plaza, refurbish existing buildings and improve frontage and main building entrances, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

135 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Heathfield High School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to extend the school's main building, refurbish existing learning areas and library, upgrade art spaces and establish a new health and lifestyle centre, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

136 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Henley High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build four new specialist learning areas, a new resource centre, expansion and upgrade of science labs and a home economics centre upgrade, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms

- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

137 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Highgate School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build five new junior learning areas, new junior and senior teachers preparation spaces, and a multipurpose performing arts building, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

138 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that John Pirie Secondary School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new facilities for the middle school precinct, indoor/outdoor learning areas, refurbishing and extending performing arts facility and improving building exteriors, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

139 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Kadina Memorial School will receive \$3 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build two new buildings replacing existing transportables, a covered central walkway and create new performance and outdoor learning areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

140 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Kapunda High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new learning areas and dedicated STEM facilities, new specialist learning areas and remove transportable buildings and asbestos, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

141 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Kingston Community School will receive \$4 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build general learning areas, common areas and bathroom facilities, building new specialist studios and outdoor workshop and a refurbishment of reception and junior areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed

under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

142 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Le Fevre High School will receive \$2 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new physical education facility and additional general learning areas, replace exterior cladding on several buildings and remove transportable buildings, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

143 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Loxton High School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace existing transportable buildings with new learning areas and upgrade the community hall, gymnasium and technology studies facility providing additional compliant amenities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

144 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Magill School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace several transportables and the junior primary building with a two-storey junior primary facility and nature playground, construct a new music centre and renovate the historic school building, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

145 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mannum Community College will receive \$2 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace aged buildings with a new performing arts and wellbeing facility, landscape, add additional shading and a build a new nature play area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

146 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mawson Lakes School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct new learning areas, an additional learning space to address growth, a new learning hub, a two-storey building housing several facilities and upgrade existing buildings and outdoor areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

147 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mitcham Girls High School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new building with general learning areas and performing arts space, upgrade food technology space, improve landscaping and remove of transportable buildings and asbestos, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

148 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mitcham Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new gymnasium with outdoor connectivity, replace a transportable buildings and the canteen with new learning areas and improved IT connectivity, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms

- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

149 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Modbury High School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct new buildings supporting growth and replacing transportable buildings, upgrading the school frontage, refurbishment of existing infrastructure and creating additional learning spaces, a new year 8 hub and a wellbeing centre, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

150 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Moonta Area School will receive \$4 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build remove transportable buildings and construct a new learning centre with common room, specialist learning area and multiple flexible areas, upgrading the music and performing arts centre and extending the visual arts learning area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

151 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mount Barker High School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to remove existing transportables and construct a new building improving

campus connectivity, refurbishing general learning areas, renovating the original historic school building and upgrading the street frontage, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

152 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mount Barker Primary School will receive \$7.5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace two large buildings with a three-level building containing new learning areas and specialist areas with STEM facilities, a new administration building and an improved school frontage, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

153 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mount Compass Area School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace several transportable buildings with a contemporary building with specialist learning areas and a second new building for administration functions, refurbishment of the trade training building and redevelopment of the main entrance, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping

documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

154 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Mount Gambier High School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to remove aged infrastructure with new buildings, refurbish older general learning areas and build a new indoor multisport facility with teaching facilities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

155 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Murray Bridge High School will receive \$20 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct two new buildings to support growth and provide new special education facilities, a new technical studies workshop, covered walkway and landscaping to improve school frontage, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas

- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

156 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Murray Bridge North School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new building incorporating general learning areas and music rooms, major refurbishment of existing buildings, a new outdoor learning area and additional toilets, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

157 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Naracoorte High School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new arts and design facility, covered outdoor learning areas, sports and agriculture spaces, a covered walkway and demolish a number of aged buildings, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

158 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Norwood Morialta High School will receive \$30 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to consolidate the two school campuses with a new purpose-built middle school, building additional specialist facilities including a new library hub and redevelopment of outdoor spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

159 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Nuriootpa Primary School will receive \$7.5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build bringing in all 12 existing learning areas into the main building with a flexible design and outdoor access, removal of transportable buildings and expanding the administration centre, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

160 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Ocean View P-12 College will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new performing arts facility in replacement of two aged buildings, landscaping and enhancing street presence and refurbish the administration building and other existing areas to create a new visual and digital arts centre, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

161 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Para Hills High School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build contemporary performing arts learning spaces, refurbishing existing facilities including reception and administration areas, removing transportable buildings and improved street frontage, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

162 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Parafield Gardens High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new building providing general and specialist learning areas, school assembly space and teaching facilities, refurbish existing leaning areas, remove transportable buildings and asbestos, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

163 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Parafield Gardens R-7 School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new building catering for future growth, new dedicated

music facilities and breakout spaces, refurbishment of existing buildings supporting greater flexibility and connectivity, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

164 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Paralowie School will receive \$12 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new performing arts centre, health and wellbeing centre, additional learning areas and a dedicated junior primary precinct, refurbishing existing facilities and demolishing aged buildings, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

165 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Pasadena High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new speciality learning centre attached to the existing gymnasium, new sensory outdoor learning spaces, entry canopy and refurbishing of selected core buildings, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

166 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Playford International College will receive \$3 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new senior centre, large outdoor area, toilets, kitchen, global studies centre and flexible learning spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

167 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Plympton International College will receive \$3 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to redevelop the gymnasium, upgrade art and drama, general learning spaces, outdoor learning spaces the resource centre and create a new year 12 study area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

168 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Port Lincoln High School will receive \$15 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new facility with specialist learning areas, special education facilities and new school canteen, refurbish existing learning areas, specialist learning areas, the amphitheatre and creating new outdoor leaning areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

169 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Reidy Park Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to upgrade all learning areas and facilities, additional under cover outdoor areas, exterior cladding on the learning hub facade and upgraded landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

170 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Renmark High School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new gymnasium, refurbishing existing spaces to create new specialty learning areas including STEM facilities, replacing air conditioning and extensive landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

171 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Reynella East College will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new two-level gymnasium with multi-use spaces, four new courts, change rooms, learning areas, an outdoor canopy for the exterior leading to the entrance and rainwater collection integrated in the buildings design to irrigate adjoining oval, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

172 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Roxby Downs Area School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to redevelop the home economics facility to provide specialised learning areas and also redevelop adjoining central courtyard, expand landscaping in the outdoor areas providing better connectivity between junior and preschool, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

173 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Salisbury High School will receive \$8 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to demolish transportable buildings and build a new facility improving street frontage, a new covered walkway linking the new building to existing STEM facility, landscaping and upgrading the main building and administrative area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

174 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Seaford Secondary College will receive \$8 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new performing arts centre, refurbish the middle school home economics area, remove transportable buildings and improve street frontage, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

175 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Seaton High School will receive \$20 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to demolish transportables and build new learning areas for anticipated growth,

construct a new student hub containing the resource centre and flexible learning spaces and refurbishment of existing facilities creating a new performing arts precinct and learning areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

176 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Seaview High School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new multipurpose creative arts complex which will be linked to a second new building for visual arts and design, a new entry point for both buildings, improve landscaping and enhance street frontage, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

177 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Settlers Farm Campus R-7 will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new multipurpose facility for gatherings and physical activities, new nature play area, single-storey building for general learning areas, new toilet facilities and refurbishing three buildings to provide flexible and better connected learning areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping

documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

178 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Stradbroke School will receive \$7 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a purpose-built facility with flexible learning spaces, demolition of several buildings and extensive refurbishment of remaining facilities, new covered outdoor learning areas and resurfacing asphalt and basketball courts, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

179 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that The Heights School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new two-storey facility and bridge to adjacent building, a new single-story facility, covered courtyard and sports facility, refurbishments to the senior school area and gymnasium and improved landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas

- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

180 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Trinity Gardens School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct new buildings accommodating early learning, reception, special education and upper primary classes, removal of transportable classrooms, extending the existing gymnasium and refurbishing the administration area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

181 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Underdale High School will receive \$20 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace several older buildings with new purpose-designed facilities, a new outdoor learning area improving connectivity with several areas and facilities and substantial refurbishment of learning areas and common spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming them into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

182 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Unley High School will receive \$20 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a two-storey building with performing and creative arts, STEM and hospitality facilities, a new reception, new outdoor learning area with amphitheatre and landscaping, refurbishment of the gymnasium and removal of transportable buildings, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

183 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Urrbrae Agricultural High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a health and wellbeing centre, new toilets, change rooms and walkway, improved landscaping and entry, an extension of the gymnasium and of the performing arts hall and removal of transportable buildings, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

184 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Valley View Secondary School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new two-storey performing arts, music and media facility with lift access, new outdoor canopy, refurbishment of the resource centre, general learning area, gymnasium and administration areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

185 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Victor Harbor R-7 School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new building with general learning areas and specialist learning facilities, additional areas to support growth and a new outdoor learning area, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

186 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Warradale Primary School will receive \$7.5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new activity hall and four new classrooms, refurbish an existing building, improve teaching facilities to incorporate STEM subjects and upgrades to the administration area and frontage, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

187 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that West Lakes Shore School R-7 will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct a new building to link several buildings and facilities, new

specialist learning areas, upgrading open space units and outdoor environments, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

188 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Westbourne Park Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to construct new areas to support growth, new learning areas including STEM facilities and refurbished teaching spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

189 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Willunga School will receive \$2 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build an advanced technologies centre, refurbish existing technical studies building, improved access to administrative areas, new toilet facilities and a middle school precinct with enhanced indoor/outdoor learning spaces, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

190 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Wirreanda Secondary School will receive \$9 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to replace transportable classrooms and aged buildings with contemporary buildings, extensions to existing STEM facilities with outdoor connectivity, major refurbishments to several buildings creating a new performing arts centre, refurbished technical studies and gymnasium facilities, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

191 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Woodcroft Primary School will receive \$6 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a two-storey building to replace 15 transportable classrooms, refurbishing the library, junior learning and administrative areas, connected breakout space for STEM activities and improved landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

192 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Woodend Primary School will receive \$5 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build new STEM learning areas, refurbishment of general learning areas, alterations to the gymnasium, new outdoor learning areas and landscaping, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

193 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (24 July 2018). Can the minister guarantee that Woodville High School will receive \$10 million under the Building Better Schools Infrastructure Program and be able to progress with plans to build a new horticultural and food technology facility, upgrades to visual arts facility, creating an outdoor artist studio and refurbishing several learning and administrative areas, as outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development's website?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The government proposes to deliver this school's Building Better Schools project in line with the announced dollar value as described.

The illustrations and lists of desired improvements prepared for all schools in the program clearly stated 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change'. This statement was placed under the illustration when the former government was in power as the allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced. Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations could be met in total.

The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with this school will determine the detail of the final project (or projects) that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, when the Member for Port Adelaide was the minister, and then published in each school's brochure in February 2018 remain:

- the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms
- creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers
- the refurbishment of classrooms and building, transforming then into modern learning areas
- landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

194 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What are the locations of the various Supported Disability Accommodations throughout South Australia as broken down by Group Home, Group Cluster and Single Cluster classification?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

There are 197 Supported Community Accommodation (SCA) properties throughout South Australia. The Department of Human Services (DHS) categorises these properties as Group Homes or Group Clusters, as outlined below:

SA Government Region	Suburb	Group Home or Cluster	Number of Home/Cluster
Eastern Adelaide	Adelaide	Group Home	1
	Athelstone	Group Home	1
	Campbelltown	Group Cluster	9
	Campbelltown	Group Home	2
	Felixstow	Group Home	1
	Felixstow	Group Cluster	6
	Prospect	Group Home	1
	St Morris	Group Home	1
	Limestone Coast	Mount Gambier	Group Cluster
Mount Gambier		Group Home	3
Worrolong		Group Home	2
Northern Adelaide	Blakeview	Group Home	1
	Brahma Lodge	Group Home	1
	Broadview	Group Cluster	2
	Clearview	Group Cluster	5
	Craigmore	Group Home	2
	Elizabeth Park	Group Cluster	2
	Elizabeth Vale	Group Home	1
	Enfield	Group Home	2
	Enfield	Group Cluster	2
	Gilles Plains	Group Home	1
	Gilles Plains	Group Cluster	4
	Greenacres	Group Cluster	2
	Greenwith	Group Home	1
	Gulfview Heights	Group Home	1
	Hillbank	Group Home	2
	Holden Hill	Group Home	1
	Hope Valley	Group Home	1
	Ingle Farm	Group Home	1
	Klemzig	Group Home	3
	Klemzig	Group Cluster	7
	Lightsview	Group Home	1
	Lightsview	Group Cluster	8
	MacDonald Park	Group Cluster	2
	MacDonald Park	Group Home	1
	Munno Para West	Group Home	1
	Northfield	Group Cluster	7
	Northfield	Group Home	2
	Northgate	Group Home	4
	Oakden	Group Home	2
	Para Hills	Group Home	1
Para Hills West	Group Home	2	
Parafield Gardens	Group Home	1	
Pooraka	Group Home	1	
Pooraka	Group Cluster	2	
Salisbury	Group Home	2	
Salisbury Downs	Group Home	2	
Salisbury East	Group Home	3	
Salisbury North	Group Cluster	4	

SA Government Region	Suburb	Group Home or Cluster	Number of Home/Cluster
	Salisbury North	Group Home	2
	Windsor Gardens	Group Home	1
Southern Adelaide	Christie Downs	Group Home	1
	Mitchell Park	Group Home	3
	Mitchell Park	Group Cluster	4
	Morphett Vale	Group Home	1
	Morphett Vale	Group Cluster	4
	Park Holme	Group Cluster	14
	Park Holme	Group Home	1
	Seacombe Gardens	Group Cluster	2
	Sturt	Group Cluster	2
	Tonsley	Group Cluster	2
Western Adelaide	Albert Park	Group Home	2
	Angle Park	Group Cluster	2
	Beverley	Group Home	1
	Birkenhead	Group Home	1
	Cheltenham	Group Home	1
	Findon	Group Cluster	4
	North Haven	Group Home	2
	Pennington	Group Cluster	2
	Pennington	Group Home	2
	Renown Park	Group Home	1
	Seaton	Group Cluster	3
	Semaphore Park	Group Home	1
	Thebarton	Group Home	1
	Woodville	Group Cluster	3
	Woodville Gardens	Group Cluster	4
	Woodville South	Group Home	1
Yorke and Mid North	Kadina	Group Home	2
	Moonta	Group Home	2
	Moonta Bay	Group Cluster	2

Note: SA Government Region is based on stated suburb of group home or cluster.

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

195 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What are the existing valuations of supported disability accommodations throughout South Australia broken down by facility?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

As detailed in the table below, the state government owns 99 properties at a capital value of approximately \$40.9 million. 22 properties are owned by DHS and 77 by the South Australian Housing Authority. DHS does not hold valuation records of properties owned by non-government organisations.

Suburb	Number of properties	Capital value amount
Adelaide	1	\$335,000
Albert Park	1	\$405,000
Angle Park	2	\$1,150,000
Athelstone	1	\$510,000
Beverley	1	\$420,000
Blakeview	1	\$310,000

Suburb	Number of properties	Capital value amount
Broadview	2	\$1,390,000
Campbelltown	8	\$3,080,000
Cheltenham	1	\$425,000
Christie Downs	1	\$345,000
Clear View	1	\$320,000
Clovelly Park	2	\$1,020,000
Craigmore	1	\$330,000
Enfield	4	\$1,975,000
Findon	4	\$2,580,000
Gillies Plains	2	\$1,120,000
Golden Grove	1	\$445,000
Greenacres	2	\$1,020,000
Highbury	1	\$420,000
Hillbank	2	\$755,000
Klemzig	4	\$1,785,000
Lightsview	5	\$1,770,000
Mitchell Park	1	\$550,000
Moonta	1	\$265,000
Mount Gambier	5	\$709,000
Morphett Vale	1	\$500,000
Suburb	Number of properties	Capital value amount
North Haven	1	\$470,000
Northfield	9	\$2,810,000
Para Hills West	1	\$220,000
Para Field Gardens	2	\$750,000
Park Holme	3	\$2,080,000
Paradise	1	\$445,000
Pennington	3	\$790,000
Port Augusta	1	\$260,000
Pooraka	3	\$1,235,000
Prospect	1	\$560,000
Renown Park	1	\$245,000
Rostrevor	1	\$530,000
Salisbury North	2	\$590,000
Salisbury	2	\$590,000
Seacombe Gardens	2	\$1,020,000
Seaton	3	\$930,000
Semaphore Park	1	\$335,000
Sturt	2	\$1,140,000
Thebarton	1	\$395,000
Woodville	3	\$1,565,000
TOTAL	99	\$40,894,000.00

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

196 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). When and how were departmental staff informed of the government's decision to privatise South Australia's supported disability accommodation facilities?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

There has not been a decision to privatise supported community accommodation services (SCA).

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

197 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). How many clients currently utilise supported disability accommodation throughout South Australia both in total and broken down by facility?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SCA provides accommodation to 518 clients across South Australia. The breakdown of each facility is as follows:

Facility location	Number of clients
Adelaide	1
Albert Park	3
Albert Park	3
Angle Park	5
Angle Park	5
Athelstone	2
Beverley	3
Birkenhead	1
Blakeview	4
Brahma Lodge	2
Broadview	5
Broadview	5
Campbelltown	1
Campbelltown	1
Campbelltown	1
Campbelltown	5
Campbelltown	5
Campbelltown	3
Campbelltown	1
Campbelltown	1
Campbelltown	2
Campbelltown	3
Campbelltown	2
Cheltenham	4
Christie Downs	5
Clearview	1
Craigmore	4
Facility location	Number of clients
Craigmore	4
Elizabeth Park	4
Elizabeth Park	4
Elizabeth Vale	4
Enfield	4
Enfield	5
Enfield	5
Enfield	4
Felixstow	3
Felixstow	5
Felixstow	5
Felixstow	2
Felixstow	2
Felixstow	1
Felixstow	1
Findon	5
Gilles Plains	5
Gilles Plains	5
Gilles Plains	3
Gilles Plains	3
Gilles Plains	2

Facility location	Number of clients
Greenacres	5
Greenacres	5
Greenwith	2
Gulfview Heights	3
Hillbank	4
Hillbank	3
Holden Hill	4
Hope Valley	3
Ingle Farm	4
Kadina	4
Kadina	3
Klemzig	1
Klemzig	3
Klemzig	5
Klemzig	5
Klemzig	1
Lightsview	2
Lightsview	1
Facility location	Number of clients
Lightsview	1
MacDonald Park	2
MacDonald Park	4
MacDonald Park	1
Mitchell Park	5
Mitchell Park	7
Mitchell Park	
Mitchell Park	
Mitchell Park	
Mitchell Park	3
Mitchell Park	4
Moonta	2
Moonta	3
Moonta Bay	1
Moonta Bay	1
Morphett Vale	4
Morphett Vale	6
Morphett Vale	
Morphett Vale	
Morphett Vale	
Mount Gambier	1
Mount Gambier	1
Mount Gambier	3
Mount Gambier	
Mount Gambier	7
Mount Gambier	
Mount Gambier	
Mount Gambier	
Mount Gambier	5
Mount Gambier	1
Mount Gambier	1
Munno Para West	1
North Haven	3
North Haven	2
Northfield	5

Facility location	Number of clients
Northfield	
Northfield	
Northfield	
Northfield	
Northfield	1
Northfield	4
Northfield	5
Northfield	5
Northgate	1
Northgate	1
Northgate	3
Northgate	1
Facility location	Number of clients
Oakden	4
Oakden	1
Para Hill West	3
Para Hills	4
Para Hills West	1
Parafield Gardens	3
Park Holme	5
Park Holme	5
Park Holme	5
Park Holme	6
Park Holme	
Park Holme	
Park Holme	
Park Holme	6
Park Holme	
Park Holme	
Park Holme	
Park Holme	6
Park Holme	
Park Holme	
Park Holme	
Pennington	1
Pooraka	1
Pooraka	5
Pooraka	5
Prospect	3
Renown Park	1
Salisbury	3
Salisbury	2
Salisbury Downs	5
Salisbury Downs	3
Salisbury East	3
Salisbury East	3
Salisbury East	3
Salisbury North	5
Salisbury North	5
Salisbury North	4
Salisbury North	3
Seacombe Gardens	5
Seacombe Gardens	5
Seaton	1
Seaton	1
Seaton	1
Semaphore Park	3
St Morris	4
Facility location	Number of clients
Sturt	5

Facility location	Number of clients
Sturt	5
Thebarton	3
Tonsley	5
Tonsley	5
Windsor Gardens	2
Woodville	4
Woodville	4
Woodville	4
Woodville Gardens	1
Woodville South	3
Worrolong	1
Worrolong	1
Total	518

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

198 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What are the current total carer staffing numbers and FTE hours per Supported Accommodation facility?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

A breakdown of staff numbers and hours per home is not available. Staffing in each house varies based on client need.

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

199 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). How many hours of care, on average, does a client receive through Disability Supported Accommodation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The majority of SCA clients live in group homes that provide 24-hour support. A small minority of clients do not require 24-hour support; however, they are able to access assistance whenever required.

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

200 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What is the existing register of assets for disability supported accommodation through the Department of Human Services?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Department of Treasury and Finance requires an asset register to be kept for all assets (plant and equipment) over the value of \$10,000. Shared Services SA maintains the asset register on behalf of the department, and DHS reconciles the content annually.

Excluding property values (land and building), the register for SCA assets (valued at \$10,000 or more) relating to Group Homes owned by DHS is as follows:

Suburb	Asset	Value Amount (after depreciation)
Cheltenham	Kitchen Upgrade	\$11,202.01
Northfield	Reverse Cycle Air conditioner	\$10,599.99
Woodville South	Bathroom upgrade	\$12,019.67

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

201 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). How many vans, cars and buses does disability supported accommodation, through the Department of Human Services, currently own or utilise on a regular to semi-regular basis?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The state government's passenger and light commercial motor vehicle fleet is owned and managed by the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA). A total of 167 Fleet vehicles are leased by DHS for SCA services.

SUPPORTED DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION

202 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What is the existing and current financial commitment of the South Australian Government to disability supported accommodation as at 3 July 2018?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

In 2017-18, the allocated net cost of services budget for the DHS directorate responsible for SCA services (properties categorised as group homes and group clusters) was \$110.6 million. This excludes any costs for Highgate Park or the Northgate Aged Care Service. The allocated net cost of services budget does not include any attribution of DHS corporate overhead costs.

CHANGING PLACES PROGRAM

203 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). Has and will the Marshall government commit to the \$1.7 million Changing Places program struck under the former government?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The government is committed to the four-year \$1.7 million Changing Places program and is working with the partner organisations that were announced by the previous government. Partner organisations have provided, or will be required to provide, a range of documentation and assurances, in accordance with government procurement requirements, for funding agreements to proceed.

CHANGING PLACES PROGRAM

204 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). Has the government committed to funding for a Changing Places facility at the Port Lincoln Leisure Centre?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The government has not committed to funding a Changing Places facility at the Port Lincoln Leisure Centre, but is committed to providing funding for a facility in a location in Port Lincoln that is supported by the local community, through consultation, and that also meets Changing Places requirements.

CHANGING PLACES PROGRAM

205 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What consultation was undertaken regarding the location of a Changing Places facility in Port Lincoln? And were other locations considered?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Department of Human Services is continuing to engage with the City of Port Lincoln. The council has advised that its community consultation process, which will provide guidance on the preferred location, is nearing completion.

EMERGENCY CODES

206 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What are the existing criteria for instigating both a Code Red and a Code Blue?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The information requested is publicly available on the sa.gov.au website.

EMERGENCY CODES

207 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What criteria do the Department of Human Services need to satisfy before a Code Red or Code Blue can be declared?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The information requested is publicly available on the sa.gov.au website.

EMERGENCY CODES

208 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). How does the Department of Human Services notify service providers when a Code Red or Code Blue is declared?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Communication in relation to extreme weather events for people rough sleeping is set out in a formal protocol between the SA Housing Authority and the participating Non-government agencies. Each metropolitan and regional area has its own communication plan that is signed off by participating agencies. This includes key contacts who are responsible for Code Blue and Red activation.

While each agency has a specific role, communication is through multiple channels (including email, phone call, and to the public, Facebook, Twitter etc) to ensure that critical stakeholders are aware of activation. Chief executives and senior managers are responsible for communicating decisions in relation to activation to their staff. In this way the communication plan delivers two tiers of communication responsibility, to send out key communication messages in a timely manner.

The Homelessness Gateway (operating 24/7; 7 days per week) coordinates communication across the metropolitan region, and each agency involved is responsible for communicating their own messages to their staff.

At a regional level, the SA Housing Authority communicates activation of a Code Blue/Red via email or phone call to key participating agencies. Regional managers of the SA Housing Authority are responsible for communicating and co-ordinating Code Blue/Red as per their local plan.

EMERGENCY CODES

209 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What were the number of Code Red and Code Blues declared from 1 January 2018-3 July 2018?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Between 1 January 2018-3 July 2018, responses were activated five times. Code Red was activated on three occasions, with Code Blue activated on two occasions.

EMERGENCY CODES

210 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What were the number of Code Red and Code Blues declared from 1 January 2017-31 December 2017?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Between 1 January 2018-3 July 2018, responses were activated seven times. Code Red was activated on one occasion, with Code Blue activated on six occasions.

EMERGENCY CODES

211 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What year were Code Reds introduced and how many have been instigated since this time?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

A statewide Code Red response was implemented in early 2017 to support people sleeping rough during periods of extreme heat. Since implementation, Code Red has been activated on four occasions.

EMERGENCY CODES

212 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (24 July 2018). What year were Code Blues introduced and how many have been instigated since this time?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

A Code Blue response was implemented in metropolitan Adelaide in July 2016 to support people sleeping rough during periods of extreme cold and/or wet weather. Since implementation, Code Blue has been activated on eight occasions.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

252 Mr PICTON (Kurna) (1 August 2018). On what dates did the Premier receive correspondence from Professor David David about the Australian Craniofacial Unit?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Professor David's letter of 18 June reached my office on 25 June 2018.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

253 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (1 August 2018). On what dates did the Premier personally talk to Professor David David AC about the Australian Craniofacial Unit?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

While I have spoken to Professor David on a number of occasions I can advise that I spoke to him in relation to the Australian Craniofacial Unit recruitment practices on 20 June 2018 and 28 June 2018.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

254 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (1 August 2018). On what dates did the Premier receive briefings on the concerns raised by Professor David David AC about the Australian Craniofacial Unit?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

A briefing was provided to my office by the Minister for Health and Wellbeing's office on 26th June 2018.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

304 Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (1 August 2018). What is the number of ministerial advisers funded for each minister in the government?

(a) What is the salary of each ministerial adviser position in the government as at 30 June 2018?

(b) What is the total employment cost of each ministerial adviser position in the government?

(c) What non-salary components are provided as part of remuneration arrangements for ministers' chiefs of staff and ministerial advisers and what is the cost of each of these components?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Salary information was published in the Government Gazette and tabled in both Houses of the Parliament on 2 August 2018. The information relating to non-salary components for chiefs of staff and ministerial advisers is proactively disclosed as required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular 035.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

316 Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (1 August 2018). As at 30 March 2018 how many total public sector FTE positions were funded in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

As at 30 March 2018, the total public-sector FTE positions in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was 1,900.6. The number of FTE positions by classification level is as follows:

FTE	Classification
AS01	42.0
AS02	428.3
AS03	272.6
AS04	156.8
AS05	181.2
AS06	208.0
AS07	135.8
AS08	115.1
AHP504	2.0
CRF003	29.2

FTE	Classification
EXEC0E	1.0
EXEC0F	1.5
LE4	1.0
LE5	1.0
LEC5	0.8
MAS2	1.0
MAS3	52.6
MINADS	27.4
MINCOS	1.0
MIN000	1.0
MINAPP	17.5
OPS1	3.0
OPS2	2.0
OPS3	1.0
OPS4	4.0
OPS5	13.0
OPS6	9.7
PO1	5.0
PO2	18.0
PO3	28.0
PO4	27.8
PO5	25.0
PO6	1.0
SAES1	59.2
SAES2	15.5
TG01	1.0
TG02	1.0
TG03	2.0

FTE	Classification
TRA124	3.0
WP601	0.8
WP602	2.8
WP802	1.0
Total FTE	1900.60

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

320 Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (1 August 2018). Can the Premier advise what consultancies and/or contractor arrangements have been engaged by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet since 19 March 2018?

- (a) What is the purpose of each consultancy and/or contractor arrangement?
- (b) What is the estimated cost of each consultancy and/or contractor arrangement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This information is publicly available on the SA Tenders and Contracts website.

REGISTER OF LOBBYISTS

321 Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (1 August 2018). Since 19 March, 2018 which lobbyists (listed on the Register of Lobbyists) had contact with the premier or a member of the Premier's staff?

1. For those occasions when the minister or a member of his staff had face-to-face meetings with the lobbyists
 - (a) What is the name of the lobbyist;
 - (b) What was the date of the meeting(s);
 - (c) What is the name of the third party for whom the lobbyist has provided paid or unpaid services; and
 - (d) The nature of that third party's issue?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The responsibility for reporting this information rests with lobbyists registered under the Lobbyists Act 2015. The information is reported by lobbyists annually as required by section 8 of the act and published on the Department of the Premier and Cabinet website.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

322 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 August 2018). How many new apprenticeships and traineeships it will create each year to reach its commitment of 20,800 over the next 4 years?

1. How will this target will be measured and reported?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills):

1 The Marshall Liberal government is implementing strong reforms to South Australia's training system to address the unacceptable decline in apprentice and trainee numbers in South Australia over the last five years. Under the previous Labor government training commencements fell by 16,900 (66%) to 8,765 from 2012-2017.

The state and federal governments are making a significant investment of \$203 million to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships over the next four years. Through our strengthened relationship with the commonwealth, we have successfully secured \$103 million through the Skilling Australians Fund. This funding reinforces the state government's \$100 million commitment.

Fundamentally, the state government is implementing an industry led training system in South Australia to ensure training is delivered in response to the needs of industry and small business, and importantly, is aligned with real job outcomes. The Department for Industry and Skills is working with industry to deliver training in line with industry requirements through our Skilling South Australia Strategy. It is anticipated that the growth in apprentices and trainees will increase every year over the forward estimates.

2. The state government has a resolute commitment to increase the number of apprentices and trainees to ensure a skilled future workforce across the state. The Department for Industry and Skills will measure and

report on training, including training commencements, delivery methods and investments in training programs – as has always been the case.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

323 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 August 2018). How many new apprenticeships and traineeships have so far been created since coming to office?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills):

1. Industry and training stakeholders have been engaged with the state government's Skilling South Australia Strategy, due to be officially launched in the coming weeks. The Department for Industry and Skills continues to provide advice and support to industry and small business, including assistance around accessing funding support through our \$203 million investment to take on apprentices and trainees.

To achieve our target, we have already implemented key reforms to boost training in South Australia, including securing \$103 million from the federal government, releasing a renewed subsidised training list and revitalising the Training and Skills Commission. We are also in the consultation stages of re-establishing Industry Skills Councils, implementing flexible apprenticeship pathways and streamlining the registration process.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

324 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 August 2018). Has the Minister for Industry and Skills read the incoming brief from the Small Business Commissioner?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills):

1. The Minister for Industry and Skills was fully briefed by the Small Business Commissioner when he became minister and has regular set meetings, and other meetings on a needs-driven basis.

TIMBER PRODUCTION

326 Mr HUGHES (Giles) (4 September 2018). What is the Marshall Liberal government doing to double the economic value of timber production across South Australia by 2050?

1. How this will be measured and reported?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): The government is establishing the South Australian Forest Industry Advisory Council which will help drive our development agenda for the timber industry.

It is expected the government and industry will pursue appropriate development based upon the advice of the council. PIRSA will work with the council to determine appropriate measurement methods towards growing the economic value of the domestic timber production.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

327 Mr HUGHES (Giles) (4 September 2018). What has been done so far to honour the government's election commitment to establish the South Australian Forestry Council?

1. When will the council be established?
2. Who has been consulted in establishing the council?
3. Who is going to be on the council?
4. What criteria will be used to appoint members?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): The South Australian government is committed to the delivery of our election policy and is currently working to establish the South Australian Forestry Council in 2018. Further advice on the membership will be advised when the council is announced.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

328 Mr HUGHES (Giles) (5 September 2018). How many people are employed within the forestry industry in South Australia currently?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): Forestry and forest product industries in South Australia directly employ about 5,500 people and indirectly generate employment for another 12,500 persons, totalling 18,000.

Source: REMPLAN Economics as at June 2018.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

329 Mr HUGHES (Giles) (5 September 2018). What is the economic value of the forestry industry within South Australia?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): The South Australian forestry and wood products industries contributed over \$2.3 billion to the state's economy in 2015-16 (ABARES 2018).

APPRENTICESHIPS

330 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). Can the minister advise the number of school leavers entering apprenticeships in 2017-18 both as a raw figure and as a proportion of all school leavers?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

To provide accurate data, the Department for Industry and Skills will need to cross reference with the Education Department (noting data has been asked for the 2017-18 financial year—not the school year). Additionally, there are issues with data collection i.e. the release of names across agencies and data only being able to be collected from government schools.

APPRENTICESHIPS

331 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). How many people in South Australia were working in apprenticeships in 2017-18?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

The most recent NCVER data available (released 5 June 2018), shows that as at 31 December 2017, there were 9,500 apprentices and trainees in-training in trade occupations in South Australia.

APPRENTICESHIPS

332 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). What is the current apprenticeship non-completion rate in South Australia?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

The most recent data from the National Centre for Vocational Education Research shows that South Australia has an attrition rate of 35.7 per cent for training contracts in a trade occupation commencing in 2013.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

333 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). How many people were employed within the manufacturing industry in South Australia as at the end of June 2018?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

Based on data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Labour Force Survey, using a 12-month average to the May quarter 2018, there were 67,400 South Australians employed in the manufacturing industry.

ADVANCED WELDER TRAINING CENTRE

334 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). When will the new Advanced Welder Training Centre (AWTC) open at the Regency Campus of TAFE SA?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

It is anticipated that the facility will be open for student use by next year.

SKILLING AUSTRALIANS FUND

335 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). How much funding has the state government received from the commonwealth towards the Skilling Australia fund?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

The Skilling Australians Fund is a commonwealth government program. The state government has been successful in securing almost \$103 million for South Australia, including a \$7.97 million bonus payment achieved by signing up to the National Partnership on the Skilling Australians Fund by the 7 June deadline.

The Marshall Liberal government has committed \$100 million to secure matched funding from the commonwealth to support a range of initiatives that will create an additional 20,815 apprenticeships and traineeships over the next four years.

In 2017-18 the commonwealth government provided South Australia with \$19.1 million.

OTTOWAY ENGINEERING

336 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). What advice has the minister received regarding the impact on local businesses, suppliers and subcontractors of the decision by Ottoway Engineering to go into voluntary administration?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

Ottoway Engineering and Ottoway Fabrication were sold to the Ferretti Group prior to being placed in voluntary administration.

The Ferretti Group are continuing operations.

Ottoway Engineering and Ottoway Fabrication have unsecured/unrelated creditors.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

337 Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (5 September 2018). What advice has the minister received from the Small Business Commissioner regarding the re-introduction of proposed laws to improve protection of subcontractors against non-payment or late payment by head contractors?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

On 21 December 2016 the Australian government announced a national review of security of payment laws. The review was conducted by Mr John Murray (the Murray Review) and was released by the federal government on 21 May 2018.

The purpose of the review was to identify legislative best practice, with a view to improving the consistency in security of payment legislation and the level of protection for subcontractors nationally.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Karna)** (5 July 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

1. One surgeon working with the Australian Craniofacial Unit (ACFU) under a Visiting Medical Specialist contract has not been reappointed. The recruitment process is being reviewed.

2. No. The ACFU, through funding from the South Australian government, supports up to 15 patients per year as international humanitarian cases. These patients are supported for their medical treatment and accommodation and living expenses while in South Australia. These cases continue to be welcomed and there is no plan from the government to alter current arrangements.

3. The ACFU is recognised as a statewide centre of excellence.

4. I am advised that there has been no split of positions.

DATACOM IT HUB

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (24 July 2018).

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:

On 1 August 2018, Datacom officially launched its facility at Tea Tree Gully with over 400 employees already working on site.

Datacom has informed the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment that it expects to surpass its announced job numbers of over 684 FTE's by the end of 2018.

MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (26 July 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Since coming to government I have reinforced the importance of being open and transparent with all ministers which includes complying with all Premier and Cabinet circulars including PC035—Proactive Disclosure of Regularly Requested Information.

I understand that both ministers were in the process of proactively disclosing their expenses when this question was asked and have since disclosed this information as required.

PRIVATE EMAIL ACCOUNTS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (26 July 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The penalty for an individual found guilty of intentionally disposing of or removing an official record from official custody without proper authority is contained in S17 of the State Records Act 1997.

LANDS TITLES OFFICE

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (3 July 2018).

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has advised the following:

Despite the commercialisation of the Lands Titles Office, the Office of the Registrar-General (ORG), now part of the Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure still plays a key role in the titles system.

The key function of the ORG is to administer the Real Property Act 1886, and the associated statutes and policy impacting land transactions. This includes maintenance of the integrity of the Land Titles Register Book in accordance with the Torrens title system and the government guarantee of indefeasibility of title, controlling the Assurance Fund and processing associated claims, and setting regulated fees and charges.

Land Services SA Pty Ltd (LSSA) are now the exclusive provider for the State's transactional land services, however the ORG with transitional assistance from the Department of Treasury and Finance has assumed responsibility for managing the contractual arrangements that govern the provision of those services.

As part of the provision of these services, LSSA administer and provide access to the South Australian Integrated Land Information System (SAILIS). As LSSA develop the processes to enable electronic conveyancing and new data products, a key focus is on information privacy and security, data verification and control to ensure the integrity of information provided through SAILIS and ensure the use of data by LSSA is permitted under the IP Licence Deed. ORG are overseeing and working with LSSA to ensure these requirements are met.

There is no reason to believe that the integrity of the titles system is at any greater risk as a result of commercialisation. There are a significant number of controls and safeguards in place in order to protect the integrity of what is an important asset of the state.

RATE CAPPING

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (24 July 2018).

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): The Deputy Valuer-General has advised that the City of Port Adelaide Enfield (the council) rates on capital value and not turnover. The Council adopts the Valuer-General's capital values for properties within the residential land use category, but they also utilise their own valuers to determine capital values for properties within the other land use categories, including commercial categories.

The *Local Government Act 1999* allows councils to adopt valuations made by the Valuer-General, or valuations made by a valuer employed by the council, or a combination of both. The council is unique in that they are the only council in the state to use a combination of both.

The methodologies utilised by the council's valuers to determine capital values for their assessments appears consistent with those utilised by the valuation industry to determine a market value, and appears consistent with the valuation practices relied upon by the Valuer-General in determining rating and taxing valuations.

In the case of commercial properties, the most common valuation methodology is the capitalisation of income approach, where the income is a product of the market rental that can be expected for the property.

In this way, the rates that are applied against a capital value for a commercial property are not against the turnover of the commercial business that occupies the property, but reflect the value associated with the market rental that the owner can expect to realise from leasing the property.

Under the Local Government (Rate Oversight) Amendment Bill, councils would not be able to increase their total revenue from general rates above the rate cap, unless they can make the case to the independent regulator that an increase above this level is needed. Councils would continue to use property valuations as the basis of the policies they set to determine the contribution of ratepayers towards this capped revenue.

The proposed rate oversight system would therefore have no impact on the method used by the City of Port Adelaide Enfield to value its commercial properties.