LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 2 November 2017

The PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley) took the chair at 14:18 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Employment (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Reports, 2016-17—
- Adelaide Festival Centre Trust
- Adelaide Festival Corporation
- Adelaide Film Festival
- Art Gallery of South Australia
- Auditor-General's Department
- Carclew
- Carrick Hill Trust
- Department of State Development
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- History Trust of South Australia
- JamFactory Contemporary Craft and Design Inc.
- Libraries Board of South Australia
- National Heavy Vehicle Regulator
- South Australian Museum Board
- State of the Sector
- Windmill Theatre Co. Australian Children's Performing Arts Company

By the Minister for Science and Information Economy (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

TechInSA, Report, 2016-17

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Reports, 2016-17—
- Adelaide Venue Management Corporation
- Animal Welfare Advisory Committee
- Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium
- Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources
- Dog and Cat Management Board
- Dog Fence Board
- Environment Protection Authority
- ForestrySA
- Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park Co-management Board
- Lake Gairdner National Park Co-management Board
- Maralinga Lands Unnamed Conservation Park (Mamungari) Co-management Board
- Nullarbor Parks Advisory Committee
- Parks and Wilderness Council
- Pastoral Board

Primary Industries and Regions SA
South Australian Heritage Council
South Australian Tourism Commission
South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board
Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-management Board
Witjira National Park Co-management Board
Yumbarra Conservation Park Co-management Board
Zero Waste SA/Green Industries SA

Regulations under the following Acts—
Fisheries Management Act 2007—Fees No. 6
Industrial Hemp Act 2017—
Fees
General

By the Minister for Water and the River Murray (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Reports, 2016-17—
South Australian Water Corporation
Stormwater Management Authority

By the Minister for Employment (Hon. K.J. Maher) on behalf of the Minister for Health (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Department for Health and Ageing, Report, 2016-17

By the Minister for Employment (Hon. K.J. Maher) on behalf of the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Principal Community Visitor, Report, 2016-17

Question Time

KINGSTON SE BOAT RAMP

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation and Minister for Water and the River Murray a question about the Kingston boat ramp.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Last weekend, the very hardworking candidate for the Liberal Party in the seat of MacKillop, Mr Nick McBride, asked me to come to Kingston for a public gathering at the boat ramp. Community members are concerned that it has silted-up with sand and seaweed. I think it was Mr Shaun Mules who convened the meeting. We expected to see the mayor and maybe one or two members of the council staff and a handful of members of the public. When I arrived at 10am on a very blustery, not that cold but pretty blustery, Sunday morning, there were more than 200 people at this particular meeting, which sent a strong message to me that this was indeed an issue that the community was quite concerned about.

They have a beautiful boat ramp with three ramps to put boats into the water, but the channel is completely full of sand and seaweed. Apparently, at low tide you can walk across it, so it's hardly navigable for boats. There was some discussion around the reasons that it was in this situation. They didn't particularly want to blame the EPA, or anybody in particular, but I gave them a commitment that this week I would ask the minister a question here in parliament, so that he would be able to give an answer as to why this is blocked-up and how quickly it could be unblocked.

Members would know that Kingston is one of our South-East coastal towns. It has a large population of retirees and tourists and a significant number of professional fishermen, none of whom can actually use this facility. I ask the minister to explain why it is taking so long to clean it out, and will he give a commitment that all the approvals will be in place so that this can be cleaned out before the Christmas holiday season?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:24): I thank the honourable member for his excellent question. It is important to give this information to the community, so I encourage him to take it away with him and feed it back through his networks, although I understand that has also been happening through the auspices of the EPA and the local council.

I can relay the advice I have had from the EPA on this, which is that on 28 September 2017 the EPA granted the Kingston District Council an emergency authorisation to allow dredging of the Maria Creek at Kingston SE. This authorisation was valid until 18 October. I am further advised that this authorisation was granted because of the potential imminent risk of flooding arising from forecast rainfall and creek conditions at the time. I am advised that council did not undertake the dredging during the emergency authorisation period, nor did it take steps to secure a full authorisation.

I understand that a request was subsequently made by council for an extension of the emergency authorisation after the emergency authorisation period had expired. Unfortunately, the emergency had somewhat passed and this request was, therefore, not supported by the EPA, based essentially on the lack of evidence to support the requirements that the EPA must function under, in terms of the Environment Protection Act 1993, that an emergency situation relating to the need to protect life, the environment or property was in place.

Council was asked to monitor climatic conditions over the following weeks and inform the EPA of any imminent threats to life, property or the environment so that the EPA could make a determination based on that advice. However, I have been advised that council has now submitted an application for a licence to allow it to undertake dredging and earthworks drainage at various locations, including the Maria Creek boat ramp. As I understand it—and I am going only on oral advice at this stage—the council has applied for a broad permit across many sites, not just the boat ramp. As per the standard process under the Environment Protection Act, there will have to be public notification and consultation in the coming weeks.

So, the situation is that the EPA was approached with a sense of imminent emergency. The EPA then did what it could under the act and issued an approval for dredging on the basis of the advice it had about weather conditions and what was being faced. That period of time expired and the council cannot now sustain 'an imminent danger or emergency' which would allow the EPA to reissue the emergency permit. The council must now go through the step-by-step process that is required, and I understand it is doing so.

I can understand a degree of frustration on behalf of the community, and certainly on behalf of the honourable member who has asked me this question. Unfortunately, not having moved in the time period made available to them through the emergency authorisation, and not being able to sustain an argument to the EPA that the emergency is continuing in terms of a threat under the legislation, as I outlined, the EPA could not reissue that emergency authorisation. They will, of course, move with all alacrity, but this is now a matter for council to undertake community consultation and go through the steps required to get approval for the dredging.

KINGSTON SE BOAT RAMP

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Supplementary question: given the urgent nature of the issue—we have community members paying their boat registrations, paying their levies, but they have a boat ramp they cannot use—it is extremely frustrating, because some of the other boat ramps and access points, Cape Jaffa and the like, are also suffering from some level of sand build-up. How quickly will this be resolved?

My understanding is that when the dredging is approved it will take a number of weeks to actually dredge it. It is not just a couple of barrel loads; there are 20,000 or 30,000 or 50,000 cubic metres of material to be moved. Is there any way the council can shorten the public consultation, given there were 200 people there consulting with me on Sunday who were very keen to say, 'Get on and dredge it right now'?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:29): I thank the

honourable member for his supplementary question. As tempting as it is to make an executive decision right now that the consultation the honourable member engaged with on the weekend would be adequate for the purpose of the EP Act, I think that would be a very brave call, given that the EPA is an independent regulator and also given circumstances that have happened in recent times with another council appearing before the courts in this state about a decision they were taking and consulting on down, I think, at Tennyson Dunes. Having fallen foul of procedural matters that they needed to apply themselves to, I think I should probably refrain from doing that.

I again thank the honourable member. I understand the frustrations and I sympathise with the community, the residents and the businesses that may be impacted by this, but the EPA is an independent regulator. It acts under the auspices of the legislation that this place has passed, and we have empowered them to do so. It can only act in accordance with the legislative approvals that were provided in that legislation. It did act and issued an emergency permit when it was requested and when that emergency consideration could be sustained in argument.

When this matter, it is important to understand, first arose, the EPA acted in providing that emergency authorisation very quickly. I don't want to, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition has refrained from doing, cast any reflection on any parties, but the time frame that was allocated during that emergency approval was not utilised by council. That has given rise to these circumstances, which, of course, are incredibly frustrating.

Notwithstanding that, the EPA has advised the council that it will monitor the situation. I am advised that, if circumstances change, to give effect to an emergency situation that could be sustained under the legislation. Emergency authorisations, it is important to understand, are exemptions and are used in circumstances where workers need to protect the environment, property or life. That is in the legislation.

I understand that council has now lodged an application, as I said before, seeking formal approval that this application must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Environment Protection Act. The act sets out the various things that the EPA and the council must do before it can determine the application; that includes formal public consultations that must be done properly.

Honourable members will be aware the EPA is an independent regulator. As I said, I can't direct them in the carrying out of their duties, other than to encourage them to act speedily in this matter and not to have any undue delay. I very happily do so; my office has already encouraged them to do so. I am quite sure the EPA will make a determination as speedily as it can. It is not, I would have thought, in any way desirous to delay this past the time when we want this dredging to occur, but the council now must go through a consultation process. It must be done properly and we will act as speedily as we possibly can.

I thank the honourable member for raising this issue. I will give him some information that he can take away and supply to his constituents. I will reiterate with the EPA our desire—his and mine and the local communities—that this be acted on very swiftly.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation on the subject of ICT.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Less than six months ago, the Office for Digital Government was rebranded to reflect a renewed focus on the consumer with the new title of Office for Customer, ICT and Digital Transformation. However, in another example of this government's failed direction in the digital and cyber department, the team responsible for the whole-of-government ICT has been changed yet again to the 'ICT and Digital Government division'.

Following the recent termination of the chief information officer due to allegedly false documentation, the government has begun advertising for yet another newly created position, the whole-of-government chief technology officer. My questions for the minister are:

1. Has the position of chief information officer been abolished?

2. How will the new position of whole-of-government chief technology officer differ from the role of the chief information officer, and what are they responsible for?

3. Can the minister confirm that the process for appointing the whole-of-government chief technology officer will be more stringent and thorough than the appointment of the position of chief information officer?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:34): I thank the member for her question and her interests in information technology and good governance in general. The matter to which she refers, I am not going to delve very deeply into. There are matters that, obviously, are being investigated and are before the relevant authority.

The position of chief information officer is, as I understand it, a position within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the restructuring around that position and positions that follow, I would presume, would still be within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I am happy to take those questions on notice as my department, the Department of State Development, wasn't the department that the chief information officer came from, it was the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, which is the lead agency in many cross-government areas. I will take those questions on notice about the process, the change of roles, what those roles are and bring back an answer for the honourable member.

SA WATER

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question about SA Water.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: A business owner on the Norwood Parade contacted me recently advising of a disruption caused by SA Water. The complaint was in relation to the lack of advance notice and the lack of courtesy by SA Water. On 9 October, when the business received a notice from SA Water advising of a temporary disruption to water supply from 7pm until midnight on Wednesday 11 October, the restaurant owner wrote to SA Water requesting to change the time of the maintenance because it was deemed to be unreasonable and unsuitable for a restaurant operation.

The restaurant owner explained to SA Water that dinnertime is their main source of income. Carrying out maintenance work by SA Water during those times would have a financial impact on the restaurant, which relies on water for its effective operation. SA Water did not mention that it was a matter of emergency, nor that it was a public safety issue. The notice said that the water disruption was mainly for maintenance purposes. After raising their concern with SA Water, the restaurant owner did not receive any response, so had no choice but to close the restaurant on 11 October and give his kitchen staff and other staff the night off.

What made him very unhappy was that he went into the restaurant on 11 October, which was the same day that the maintenance work was scheduled, and he was at the bar counter when he saw a worker slip a piece of paper under the door. That paper happened to be a revised notice by SA Water to state that the water maintenance work had now been rescheduled. Whilst it was good news, the notice came a bit too late. The restaurant and a number of businesses on Norwood Parade had already rostered to have their staff take the night off and the businesses were affected because they had closed down their businesses and been impacted. My questions to the minister are:

1. When the situation is not of an emergency nature, can the minister explain why SA Water would undertake maintenance work during business trading hours?

2. With businesses experiencing financial loss due to water disruption, can the minister explain why there was no consultation from SA Water to affected stakeholders in order to provide adequate advance notice?

3. Will SA Water implement a better customer service and better communication policy to address these problems?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for her most important question relating to her constituent on the Norwood Parade. Of course, there are some broad issues that need to be contemplated when considering SA Water upgrading or doing maintenance work in general on its infrastructure, be it water pipes or sewerage, indeed.

One thing that is important to understand is that SA Water does attempt to give adequate notice to all impacted persons, whether they be natural persons, householders or businesses, and they do take into consideration feedback that they get from businesses in terms of scheduling their works, but we need to understand that not all businesses operate at the same time. I think the honourable member was referring to a time period for SA Water maintenance between 7pm and 11pm. I imagine that was set to try to minimise the disruption it causes to businesses on Norwood Parade.

Of course, businesses that operate into the evening will be impacted but they may have been the minority of businesses on the Parade. Nonetheless, I am aware of situations where SA Water does reschedule its works to different times or staggers it over a longer period of time so that it has as little disruption to the community as possible.

The counterfactual is this: if SA Water doesn't do this work, if it doesn't maintain its pipes, then we are into the situation where people are complaining that pipes are bursting all the time and interrupting their business and their home life and their travel and commuting life, because there has been no warning of an emergency burst. Of course, when there is an emergency, SA Water can't, generally speaking, give notice that they are going to interrupt supply to do that work because it is an emergency. That is pretty much common sense, really.

As I say, in terms of scheduled maintenance or renewal of pipes or laying of new pipes, SA Water generally gives the community an extended period of notice, sometimes up to 30 days and sometimes more, depending on the location and the prominence of the location. There are longer periods, I expect, for busy main streets and roads, particularly those that have a large business or even restaurant sector, as compared to a normal street in a suburb where the interruption will be much less generalised, I suppose.

That is just the basis of the work. SA Water goes out of their way to consult business. It is unfortunate, and I am unhappy to hear, that the honourable member's constituent had an unhappy situation. She didn't really explain the claims that she made about lack of courtesy. That would very much surprise me, as SA Water has put in place a customer support team and one of its prime considerations is courtesy, speaking to people and looking after their needs.

I would be very surprised to hear if there was a lack of courtesy shown by staff in this instance, particularly to a business owner who was being impacted. I am not quite sure what she meant by that. If she meant simply that the lack of courtesy related to a sense that the customer was not being responded to, well I can understand that, but if it is more than that, if it was someone being rude directly, then I would like to hear that and ask for reasons about it.

It is unfortunate, but SA Water has to balance its maintenance program. As the honourable member said in her question, this one was scheduled between 7 and 11. Probably doing that has a minimal impact on most businesses, but certainly it would have an impact on businesses trading in the evening. That can't be avoided. It, generally speaking, can't be avoided and we do ask for patience from our community, because in fact what SA Water is trying to do is provide a better service. By re-laying pipe, doing this pipe maintenance, clearing out pipes or clearing out sewers, they are trying to provide a better service and we need to understand that that will sometimes inevitably mean there will be disruptions to day-to-day life for residential customers or business customers.

Having said that, my expectation is that SA Water will provide the best level of service in giving customers advance notice, trying as best they can to juggle all the competing interests of different types of businesses along a road to try to minimise the disruption, but at the end of the day, disruption there will be. The key is to get the job done as quickly as possible and minimise that disruption so that we can provide the best service to our customers.

WATERLOO BAY MASSACRE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can the minister tell the chamber about steps taken to create a memorial for the Waterloo Bay massacre?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in areas to do with Aboriginal affairs. Australia's colonial past has some very difficult chapters, and there are some very difficult parts of our history. Since white settlement of this country, there have been, particularly in the early days, many instances of massacres of Aboriginal people.

Growing up in Mount Gambier, I know the local Boandik Ngarrindjeri population certainly were aware of a number of sites in the South-East where there were such conflicts and large numbers of Aboriginal people lost their lives. Perhaps one of the better known incidents in South Australia's history, and certainly one I can remember being often spoken about when I worked for the late Terry Roberts as minister for Aboriginal affairs, was what occurred in the mid-1800s on the West Coast of South Australia.

Contemporary and recent accounts following that time talk about, in June 1848, a local hut keeper, John Hamp, being murdered on his sheep station, and there were various accounts of the reasons for that at the time. Contemporary accounts talk about the retaliation that was taken at the time. Most accounts talk about a large number of the local Wirangu being murdered in response to that incident.

Accounts range from some dozens up to a couple of hundred Wirangu losing their lives, and contemporary accounts, and accounts that persist to this day, talk particularly about the cliffs at Waterloo Bay near Elliston, where a number of Wirangu people were forced or pursued off those cliffs and lost their lives. These are not easy things for us to reconcile with where we are today. It was a different time with different standards applying, but what happened in the past is important to remember; it is important to talk about today. Much of what happened in the past informs where we are today with some of the issues being faced by Aboriginal people, and can inform us about steps to take into the future.

A coastal trail has been developed around this area near Elliston, and some time ago the Elliston council, with the help of federal funding, placed a memorial at the Waterloo Bay cliffs in recognition of the local Wirangu people. I know that it has generated some debate in the community over the last few months, and I think the last couple of years, about the appropriate wording to go on that Wirangu memorial at Waterloo Bay.

I pay tribute to the Elliston council, particularly the chairman of the council, Kym Callaghan. With his leadership, the council, after much local debate and debate within council and a lot of consultation with local Wirangu, has used the word 'massacre' on that memorial. It has not been an easy decision for that council to arrive at. There was some community opposition, but telling the truth about what happened in the past is exceptionally important to where we are today, and I congratulate the council for doing that.

There are other similar memorials around Australia that refer to some of these difficult parts of our past, and I know that it is not an easy thing to reflect on. There are people in areas of Australia who have direct descendants, part of their genetic line, who in centuries gone by were involved in some of these atrocities. The leadership taken by the Elliston council I think will make it easier in the future for us to tell the truth about some of these areas of our past.

The Elliston council's example has quickly been followed and has helped others reconcile some of the past. Ned Luscombe, the Deputy Mayor of the Wudinna council, has inherited a large part of, I think, his grandfather's belongings, which included items that had for a long time been in the local Kyancutta Museum. I have spoken to Ned Luscombe about this over the last few months. The items he inherited included remains that he understood were remains from Wirangu people who perhaps were murdered in retaliation in the 1848 massacre that included Waterloo Bay.

As a result of the Elliston council and the debate, and using the word 'massacre' on the memorial, Ned Luscombe has had interaction with local senior Wirangu elders about the return of those remains. Through the procedures in the Aboriginal Heritage Act, that is being facilitated. I pay tribute to the Elliston council. This example is important for our other leaders in South Australia to follow, and I look forward to our reflecting on some of the more difficult areas of our past, how that informs us today and how it can help all South Australians move forward.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Employment, representing the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, regarding the Festival Plaza redevelopment. In an article in *The Advertiser* last Monday, the headline was 'Walker to reveal tenants in plaza 23-storey tower'. Can the minister advise whether the South Australian government is negotiating with Mr Lang Walker, or any other proponents, to lease office space for SA government employees in the proposed new office tower that will be built by the Walker Corporation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question and I will refer it to the minister responsible—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Oh, have a go at it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —as he has asked in the question—and bring back an answer for the honourable member.

DIGITAL ROADMAP

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation a question about the digital roadmap.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: In a media release from 28 June this year, the minister claimed that the government had provided $2.9 million for Gig City's expansion into additional precincts, as well as the development of a digital roadmap for the state. My questions to the minister:

1. Will the digital roadmap apply to the whole of government or will it be DSD-specific?

2. How will the digital roadmap referred to in the minister's media release differ from the Department of Treasury and Finance's digital roadmap of 2016 to 2018?

3. How much of the $2.9 million will be allocated to the development of the roadmap, and who will take the lead in the development of the roadmap?

4. How does the digital roadmap fit into the government's wider innovation strategy?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. I might address that in a couple of parts because he referred to a number of areas in there. I will do it briefly. In relation to the Gig City program, it is true that, in last year's budget, about $5 million was provided for the establishment of the Gig City project which piggy-backed off the SABRENet network, which three universities are co-owners of. The state government also has a share in the SABRENet network—a dark-fibre network that operates right across, from the north to the south of our metropolitan area.

We are the only state that has ownership of part of that universities' fibre network, which is why we could leverage off that and offer up the fibre network to innovation precincts across Adelaide when no other city could. What that's done is allow us to become the first Gig City, a city with precincts right across the metropolitan area that are gigabit internet speed-capable—that is, symmetrical, upload and download speeds of at least one gig and, with the right infrastructure, up to 10 gigabits per second—which has given us quite a distinct competitive advantage in how we market ourselves and our capabilities in terms of being connected to the rest of the world.

We are seeing companies that have a presence already in Adelaide moving offices from other cities to Adelaide on the back of that because it is cheaper to be connected to exceptionally fast internet speeds and, frankly, the internet speeds that they can't find anywhere else in Australia as a result of the Gig City project in some of those 10 or 11 precincts that are already connected, with more to come online.

In this year's budget, there was funding to expand that Gig City program. We have a memorandum of understanding with the University of South Australia and both the Mount Gambier and Whyalla councils. The AARNet—the federal universities' fibre network—was recently taken down to Mount Gambier's University of South Australia campus with a juncture from around the Keith or Bordertown area where it goes between Adelaide and Melbourne. It is also—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: You are killing my old farm.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Hon. David Ridgway says it's through his old farm, which would be very good if his farm is being ploughed up for the economies of the future. We are looking to expand that to co-working space in both of those regional locations in Mount Gambier and Whyalla because, of course, for many endeavours today, it really doesn't matter where in the world you are, if you are quickly connected via the internet to the rest of the world.

In relation to the digital roadmap, what we are looking to do is, not just within government but across South Australia and our economy, look at the best ways to exploit the infrastructure that we have, which is what we have done with the Gig City network using the SABRENet network, which is what we are looking to do with the AARNet network in Whyalla and Mount Gambier. We will look to see what other infrastructure and what other programs we can do to expand out the digital network we have to benefit the rest of the economy.

DIGITAL ROADMAP

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:54): Supplementary: minister, when will the roadmap be completed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:54): I am happy to answer that question. I don't have that granulation of detail with me at the moment but, if I can find that detail quickly, I will bring it back or let you know as soon as I possibly can.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Water and the River Murray on the topic of the integrity of the water market in the Murray-Darling Basin Senate committee hearing in Adelaide this morning.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: This morning, I attended the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee's public hearing on the integrity of the water market in the Murray-Darling Basin at the Adelaide Town Hall. I did so as an interested member of this council and as a member of a party, the Greens, that believes that we do need an inquiry—preferably a judicial inquiry—into the water theft that we saw exposed in the *Four Corners* program back in July.

The minister also attended that inquiry and sought to present, with his department, which was scheduled as the first witness, but the minister was unable to present to that committee this morning. He was refused the ability to represent South Australians, so my question to the minister is: what did the minister intend to share with that committee and will he now inform the council of what he intended to present this morning?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:55): I rise to thank the honourable member very much for her very important question. I do need to correct her, however: she said in her explanation that the minister was 'unable' to present; I was actually very able—willing and able—but I was prevented. She gives me an opportunity, I suppose, to reflect on some of the

things that I might have said to the Senate committee. Depending on how the chamber wants me to do this, I could read my Senate presentation or I might just seek to table it for members' interest, otherwise we will be here for the rest of the day.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Just table it; we can insert it into *Hansard*.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Alright. I seek leave to table the document that I sought to read from.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Can you now table the rest of your answer?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: No, I am going to make you suffer through that, the Hon. Mr Ridgway. Again, thank you to the honourable member; I hope she wasn't moved out of the Senate inquiry, as I was. But this morning I stood up for South Australia because—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: You got kicked out.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I suppose you have to stand up if you are being moved out. It is interesting to note that the Senate committee was coming to Adelaide to hear concerns from South Australians. My office contacted the secretariat, I think it was last week, saying that I would like to present, and they said, 'No, we don't have any time. We don't have space for you. We've got your agency down.'

It was interesting to look at the witness list that was on for today. They had a witness, I think, from a council in Queensland appearing today. They also had time put aside for a 45-minute phone call from, I think, the cotton industry, which I don't think is domiciled in South Australia, and they only went to 2 o'clock. So, I don't know how it was possible for them to conclude that, in fact, there was no time.

In any case, I decided that it was such an important issue for our state that I would join my officials in the presentation and I would give the Senate the government's views about the River Murray, why it is so incredibly important to our state, and why it is very important that the Murray-Darling Basin Plan is delivered on time and in full for South Australia. The key point I wanted to make to the Senate committee was—there were a couple, but one of the key points—that South Australia has come to the end of its tether in terms of trusting the other states.

The way the Murray-Darling Basin Plan is laid out—and honourable members will be well versed in this, having listened to me talk about it in this place for a period of time—it is a grand compromise. There are 3,200 gigalitres of water to be returned. That is to be returned in parcels. One of those parcels is called downwater, which was up to 650 gigalitres, and one is upwater, which is 450 gigalitres. It is important to understand that the downwater is not real water. This is not water being put back into the river; this is water being kept out of the river for productive purposes.

Of course, the intricacies of the plan provide that that can only be done provided there are equivalent environmental outcomes for an equivalent amount of water, for which the commonwealth government is investing billions of dollars in the Murray to build infrastructure and to do some of the things that would otherwise be dubbed as real water overflowing banks. In a nutshell, that is what the downwater component is.

The agreement was that we would deal with that and that would be in place by 2019 and then we would move on to the 450 gigalitres of upwater, which is real water that has to be found through efficiency measures in a positive or socio-economically beneficial way—a neutral or beneficial way—and that is the 450 gigalitres of real water being put back into the river to sustain it.

What has come to light over many months—indeed more than that, but certainly since the *Four Corners* program aired on the ABC earlier this year—is that we believe there is a desire by many on the basin, particularly in the Eastern States, not to deliver the full plan. We believe there is an ulterior plan that is, in fact, 'We will duchess this along a little bit, we will keep South Australia on tenterhooks saying yes we are all going to be delivering this plan, and get South Australia to sign up to the downwater, the not real water'—the water that is returned in environmental equivalents—'and then not go and deliver the extra 450 gigalitres of water,' which is what got South Australia over the line.

We don't like taking water out of the river when the river needs that water to sustain itself for the long-term future. The reason we agreed to the downwater was only because of the 450 gigalitres of upwater that therefore would provide real water to be put back into the river for the benefits of the river's environment and sustainability. Our very real concern, coming out of the *Four Corners* program and the almost weekly and monthly exposure in the national media of other allegations about wrongdoing and malfeasance, theft, potential corruption in the Public Service at a very high level—and we do not know how far that extends, whether it extends into government, or not, in New South Wales.

That was the message I was taking to the Senate committee, which was not heard today. They accepted to take my statement in confidence. I am not sure it will ever see the light of day, through the Senate process, although a number of senators, I must say, were very keen to hear from me but they were overruled. My message to the Senate is: please do not support and allow the downwater component, the 605 gigalitres as it is at the moment, to be endorsed through the Senate process. Hold it up until we can see the colour of the money from the Eastern States in terms of their dealing with constraints measures; that is, the amount of water that comes down the river, particularly through areas such as the Barmah Choke, which regulates the total amount of water that can come into the system. Hold it up until we can see them working, really working, on addressing the constraints issues, which they promised to do as part of their agreement.

We want to see a genuine attempt to find that 450 gigalitres of downwater. Don't forget, I have reminded this place before: South Australia is the only state to have embarked on a trial project, a pilot project, to find some of that 450 gigalitres of water for the upwater. We have: the other states have not. It was vitally important that that message was taken to the Senate. But the lack of trust now in the basin states is such that we believe that the commonwealth government needs to step in and take control again.

Unfortunately for us, unfortunately for the whole country in many respects, the national government abolished the National Water Commission, whose job I believe it would have been to oversight the states and the implementation of the plan, to be the cop on the beat, if you like, to make sure that we were doing the right things—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Yes indeed, a very tough cop on the beat—but that was abolished and its functions were carved up and scattered to the four winds of the bureaucracy in the commonwealth, and that is part of the reason, I believe, why we are in the state we are at the moment. So, that was my first message.

My second message was essentially this: there is a fundamental flaw in policy at the commonwealth level and also in New South Wales in having the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Water answering to the same minister. When you have these two important policy groups in a bureaucracy, not having the independence to give ministers separate advice, you run the very real risk of the bigger, the uglier, the richer, the more powerful agency overriding the agency that is standing up for the river.

So, when you have agriculture in this country, which is a multibillion-dollar enterprise, with all the power that comes with that—bureaucratic power, financial power, political power—and when you have that pushing up against the water policy unit, which is saying, 'But we have to do something to restrict the amount of water that is being taken out of the river in consumptive use because there is not enough water in the river to sustain it, particularly in times of drought,' then you have a real problem.

In New South Wales we have the situation where we have a National Party MP in charge of agriculture and water policy. I tender to the chamber my view that some of the problems that New South Wales is in are precisely because of that policy distribution of both those agencies reporting to one minister. We can see from the evidence that is on the public record already, when that one minister had to get something approved by the environment minister in relation to a decision he was making, she said no.

The environment minister had separate advice, where she was involved in a small part of the project, and she considered the advice and said, 'No, I'm not agreeing to this.' That's what should happen. At the same time, at the commonwealth level, we had—until New Zealand claimed him—a National Party MP in charge of agriculture and water policy. I will contend that is the reason why we have seen no progress on the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, led by the national government under Barnaby Joyce.

Fortunately, we have a little period of time when water policy is now back in the hands of Malcolm Turnbull, where it once was. As Prime Minister, he has taken on these portfolios. So, my plea to the federal government, my plea to the Prime Minister, is take this opportunity to whack a few heads together to get this Murray-Darling Basin Plan back on track and deliver what was promised to South Australia. The 450 gigs of upwater is a crucial part of the plan and, quite frankly, I have instructed my agency officials not to sign-off on the SDL component until such time as we can feel satisfied that the plan will be delivered on time and in full.

I am very pleased that the honourable member asked me this question. It won't surprise her to know that I had a prepared question in place for my colleagues, who might have been contemplating asking a similar question. I will now ask them to go to question number two for me.

GM HOLDEN WORKERS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:05): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Automotive Transformation questions regarding Holden's closure, and specifically the impact on the workforce there.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: The government has previously announced various programs to help affected Holden workers transition to other jobs and industries after the unfortunate closure, on 20 October this year, of the Holden plant. Recently, an additional $600,000 joint funding boost was given to the automotive worker support scheme to support those people who are yet to secure work. In recent times, some development projects have announced the desire to employ former Holden workers, which is obviously a good thing. For example, there is the $5.5 million Prince George Plaza upgrade and the government IT contract with CSC, which has indicated the creation of approximately 400 new jobs as well as worker retraining for Holden employees.

Additionally, the government has announced the northern economic hub, which was to receive $25 million in funding and was expected to bring some 25,000 new jobs by 2025. Those are in the public domain and the ones we know about. My questions are for a little bit more information. I appreciate that the factory has just closed and so some of the information may not yet be at hand. If that's the case, I ask the government to provide it when it does come to hand. My first question is: how many of the workers who were made redundant on 20 October have been able to secure work, or look like they are in the process of securing work? Does the government have any figures on that at this stage?

How many former Holden staffers have secured a job after engagement with the Automotive Workers in Transition Program and the Growth Fund Skills and Training Initiative, and how many still remain unemployed? Are those statistics yet available? How many jobs from the proposed developments in the northern region have been realised, and how many will be realised by the end of the year? Is there a quota of former Holden employees that must be met in these northern contracts? If not, what guarantees do we have that Holden workers will be considered for these new northern contracts? Finally, what further plans, if any, does the government have to ensure these workers find suitable employment quickly and, in the meantime, have access to Centrelink and other appropriate benefits?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. He has asked a number of questions about the automotive industry and the transition that's occurring with Holden's closure just a couple of weeks ago. I might answer generally, which I think encompasses most of what you have asked for. I will

say from the outset that I don't have any statistics from the 950-odd workers who finished at Holden just a couple of weeks ago.

Over the last couple of years, Holden has run a transition centre at the Holden plant at Elizabeth. I have visited the transition centre a number of times, and I have to say that Holden, to their credit, have been doing a good job with their workers. One of the ways in which I am reasonably satisfied that they have been doing the right thing in terms of the training, the transition, the job services with their workers, is that the union, the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, which represents workers there, has said rather positive things to me about how Holden is going in terms of helping their workers find new jobs. In my experience, if unions are not happy with the employers they don't hold back on letting people know about it. So, from everything I have seen and from the reports, Holden is working well with their workers.

I think Holden learned a lesson about how to provide these services from Mitsubishi a decade ago. Holden has funded training, careers counselling, helping with resumes, that sort of work for their own workers. We have been mirroring what Holden has been doing for the auto supply chain, which is, of course, another very critical element of this transition. The sorts of services that Holden has been providing to their workers through their transition centre, the state government, through the $7.3 million Automotive Workers in Transition Program, has been providing to workers in the supply chain.

In addition to the career advice, the career counselling, the funds for training for the auto supply chain, the government has also been helping the supply chain companies. A bit over two years ago, about 74 tier 1 and tier 2 supply chain companies were identified that supplied not just Holden but also Ford and Toyota, primarily in northern Adelaide but also in western and southern Adelaide. Helping those companies diversify has been a key element of the government's strategy to help workers with employment. If a number of those supply chain companies can survive and offer ongoing jobs there will be fewer people looking for work and needing those career transition services.

About two years ago, when the automotive transition team went out to those supply chain companies, I think the stats were that somewhere around 80 per cent of those companies intended, at that time, that they were just going to shut up shop once Holden finished. They ranged from big multinational companies like Futuris, Hero Tech, SMR to much smaller, family-owned engineering, metal fabrication, plastic moulding or blowing companies. Once Holden closed, about 80 per cent of those companies, across the range, were intending that they would also close.

With a lot of work and with, I think, $11.63 million initially, supplemented in the last budget by another $5 million for the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, today, with Holden closed, about three-quarters of those supply chain companies are still around. It has been a quite remarkable turnaround over those last couple of years, particularly with the smaller companies which, as small businesses generally do, have been concentrating on the day-to-day manufacturing of what they make for the supply chain and have not really had the opportunity to lift their head above the horizon to think about doing something different.

So, with a lot of work from the state government, with funding for retooling, for looking at diversification, a lot of those companies—and I have been to many over the last couple of years but particularly in the last few months—that have typically been between 90 to 100 per cent reliant on auto for their revenue have diversified away, from areas like medical devices, food manufacturing, and particularly food packaging, into the defence area, for aftermarket auto parts, for export parts, for services and goods for the mining industry. That has certainly been a key plank of the government's strategy to help some of those companies survive.

There are quite a lot of them that have downsized and there are even some, like Trident Plastics in the western suburbs, that have grown as they diversified out of supplying the auto companies and into other areas. One example that stood out was Jano from Sonnex Engineering, which is right next to the Holden plant at Elizabeth. When the Premier and I visited him, in the last couple of months, he was quite emotional talking about the fact that he had thought government had no role in business, but once the auto transition team came out to visit him he realised that working with government could provide opportunities.

They were in despair. His company was going to fold, his family company that had been here since he emigrated from Czechoslovakia in the early 1980s, but working with government they are now expanding. They are taking on Holden workers. The day we visited him, a few weeks ago, he was interviewing for new positions, interviewing Holden workers to go into his expanding company.

There is a combination on the supply side, with government programs to help companies stay in business with that Automotive Workers in Transition Program for supply chain workers to retrain for other industries and some into other manufacturing areas, and Holden with their own workforce.

In terms of some statistics, there are about 950 people whose jobs finished when the last red Commodore rolled off the production line at the end of October. But for the year or two years preceding that, there were about 1,000 employees who left Holden as Holden re-rated their Commodore line but also ceased their Cruze line.

Holden's own statistics show that 84 or 85 per cent of workers had an employment outcome from those who had left in the couple of years preceding. In that employment outcome, somewhere around 78 per cent of those had found a job after leaving Holden. Certainly, my experience from talking to people at Holden and those who have recently left Holden is that the skills that they have are highly regarded in many other areas.

Micro-X is a new medical devices company that is manufacturing down in Tonsley, in the southern suburbs, one of the world's first portable X-ray machines. I think they are up to about their eighth or ninth ex-Holden worker being employed there. That has been repeated quite a lot. Once a company takes on one Holden worker, they often take on more and more Holden workers, after they understand the very, very precise skill set that people who have come out of the auto industry have.

Another thing we have found is that, when a team leader from the Holden plant goes to work somewhere, he often takes a lot of his former team with him over time as jobs become available, having worked with them and knowing the skill sets that they have.

I am pretty sure we will not have figures about those 950-odd who left recently, but I will liaise with Holden to see when figures can become available for a refresh of about the same number who have left over the last couple of years, and I will provide them to the honourable member when I am able to.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:17): Supplementary: when will the minister respond to my recent question regarding details of Beyond Auto's interaction with suicide prevention networks in the northern suburbs?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. I can't remember if this is one where there was a response provided, but that I accepted that—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: I sought more detail.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —yes, that there should be more detail—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: You said that you would bring it back promptly.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and I accept the honourable member's interest in this area and will make this one of my highest priorities to satisfy the honourable member.

ALLWATER JOINT VENTURE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:17): I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister for Water on the subject of the Allwater contract.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On 16 October on ABC radio, David Bevan asked a series of questions to the minister about the Allwater contract. The transcription of the interview went as follows:

Mr Bevan: When's the contract expire?

Mr Hunter: I couldn't tell you…I don't have that figure in front of me.

Mr Bevan: Well, if you're actively considering it, you'd know, wouldn't you? That goes to how active you are.

Mr Hunter: No…if we make…

And then further on Mr Bevan says:

But if you're actively considering it you'd at least know when the contract is going to expire and you don't know that.

Mr Hunter: I don't know these operational matters. I don't keep it in in my head.

Mr Bevan: That's not an operational matter, that's…if you're actively considering this, if you want our listeners to seriously think…

Mr Hunter: I think the contract renewal date is pretty much an operational matter. I can find out for you in a very short time though and get back to you by asking someone.

Mr Bevan went on:

But if it was a year away you'd have to get your skates on, if you're serious about this.

Mr Hunter: Well we will be getting our skates on. This is our election policy and we will need to consider how we actually bring it back in. If we bring it back in just as the SA Water corporatised entity or do we bring it back as a bigger entity completely. We will have to look at the pros and cons of that…

In particular, I refer the minister to the question about the contract renewal date. He said that he could find out 'in a very short time' and get back to Mr Bevan 'by asking someone'. That question was asked on 16 October and I have asked similar questions since in the chamber. Can the minister now advise the chamber and, indeed, through the chamber, Mr Bevan and anyone else who is interested what is the contract renewal date of the Allwater contract?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:19): I cannot believe my luck. I thank the honourable member for his incredibly important question, another important question on just how fixated the Liberal Party in South Australia is on privatisation of SA Water, one of our key essential services.

I have already pointed out that the Liberals have misled the people of South Australia—no surprise there, it is what they do. I should say, they use severe terminological inexactitudes in what they intend to do, and it is something that we have been paying for ever since. As we know, and as the people of South Australia know, bills don't go down when a utility has been privatised, they go up. There is one person responsible for that in this chamber and that is the Hon. Mr Lucas. We know that he still has plans, which he drew up when he was last in government, to sell SA Water. We know it. It is in his blood. This is all of a piece. This is why they corporatised SA Water in the first place, because they knew that they could fatten up the calf for sale into the private markets.

We know that we need to stop the Liberals ever getting a chance to privatise SA Water again into the future because we know what happens when privatisation occurs. We know the impacts on our community. In fact, you don't have to listen to me make those claims, you can listen to the chairman of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. He told people what happens when essential services are privatised—he told the world—and the Hon. Mr Lucas knew this when he was responsible for selling ETSA in the last Liberal government.

The Hon. Mr Lucas had reports at the time saying it would mean higher power prices for householders. What did he do? He ignored that advice, he argued with them, he pretended it wasn't accurate. He said, 'I have a different view,' and, 'I am taking separate advice—different advice.' Not only did he ignore the reports that the Liberals managed to make this a much worse deal than it otherwise would have been—and it is something, of course, only the Hon. Mr Lucas could manage in his inestimable way—the Liberals botched the sale of ETSA. They could not get the sale contract

right and they needed to come back to parliament with legislation in this place to fix their contractual errors.

The Auditor-General has indeed questioned if the sale represented the best value for the state. The Auditor-General, Mr President. The Auditor-General also found the process led by Mr Lucas to be shoddy. The Auditor-General found that the process led by the Hon. Mr Lucas was shoddy.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable minister's colleagues to allow him to give his answer in silence.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Even the Hon. Mr Lucas's colleagues said he botched it and one of his fellow travellers in the business sector, who wouldn't normally be considered to be a Labor supporter. I can quote from the Adelaide *Advertiser* in 2001. This is Mr Hugh Morgan, the managing director of mining giant—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, when did you privatise it? It states:

…the state's biggest power user [Western Mining] put the political cat among the pigeons on Wednesday by speaking out publicly over the ETSA privatisation process and blaming the Government—

the Liberal government at the time—

for power price rises because it wanted to secure a good price in the ETSA leasing deal.

So, the Hon. Mr Lucas and the Liberal government ignored all that advice so that it could get a good price in the ETSA leasing deal. We are acting on this side of parliament to make sure that the Hon. Mr Lucas never gets his chance again to privatise another asset, never gets his chance to get his hands on SA Water. We are acting because selling off essential services like electricity and water leaves the community worse off.

A re-elected Weatherill Labor government will establish the energy and water services department to bring together publicly owned water and electricity essential services and protect them from privatisation. This is a clear point of difference between the Labor and the Liberal Party that will give South Australians a clear choice at the next election. Water services provided by SA Water are highly valued by South Australians and the government is committed to keeping these services in public hands. Over the last four years, SA Water customers have seen a 6.5 per cent decrease in combined water and sewerage bills, which is the largest reduction for urban and residential customers out of the 13 similar sized water utilities across the country.

Since the introduction of independent regulation in 2013, the government has driven down the price on an average household water and sewerage bill by $171, including the remission of the Save the River Murray levy. We have delivered on our commitment to contain cost of living pressures for South Australians, because we have SA Water in public hands. What has happened with ETSA? There is the case in point that we draw an example from. The Liberals sold ETSA, and did prices go down? No, they did not—no, they did not.

This is the key difference between the Liberal Party of South Australia, the privatisers of essential utilities, and the Labor Party. Keeping SA Water in public hands will ensure this essential service continues to provide in the long-term best interests of South Australians rather than being driven by the financial considerations of big business and the Liberal Party.

These changes will bring together publicly owned essential services and protect them from privatisation, and we will provide a clear distinction to the voters of this state at the next election: those on this side who will protect these key public assets and bring water and our energy assets back into the hands of the public, unlike the Liberals, who just want to flog them off.

The PRESIDENT: I just let the council know that we have placed the crossbench up a bit higher on the ticket, so the opposition had five questions today, the crossbench had three and Labor had one.

Bills

LIQUOR LICENSING (LIQUOR REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 October 2017.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:27): I wish to thank all those honourable members who have contributed to the debate on this bill. I provide the following information in relation to a number of questions raised. I will refer to questions raised in the other place that still need answering. I think they will be helpful in making sure that we have a reasonably speedy committee stage.

The member for Bragg in the other place sought information about how much per year in the forward estimates has been taken into account as revenue from the increase in annual fees. I am advised that only the current annual fees, as detailed in the Liquor Licensing (General) Regulations 2012, have been included in the forward estimates, indexed by CPI.

The member for Bragg in the other place also sought information about how much has been allocated for transitional costs. I am advised that funding allocated for transitional costs was approximately $5,000 for project implementation expenditure in 2016-17, and the actual spend for 2016-17 was around that amount.

The member for Schubert in the other place asked whether the minister could confirm that the licences as they currently exist on the CBS website were actually up to date and whether the current conditions for licences were up to date on the website. I am advised that that is generally the case. The licences appearing on the CBS website will include all current conditions.

However, I am advised that in some instances this may not be the case because the website does not capture point in time data but relies on information being updated manually. As you might expect, there is a lag between the time decisions are made by the commissioner, a delegate of the commissioner or the licensing court on a scheduled hearing date, and the licence being updated and published on the CBS website.

Our systems ensure that an alert is triggered if a licence is not updated within six days of the hearing date, I am informed. Of course, as with all manual systems, there is the potential for error, and it may be the case that there are examples of licences on the website that do not contain all the current conditions. There may also be licences with interim conditions that have expired, and it is expected that these will be updated as all licences are reviewed when we transition to the new licensing class under the new legislation.

The legislation which commenced in December 2015 regarding entertainment unlicensed premises has the effect of deeming some conditions of no effect. Conditions on licences that have not been updated since that time have to be read subject to that change.

The Hon. Robert Brokenshire in this place had a question regarding minors and warehouse parties. The government will be moving an amendment to proposed section 1(10)(a)(vi) in relation to the definition of a prescribed place for the purposes of the secondary supply laws. The amendment refines the definition of a prescribed place with respect to public places, due to the concern that warehouse-type parties attended by minors might be held in public places.

The Hon. Tammy Franks spoke about the new section 77 proposed in the bill, and the removal of the ability of councils to make submissions with respect to applications. I am informed that Mr Anderson, in his review of the state's liquor licensing laws, was of the view that applicants before the licensing authority are often required to revisit the same issues that were considered at the planning level due to the ability of councils, presently, to intervene or object. This often delays determination of the application, duplicates the planning process and may result in planning-type conditions on liquor licences.

The government seeks to address this duplication by limiting the grounds on which councils may make submissions and removing the ability for councils to intervene. The current requirement that applicants must satisfy the licensing authority that relevant planning and other council approvals or consents have been obtained will remain.

Under new section 78 the commissioner will also have a discretion, in accordance with the rules of natural justice, to invite submissions from particular bodies in relation to an application. Therefore, if, for example, development approval is not required for an application, the commissioner will have the ability to invite the local council to provide a submission on any ground.

Furthermore, for new licence applications the licensing authority must be satisfied that the operation of the licence would unlikely result in undue offence, annoyance, disturbance or inconvenience to people who reside, work or worship in the vicinity of the premises, noting that certain entertainment is to be disregarded.

In relation to comments made about extending the small venue licence statewide, it is the government's view that more time is required to assess this relatively new initiative and to determine the viability of that licence in other areas of the state. In any event, the bill allows for extension of that licence class to different areas declared in the regulations following the consultation process.

In this place the Hon. Rob Lucas made comments about the transition of existing licences to the new classes of licence, and in particular to the conditions attached to the existing licences. The general principle regarding conditions on existing licences is contained within schedule 2, clause 5. The intention is that existing conditions will be preserved. However, the commissioner will have the power, by providing notice in writing to the licensee, to add, substitute, vary or revoke a condition of the licence under particular circumstances. The main aim of this power is to restructure licences to be less complex, easier to read and to remove any outdated, irrelevant or unnecessary conditions.

Mr Anderson's review recommended such a power to enable liquor licences to be in a form that is simple to read, and that the conditions placed on the licence are relevant to the sale, supply and consumption of liquor. There are review rights associated with notice given by the commissioner, which are also contained in schedule 2.

The Hon. Rob Lucas spoke about the proposed section 135A, which allows the commissioner to publish prescribed details of licensees who have committed offences against the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. The publication of these details is at the discretion of the commissioner. As stated by the minister in another place, if a person seeks to remove their details from the register, it will be up to them to contact the commissioner, and the commissioner will then determine if there is a reasonable case for removal.

Comments have been made about the changes to the annual fee structure arising from Mr Anderson's recommendations in his review of the liquor licensing laws. I reiterate the government's intention to consult with the industry before any change is made to the annual fee structure. As indicated by the minister in another place, Mr Anderson's recommendation is a starting point for the conversation with industry. Annual fees are set out in the Liquor Licensing (General) Regulations 2012. Therefore, any changes to fees would occur through those regulations.

This bill has been developed through an extensive consultative process, beginning with a discussion paper and independent review. There was also extensive public consultation on the draft bill, including with industry. As a result, the government believes that this bill will reform South Australia's liquor licensing laws so that the laws reflect community standards and facilitate a vibrant hospitality industry, while ensuring adequate regulation to maintain a safe drinking culture. I commend the bill to this chamber.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The minister, in his reply to the second reading, answered a number of questions. Some of the responses were to questions I think raised by the member for Bragg in

another place, and the minister in another place had undertaken to bring back replies. Can I firstly just clarify: did the minister say the cost of implementation of this new scheme was $5,000 in 2016-17?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will just repeat that one sentence for the sake of clarity. I am advised that the funding allocated for transition costs was approximately $500,000 for project implementation expenditure in 2016-17. The actual spend for that year was around the same amount.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I either misheard that or the minister misstated it. I thought he said $5,000, which I thought was an extraordinarily cheap transition process. That was for 2016-17. I think the member for Bragg raised a series of questions about the implementation costs of the new system. Clearly, those costs, I would assume, did not conclude in 2016-17; that is, in 2017-18 at the very least, and maybe in future years, there will be implementation costs for the new system. So, what are the budgeted implementation costs for 2017-18, and is it expected that there will be additional implementation costs in 2018-19 and 2019-20?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The policy adviser I have for this bill does not have the financial information in relation to that. I am happy to undertake to bring that back, and I will make sure, as people listen to that, they write it down.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy, and I do not intend to delay the proceedings of the committee. If the minister is prepared to undertake to correspond with interested members, including myself, as to what the budget implementation costs are for this year and for any of the forward estimate years, we would appreciate it. Can I also clarify the answer the minister gave in relation to the fees that are to be collected? As I understand it, they are to be outlined in a regulation at some stage.

In the debate in the House of Assembly, the member for Bragg highlighted correspondence she had received from minister Malinauskas dated 22 April this year, which indicated that at present the revenue per year from liquor licensing annual fees is $2.65 million. He went on to say that if table 10 in Mr Anderson's report was implemented, the revenue would be approximately $7.21 million per year. The government has left open the option of not implementing fees at that particular level. It could be anywhere between $2.65 million and $7.21 million per year.

My understanding is the minister in his reply said that the forward estimates actually include the existing $2.65 million but are budgeted to increase by CPI through the forward estimate years. The minister is indicating by nodding his head that, yes, that is exactly what he said. My understanding is the government is, in the new regulations, going to settle on some more significant fee increase than just the status quo and increase by CPI, but they have not yet said whether it will be the $7.21 million a year that Mr Anderson has indicated or some number in between.

Can the minister indicate whether that is in fact correct; that is, it is highly likely that the government, in terms of implementing the new system, is going to settle on a number more significant than just a CPI increase on $2.65 million? If the minister can confirm that is the case. Can he also indicate his latest estimate as to when those particular regulations, with the particular fee implications in the regulations, are likely to be publicly available?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is, as I said towards the end of the second reading contribution, that it is the government's intention to consult with the industry before any change is made to that annual fee structure. My advice is that the starting point for that conversation with the industry will be the recommendations from the Anderson review. My advice also is that we do not expect this to be done very quickly. It will take some time to do that consultation with the industry. I do not have a particular month that it will be completed by, but this will not be a super quick process. It will take some time to consult with industry. For those reasons, I do not have advice on a figure for future years, except to say that this will occur with industry consultation.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 21 passed.

Clause 22.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I have questions at clause 22 and then I will move to my amendment. In his response in his second reading summation, the minister indicated that the government was not supportive of extending the small venues licence beyond the city limits because that had yet to be appropriately reviewed and, indeed, the implications not known. Can the minister outline what date the small venues licence came into operation, what date it was reviewed and who was consulted in that review that was required by the original enabling legislation a year after the implementation of the small venues licence back in 2014?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have some information but not all the information you seek. My advice is that the small venue licence began operation on 26 April 2013. I do not have information on results of any reviews, but I am happy to take that on notice and bring it back. I just do not have the information at hand during the course of this bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: For the information of the minister, when we enabled the small venues licence in the CBD, which was then indeed not North Adelaide but has now been adventurously extended to North Adelaide, it was promised to be extended across the entirety of the state when that government legislation was debated back, as you have said, in 2013. A year on, it was reviewed in 2014, so there is a review that the government has done.

Does that review say that it should not extend beyond the city limits? Has any other review been done by the government in the intervening years to leave them in this position where they feel that they still do not have enough information to extend a small venues licence beyond the city limits of the City of Adelaide to the state of South Australia so that the people of Strathalbyn might be able to sit in a small bar?

The Hon. S.G. Wade: And Macclesfield, the Three Brothers Arms.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: A mojito in Macclesfield could be on the cards.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that further consideration was taken as part of the Anderson review which we have talked about extensively as part of this bill. The Anderson review's recommendations were to have that extension to North Adelaide but no further extension from North Adelaide. That is something the government will obviously consider as we see the successes within the Adelaide area and as recommended by the review of the North Adelaide area. That was a recommendation of the Anderson review that the government is considering but has not taken up, the extension to North Adelaide.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: With respect, the minister is conflating two reviews. Yes, the Anderson review looked at that adventurous step to North Adelaide. I was talking about the original legislation, the debate which promised the member for Schubert, for example, a small venue licence to be available in the Barossa. It promised the member for Morphett, for example, a small venue licence to be able to be enjoyed in Glenelg, back when the original enabling legislation was determined.

In fact, the Attorney has had the power since 2014 to extend these small venue licences, should he have so chosen, but the Attorney-General seems to have erected a hipster-proof fence around the city. The Greens have previously moved a private members' bill on this matter. It would be no surprise to the government that this amendment that I am now leading up to moving reflects that private members' bill, the Liquor Licensing (Small Venue Licence) Amendment Bill 2016. I move:

Amendment No 1 [Franks–1]—

Page 20, lines 1 to 3 [clause 22, inserted section 37(2)]—Delete subsection (2)

This is the first of a series of amendments designed to enable the small venues licence to be enjoyed beyond the city limits. It reflects the Greens' legislation previously brought before this place to enact that in 2016.

At that time, I certainly consulted, and one of the pieces of correspondence that I draw to the council's attention in support of the extension of the small venues licence beyond the Adelaide city limits is from the Local Government Association, which has consulted widely on this particular matter. I note in correspondence from Andrea Malone of the LGA, dated between 11 August 2016 and 30 September 2016 when they did their due diligence and responded on this, that:

The LGA supports this move and issued a media statement in July [2016] supporting the extension of the licensing regime to council areas outside the CBD, where councils supported the move.

Indeed, they supported the extension of that licence. That call by the LGA, indeed a motion was moved at their annual meeting, has so far been ignored by government and that is why the Greens move this amendment yet again, in an amended form, to a government bill today that we have previously put before this place in a private members' bill.

We think it is ludicrous that the government promised that this small venue licence would be available to those across the state to secure the votes of people like the member for Morphett and the member for Schubert and so many others, indeed many of the government benches in the other place were promised that there would potentially be small venues in their electorates, yet we have seen a glacial pace of progress from the Attorney on this. I am hoping that the council today will see fit to support a Greens amendment to take down the hipster-proof fence that has been erected around our city.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have some questions on the clause. Is the minister able, and I am happy for him to take it on notice because I do not expect he will have the answer with him, to provide on notice a list of all the current small venue licences that are operating? I notice in some media reports a number of sites refer to small venue licences, but those who know more than I do about these things have indicated that a number of them do not actually have small venue licences. They have had the advantage of other forms of licence, albeit they continue to be referred to as small bars or small venue licence outlets or sites. So, if the minister is prepared to do that. My other question pertains to subclause 37(1) of the bill before us, which provides:

Subject to this Act and the conditions of the licence, a small venue licence authorises the licensee to sell liquor on the licensed premises for consumption on the licensed premises between 8am on 1 day and 2am the following day.

Can the minister indicate if there are currently small venue licences that have been given special conditions that are different to the 8am to 2am trading arrangement?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his two questions. He is right, I do not have the answers immediately. I will take those on notice and bring back a reply for both those questions. Certainly, in my younger days I might have had a better idea of how many bars (and their names) that might be around Adelaide, but, sadly, these days I am not so familiar with drinking establishments around the city.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The minister should have a discussion with the Attorney-General. I think he is a bit older than the minister in this chamber. In relation to the amendment that has been moved, as the member for Bragg has indicated publicly, the position of the Liberal Party is that we will not be supporting the amendment for similar reasons to the ones given by the minister in his reply to the second reading.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Employment–1]—

Page 26, line 8 [clause 22, inserted section 40(8)(e)]—Delete '3 years' and substitute '5 years'

This amendment changes the maximum term for a short-term licence from three to five years. The Adelaide city council has recently approved multi-year event licences. For events using the Adelaide Parklands it is understood that multi-year event licences may be granted for up to five years. Extending the maximum of a short-term licence will make this consistent with the Adelaide city council multi-year event licences and allow for more certainty for event organisers.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In the consultation the government conducted on this, were there any stakeholders who indicated opposition to the proposed amendment from the government?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that we are not aware of any, but we will go back and check and if we can find any we will be happy to bring that answer back to interested honourable members, particularly the Hon. Robert Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The member for Bragg has advised that the Liberal Party will support the amendment being moved by the government.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 23 to 25 passed.

Clause 26.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Franks–1]—

Page 27, lines 33 to 35 [clause 26, inserted section 44(2)]—Delete subsection (2) and substitute:

(2) This section applies in relation to the licence (under this Act) held by the holder of the casino licence in respect of the casino premises (both within the meaning of the *Casino Act 1997*) despite any provision to the contrary in that Act, the conditions of the casino licence or the approved licensing agreement under the *Casino Act 1997*.

This is to clause 26, page 27, lines 33 to 35. It deletes subsection (2) and substitutes (2). This section applies in relation to the licence under this act held by the holder of the Casino licence in respect of the Casino premises (both within the meaning of the Casino Act 1997), despite any provision to the contrary in that act, the conditions of the Casino licence or the approved licensing under the Casino Act 1997. I move this, as the Greens have done to liquor licensing bills before, because the Casino, of course, gets special treatment. This removes that special treatment from the Casino. Simply put: if a law should apply to one, it should apply to all, and it should apply to the Casino. This is, of course, with regard to the mandatory closing provisions.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I indicate that the government will oppose this amendment. It is the government's position that the Casino is a unique tourist destination compared to other licensed premises, attracting tourists from interstate and overseas. Enforcing a three-hour break in trade would place South Australia at a disadvantage in comparison with similar operations in other states, which have casinos that operate 24 hours a day.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Before I move my amendment I would like to speak to this particular amendment. The Liberal Party holds a similar view to the government on this issue, and we will not be supporting the amendment.

For some time the Liberal Party's position has been that the Casino is a special beast. There is a whole range of site-specific restrictions, regulations and laws that apply to the Casino and, as the minister has highlighted, casinos in most other jurisdictions are similarly treated differently in terms of restrictions on liquor licensing and gambling licensing and a range of other issues as well. The Liberal Party believes there is a sensible argument to be made to continue to treat the Casino separately in relation to these issues. For those reasons, we will not support the amendment.

Whilst I am on my feet I will move the amendment standing in my name. I move:

Amendment No 1 [Lucas–2]—

Page 27, lines 25 to 35—Delete the clause

As the member for Bragg outlined in her contribution in the House of Assembly, and as I outlined earlier in my contribution to the second reading debate, this issue relates to freedom of choice for trading between 3am and 8am or 9am, depending on your particular perspective.

It is associated with a debate we have had before in this chamber, and I know there are strongly held differing views in this chamber in relation to the lockout provisions. We have lockout provisions in South Australia, and a number of other jurisdictions also have lockout provisions. My personal views on the issue have been well known in this chamber for many years, but the reality is that we do have lockout provisions in existence at the moment.

I will not delay the debate in the committee stage by going over some of the detail, but we did take some evidence on this in the Budget and Finance Committee. There are some strongly conflicting views on what the evidence has been in relation to the success or otherwise of the lockout laws. I think I mentioned, in my second reading contribution, that someone regarded as a security expert referred to the brawling in Hindley Street last weekend as being generated in part by the

lockout laws. Certainly, some of the claimed benefit of the lockout laws that the government and the former minister for health have sometimes trotted out have been strongly contested by some academics who have made a living working in this particular area of liquor licensing regulations and lockout laws.

I do not stand before the chamber and say that there is a damningly overwhelming body of evidence one way or another that proves lockout laws have either worked or not worked, but I do argue that the jury is out in relation to the evidence. Those who might have a view that lockout laws are bad are certainly able to find evidence to justify that argument. As a strong supporter of lockout laws, the government clearly believes it has the evidence to justify its position.

In essence, what we are being asked to do here, over and above the lockout law that exists, is to add another form of restriction to the ability of people to trade, the ability of people to engage in entertainment at whatever hour of the day or night they choose. As I said in the second reading, my personal view on these issues is very strongly that if you have bad eggs then punish them and penalise them.

However, if the majority of people want to be entertained at the Casino in the early hours or want to be entertained at a late-night venue in the early hours, or if they finish their work at 4am in the morning, or whatever it might happen to be, and they want to go to an entertainment venue or if they have gone to a party and they want to kick on into the early hours of the morning of a Saturday or a Sunday morning, as long as they are behaving appropriately, why should we be preventing that sort of behaviour?

I think they are powerful arguments to support the amendment that the member for Bragg highlighted, which I am now moving on her and our behalf in this particular chamber. That is to say, the licensing regulations should crack down on those licensees and individuals who do not behave. We have a view that, in terms of policing in the precinct, in particular if we are talking about the entertainment precinct of Adelaide, more police on the beat at the peak periods, Fridays and Saturdays, not just during the summer months but throughout the year, more resources in the Adelaide precinct in relation to these issues is an important part of ensuring that appropriate law and order is established and maintained in the precinct so that those people who do want to enjoy the precinct in the early hours of the morning should be able to do so safely without fear of being assaulted, accosted or interfered with in any way by drunken hoons or louts at that particular hour of the morning.

There is an important policing role—we accept that—in relation to these issues. Just constantly restricting trading hours, in our judgement, is not the way to go in the entertainment precinct. Again, we accept the entertainment precinct of Adelaide is a special beast. There are special provisions and policing and all of those sorts of things which can and should apply in that particular area. Not just young people but young people in particular should be allowed to enjoy themselves into the early hours of the morning. Just because some of us perhaps no longer relate to marauding the streets of Adelaide in the earlier hours of the morning, between 3am and 9am, does not mean that there is something inherently wrong in young people choosing to entertain themselves and be entertained during those particular hours.

It seems to be a view that certainly some within the government have held—the former attorney-general was notorious in relation to these provisions, as was the former premier. There were senior people who were looking for lockout laws at a much earlier hour than 3am. There was discussion at various times of 2am and 1am. I think at one stage some sections of the police were even supporting lockout laws at midnight. As soon as you start restricting, this is the sort of thinking that becomes pervasive in terms of a government further restricting and further restricting.

The Liberal Party's position is to oppose the amendment that the Hon. Tammy Franks has moved, but I have moved the amendment standing in my name in relation to the further restriction. We are advised that the impact of ours, if passed, will be to return the situation to essentially the status quo. That is where we are at the moment. That is, there is still a lockout, but there is not this further restriction.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have already indicated the government's opposition to the Hon. Tammy Franks's amendment. I will not speak at any length whatsoever. I do not think it will be

any surprise to indicate the government's opposition to the Hon. Rob Lucas's amendment. He is right; this issue has been agitated quite a lot in the public and particularly in this chamber.

I note that, in his report, Mr Anderson stated that closing times in South Australia, in comparison with other cities of Australia, are quite liberal and, indeed, that is the case around the world. The government agrees with Mr Anderson that the mandatory three-hour break in trade is consistent with harm minimisation principles.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I rise on behalf the Greens to thank the government and opposition for indicating their positions on subjecting the Casino to the same laws as all other licensed venues and then move to address the opposition's amendment, which is with regard to the 5am mandatory closing. In doing so, I thank Tim Swaine, who is the president of the Late Night Venue Association of South Australia Incorporated, for his correspondence of 4 April 2017, because while the government has just indicated that they believe this issue has been well agitated, the letter that I have received on 5am mandatory closing leads me to think otherwise. It reads:

> The Late Night Venue Association of SA Incorporated (LNVASA) is the representative body for South Australian businesses operating licensed premises trading past midnight.
>
> The State Government has proposed in the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Bill 2017 that all licensed premises close for at least 3 hours each day between the hours of 3am and [5]am except the Skycity Adelaide Casino. If passed, this will mean, in practice, a 5am mandatory closing for all licensed premises in South Australia, except the Skycity Adelaide Casino.
>
> The LNVASA is, quite frankly, astounded that such a draconian measure has been recommended as part of a review of liquor licensing laws and is currently being proposed without any consideration of its merits for the following reasons:
>
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade was not mentioned in the Liquor Licensing Discussion Paper or the Terms of Reference for the Review of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 (SA)
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade was not discussed with the LNVASA and Tim Anderson QC at a meeting held on 22 February 2016
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade was not raised in the South Australian Police written submission to the Review of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 (SA)
> - In Tim Anderson QC's 330-page report on the Review of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 (SA), the proposed 3-hour break in trade was given half a page [of a 330 page report]
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade will not reduce alcohol-related harm after 5am, given even the rubbery statistics in the 2015 Review Of The Codes Established under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 show there to be a substantial decrease in police incident reports and apprehensions by police between 5am and 7am (even without the proposed 3-hour break in trade)
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade is not a genuine break in night trade, as argued by the State Government; it is a break in morning trade
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade is a form of restricted trading hours and completely inconsistent with contemporary community expectations which, according to the State Government, new liquor licensing laws are meant to reflect
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade is contrary to the State Government's stated desire to reduce red tape in liquor licensing
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade will mean that large numbers of patrons will be ejected from late night venues onto the streets at 5am
> - The proposed 3-hour break in trade unfairly strengthens the Skycity Adelaide Casino's competitive advantage with respect to late night entertainment.
>
> In the circumstances, the LNVASA strongly urges you to oppose the introduction of a 3-hour break in trade [and welcomes the opportunity to discuss it with you.]

Indeed, the Greens will not support funnelling people into the Casino at 5am and that is why we will support the opposition's amendment.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: The Australian Conservatives will also support the amendments. We have had lengthy debate on this issue over the years and we believe that the status quo, certainly from the evidence that we are aware of, appears to be achieving the objectives for which it was originally supported, and we have seen little, if any, justification to change what is currently in place.

The Hon. T.A. Franks' amendment negatived; the Hon. R.I. Lucas' amendment carried; clause negatived.

Clauses 27 to 51 passed.

New clause 51A.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Lucas–2]—

Page 37, after line 4—Insert:

51A—Amendment of section 69—Extension of trading area

(1) Section 69(3)—delete 'An' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (4), an'

(2) Section 69—after subsection (3) insert:

(4) If the licensing authority considers that a council is unreasonably withholding its consent or approval for the purposes of subsection (3)(d) or (e) in relation to a prescribed application, the licensing authority may grant an authorisation under this section in respect of the prescribed application without the council's consent or approval (as the case requires).

(5) In this section—

Adelaide CBD means the area of the City of Adelaide bounded—

(a) on the north by the northern bank of the River Torrens; and

(b) on the south by the northern alignment of South Terrace; and

(c) on the east by the western alignment of East Terrace and its prolongation north to the northern bank of the River Torrens; and

(d) on the west by the eastern alignment of West Terrace and its prolongation north to the northern bank of the River Torrens,

but does not include an area in the City of Adelaide determined by the Commissioner, by notice in the Gazette, not to be part of the Adelaide CBD for the purposes of this section;

prescribed application means an application relating to a relevant place that is in a prescribed area;

prescribed area means—

(a) the Adelaide CBD; and

(b) any other area determined by the Commissioner, by notice in the Gazette, to be a prescribed area for the purposes of this section.

I referred briefly to this in the second reading. I think those of us who attend the AHA's annual Christmas lunch have been regaled on various occasions by the President of the AHA's concerns about various pieces of red tape as they relate to liquor licensing and other issues on occasions. On one such occasion, he raised the issue of the requirement under the Liquor Licensing Act for people to be seated when they are having a beer at a table. This was some years ago and, as has been explained, there is a complicated process where, evidently, venues can have that sort of restriction removed.

The argument from the AHA, and indeed drinkers, was that in many circumstances and arrangements there is no particular problem being created by people standing around a table and sharing a schooner each, or whatever it might happen to be, without being required by law to have to sit down around that table and have the same schooner. I am sure the minister will be able to outline what the explanation for this particular provision was. I am sure in some way it was directed to prevent unruly behaviour and that perhaps people who were standing were more unruly than people who were sitting. I am not sure. I guess there was some argument there originally for it.

The member for Bragg has advised in a discussion with parliamentary counsel that this was quite a complicated provision to try to draft by way of an amendment to the liquor licensing law. The explanation given to me—and I will read it—is that:

On consultation with the AHA, [parliamentary counsel and others] a further aspect of reducing red tape for licence holders has been raised, regarding hotel and small bar licences to allow standing outside their venues, without the requirement to be seated.

Currently, licence holders must apply to both the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services and also their relevant council, at a fee, to remove the restriction imposed on all licences that patrons must be seated when consuming a drink outside.

That is the process, evidently. If the minister has a different view, I would seek clarification, but the advice given to the member for Bragg is that licence holders have to apply both to the commissioner and their local council, pay a fee and get the appropriate approval to remove this particular restriction. Our position was: why do we not just get rid of this restriction completely? Evidently if you do that, there are other complications that the government and the licensing people see in relation to just a blanket removal of that particular provision.

The advice that has come back—and as I said, we were told that this is quite complicated—is that our amendment seeks to allow the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services to authorise the no standing restriction to be removed on a licence, on application, without the council's approval. In essence, we have already given the commissioner, who is the chief Pooh-Bah on a whole range of issues in relation to liquor licensing, those powers and we are giving him even more powers in relation to the legislation we have before us.

We would be giving the commissioner one additional power; that is, it will be the commissioner who will make the decision, not the local council, who may be subject to all sorts of arguments as to why we should not allow people to stand and drink at a table in a hotel or a small bar.

The advice the member for Bragg has given me is that, although an application and a fee to allow patrons to stand will still be a requirement, the burden of council approval will not exist. We think it is a common-sense amendment, but it has proved very difficult to actually achieve. What we set out to achieve was to have a blanket 'you don't have to worry about this particular provision'. There are evidently sensible reasons why we cannot and should not do that. This amendment therefore seeks to remove some of the red tape and regulation in relation to it and to make it easier for venue holders to get approval from the commissioner to allow people to stand and drink in certain circumstances.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I rise on behalf of the Greens to indicate that we will support the ability of people to stand and drink alcohol and not be penalised, and for liquor licensed venues not to be penalised for that process. We think it is one of those quaint aspects of the South Australian liquor licensing regime that possibly had a history that made sense at one point, but certainly makes no sense to us here and now.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: The Australian Conservatives also support the amendment. The particularly attractive part from our perspective is that having to gain the approval of two authorities to allow standing up and drinking is overkill. Perhaps this amendment strikes the right balance.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will not speak for a large amount of time. It is the government's view that this amendment is inconsistent with provisions of the Local Government Act and the role of councils in relation to council land that is under council control, but given the indications of where we are today, I will put on the record that we oppose it but we will have a vote on it.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 52 to 71 passed.

Clause 72.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Employment–1]—

Page 49, line 37 [clause 72, inserted section 110A(6), definition of *prescribed place*, (a)]—Delete 'public place; or' and substitute:

public place, other than—

(i) a public place of a kind referred to in paragraph (d) of the definition of *regulated premises* in section 4; or

(ii) any other public place, or kind of public place, declared by regulation not to be a prescribed place; or

This amendment relates to the new secondary supply laws in relation to minors under proposed section 110A. Under proposed section 110A, the supply of liquor to a minor, and the consumption or possession of liquor by a minor, will be an offence unless it is a gratuitous supply occurring in a prescribed place under certain conditions referred to as an exception. These conditions include that the liquor only be supplied by a responsible adult, for example, the parent, or with the consent of an authorised adult, and that it be properly supervised according to the responsible supervision requirements in the bill.

The prescribed place will include public places. This amendment refines the definition of a 'prescribed place' in respect of public places. It has the effect of excluding from the definition of a prescribed place a public place that is being used for the purpose of an organised event where admission to the event is gained on payment of money, presentation of a prepaid ticket or purchase of some item. This means that the exemption would not apply to those organised events. In taking a cautious approach, the amendment also provides a power to exclude other public places from the definition of prescribed place just in case other issues arise in the future.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The member for Bragg advises that the Liberal Party will support this amendment for similar reasons to those the minister has just outlined. The member for Bragg advises that, in a briefing she had with government representatives, she was advised that this particular amendment had come about as a result of a request from a number of non-government schools to try to curb the behaviour at afterparties.

I guess many of us have had children and friends go through the late secondary school years. To those who have not, good luck as your children go through those particular years, says he looking across the chamber. The behaviour at some afterparties perhaps does not bear closer inspection but certainly bears the need for greater regulation.

The reality with afterparties for schools, school formals and those sorts of things is that the law can only do so much. Ultimately, it is going to be the behaviour of young people and others that will dictate whether or not there will be safe passage of those young people through those afterparties and the aftermath of the afterparties as well.

The government has moved this particular amendment. We are advised it is designed to now include warehouses where afterparties are often held, which are classified as non-residential premises and were previously not caught by the legislation, so it is a further endeavour to tighten and provide some regulation and restriction. To that end, we are therefore happy to support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 73 to 94 passed.

Clause 95.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Lucas–2]—

Page 62, line 36 to page 63, line 3 [clause 95, inserted section 135A]—Delete inserted section 135A

Anderson recommended to the government in recommendation 95 that the government 'legislate to require that offences relating to the sale of liquor to minors are strict liability offences with offending licensees recorded in a register and details published on the CBS website'. The government has accepted that recommendation and inserts section 135A into the bill to publish the names of licensees who have been convicted of an offence against this act on the CBS website. These details will be removed after five years from the date of conviction.

As I outlined in the second reading explanation, the AHA and some other stakeholders have strongly opposed what they have referred to as a blacklist. Their view, which is one the Liberal Party

has been prepared to support, is that licensees have already been penalised, as they should. I go back to my position as I outlined in the second reading; that is, if licensees behave poorly, they should be penalised; if individuals behave poorly, they should be penalised and held responsible for their actions.

However, the AHA has made the argument that, for example, if an employee who they have employed at that particular hotel has been responsible for the breach and the conviction of the licensee for offences in this particular area, clearly, the licensee has to take responsibility because they have employed the particular person. That particular person is punished and so is the licensee.

But if the licensee has taken all actions that they thought were reasonable to ensure that these sorts of offences would not occur, and then take action to dismiss and remove the one employee who created the problem and that person is no longer employed by that particular licensee, the AHA is asking why the blacklist, as they portray it, should then continue to exist. Clearly, it would be something that would be perhaps potentially publicised and publicised widely, and may well lead to a loss of custom and support for the people trying to operate that particular licence.

Of course, it is also possible that a licence might change; that is, new management comes in, pledged with maybe a very good reputation in terms of managing a whole range of other sites over a long period of time, and very successfully, without any breaches. Maybe there was poor management at one particular hotel, they bought it out and new management comes in. It would seem unfair if the operation of this register would continue to portray this particular venue in an unfavourable light for a five-year period. For those reasons, the Liberal Party has decided that it does not support this new provision and, by way of this amendment, is urging members to oppose it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his contribution and I understand the intent of what he is moving. As I outlined in my second reading contribution, the government will oppose this amendment. I will add that it is our view that the register will also act as a deterrent for licensees and will encourage licensees to become more vigilant in complying with the law. Other states publish incidents of noncompliance with the liquor licensing law. For example, the Victorian Commission for Gambling and Liquor Regulation publishes summaries of the results of prosecutions each financial year on its website.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Greens will be supporting the opposition amendment. It is pretty much a measure that uses a sledgehammer to crack a walnut; it is overkill. The reason I say that is that, as the Hon. Rob Lucas outlined, these people are already being punished for wrongdoing. There are circumstances where people who were not actually responsible for the wrongdoing will be punished, and continue to be punished, which seems an unusual approach to take.

We are also concerned that there seems to be an equation and a language now of risk-based licensing and punishing those who are seen to be a risk, yet the equation and the methodology that the government uses to get to those processes I find somewhat concerning. I think those people who are doing the right thing should, obviously, not be punished and those people who do the wrong thing obviously should be punished, but the idea of a name and shame list does seem to be overkill.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: We will also be supporting the amendment. I think it has been enunciated well by my colleagues. It does seem that people are being punished twice and some of the breaches in these situations that have been outlined to me can be very, very minor indeed, yet they are subject to what is effectively two punishments, so we will support the amendment.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I indicate that I will be supporting this amendment as well. I do not believe licensees should be penalised twice.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 96 and 97 passed.

Clause 98.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Employment–1]—

Page 64, lines 29 to 32 [clause 98(1), inserted subsection (1b)]—Delete inserted subsection (1b)

This amendment removes a new regulation-making power that allows the regulations to regulate, restrict or prohibit advertising, sponsorship and other practices designed to promote or publicise liquor and its consumption. The government has listened to the concerns raised by industry and therefore moves this amendment.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise with a smile on my face to support this amendment. If I was in a less charitable frame of mind or a less charitable mood, I might unload on the current Attorney-General at his incompetence and negligence in handling this bill in another chamber when this amendment was moved. However, I am in a charitable mood and I will not belabour that particular point.

How this amendment ever got into the legislation, how the Attorney-General found himself in a position to agree to this during debate in the House of Assembly, certainly did not show the Attorney in the most flattering light. I am sure even some of his own hardworking staff members would have been horrified at the prospect of what he had done on the floor of the chamber without their knowledge and agreement. As I said, I am feeling in a charitable mood. I will not belabour the point. I am delighted to see that this minister in this chamber has seen the error of the ways and has moved to tidy it up on behalf of the government.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: It will come as no surprise to members of this council that the Greens will be supporting this amendment. Indeed, I am not feeling quite so charitable but I certainly will not belabour the point. It is often said by the Attorney, I believe, that he brings these magnum opuses to this council and we somehow damage and diminish his creative work. Well, this was some creative work indeed in the other place and I am glad to see that the minister has admitted he was wrong.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Lucas–2]—

Page 64, after line 34 [clause 98, after subclause (2)]—Insert:

(2a) Section 138—after subsection (2a) insert:

(2b) A regulation required to be laid before each House of Parliament in accordance with the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* that prescribes fees for the purposes of this Act may not prescribe or provide for any matter that is not prescribed in connection with such fees.

In my view, this is a very important amendment and I strongly urge members to consider it carefully and support it. As I outlined in the second reading, and the minister has just confirmed it, Anderson has actually potentially recommended a massive increase in licence fees for licensees in South Australia. That is, they currently collect about $2.65 million in licence fees, and Anderson is recommending massive increases of up to $7.2 million and the government has left open the possibility that they may well agree to licence fee increases up to that level.

Various members, I am sure, have had pieces of correspondence and emails from people saying, 'Our current licence fee is $20,000 and, if this goes ahead, it is going to go up to $200,000,' or some extraordinary increase depending on what the classification under the new licence arrangements is going to be. This is potentially draconian. The government is still saying as of today, 'We cannot tell you what the licence fees are,' so we are being asked to buy a pig in a poke, to use an old colloquial expression, and that is something which we should not be asked to buy.

The problem we have with regulations is that we are going to get a massive dump of regulations under a new act and, if one part of those happens to be a $4.5 million increase off a $2.5 million base in licence fees, if we move to disallow it at some stage, we are going to have to disallow the whole bally lot. Of course, we will then get the arguments from the government saying, 'We are now going to stop licence holders being able to trade after hours or licence holders to do this other thing because we are about to disallow a regulation that protects the safety of customers.' All those sorts of arguments are what the government will use to try to get the parliament to approve (or not to disallow) this massive increase in licence fees.

In essence, this amendment is saying you can have all your other regulations in one box set, if you want to, but the regulations in relation to licence fee increases will be a stand-alone licence fee increase and that will mean that, if a member wanted to argue that should it be disallowed, then we will be asked to disallow the actual licence fee increases. It is an eminently sensible position.

Personally, as someone who is a shadow treasurer, there will be increased costs in terms of implementing this new system. We accept that, therefore there is probably likely to be the need for an increased licence fee commensurate with that over and above what is in the forward estimates, which is just a CPI increase on the current base.

In moving this amendment, we are not doing so and assuming a position in relation to a licence fee outcome. What we are saying is: let's address that issue when it occurs and be able to address the issue solely concentrating on what the licence fee is, and we can address the other regulations separately as a box set if we wish. With that, I urge members to support this particular amendment.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I have a question for the government on this one, because it concerns licence fees. Will the government confirm that they will be consulting with all stakeholders, including the South Australian Wine Industry Association, when they come to setting these fees?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the government will consult with industry. I assume they would have been consulted with, as that is an important stakeholder, but we will take on board that suggestion. I think the honourable mover of the amendment would be aware that the government is opposing this amendment. While the government may choose to include fees in a separate set of regulations, a legislative obligation to do so may be unnecessarily restrictive. That is the government's view. On that basis, we oppose the amendment

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: We will be supporting the amendment. I think it is an eminently sensible amendment because it allows flexibility, if you like, for members to oppose the actual licensing fees that are going to be proposed. I think the Hon. Mr Lucas made a salient point, namely, that there is an expectation of increase, so I do not think that anyone will be surprised should that take place, but there needs to be some reasonable restriction on that. If we look at the cost pressures on not just hotels or licensed venues but all businesses, they are very significant in today's economy—power prices, wages, etc. The scope for very large increases in licensing fees will just be a bridge too far for a number of businesses. So we will be supporting the amendment to allow this chamber the possibility of denying regulations in the future, should it come to that.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: For the record, I will be supporting the opposition's amendment.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Greens will also be supporting the opposition's amendment. We do so because we have grave concerns about the practice of this parliament of not allowing separated regulations to be disallowed. Certainly, that would be our preference overall: to have all regulations able to be disallowed to stand alone, rather than as a package. We know that that is often used as a tool by government to get through things that it could not possibly get through the parliament. However, we have to make the choice, then, of not throwing out the baby with the dirty bathwater.

In this case, we also have a government that continues to equate risk with the time of day. This is not an episode of *How I Met Your Mother*. Things do happen after 2am that are sometimes actually okay. We believe that licensees should basically have licences that reflect their real risk and not some mythical time frame formula that has previously been applied by this government. We look forward to a reasonable document being proffered when we see the regulations for these new fees.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Schedule 1.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I believe my amendment No. 4 would be consequential to the previous amendment, so I will not be moving it.

Schedule passed.

Schedule 2.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Lucas–2]—

Page 69, lines 15 to 17 [Schedule 2, clause 4(2)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a)

This amendment is consequential to the passage of an earlier amendment.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (16:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT NO 2) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 October 2017.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (16:41): I thank honourable members, in particular the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, for their second reading contributions and indication of support for the bill.

There are two questions that the Hon. Andrew McLachlan specifically asked during his second reading contribution. The first was regarding the co-location of SACAT at a single location, and what the government was doing to work towards co-location and within what time frame. My advice is that a SACAT accommodation strategy is being addressed to develop SACAT's current accommodation needs, including the increased needs as a result of future jurisdictions that may be conferred.

In light of the need to assess multiple options, funding requirements and accommodation availability, noting existing leases and the third parties involved, this issue cannot be resolved immediately, but it is expected that the accommodation strategy will be substantially completed by the end of the year. That is my information. SACAT will chart the progress of the implementation of this and other recommendations arising from the statutory review of SACAT on its website, with the next substantive report being uploaded, I am advised, by the end of January 2018.

The honourable member's second question related to a Law Society submission on this bill urging that SACAT members be appropriately trained in dealing with children in light of the proposed transfer of jurisdictions from the Magistrates Court to SACAT under the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. The government has forwarded the Law Society letter referred to by the honourable member to SACAT for consideration in its planning for implementation of the transfer of the aforementioned Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act jurisdiction, including in relation to member training, as the honourable member has outlined from the Law Society's submission.

SACAT has within its membership numerous members who are very skilled at taking evidence from vulnerable persons, including those with, for example, dementia or mental incapacity. SACAT also adopts processes to ensure that it receives the evidence required to ensure that its decisions are fair and afford all interested parties an opportunity to be heard without stipulating that such evidence must be received in a courtroom-like hearing.

SACAT is conscious that in assuming new jurisdiction for matters that require evidence to be taken from children, training for existing members will be required and, in all likelihood, new members with specialist knowledge may be recruited. Further consideration will be given to the ways in which evidence will be taken so as to minimise any negative consequences to the child that might otherwise arise. I trust this answers the honourable member's questions, and look forward to the speedy passage of this bill through the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: I do not have any questions on the bill for the minister because of the comprehensive response at the summing-up of the second reading. The Liberal Party will support the passage of the bill at the committee stage.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 125 passed.

New clause 125A.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Employment–1]—

Page 43, after line 11—After clause 125 insert:

125A—Amendment of section 11BA—Commissioner may suspend or impose conditions on registration in urgent circumstances

Section 11BA(4) to (8) (inclusive)—delete subsections (4) to (8) and substitute:

(4) A person whose registration is suspended or made subject to conditions under this section may seek a review by the Tribunal under section 34 of the *South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013* of the decision of the Commissioner to suspend the registration (including the period of the suspension) or to impose the conditions.

(5) Subject to subsection (7), an application for review must be made to the Tribunal within 1 month after the making of the relevant decision.

(6) The Commissioner must, if so required by the person, state in writing the reasons for the Commissioner's decision.

(7) If the reasons of the Commissioner are not given in writing at the time of making the decision and the person (within 1 month of the making of the decision) requires the Commissioner to state the reasons in writing, the time for making an application for review runs from the time at which the person receives the written statement of those reasons.

This is reasonably simple. This is an amendment that is required as a result of the recent passage of the Land Agents (Registration of Property Managers and Other Matters) Amendment Bill.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: The Liberal Party indicated in its second reading that it will support the technical amendments of the government.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 126 to 218 passed.

Clause 219.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Employment–2]—

Page 69, lines 30 to 37 [clause 219(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

(1) A right of appeal under section 10, 14 or 42 of the principal Act in existence (but not yet exercised) before the relevant day, will be exercised as if this Part had been in operation before the right arose, so that the relevant proceedings may be commenced before the Tribunal rather than the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court.

Again, this is a technical amendment that is required to correct an error in the wording of the transitional provisions relating to transfer of jurisdiction from the District Court to SACAT under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: As I indicated in my second reading, the Liberal opposition will be supporting the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (220 to 277) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (16:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTION (ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION) (APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (16:51): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill has come from the House of Assembly and it is a technical amendment to the constitution and involves the Electoral District Boundaries Commission ruling and the subsequent finding of the Supreme Court that the ruling of the Boundaries Commission stood. The bill was moved through the House of Assembly by the shadow attorney, the member for Bragg, in the other place.

The effect of the bill is to amend section 86, which enables a registered political party, or any other person with an interest in electoral redistribution, to be the appellant to a decision of the Electoral District Boundaries Commission.

At present, section 86(2) of the Constitution Act provides that only an elector (that is a person registered on the electoral roll) may appeal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court against any order of the commission. The only ground is that the order has not been duly made in accordance with the act. Members will be aware that on 10 March 2017 the Full Court of the Supreme Court handed down a decision in Martin v Electoral District Boundaries Commission [2017] SA Supreme Court Full Court 18, and all five judges sat.

During the course of the hearing and the delivery of the judgement, the Chief Justice pointed out that the current law requires the appellant to be an elector; hence we have Mr Reggie Martin as the applicant and Ms Sascha Meldrum from the Liberal Party as the second respondent in the course of the proceedings. His Honour pointed out that the current law produces the result that the elector is a member of a political party which made the representations to the EDBC but who did not personally appear before it. His Honour noted:

Parliament may wish to consider whether a registered political party, or any other person with an interest in an electoral redistribution, particularly if that party or person has made representations to the EDBC, should be entitled to bring an appeal against an order of the EDBC. It may also be prudent to allow the Court a power to preclude a political party from appearing on appeal through a proxy if that party made representations before the EDBC. As a practical consideration, Parliament may also wish to contemplate prescribing a procedure for the giving of public notice that an appeal has been instituted and of the right of persons to be joined.

This bill seeks to act on the advice of the Chief Justice in that hearing and the fact that it has found its way here from the hands of the shadow attorney must, by very implication, have passed the rigorous examination of the Attorney-General in the other place. I commend the bill to the members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

At 16:55 the council adjourned until Tuesday 14 November 2017 at 11:30.