

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 May 2012

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

### SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (11:01)**: I move:

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

Motion carried.

### CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (11:02)**: I move:

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

Motion carried.

### CHARACTER PRESERVATION (BAROSSA VALLEY) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 April 2012.)

The **Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:02)**: I rise to speak on the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill, which is before the house. There is a bill following, which is to do exactly the same measure in relation to the McLaren Vale district, called the Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Bill, and some of the comments I will make in relation to this bill apply to the other bill as well.

Madam Speaker, you might ask how we have got to this stage of bringing these bills before the house. I think the general community's belief is that the reason the government is here with these two bills is due to the mishandling of the rezoning and the development issues in the Mount Barker region and the community outcry that has occurred following the planning decisions of the Mount Barker district. As a result of that, the government has gone down the path of producing this bill, which has to do with the character preservation of the Barossa Valley.

The impact of the bill is essentially to allow no residential subdivision in areas outside of townships in the Barossa Valley district. The district is defined in the bill as being 'the Barossa Valley district by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered GP4 of 2012...but does not include the areas marked as townships'. So, what we are talking about is the non-township areas of the Barossa Valley region generally.

The community are raising the question: what problem is the government trying to solve in the Barossa Valley? The government has done its 30-year plan and it has set aside the areas that it sees as the land that is going to be available for future residential development. That land is essentially outside of the land that is proposed to be an area of no development, no new titles or no subdivision under this bill. They have already made their announcement that for the next 30 years land outside of this area will be what is subdivided and land inside this area will not be subdivided—and the minister nods.

The community are then saying, 'Well, you have already made that decision. Why then do you need another level of bureaucracy and another level of planning over the top of what already exists?' That becomes the fundamental question in relation to this particular bill and, indeed, the next bill. We are now aware that the Barossa Council has another two weeks to come back to the government with comments on this bill. Why the lower house is being asked to decide on something when the council which it impacts on has just been given an extra two weeks to come back with comments is a matter of some interest. We would suggest to the government that there might be some value in them, at the end of the second reading, simply adjourning this off until we get the Barossa Valley council's comments back.

The reality is that no-one anywhere is suggesting that the Barossa Valley should be subdivided, or that the Willunga Basin should be subdivided. No-one in this house is going to argue for that subdivision. Everyone will argue, quite rightly, that the character of those areas needs to be preserved, and the issue is about what method you use, ultimately, to preserve them.

We need to recognise, of course, that the reason the character is there to be preserved is that it has been preserved over the whole history of the state. The processes that have been in place have worked up until this point to preserve the character, otherwise the character would not be there to be preserved. Indeed, the local councils argue that case in their submissions to the government. They argue the case that local governments are in a good position to manage the development process.

If the government proceeds with pushing through all stages of this legislation in the lower house this week, the opposition will be reserving its position until we get the final submissions from the various councils so that we can properly consider exactly how the councils see this particular bill. The reality is that the councils, through their planning processes, have always sought to get the balance right in their district, as the local representatives, and no-one here is going to argue for outright subdivision or residential development within those areas. We respect and want to listen to what the local councils have to say in relation to these pieces of legislation.

We are aware that there was a meeting with the minister on 11 May. So, just in recent days there was a meeting with the minister and we are aware now that the minister has allowed for a brief task force approach over the next two weeks to scope issues in relation to the bill and its intent. We are talking about the Barossa Valley bill here and the minister has had a meeting with the Barossa Valley council on 11 May, where he agreed to another two weeks for the council to consider the issues, yet, at the same time, he wants the lower house to vote through the bill, not knowing what the council's final issues really are once the council gets its opportunity to go through the detail in its final form with its elected members.

Why the government would want to put this through the house this week, when it does not know the Barossa Valley council's final position and we do not know the Barossa Valley council's final position is a mystery to the opposition. The government will get no criticism from the opposition if it seeks to adjourn it at the end of the second reading so that we can hear the Barossa Valley's viewpoint. That is ultimately a matter for the minister.

There are some councils in the Barossa district generally, or those that have land in the Barossa district that is covered by this legislation, that have made their positions clear. I refer to the Light Regional Council. Correspondence was sent to various members of parliament regarding the Light Regional Council's position, and the council says this:

I note that the [Light Regional Council] became aware of the tabling of the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill 2012 and the Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Bill 2012 in Parliament on 5 April 2012. Further, Council noted the concurrent termination of the 'Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale Protection Districts' Development Plan Amendment and its replacement with the 'Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale—Revised—Protection Districts' Development Plan Amendment (the DPA) for public consultation by the Deputy Premier and Minister for Planning, the Hon. John Rau, (the Minister), as announced in the *Government Gazette* on 5 April.

The public consultation arrangements regarding the amended Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill 2012 have not been publicised to Council's knowledge—

so, the council was not aware of the public consultation process—

however it has become aware via the *Hansard* from 5 April...that the Minister provided members of the House with the opportunity to consult with their constituents by letting Bills 'lay on the table' for...four weeks to allow public comment. Further, the Council has now been advised that revised Bills are listed for further consideration [of the house]...this morning—

which was 2 May, when this was written. It continues:

I advise that the Light Regional Council's Strategy and Projects Committee considered the proposed 2012 Bills at its meeting held on 1 May and as a consequence to this meeting, the Committee has asked Council staff to advise you of the following key matters so you may be aware of its preliminary position before the debate scheduled in the House of Assembly, this morning.

In this respect, the council:

1. Notes that it remains supportive of the notion of preserving the character of the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale;

Before everyone runs off thinking that means they support the bill, you have to read very carefully what they have actually said. They say they 'remain supportive of the notion of preserving the

character of the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale'. They do not actually say that this is necessarily the best mechanism to do that. They just simply at that point are saying that they agree with the broad principle. Then they say that the council:

2. Is concerned that no formal consultation process has been publicised for the revised Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill 2012 or the Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Bill 2012;

3. Requests clarification of its opportunity to be involved in defining the 'special character' of the Character Preservation District area (as discussed with the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Planning, the Hon. John Rau on 15 November 2011)—

So, as of 2 May they still have not had a sufficient response to a problem raised in November 2011.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** They should read the bill, says the minister. I will forward that on to them so they know what they should do. Here they say that they just wanted an opportunity to be involved in defining the 'special character', since it is, after all, their land we are legislating about. Point 3 continues:

...(as discussed with the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Planning, the Hon. John Rau on 15 November 2011) as the proposed use of the Planning Strategy via the Development Act, 1993 for this consequently makes it a State Government function; which would limit the opportunity of the effect of councils to have an input into this key matter;

What they are raising is the role of the local council, who are their local representatives and who have managed the planning process for what must be 100 years, and what process and what opportunity there is for local government to be involved. It continues:

4. Request clarification of responsibility for progressing any subsequent DPA(s)...whether these will be further Ministerial DPA(s) or the responsibility of each respective council and the relative time frames envisaged;

5. Considers that 'Major Project' provisions should also be excluded from developments or projects in the townships of the district [as distinct from just the district, which excludes townships];

6. Remains concerned that revised bills retain the suggestion of very broad powers via future unspecified regulations. Further, while the responsibilities for administering these regulations are not clear the inference of retrospective application (...that those undertaking particular 'existing' activities may be required to comply with 'new' requirements or conditions, could be fined (up to \$10K) for noncompliance or be required to cease such activities (whatever these may be) altogether) remains a concern;

7. Is concerned that the bill currently only obliges the Minister for Planning to consult with the minister responsible for the administration of the character preservation law with respect to DPAs affecting the area contained within the character preservation district (including townships). It is considered that the state should also be obliged to consult with the affected council(s) with respect to any DPAs within their areas in this context;

It is hard to argue that the local council should not be consulted about a DPA that impacts on its district, but such is the minister's legislation.

8. Is concerned that proposed changes to section 34 of the Development Act 1993 are too broad, and similar intent to the 'Major Project' powers (which would no longer apply to the Character Preservation Districts) and are not supported;

9. Remains concerned that all other authorities (responsible for the administration of any act) retain the opportunity to request 'specified information' (undefined as yet) from government authorities (including councils) which could translate into potential resource implications for the council. Further, it is council's view that administrative responsibilities prescribed through the bills (particularly those identified within sections 5(2) and 9(1) in each bill) are too broad and should not extend beyond the Development Act 1993;

10. [The council] Remains concerned that the adoption of the legislation as proposed (including the revised Character Preservation District mapping for the Barossa Valley) will preclude the correction of zoning anomalies on the western periphery of Nuriootpa (as previously noted and consideration requested of by Light Regional Council in its earlier submissions); and

11. Is of the strong view that the existing legislative framework comprising the Development Act, Planning Strategy & Development Plans is sufficiently robust to provide the additional protection outcomes desired by the state government without the need for additional legislation.

Point 11 goes to the issue that I made in relation to point 1, and indeed I think the general view of the house, that is, when someone says that they want to preserve the character of the Barossa Valley and the McLaren Vale districts, the answer to that is yes—it is the vehicle as to how you get there. The Light Regional Council says, yes, it wants to preserve the character but it is of the strong view that the existing legislative framework comprising the Development Act and planning strategy, etc., is sufficiently robust to provide that protection. That is the view of Light Regional Council.

Then there is the Adelaide Hills Council, which, by the reading of this submission, has some land north of its council area that is captured in the Barossa Valley district zone. This email to the opposition leader, dated 14 May (so this is recent), states:

Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) has made a submission on the concept of the Protection Districts, two submissions on the related Development Plan Amendments (DPAs), and now two submissions on the proposed legislation establish Character Preservation Areas. In each of these submissions, Adelaide Hills Council has requested:

- it be noted that the proposed Protection District concept does not directly address encroachment of urban development into rural areas, as intended;
- that the Protection District areas within the AHC be withdrawn from the proposed Protection Districts, on the basis that these land areas are not a meaningful part of either the Barossa or McLaren Vale [district];
- that the Protection District concept will provide no additional benefit to the functioning or character of the areas affected;
- that the affected areas are already part of the Hills Face or Watershed Zones, which are some of the most rigorous planning restrictions in the country; and
- that Council has plans (DPAs) in hand to better manage the lands in question.

This local council thinks its DPAs are going to better manage the land in question. The email further stated:

The revised DPA has removed part of AHC in the McLaren Vale Protection District. Council strongly requests that land near Kersbrook also be removed from the Barossa Protection District.

Adelaide Hills Council has no desire to be part of the Protection Districts as described by the Character Bills 2012 or the Revised DPA.

The council has made a lengthy submission to the minister. I will not read all the submission, but I will touch on some of the key points. Council would like the following comments relating to the proposed bill to be considered by the parliament when deliberating on the matter. So in fairness to the council, I will raise these points:

1. The intent of the combined bills and DPA package is to 'provide protection from inappropriate urban development' in the selected areas, yet this package only does so second hand by attempting to preserve, as yet, unspecified elements of those areas' character. A direct prohibition on various types of suburban development and rural living development, and their direct impacts, would achieve the stated intention in a more effective way than attempting to maintain a current inconsistent character which is expected to change and evolve over time.

2. The areas of the Mid Murray council previously included in the Protection District have now been excluded on the basis that they are 'not obviously related to the character of the Barossa Valley or intrinsic to its fabric'. The area of the Adelaide Hills Council north of Kersbrook is similarly 'not obviously related to the character of the Barossa Valley or intrinsic to its fabric'. Adelaide Hills Council has previously indicated that this area is not a part of the Barossa Valley as it has a fundamentally different character, and again requests that this area also be excluded from the Barossa Valley Protection District.

3. Land division is currently non-complying in the area north of Kersbrook which is in the Watershed (Primary Production) Zone. As a result, the Bills' planned provisions restricting residential land division provide no additional protection in that area.

I am assuming the council's argument is that if it provides no additional protection, why have another layer of bureaucracy over it; that becomes, I think, the council's argument. It continues:

4. The development of a dwelling on each of the 64 existing undeveloped allotments in the area north of Kersbrook will not constitute urban development, and are not likely to fundamentally change, or provide incremental erosion of the character of this area.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** They are not prohibited.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister says that they are not prohibited, but I think I am right in saying they have become noncomplying.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** They are not prohibited.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, but they have become noncomplying and so people have lost their right to build as such.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** They never had a right to build.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister says that they never had a right to build, but they are valued on the fact they can have a residential home on them.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** They can't now; they are noncomplying. It is a different valuation process. Point 4 continues:

Existing provisions in the Council's Development Plan are more than sufficient to control and guide individual residential developments within the Watershed, and maintain its distinctively non-Barossan character—

Non-Barossan? That's an interesting set of words—

Residential developments comprising more than a single dwelling are also non-complying in the Watershed. During the history of Adelaide Hills Council, no applications have been approved which propose either a residential land division or the division of a rural allotment to accommodate more than one dwelling.

The point they are making is that, under this section of the Adelaide Hills Council, their planning rules already deal with the issue, so why another level of bureaucracy over the top? It further states:

5. Council is concerned that the amendment of the Planning Strategy to give effect to this Bill will require Council to undertake another Strategic Directions Review according to the requirements of Section 30 of the Development Act. If no Section 30 review is to be required, then details of the proposed 'review of relevant Development Plans' should be provided.

6. Part 11 of both Bills provides for the making of regulations 'without limitation'. However, your statement to Parliament on 5 April 2012 indicates that this regulating making power is limited and reflects the standard regulation-making powers contained in most legislation. This inconsistency should be resolved through close consultation with affected Councils in the drafting of the Regulations with the resolution clearly stated in a final draft of the Bills.

7. While the new Bills no longer contain 'objectives', the lack of an over-arching concept to guide development assessment remains. The intent of the Bills is to protect the areas from urban development, but the action addresses currently undefined character elements. There is no explained concept to provide a linkage between the intent and the action. Without such a binding and overarching concept, the determination of development applications or the resolution of policy issues will have no objective basis for analysis or assessment.

8. 'Once operative, this legislation will set out what is desirable and undesirable in the Barossa Valley. Neither the State Government nor any of the councils will be able to change the rules, or allow incremental erosion of the landscape for urban development, without the approval of the parliament.' The current draft of the legislation does not 'set out what is desirable or undesirable' in either the Barossa Valley or McLaren Vale. The legislation provides a number of general criteria which will, in time, guide the creation of unspecified amendments to the Planning Strategy and the unspecified content of new regulations. This proposed legislation creates a framework for eventual action but does not 'set out what is desirable and undesirable' in either area.

Council is appreciative that the Minister has excluded the Upper Sturt area of the McLaren Vale Protection District, on the basis that this area, amongst others, is not related closely enough to the character of McLaren Vale. Council requests that its area north of Kersbrook be removed from the Barossa Valley Protection District on the same basis.

I should say that my family, through my father and uncles (from memory), have some land at Upper Sturt, but I made no submissions to this particular bill in relation to that matter, to the council or the government.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I didn't make any submissions.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** The council made submissions.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The council made submissions, I think; yes, that is right. The points for parliamentary consideration:

In reviewing this legislation, Council has been aware of a number of factors that do not seem to have been considered in preparing the legislation and associated DPA. Accordingly, Council suggests that the Parliament may benefit from considering the following points in its review of the proposed legislation, in order to address Council's concerns:

(a) The Adelaide Hills Council is addressing the specific and complex needs of its rural areas in a series of linked rural DPAs. The current Primary Production Lands DPA will implement the findings of PIRSA's Areas of Primary Production Significance project, and provide a land capability basis for developing policy and policy areas suited to protect such areas of primary production significance and the variety of rural activities which exist in this area. This work will be further developed in the Natural Environments and Rural Policy DPAs to come.

In a separate response to the DPA, Council requests that the area within Adelaide Hills Council and north of Kersbrook be removed from the Barossa Valley Protection District, as separating this area from Council's well-researched and scientifically-supported DPA process will have no beneficial effect on the area or the region.

(b) The DPA and the Bills do not appear to recognise, or provide for the management of, the complexity arising from competition between major land use types;

(c) Establishing protection districts to 'protect' the agricultural character of these areas is an obvious application for land capability planning, such as the Areas of Primary Production Significance project, recently completed by PIRSA. Any regulations should encourage the development of such scientifically based planning policy and land management for implementation through the Development Act and specific quantitatively-based regulations;

(d) This proposed legislation provides no basis for addressing issues or changes arising from unanticipated farming or other innovations, such as 'environmental covers'—the netting structures which protect and improve the quality of orchard produce; and

(e) This proposal has almost no capacity for responding to changing community and landscape values over time as it will require Parliamentary approval to amend the legislation. Although Parliamentary scrutiny is considered appropriate for stopping any proposed changes to the protection districts, it is not a practical way to manage changing community needs and values over time. A five yearly review by Parliament does not guarantee an adequate response timeframe for such changes, especially where the review is not fundamental to the political parties at the time.

(f) The area north of Kersbrook, which is included in the Barossa Valley Protection District, is located within the Watershed (Primary Production) Zone. This Zone has some of the most restrictive development policies in the State in order to preserve water runoff quality, and will not be considered for any intensive or urban development while the land is used for water harvesting. It is considered that adding the Protection District layer to existing and proposed DPA controls will have no beneficial effect on this land's use.

(g) The area north of Kersbrook seems to have been included in the Protection District legislation on the basis that it is part of the Gawler River Catchment. It is considered that this selection criterion is not relevant, as this area is not part of the Greater Barossa Valley, as it has a different character, landform, and agricultural production pattern. It is part of a Torrens Valley character area, and has no functional link to the Barossa Valley. The Council boundary is therefore considered to be a more appropriate border for the proposed Protection District, as that area around Williamstown can be argued to be a functional part of the Barossa. Retaining this Kersbrook area within the Protection District dilutes the cultural and integrity basis for supporting the character preservation and Protection District concept.

(h) The 'identity of the district' is defined by its constantly changing land-uses, design and architectural patterns, with its forms defined by the changing nature and values. Adding an additional barrier to this process of change, simply to stop specific land uses that are, in any case, contrary to existing strong policies, will have no beneficial effect and is likely to stifle or break up the existing agricultural character and the very culture slated for protection.

(i) Despite the Protection District concept being promoted as a means to restrict the encroachment of urban forms of development into Country areas, it is considered that neither the Bills nor the DPA address this matter directly.

It is pretty clear from the Adelaide Hills Council's submissions that they are yet to be convinced in regard to this particular policy.

The Light Regional Council does not support it, the Adelaide Hills regional council does not support it and the Barossa Council, which we are arguing about at the moment, has been given another two weeks. They have so many concerns that the minister met with them on the 11<sup>th</sup> and they have been given another two weeks to go away and bring their concerns back to government.

Why we are debating this bill in the lower house today when the main council—the Barossa Council—still has concerns and has not put its final submission to government is a bit mystifying, I must say, to the opposition. I think it devalues the debate because I would love to be able to stand up and contribute on behalf of the Barossa Valley council the concerns of their local ratepayers but I cannot do that today.

I am sure some of the local members from that area would get a general feel from the community and might make some comment, but the formal position of the council has not yet been established, so it is just unfortunate that we are here today debating this. Again I say to the government that, if they want to adjourn it at the end of the second reading and put it off for two weeks to give the Barossa Valley council a chance to come back in, they will get no criticism from us. I do not think two weeks in the time frame is going to make a lot of difference to the outcome, ultimately, that the government seeks.

The broader issue is: why is the government here with this bill and, indeed, the next bill? Why it is really here is that the government has copped so much flak over the Mount Barker rezoning and development that it has now sought to try to quell public anger by saying, 'Look, we'll have this new process.' However, the reality is that the Mount Barker redevelopment was not a creation of the local council; it was not the creation of the local ratepayer. The Mount Barker redevelopment was a creation of this government.

It was this government that trod all over Mount Barker through its process—a ministerial DPA, if my memory serves me right. The government came in and said, 'We know better. We will bring in a ministerial DPA and we will expand significantly the Mount Barker area and a lot of that will go to housing.' Having done that, and having had screams of protest from the Mount Barker/Hills community in general, they are now saying, 'Well, look, we'd better come up with this different process.'

The councils have made it clear in their submissions that if the government had stayed out of Mount Barker and not done a ministerial DPA, the Mount Barker redevelopment would not have been happening to the level that it is. It would have been simply done in accordance with the council's planning rules—you know, those local people who are elected as local councillors who come up with council-based planning decisions and planning policies. It would have been done to those rules. Right up until that point the land was protected and being used for its agricultural purpose. It is only when this government intervened and brought in its ministerial DPA and got all the flak that the process seemed to go against the government, causing it to rethink the matter.

So, what the government is really trying to say is that now it has stuffed up and we have this outcome in Mount Barker, we now need some other process. What do the councils say? They say that that is not quite true. The government should simply stay out of the way; councils are quite good at making planning decisions to preserve and enhance their local district as they wish it to be.

The reason we still have vineyards down in the Willunga/McLaren Vale area and the Barossa Valley, and indeed throughout the Adelaide Hills, is that councils have had planning policies that have allowed them to remain there and be protected over many years. The Magarey family pear orchard at Coromandel Valley has been in my electorate for many generations. It has been there because, over generations, the council has had appropriate planning processes in place. The reality is—as some of the councils' submissions point out—that the types of agriculture and the types of primary production will vary over the years.

I can take you to places in the Adelaide Hills where I used to work (in orchards) in my teenage years. The orchards are no longer there. I went to dairies during my school holidays. The EPA and other regulations have forced dairies out of some areas of the Adelaide Hills. They are no longer there. So primary production and agricultural activity can actually change over the years.

If you want an example of how regulations can make life difficult, go and ask John McGough at Upper Sturt. He, for his sins, is in the Mitcham council area and, because he is in the Hills Face Zone, if he wants to go from apples to pears, or change crops, he has to get council approval. He has to go through the process of getting approval, and the council will decide whether he can change. That is the reality of it. The advisers can shake their heads, but I have been down that path; that is the reality. Legislation can quite often have unintended consequences.

As I understand it, a letter from the Barossa Council was sent to the minister on 3 May. The council had a meeting on 11 May, so this letter predates the meeting but still sets out some of the Barossa Valley council's concerns in relation to this bill:

The council's concerns relate primarily to the 2012 bill's express intention to reduce the council's decision-making powers under the Development Act—

So, this is another example of a council saying, 'You are stripping the local people of their say'—  
...especially:

- the increased ability of the minister administering the Development Act...to undertake development plan amendments in respect of the council's development plan which relate to the 'special character' of the Barossa District, with no need to consult with the council;

So having gone through a ministerial DPA with Mount Barker, they are now going to have ministerial DPAs over the Barossa Valley district and, according to this, not even consult the local council about that ministerial DPA. You can understand why councils might have some concerns. The council also raised concerns about:

- restrictions on the ability of the council to act as the 'relevant authority' in respect of development applications made under the Development Act in its area.

In particular, the 2012 bill and related amendments to the Development Act in the 2012 McLaren Vale bill—

So the Barossa and McLaren Vale bills together—

do not address the following concerns of council, which were expressed in respect of the previous bills—

So, even though they have raised it previously, these concerns have not been dealt with—

- the fact that the Council's Development Plan may be amended by the Minister to achieve the objectives of a character preservation law (i.e. the 2012 Bill if the bill passes into law) without prior consultation with the Council;
- the potential for the Minister administering the Development Act to appoint the Development Assessment Commission as the relevant authority for the developments which may, in the opinion of the Minister, administering a character preservation law, have a 'significant impact on an aspect' of the district or a township;
- the fact that developments within townships may still be designated 'Major Project Status' under section 46 of the Development Act;
- that the 2012 Bill still proposes to designate the DAC as the relevant authority in respect of land divisions in the district;
- the 2012 Bill still contains onerous powers which allow any person or body involved in the administration of any Act to request significant amounts of information relevant to the district;
- the 2012 Bill still contains broad regulation-making powers which purport to allow the Governor to make regulations prohibiting acts and activities of development within the district.

Further, the 2012 Bills introduce a new form of control over the Council's Development Plan, which the Council is opposed to, in that:

- the Minister will, if the 2012 Bill passes into law, be obliged to, on a unilateral basis without any requirement for consultation with the Council, amend the Planning Strategy to reflect the 'special character' of the district (which term is not defined in the 2012 Bills) within 6 months of the 2012 Bill becoming law; and
- within 6 months of the amendments to the Planning Strategy taking place, the Minister is obliged to review the Council's Development Plan and, if required, undertake a Ministerial DPA, again, with any requirement for consultation with the Council, to ensure that the Council's Development Plan is consistent with the planning strategy.

Lastly, the Act will be amended to allow the Development Plans to refer to or incorporate statutory provisions, meaning that the Council's Development Plan may be amended by way of the Ministerial DPA (again, without any requirement for consultation with the Council) so that any provisions of the Development Plan which are inconsistent with the 2012 Bill are read down to the extent of any inconsistency.

This is interesting here, where the council then goes on to say:

The controls are not necessary

It is Council's view that the above controls are not necessary to protect the unique qualities and values of the Barossa District. The Council submits this objective could be better and more effectively achieved through adopting a collaborative approach in undertaking specific Development Plan Amendments for each particular area within the Barossa District.

Regarding need for consultation with the council, it then outlines a case as to why the council should be consulted. They then emphasise the point:

The Bills do not prevent inappropriate, high-density development from occurring within townships.

The way I understand the Barossa Council's submission, back on 3 May at least, is that the bills do not address what can happen within the townships proper, so the major project status, for instance, can still be used within the township proper, not outside the townships proper. So, I am assuming that means that they are concerned about a five-storey hotel or something being approved under a major project status and, while the vineyards may retain their character, the township, in actual fact, may not.

The opposition is a bit surprised that we have been asked to conclude a debate, and debate this issue, given that the Barossa Council itself has not formally signed off on its final submission. It is indicative that they certainly had some problems back on 3 May and there was a meeting on 11 May. What compromises, if any, were made on 11 May, we are unsure. I understand it has to go back to council and that council needs to make a formal decision and then feed that into the process, so we will have to look at that once that decision is made.

They are some of the issues raised by the three councils in relation to this particular bill. I have some comments from the Onkaparinga council regarding McLaren Vale, which is the next bill, and I will make those during that particular debate.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:45):** I rise as the member for the Barossa Valley, the member for Schubert. I also note the presence of the member for Mawson, who represents McLaren Vale, and I understand we have a different point of view but probably the same intent. In



May 2011, a year ago, the Minister for Planning released a discussion paper regarding his proposal to introduce legislation to protect the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale regions.

The original intent, as described in the discussion paper, was to protect the regions from urban encroachment and sprawl and large-scale industry. Three local Barossa identities who have been previously named twice by the minister in *Hansard*, so I think I can—Jan Angas, Maggie Beer and Margaret Lehmann—have been pushing for this legislation. These identities, some would call them luminaries, got the minister's ear and commenced this process with no consultation with the affected councils until the discussion paper was released. I understand the member for Mawson was also involved in that, but I was not named in the minister's list with some reason.

On 28 September 2011, the minister released a draft bill, the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill 2011, and declared an interim Development Plan Amendment (DPA), effectively putting a freeze on all developments in the region by making virtually all proposals—and there is some dispute about this—from farm sheds on farming land, expansion of industry within an existing industrial site and shops within a main street shopping precinct non-complying. Although non-complying does not mean prohibited, the process is much longer and much more expensive than a complying or merit-based development application. Naturally, people were not submitting applications and this impacted hugely upon the local economy.

Feedback and a multitude of complaints and concerns resulted from the first draft bill and interim DPA. The Minister for Planning admitted that the DPA had resulted in unintended consequences. He subsequently released a revised bill, the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill 2012, which is what we are here debating today. He declared a revised interim DPA on Thursday 5 April 2012.

While I support the principle to protect the Barossa Valley district very strongly, particularly from urban sprawl and developers—and everybody does—the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill 2012, although an improvement on the first draft, does not reflect the original discussion paper and subsequent feedback from the community and stakeholder consultation. It still does not address urban sprawl and inappropriate large-scale industry. The bill affects 95 per cent of the Barossa Council area; the other 5 per cent approximated balance comprises the state government's own 30-year plan growth areas; 10 per cent of Light Regional Council and a small portion of Adelaide Hills Council.

The minister stated in his second reading that the feedback received during consultation on the 2011 bill highlighted and confirmed the government's view that the protection of the Barossa Valley from urban sprawl from townships or creeping suburbia is a priority for the community. I do not think anybody can argue against protecting the valley from urban sprawl and encroachment, but the interesting point is that the government itself creates the threat with its planned urban land 2038 boundary and growth areas via the planning strategy.

The draft plan of the 30-year plan included a projected target of approximately 100,000 people in the Barossa region. Where does this sit with this bill and all this rhetoric? That is how we read it and that is how everybody else has read it. Pick it up and re-read it, whether they have changed it. Effectively, what the government is trying to do with this bill is protect itself from itself. The urban sprawl that has been allowed to take place in Mount Barker was not approved by council, as mentioned by the shadow minister. It was forced upon them by this Labor government. They bulldozed and insisted upon a plan that both the local council and the community were against.

The state government expects the public to believe that it will be protecting our regions from urban sprawl and large-scale industry, but Mount Barker is evidence of how the government has allowed the opposite to occur in the Adelaide Hills. I understand that the minister admitted that mistake, and I say all power to him for admitting it, but please do not let it happen again here. The measure proposed in this bill seeks to grant planning powers and authority to the minister and the Development Assessment Commission (DAC) which will reduce councils' powers to assess development applications and undertake Development Plan Amendments (DPAs) within their jurisdiction.

I commend the council in the proposed Barossa district protection area on doing a good job in assessing planning applications and development proposals in its area. I have been working with them for nearly 20 years, and my own personal experience tells me that the Barossa Council in particular has a very careful and consistent policy. I personally wanted to buy some land or some block houses and create hammerheads on them. Down by the river there were large blocks and I

saw that this land was a bit useless and I thought a great idea would be to buy this land and make hammerheads. No way—I did not even attempt to change their minds.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** You're the sort of person who tries to buy—

**Mr VENNING:** No way—exactly right. If I cannot convince them nobody was going to. Irrespective it was not going to happen and it did not.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I know firsthand—

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** Come and sit over here.

**Mr VENNING:** —they have strong rules in place and nobody but nobody was going to break the rules, and I respected that very much—and I still do. This bill demonstrates a lack of faith the state government has in councils to make effective and appropriate planning decisions in the region and will add an additional layer of unnecessary bureaucracy. I have always believed in the decentralisation of decision-making powers. I would never support councils' powers being diluted and/or removed.

I am all for the protection of the Barossa from urban sprawl but current development plan controls that councils have in place have been working well, as I just said. They are based on local knowledge and extensive experience in respect of township development and primary production requirements. Threats of urban sprawl and encroachment are not coming from the councils; it has only been the state government's planning strategy changes, metropolitan ResCode regulations and the 30-year plan growth areas that have caused problems and posed threats to the region.

Existing council development planning has strict site area and performance criteria to determine whether a dwelling is allowed. The performance criteria and site areas are based on landscape characteristics and farming potential. A single-dwelling policy and prevention of further subdivision is what results from this approach and, therefore, prevents inappropriate densities and sprawling development.

In addition, the industrial scale is also noncomplying in rural zones development already. Separate legislation is not required to limit and prevent residential subdivision. Controls already exist in the council's development plan amendment (the DPA). Land division to create additional lots is already noncomplying in the rural zones—I repeat: land division to create additional lots is already noncomplying in the rural zones. That is not going to change.

I know that when the minister announced this he had a bit of a shot at the council, particularly in relation to the Tanunda East development. It was a bit of a friendly shot, but he had a bit of a shot at them. However, when you look at your own 30-year plan, Tanunda East was in the 30-year plan as being an area that was agreed to. So all council did was say, 'Okay; it's been agreed in the 30-year plan; we'll go along with this.'

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** Hang on, who wanted it?

**Mr VENNING:** Still it is on your desk, minister.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** Who wanted it?

**Mr VENNING:** It's still on your desk.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** Who wanted it?

**Mr VENNING:** I don't know who wanted it.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** The council.

**Mr VENNING:** I do not know who wanted it. Anyway, the 30-year plan was in there; you cannot deny it was in there. It still waits on your desk, minister, at the moment; it still sits there, so it is irrespective of all this. There are several examples of promises that were given in respect to the legislation that have not been delivered, including but not limited to: that legislation would not override local planning decisions; that townships within the protected areas will continue to be controlled by council; and that there will be no changes to existing development rules and processes as the legislation is being developed.

In relation to the proposed Barossa protection district, none of the affected councils have come out in support of this bill. It has taken a while, but they have not. All are supportive of

preventing urban sprawl and inappropriate large-scale industry in their districts, but they all have concerns about many of the objects and clauses in this bill—in fact, in both bills with the one that is coming next.

Of all the council submissions that were tendered to the government, the only submission that the government intently listened to was the Mid Murray Council. The protection district defined in this bill was altered and the Keyneton area was removed. When the minister's advisers were questioned about this change the response was that they listened to the Mid Murray Council's submission and they felt that their area was not in the Barossa Valley.

Now we have the ridiculous situation where Henschke—one of the most prestigious and famous wineries in the Barossa Valley and the home of Hill of Grace (with the vineyard in but not the winery)—the Henschkes and the wine industry in the Barossa tourism area are not very happy about that. We are hopeful that whatever happens the minister will put it back in. Or is it all about allowing wind farms, minister? You might like to address that when you come back to us.

It is interesting that there has been no formal period of consultation on this version of the bill. On the other hand, the second interim DPA is going through a period of consultation which does not end until 27 June. This bill does not proceed until that consultation period has finished. I hope that, after it leaves here, we can wait a bit until we have seen that. It is not that far away; it is only a few weeks. As the shadow minister just said, I hope we are able to do that. We do not want to delay this any longer than we need to, as the minister would know, because this has caused a lot of pain for nearly a year—certainly for eight months a lot of businesses have been affected. The minister will dispute that but I can show him the files (I have already sent them to him) of people who have been affected by being held up in their planning applications. It has been pretty horrific and some of the banks are also getting pretty excited about this.

The bill in its current form will remove future democracy and community accessibility to the planning system and will replace it with increased bureaucracy that fully empowers the state government to determine the strategic direction for the protection of the district based on a political lobbying arena rather than such direction being determined through local research, analysis and consultative planning through local communities. Ever since the minister made the initial announcement at the special lunch at the Old Redemption Cellars at Peter Lehmann (I was there and thanks for the invitation, I did appreciate it; it was mid last year and it was a good lunch) people got carried away and swept up in the euphoria of protecting the Barossa. The minister certainly put it over very well, he took the meeting with him and it was going to be very easy.

I did not support it and I put out a press release at the time, and the minister was not too happy about that. I drew criticism from the council as well, not just you, minister, and I was told that I was the odd man out. Minister Rau, you did not name me in *Hansard* but you named everybody else so I was a bit snuffed about that.

Council has now voted unanimously (of those present—two were missing and one was excluded) to retain all of its decision-making powers. Council has wobbled, there is no doubt about that. The minister has had a bit of a go about the delegations coming in with differing points of view. Eventually, when the dust settled, they all came out with a strong opinion. This area is very technical. I was chairman of the ERD for seven years and it is an extremely difficult and complicated area. If you want to have grey hair or be bald, be a planner. I notice the minister has gone grey; I think you were grey before you got it, minister!

I want to pay tribute to the Barossa Council's planners (something I do not often do but I will in this instance), especially Mr Louis Monteduro and his team—excellent work: consistent, up to the mark, and irrespective of time they deliver the goods. I believe that has been a very, very worthwhile effort.

The bottom line is that we do not want to have housing subdivisions in the rural Barossa; we do not want a Mount Barker in the Barossa. As I said earlier, how did that happen? I was on the ERD Committee when it happened and the minister was not the minister. It should never have happened, it was railroaded through. The government overrode the local council and inflicted it on them via a ministerial DPA—a mistake that the minister has admitted to and that is fair enough; I reckon it takes a bit of professionalism to do that. How can we say in this instance that to protect the Barossa we should take power away from council and hand it to the government? The logic is astounding, I just cannot work that one out. The Barossa is a wonderful place, and it is certainly worth protecting from wanton development.

I had a lot of other information to give the house, but I believe the shadow minister has already read in some of the issues in relation to the Barossa Council's position, particularly on the 2012 bill and the related amendments to the Development Act in 2012.

They say that they do not address the concerns of the council expressed with respect to the previous bill, particularly the fact that the council development plan may be amended by the minister to achieve the objects of the character preservation law, that is, the 2012 bill, if it passes into law, without any prior consultation with the council. I will not go through the other issues.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** It can be now.

**Mr VENNING:** The minister says, 'It can be now.' Well, I am sure we will have a good look at that. It is an honour for me to represent the Barossa Valley as an outsider, as I come from the north. It is a wonderful area, and I will not do anything ever to put it in jeopardy. I have had discussions with the member for Mawson, and I will be interested to hear what he has to say about McLaren Vale in his speech. He may wish to enter the debate on this one. We have the same intent, I think: it is a matter of who you trust—whether you trust the council to get it right, and I do, as in this instance I have personal experience, or you trust the government, and I am sorry, but I do not.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** Parliament, not the government. There is a difference.

**Mr VENNING:** Parliament; yes, there is a difference. Again, governments can get control of parliaments. I have been here long enough to know, minister Rau—longer than you, actually—the shenanigans and games that can be played in relation to lobby groups and pressure groups who come in here and affect the decision-making powers and the way the legislation is framed. How often do we get that wrong?

I am quite happy to praise the Barossa Council for getting this right, because the issue is complicated. In particular, I will mention that two or three councillors have been superb in working this through with me, particularly one (and you obviously know who she is), because it has been a difficult area. The council has almost done a 360-degree turn on this, you would say, but in the end it voted unanimously.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Particularly one of those councillors has a difficult personal issue at home, because the husband of one of the luminaries you name happens to be on the council. That has been interesting, and nothing has been said about that in the media, although I am amazed that it has not. I challenged the journalists to ask the relevant questions that nobody will. So, it is just a matter of—

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** Why don't you leave it alone?

**Mr VENNING:** Leave it alone—you do, and I have. With that, I hope that the minister will see the light or, if he does not, that he can leave this on the table for a couple of weeks until we see the final DPA decision come through from everybody, and in the end I hope common sense will prevail. Yes, we agree with the intent of the bill, but I have never believed and still do not believe that this is the way to do it.

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (12:03):** I rise to support the bill and to point out that there are two sides to this debate: one side, the government side, the Labor Party, is here to protect the agricultural lands of McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley into the future; the other side is here to protect the positions of council bureaucrats. We have heard the shadow minister's contribution: the entire contribution of the member for Davenport was reading out emails and submissions from councils—it was all about what councils want and not about what the people want. It is actually lazy politics. If you get out there and talk to the people in the area and find out what they want, they want more than anything for this land to be preserved. They want this land preserved forever. If you were in touch with your community you would know that.

Member for Schubert, the people of the Barossa Valley came to me for help because they were not getting any help from you because you were not interested.

**Mr Venning:** Three people.

**Mr BIGNELL:** Three people? Not the three people you mentioned. This goes back to 2009: they were Margaret Lehmann; Sam Holmes, who runs the Barossa Grape and Wine Association—

**Mr Venning:** I didn't know that.

**Mr BIGNELL:** —yes, Sam Holmes—and Jan Angas and Anne Moroney. We had several meetings in here in parliament, in the Barossa and in McLaren Vale with those people.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** The initial approach to me, because of the work I had done in McLaren Vale, came from people—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** —in the Barossa—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The members on my left will keep quiet while the member is speaking.

**Mr BIGNELL:** —who said to me, 'We like what you're doing in McLaren Vale. We need that sort of work done on our behalf to save the Barossa Valley from urban sprawl.' What had happened in McLaren Vale was that we had had a lot of issues boiling away down there; one of them was Bowering Hill, where the government owns the land, and there was a proposal to sell that land to developers so that 6,000 homes could go there. We won that battle. I went to the community, and the community said, 'That's great, but what's to stop another minister coming in and changing that ruling?'

They do not actually trust ministers, they do not trust governments, and they do not trust councils. That has nothing to do whether they are Liberal governments or Labor governments; it gets down to the fact that a minister or someone in council can quite easily re-draw a line on a map. What they sought was the protection of this place—this parliament—so that the 47 members in here and the 22 in the upper house have to decide whether the rules we lay down here this year can be changed sometime in the future. That is what they wanted. That is the sort of protection they were after.

We have worked very closely—and I am very sorry, member for Schubert, if you only got on board last year, but people in your area were working on this back in 2009. We had meetings—

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** Well—

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** You didn't invite anyone to the meetings, Leon.

**Mr BIGNELL:** Well, it was not for me to invite them to the meeting.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** You would have been welcome, but you had four constituents from your area on that committee, and it was up to them to invite their local member if they thought that they could contribute. The embryo of where we are today came out of 2009 and, in fact, you can trace it back further than that in the McLaren Vale region, from work that we had been doing from 2006 and 2007.

It gets back to the fact that we are not in here to represent local councils. Each of the 47 of us are in here to represent the 22,000 or 23,000 voters that we have in our area. I can say, as the member for Mawson, in getting around the electorate of Mawson, the overwhelming majority of the people in the electorate want food security; they want to be able to grow food in our areas and not rely on importing food from overseas.

So, it is not just about the wine industry, because future use of that land—which is acknowledged by people in both the Barossa and McLaren Vale—may not be entirely for grapes. It is largely that way now, but it might not be that way in the future. We need to protect the land, because once the land is gone, we do not get to plant any sort of crop there; there will be houses and strip malls on that land.

The member for Davenport mentioned that the reason we have land there to protect is because of the strong council rules that are in place. Well, if we look at the McLaren Vale wine region, we have a look at Woodcroft which, 25 years ago, consisted of dairies and vineyards which are no longer there. If we go back 10 years before that, Reynella was in exactly the same boat. Now, both of those areas have become suburbs under houses and shopping centres.

Look at Huntfield Heights or Hackham South: that area used to be prime grain country, and now it is under houses and shopping centres. What we want to do is stop politicians, whether they be at local or state government levels, from changing those lines. We want to do that because that is what the people want us to do. We are actually putting in protections, and that is what this bill and the bill that is coming up are all about. We need to get back to basics, and not just come in here and worry about paid council employees, who are actually worried about their own job and some loss of power they might have, because really the power is actually vested in them and vested in us from the people, and we are here to represent the people.

I will have more to say on this when we move onto the discussion about McLaren Vale, but I support the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:09):** Mr Deputy Speaker, with your indulgence, I will address both the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) and Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) bills in my contribution. Doubtlessly, the minister will sigh with merciful relief that he will not hear two speeches from me. In short, I will say this: the model of alleged protection that is presented in this bill under the guise of parliamentary protection and scrutiny has an element introduced into it of the government. What I say in this contribution is that as far as I am concerned, the introduction of the government into this process is duplicitous, and I do not trust it. I suggest to this parliament that over the last 10 years this government has demonstrated that it is unreliable, incompetent and untrustworthy, and I will address those three issues.

Let me just identify the districts we are talking about in these two bills, what has been described as the McLaren Vale wine region by the member for Mawson just a few minutes ago, and the Barossa region. I do not think there would be anyone in this house that, if they drove into either of those valleys, as they are today, would disagree that they are beautiful, that they are scenic, that they are world renowned for their produce—more particularly, in recent decades, wine and horticulture.

They are clearly different. Of course, the Barossa's early inhabitants were the Germans, 200 families of which signed up to the South Australia Company in 1836 and came here in 1838. There has been a very strong development of that community, over the last 173 years, from food production and some mining, as well as quarries and other developments, to today, with its expansion into tourism, wine production and industry—including bottling and the like—which is world-renowned. My own maternal great-grandparents, Arthur and Emily Lehmann, operated a sheep property in Cockatoo Valley before they moved to the Riverland to develop food produce there.

That property has now been subdivided up, and in recent decades some of it has been owned—and under grapes—as a holiday destination for an Adelaide family, who has occupied it. I suppose that is symptomatic of the change in that region. That region today is still magnificent. Clearly it has been developed, with the additional infrastructure giving it extra water from the River Murray—at a high price, I might say—but nevertheless they have, as a community, developed it to what we see today; absolutely magnificent, and a premier tourist destination.

The McLaren Vale was a little later, I suppose, to come into intensive wine growing. Certainly in the 1970s and 1980s, when I visited areas like Willunga and McLaren Vale, apart from the late Greg Trott operating his winery, and a few others, a handful really, this was an almond-growing district, with sheep and racehorse breeding and training. It has a very different profile, but it too has developed not only in tourism but in other types of food and wine production, and is internationally acclaimed. All of this has been managed over the last 150 years-plus by our planning laws and, in particular, by local government.

I suppose the introduction of this model had its gestation in a light bulb moment of the Premier, when he announced, in February 2011, that he was going to 'protect the identity and integrity' of these two wine regions. At the time these proposed regions were, in fact, quite a bit larger than they are today. The McLaren Vale region was going to include areas of Davenport, Heysen, and Bragg (my own electorate), which is largely urban and which now includes some area up in the hills. It was going to take in areas of the Burnside council.

How we were in any way involved in the McLaren Vale district was beyond me, and I said that to the minister at the time. In fact, eventually, apart from his idea that it was in line of sight and in some way had a connection, some parts of this have been excised, as though we are to be grateful. Certainly, the people in my electorate are grateful, but it does not mean the others have

not been abandoned, that is, those who are now compulsorily within the current boundaries and who, in some way, are supposed to be appreciative of this.

The minister has been, during the material time, the minister for tourism for a period of time, and I think he even introduced the original bill at a time when he was minister for tourism; he is the Attorney-General, Deputy Premier, minister for consumer affairs and, of course, importantly for this exercise, the Minister for Planning. That is not an aggregate that I would endorse, personally—I think that the Attorney-General should be independent of these—but, nevertheless, these are extra roles that he has been given during the development of these bills.

The general concept of the government is that, under the umbrella of the parliament, there is going to be this protection against urban sprawl and inappropriate development in these two basins, these two valleys. That begs the question, of course, as to what is being protected and against whom we are protecting it. This is a very interesting consideration because, of course, to say that the government is protecting agriculture and farming, as some have said, is a complete nonsense. That is a complete nonsense. That is a fantasy in the imagination of somebody who is trying to suggest that this government gives a toss about rural communities in this state, and I will elaborate on that shortly.

I suppose the most significant example of that in recent years has been (with the government's blessing, or direct intervention) the development of the Mount Barker area in which they bulldozed a ministerial DPA. Mr Deputy Speaker, in your own district of Gawler, I can remember attending a number of public meetings when it was proposed by this government that it would support a population infill, doubling your major town of Gawler in your electorate, about which there was public outrage.

What this government has come to this house to do is introduce a model because they have so blatantly abused their own power in government that they now need to come along and try to form a complete shell against their own actions. Instead of coming in here and saying, 'We made a mistake; we undertake to the people of South Australia that we will not abuse our power again,' they have come in here and suggested that we adopt a model under the guise of protection in which they are going to play a part—an increasing part—on proposed noncomplying development. I do not accept that, and the people in these districts do not accept that.

It seems to me that the way the government (and, particularly, the former premier in his statements, to start with, which were all spin and, of course, what we get delivered is something different) perceives these valleys is not as important food bowls comprised of thousands of people who have competently managed their own affairs and developed their own produce consistent with their decisions, but as valleys that are playgrounds for the urban rich. That is the reality of this.

The minister can chuff and chaw all he likes. He was the minister for tourism, and I know where their bent is, because he stood in this very parliament and told us that we need to understand this because, if this works, he is going to replicate it in other tourist districts—the Coonawarra, Kangaroo Island, I suppose the Adelaide Hills will come in, and the Clare Valley. This is consistent with what they do. What they do is announce a model and a framework, and we have had form on this—marine parks. What a classic example of 'This is what we are going to do to protect the fish in the ocean and the biodiversity' blah, blah, blah. What have we ended up with? Ten years later, after great expense in time and money, we have a community who have been completely led down the garden path by this government. Now we have the commercial fishers arguing about compensation.

We have had other examples, of course, such as the prescribed water. What another classic example of setting the statutory program and the mandate, then the detail comes out and it is a complete disaster. This is just not acceptable and the local communities have now looked at this, including the local councils on their behalf, and they have said, 'Well, this is very different to what we were told.'

The member for Davenport has read out their submissions. They have come from what is a motherhood statement that we want to protect the integrity of a community—great. It sounds fantastic, but what have we ended up with? We have ended up with the detail, which they are running away from at 100 miles an hour. You only have to read the 230-odd submissions on these bills or read the more than 100 submissions on the DPA debate, which is still going on and which the government wants us to just ignore. They want to pass this legislation before we have even concluded that debate—and the public meetings are not even scheduled until August this year.

That is the expectation of this government. They have done it before and they are trying to do it on this occasion.

Why don't I trust them? It is not just the Mount Barker exercise, look at the 30-year plan. The 30-year plan is their document for development in South Australia, post minister Holloway changing the urban boundary to control urban sprawl. He changed that so that he could expand the sprawl. Following that, we have the 30-year plan. The 30-year plan also came in at a time when the government had said, 'We are going to listen to the people. We are going to have all of their submissions. We are going to be able to consider what they think and what they would like to do.'

Conveniently, of course, in these new zones, the very areas which had major areas of objection, including along the coastal Reynella and Aldinga areas and including the Gawler region—Roseworthy, Hewett—and the regions that come up to the buffer zone that has now been proposed in this boundary, have a 30-year plan which envisaged, for example, in the Barossa region, an increase in population of 100,000 people. When the public balked at that, when they said, 'No, that is not acceptable', the government carved it down a bit. I think it is down to 80,000.

This government was very intent—and it still is—on increasing population and increasing urban sprawl, which it sees as the evil in this, and it is now going to say, 'But aren't we good? We are going to cherrypick these two valleys out and we are going to provide them with a layer of protection, but we are going to be in the model that makes the decision about noncomplying.'

That is just not acceptable. The reason why it is particularly not acceptable is that still today—and the minister knows this because he is also the Attorney-General—we are in the District Court over an FOI application which has been going on for years and about which the Ombudsman has said that documents and submissions on the 30-year plan have been presented and even have the consent of the persons making those submissions for them to be published, yet the government has refused to publish them. The Ombudsman has said it is in the public interest that they be available.

What does this government do? This government goes off to the District Court to try to stop the people of South Australia reading those submissions. That is why I don't trust them. That is totally unacceptable. Whatever the ultimate decision of the District Court is—and we will be waiting for that for another year—it is unacceptable that this government should plan for South Australia and not really allow South Australians to know what is going on, where their priorities are and what they are doing.

As for mismanagement by this government, there is a litany of mismanagement, but I will just give you an example. They introduced their own ministerial DPA over the Glenside Hospital site because they knew best. They cut out the local council. 'We know best about the development.' They are happy to bulldoze trees there and to be able to put housing on it. The Film Corporation does not make any money. They have their own little supermarket projects, etc., because they know best. Well, the government does not always know best, and a stunning example of that is when the Supreme Court recently made decisions on three major projects in this state.

As we speak, Urban Construct is taking the government—the masters of mismanagement of master plans and major projects—to court in relation to Newport Quays. That has been a big success! Let's look at a couple of others. The Marion pool is a beautiful facility; we have all read about it. Where are we? In court. Candetti Constructions has taken the government to court. The superway, the compulsory acquisition of land to develop that—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Bragg, please resume your seat for a second. I have allowed you quite a bit of latitude. You are now going into areas that have nothing to do with the bill before us. I ask that you go back to the bill.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** My only point, Mr Deputy Speaker, is—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If you repeat the point, you will be going—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am not going to refer to the projects; I think it is previous obvious. There are dozens out there—there is a litany of them out there. My point is that I do not trust this government for good reason: it has not been honest with the people of South Australia. The government has been demonstrably unsuccessful and incompetent, and we cannot rely on it.

This is the third time the government has asked this parliament to embrace and support a parliamentary model where the government is left in control. That is not acceptable to me, and I



know that it is not acceptable to a very large number of people out there. Representatives have made submissions to the government, including from councils, whose members are elected by the local people. These councils, which have competently managed these districts for generations, are wising up to what is happening, and they will not accept it.

In short, I say that it is unconscionable that this government should expect us to debate this bill before it has even signed off on the detail of the new DPA, which is still out for consultation until the end of June, with public meetings to be held in August—as set out on the minister's own website. Yet the minister expects us to sign up to this—a recipe for disaster—when the government has demonstrably failed every other time it has asked us to do that. Well, I do not trust the government, and I will not be supporting that.

At the very least, this government should adjourn consideration of this bill after the second reading and let the people be heard, and I ask the government to put those secret submissions in relation to the 30-year plan on the table and let the people of South Australia read them.

**Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (12:28):** I certainly support the intent of this bill in relation to the preservation of character. It is a pity that the government did not act in the same way when it introduced the ministerial DPAs for wind farms, which certainly did not take into consideration the preservation of character.

On principle, I do not support this bill. I believe that we have an existing planning framework and development plan amendment report processes that can address the issues. I think a much better way for us to work on these sorts of issues would be for the government and the councils to come together and, through the government planning strategy, work out a way forward that can address all the issues and have some commonality between all those councils in the McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley, and I will give an example in relation to this.

In Mount Gambier, we developed the Greater Mount Gambier master plan, which was led by the planning minister of the day. The councils and the department came together to work a way forward that gave the people of Mount Gambier and the surrounding districts some surety of how the town would grow into the future and still retain its character. I think that is a much better way to go. The councils, of course, then altered their development plan amendment reports to take that process into consideration.

As far as I am concerned, we as a government should be sitting down with those councils and working on a strategy to move forward that has commonality and does preserve the character. We must never forget that at the end of the day those DPAs are signed off by the minister, so the minister does have control of what goes into those DPAs and also on how those DPAs are interpreted. I think that is a much better process than government coming in and trying to stand over. I will not be able to support this bill or the McLaren Vale bill.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:30):** As a start, I thank every member who has contributed to the debate. As usual, I received a bruising tongue-lashing from the member for Bragg, but one becomes accustomed to that. In relation to the general propositions, perhaps if I can start with the last contribution, because the honourable member said something very, very important in his last few phrases, which is: the minister ultimately has control through the DPA processes.

Today, that minister happens to be me, and I can assure the house that, so long as that continues to be the case, there is no threat to the Barossa Valley and there is no threat to McLaren Vale. However, at some point in time, I am prepared to accept that there will be another minister, and there will be several ministers after that, and after that, and after that. Each one of those people can, by the stroke of a pen, do what none of us in this debate want to happen—because everyone has got up here and said, 'We don't want to see subdivision in those areas. We don't want to see incursion of urban sprawl.' Everyone said that. The argument has been confined to how we give effect to that.

Every single minister who occupies this position from here on, by picking up a pen, can do, by himself or herself, what nobody here wants to happen. In fact, in the past it has not just been ministers; it has been councils who have created problems. I will let the member for Mawson explain in more detail about one particular instance that has been a big headache for me. Ultimately, I think we have resolved it, with everybody being unhappy, instead of some people being profoundly unhappy. Anyway, I will leave that to the member for Mawson because that is in his patch.

To be perfectly frank, this is about a power shift. That is true: it is about a power shift. I make no apology for that. The power shift is away from my right hand to two houses of parliament. That is the power shift. What do you have more confidence in: my right hand, or whoever it is that has a right or left hand with that pen poised in it over the next 20 or 30 years, or two chambers of this parliament, that has to have a debate in public, with Hansard recording every word and with scrutiny in terms of the parliamentary committee system and the second reading debates? Who do you trust more?

I would prefer to put my trust in 69 people in two houses of parliament, reported publicly in *Hansard* and covered by the media, than in an unknown series of people who will occupy my job over the next however many years and can sign on a dotted line with their pen, under any circumstances that happen to suit them—and I am not casting aspersions on the character of future office holders because I do not even know who they will be; none of us do.

**An honourable member:** What about the past ones?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Nor the past. I am saying that all we are doing here is elevating the level of security that these regions can look to to comfort them that they will not become the victims of urban subdivision. There may be change, and there can be, because change is very, very simple. Change simply involves bringing a bill in here to change it and publicly explaining why you think it is important to change it. And, in that context, nobody is going to be taken by surprise. There will be a public debate, and if the bill changes in the future, well, fine, it changes, the process has been gone through, but it will not be down to the minister of the day. So, when we are talking about power shifts here, let's be very clear who is having the power shifted off them and who is getting the power. The minister is losing power: the parliament is gaining power. I would have thought that would have been a good thing.

**Mr Bignell:** Hear, hear! It's what the people want.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Exactly, it is what the people want. Now, there are a few other misconceptions that are floating around the place. First of all, the process has been going on—and I think the member for Schubert announced this, quite correctly—since May or so of last year. It's now been going for 12 months. You would have thought, however, to have read some of the correspondence that has come to my desk in the last fortnight, that we are talking about May this year, not May last year.

There was a discussion paper, there was a draft bill, there was an interim DPA, there was consultation in relation to the interim DPA and the draft bill, as a result of which we now have a different interim DPA which follows a statutory process, and we have a new draft bill, which is an even slimmer volume than the original draft bill. Actually, I think the original draft bill probably did a lot more than this one does, and in some respects I prefer the original one; however, we did listen to representations that were made to us, and as a result the original bill was streamlined even further; it sought to do even less.

For the Barossa Council to suddenly come to this point in the last week or so defies description. I am attempting to have a continuing rapport with them in a discussion with them, so I do not think it is appropriate for me to go too far into my views about how they have conducted themselves, other than to say they are a little bit like that the member for Schubert: they can be on many sides of the same point simultaneously.

I had a meeting with these people—and I should inform the house of this—last week. There were a number of people in the room, so there can be no ambiguity about what was said. I think probably notes were taken by everybody in the room. And here is where it landed: the City of Onkaparinga said, 'Yes, we're okay with it. There's a couple of little finetuning around the DPA and so on, but we are fine with it.' And, get this: they asked me, 'Do we have to be coupled with the Barossa Valley? Because we do not want to be slowed down. If they are going to slow it down, please do not slow us down.' That is their position. I realise that is not about this bill—it is about the next one—but that is what they want.

As for the Barossa and Light councils, they have raised a number of furrphies. Now, there are possibilities that they are doing this because they do not understand what we are doing. That is a generous interpretation. A less generous interpretation is basically that I think the member for Mawson might have got pretty close to the mark, but let's be generous.

The only thing this bill does is prevent subdivision for urban purposes. That is the only thing it prohibits. It does not even address industrial issues any more, as the former bill did. How does it

prohibit this? It prohibits it from the external perimeter of the zone by not letting subdivision come in, and it prohibits it from within by not allowing the townships to spill out, and it prohibits it by preventing stealthy subdivision by chopping pieces off large blocks and relabelling them, putting a house on them, and chopping them up again and again.

There are three risks: one is encroachment from exterior pressure; the second is expansion of the township; and the third is stealthy subdivision—hammerhead blocks (as, I think, the member for Schubert referred to), amongst other things. The legislation simply says that urban subdivision is prohibited; however, an agricultural block which does not have a dwelling on it can have a dwelling on it. That is not prohibited. People need to pause for that—'not prohibited', okay? People get hung up by the planning terminology which is noncompliant. That means that it has to go through a process: it does not mean it is prohibited. That is basically the entire effect of this legislation.

The member for Schubert and others say, 'Look, we're worried about what the special character is.' The original legislation attempted to go into that in some detail in the schedules to the original legislation. I had representations from the councils, including Barossa, which said, 'Look, we don't want you to tell us what the special character is. That's for us to know', and I said, 'Good. I agree with you.' I said, 'You shouldn't ask me, because if you ask me I'd probably say you all had to wear lederhosen.' So they said, 'Okay.' I said, 'If you don't want to wear lederhosen, you work it out for yourselves. That's fine,' and, as a result of that, we changed the bill. The new bill therefore leaves it entirely to them.

I am not telling anyone what their special character is. That is their business, not my business. That is their business, and they will continue to do that as they do now. They will continue to do that. This furphy about the townships suddenly becoming small Manhattans with multistorey buildings in them: again, it is a furphy, because the council continues to have control over the planning within the township zones. If the council does not want multistorey buildings it will not have them. It is that simple.

In relation to this particular measure, I did express my concern to the Barossa Council that it had occupied every point in the compass—the whole 360°—and it was now at about 180° from where it started. I did say to them that I thought it was disappointing that they did not keep me in the loop because I was addressing their last point of view, and by the time I had addressed that they had moved on to another point of view, which makes it rather difficult.

The answer to the suggestion, 'Why haven't you gone out and consulted yet again on this?' is that we have already consulted on it, and if we keep going out and consulting on it this will never end, because they do not have a fixed position. If you get a bit of string and a drawing pin and you start moving the string around in a circle, you get somewhere like where these people have been and will continue to go; so, there is no point in trying to stop it; it is just the way it works.

We did listen to representation from various people, and I have to say that it is quite amusing. This is actually quite funny. The other day, on 1 May, the Leader of the Opposition in the upper house, who is, I believe, the spokesman for the opposition in relation to planning matters, put out a stinging press release entitled, 'Hill of Disgrace', and in this he refers to the fact—and the member for Schubert did, too—that the actual Henschke winery is now not within the preservation zone although most of the vineyards are.

Just so that members are completely clear on why this happened, the original proposition put up by me included a line of sight thing which brought in a large area of the Mid Murray Council. The Mid Murray Council in representations to me said, 'Look, please don't leave us in. There's no development pressure here, anyway. There are no townships here, anyway. The protection is unnecessary here, because there is nothing here and never likely to be.' We said, 'Fair enough. Given the fact that there's not much pressure in that area and you don't want to be in, fine; we'll take you out. We'll adjust the boundary so it reflects the council boundary.' Here we are, listening to the council.

**Mr Bignell:** They love the councils.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** They love the councils, the opposition. We listened to that council. We gave them exactly what they wanted and out he comes with the boxing gloves on, the Hon. David Ridgway, hooking into me. The press release continues:

'But unfortunately all the money on earth won't buy you a sensible planning decision from this Government.'

The Barossa and McLaren Vale protection zones protect the two regions from wanton development—

we are on the same page there—

housing sub-divisions, industrial despoliation—

well, actually it doesn't; that is already in the current bill, but never mind—

and inappropriate commercial activity.

Again, no, that is up to the council, not up to me. Anyway, never mind.

'For the Eden Valley not to be included defies belief'

Defies belief! The press release continues:

'The government's protection zones are squiggles on a map drawn by the incompetent,' Mr Ridgway said.

So there we are. The incompetent are the people who drew up the council boundaries, by the way, because that is what we follow; that is point No.1. Point No.2: I was moved by this public missive from Mr Ridgway and so I thought I had best write to him. A couple of days later I did write to him and I said:

Dear Mr Ridgway

I write in response to your recent media statements regarding the draft Barossa Valley Protection District.

I note that you seem to be advocating changes to the eastern boundary of the protection district, so that the Henschke cellar door is within it.

Are you asking me as Minister, to return the eastern boundary to where it was before the representations of the Mid Murray Council were acted upon (i.e. to remove all land within the Mid Murray Council from the protection area)?

If this is your request I will happily amend the boundary accordingly as a matter of priority.

I am waiting for a reply. Do you know what the reply is? I got it today. You are not even supporting the bill! All this rubbish about complaining about where the eastern boundary is, is just so much rubbish, because you are not even supporting the bill! I have made an offer to move it back to where it was—no reply.

It is very difficult to take things seriously. In fact, I understand that the Hon. David Ridgway was speaking at a conference recently about treasures above the ground. He was a keynote speaker; I think it is actually today. Goodness me, it is today. He says, 'The subterranean riches cannot be ignored, but neither should the wealth that is close at hand, more easily discovered. I want delegates to take a few days at the end of conference to have a look at this around the state.'

He talks about what a beautiful place it is. Fair enough, but the person who wants them to go around and look at the wineries and everything else, the person who is asking me to include the Henschke winery in the protection zone (which I am happy to do when I get a response to my letter), that person leads the party in the upper house that today is saying, 'Lord, make us holy, but not just yet. Lord, make us holy, but not just yet. Yes, please preserve everything, but don't do it by law, because that's too hard to get around. That's too tricky.'

We are not being tricky; we have both hands above the table. We are doing exactly what we said we would do. We did consult with all the councils about this. We adjusted districts in relation to complaints made by the member for Bragg because she said they were already in the Hills Face Zone and did not fit entirely in that area. We said, 'Okay, fine, fair enough.' We took them out.

Mid Murray Council came in and complained about things. Fine; we took them out. It is interesting, though, that the member for Bragg mentioned the Cockatoo Valley, where her ancestors apparently farmed. I agree with her; it is a beautiful part of the world. Do you know what now? It is practically useless from an agricultural point of view. Why? Because instead of having broadacres there, it has been chopped up basically into hobby farms. If we are not careful, that is the way the whole Barossa Valley will go.

Let's make no mistake. That Cockatoo Valley precinct will explode if we do not send a very clear message that that sort of development, which inevitably then leads to the next sort of development, will ultimately eat away the Barossa from the inside just as much as the townships having no borders around them. I realise that for 100 or so years or more the council has managed the place, but, quite frankly, for the last 100 years the Barossa Valley has not been within a few minutes' drive of a city of one million and something people. It is going to grow by 500,000 in the

next 30 years and they are going to be looking for somewhere to live. It has not confronted that problem before.

We have to realise that the pressure now on the Barossa is chicken feed to what it will be in 20 or 30 years time, and the same goes for the McLaren Vale region. So, we are either serious about it and say, transparently and publicly, that we are going to bookend the city (northern end and southern end), with no incursions by subdivision without parliamentary permission—not my permission, parliamentary permission. I would have thought the least we could do for the people who legitimately have a concern about this is to give them that level of security and transparency.

The people who are concerned about food security, urban sprawl and the transport and social consequences of a city that goes from Port Wakefield all the way to Victor Harbor—all those people with a whole range of different agendas and different issues—all come together on this point: protect these two regions from subdivision, and that is exactly what we are doing. Any future government is perfectly capable of changing those boundaries and changing those rules, all they have to do is march in here, with all the cameras on them and the lights on, and explain why, and answer the questions: 'Have you been asked by X, Y and Z to do this? Do you have any association with A, B and C?', etc. If they are happy to run the rubric of that, then they can change anything they like at any old time. After all, we change acts of parliament every day.

So, that is basically the proposition. All we are doing is protecting them from subdivision. The person who is being most impacted by this is the minister of the day—that happens to be me presently, but it will not be in the future. It means that the people who live in those two regions, and indeed the people of South Australia, will have an opportunity to have a public debate about any proposal to change those boundaries, or what can go on within them. It is as simple as that.

Whilst I understand the points of view made by some people today—the member for Davenport read out a number of letters from local government people—with the greatest of respect, I think a number of them have misunderstood what we are doing, or have been poorly advised as to what we are doing. The bill, after all, is only two pages long and only contains, I think, eight, 10 or 12 sections. It is hardly a serious and organised crime bill, for instance. It is a very simple piece of legislation.

As I have indicated, we will be pursuing both of these pieces of legislation. There will inevitably be a period of time between here and the other place, and I have indicated to the Barossa Council that it can have a couple of weeks to get back to me about yet another perspective it has on the matter. It has had many perspectives. The Barossa Council is like a diamond, it has so many facets. It is going to get back to me with yet another take on what its settled view is, and I will listen to that. If what it is putting is reasonable and does not do some profound damage to what we are trying to achieve, I will give it consideration.

I do not want to delay this anymore. These pieces of legislation have been sitting around for a very long time. There has been consultation for a year, one way or another, about this. It is time to get on with it. As I said (although it is more relevant to the next debate) in the case of the McLaren Vale bill, as recently as last week I was told by the mayor and the CE of that council that they were supportive of it. Indeed, I was specifically asked whether they had to be concerned about being held up if the Barossa one got stuck in the mud. I said, 'As far as I'm concerned, no, we will just keep going.' So, their position was: keep going, they want it. They are continuing to talk to us, of course, but they are fine.

This one is the one where the issues arise, and I guess we will see how things pan out over the next week or two, but any suggestion that we have not talked to these people is nonsense. We have had consultants in there. We have talked to them endlessly and they have raised their issues with us. We address them, and we come back and say, 'Are you happy now?' Then they have a new range of issues. We address those. 'Are you happy now?' 'Oh, yeah, we're happy now.' Next thing I know, at some public event, a representative of the council is telling people what a terrible thing we are doing to them. It is the first I have heard of it, and I hear it from a third party, so I go back.

Then more recently they have decided they have a new technique to communicate with me. It does not involve use of a telephone; it involves the use of a newspaper where, instead of picking up the phone and talking to me about something, they just tell the newspaper about it. We are now conversing through the front page of the Barossa *Herald* or something, which I guess is terrific for the Barossa *Herald*, but whether it is advancing this in any way is difficult to say. Anyway,

I think I am probably about done on that. As I said, we will be seeking to push these through and we will no doubt have a bit of a chat in due course about the McLaren Vale bill.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*[Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00]*

#### **MINING (EXPLORATION AUTHORITIES) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME) BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME (CONTROL) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I draw members' attention to the presence in the gallery of a lot of people today. We have a group of students from Craigmore High School, who are guests of the member for Port Adelaide; students from Pulteney Grammar School, who are guests of the member for Adelaide; and with great delight I have a group of students from Samaritan College in Whyalla, who are my guests. It is lovely to see you here. I know a few of your faces, and that is very good. I am also happy to welcome a group from Port Augusta, a suburb of Whyalla, who are guests of the member for Stuart, so I am sure I know a few of your faces as well. Lovely to see you here and I hope you enjoy your time here. I imagine I will get into trouble from your mayor about that!

#### **POLICE LOCAL SERVICE AREAS**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta):** Presented a petition signed by 166 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the Minister for Police to change SAPOL's local service areas so that Woodforde falls within the Eastern Adelaide Local Service Area or the Holden Hill Local Service Area.

#### **POLICE LOCAL SERVICE AREAS**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta):** Presented a petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the Minister for Police to change SAPOL's local service areas so that Teringie falls within the Eastern Adelaide Local Service Area or the Holden Hill Local Service Area.

#### **ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

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

#### **MEDICAL STUDENT UNIVERSITY PLACEMENTS**

**80 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 May 2010) (First Session). How many university placements for medical students in South Australian Universities have there been in each year since 2001, what is the current number of placements and how many of these placements for medical students were funded by the South Australian Government and Federal Government, respectively?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts):** The University Placement numbers from 2002 to 2011 for the medical workforce (defined as Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery undergraduate program offered at Flinders University and The University of Adelaide) are:

SA University Placements 2002-11										
Year Commencement	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Total	245	219	249	234	227	276	295	308	327	351

- All non fee paying positions in universities are funded by the Commonwealth.
- In 2007, the South Australian Bonded Medical Scholarship Scheme (SABMSS) was introduced, offering up to 10 places funded by State Government from 2007-09. The scheme was introduced as an initiative to increase the number of medical practitioners working in rural South Australia.
- The scheme was extended for the 2010 intake and a review was completed regarding the future of the scheme.
- The 2010 review determined that the scheme would cease from 2011 onwards to allow for:
  - Medical students to pursue other identified opportunities; and
  - Allow time for the intended outcomes of the scheme to be evaluated based on the 2007-10 graduates.
- All current SABMSS recipients will continue to receive their scholarship and support program until the completion of their course.

South Australian Bonded Medical Scholarship Scheme placement numbers 2007-10:

Year	2007	2008	2009	2010
No. of SA Government funded placements	9	6	10	6

#### PRIVATE RENTAL LIAISON OFFICER PROGRAM

**158 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (19 October 2010) (First Session).

1. How many tenants were housed during 2009-10 by each regional office as part of the Private Rental Liaison Officer program?
2. How many FTEs were allocated to each Housing SA regional office for the Private Rental Liaison Officer program?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs):** The Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion has been advised:

1. During 2009-10, the Private Rental Liaison Officer Program housed 664 tenants overall. The following provides a breakdown:

- Adelaide (40)
- Aboriginal PRLO (24) based at Adelaide
- Elizabeth (123)
- Marion (35)
- Modbury (28)
- Noarlunga (78)
- Port Adelaide (52)
- Salisbury (31)
- Berri (47)
- Murray (54)
- Port Augusta (78)
- Pt Pirie (28); and

- South East (46).

Housing outcomes in offices vary due to specialist work with high need groups such as homeless people, refugees, domestic violence victims and Aboriginal people. Private Rental Liaison Officers also conduct seminars and workshops for prospective private renters and liaise with community organisations and other government agencies to arrange accommodation and support for tenants.

2. The number of FTEs allocated to the Private Rental Liaison Officer program in 2009-10 was 12.4. The following provides a break down of the number of FTEs per Housing SA Regional Office:

Adelaide	2 FTE (inc Aboriginal Specific PRLO)
Berri	1 FTE
Elizabeth	1 FTE
Marion	1 FTE
Modbury	1 FTE
Murray & Fleurieu	1 FTE
Noarlunga	1 FTE
Port Adelaide	1 FTE
Port Augusta	0.8 FTE
Port Pirie	0.6 FTE
Salisbury	1 FTE
South East	1 FTE

#### HOUSING SA, DISRUPTIVE TENANTS

**160 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (2 November 2010) (First Session). How many 'strikes' in line with Housing SA's Disruptive Tenants Policy were recorded in 2009-10 and how many tenants were evicted for disruptive behaviour during that period?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs):** The Minister for Social Housing has been advised:

During 2009-10, 1,441 'strikes' were issued by Housing SA to disruptive tenants. 130 tenants were evicted during 2009-10 for a variety of reasons, with disruption being the primary reason in 12 cases. 47 other tenants agreed to vacate their property following disruption without a formal eviction process.

#### PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY HOUSING

**162 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (2 November 2010) (First Session). How many public and community housing dwellings in South Australia were not tenanted as at 30 October 2010?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs):** The Minister for Social Housing has been advised:

As at 30 October 2010 there were 926 vacant tenantable, and 1,005 vacant untenantable, public housing dwellings out of a total stock of more than 44,000 properties.

Tenantable properties are those under offer to a new tenant or undergoing maintenance works prior to allocation.

Untenantable properties may be undergoing major maintenance or being held for redevelopment and other purposes that do not make them suitable for allocation to tenants in the near future.

Community housing data is only collected on an annual basis and there were 268 vacant dwellings as at the end of June 2010. This figure includes both tenantable and untenantable properties.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

**244 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition)** (13 July 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 3, p26, Table 2.9—



What are the comparative FTE numbers for the public non-financial corporation's sector and the public financial corporation's sector (which have been provided in previous Budget Statements)?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs):** The Department of Treasury and Finance has provided the following estimate of full-time equivalent employees (FTEs):

30 June, 2011 Estimate:

Public Non-Financial Corporations	4,765
Public Financial Corporations	538

30 June, 2012 Estimate:

Public Non-Financial Corporations	4,590
Public Financial Corporations	548

### BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CENTRES

**334 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (23 August 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 4, p47—

What is the status of the funding and timetable for budget cuts to BECs and what is the future of the organisation and its members?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business):** I am advised the State Government previously contributed to operational funding of nine Business Enterprise Centres (BECs) in metropolitan Adelaide through three year funding agreements, which concluded on 30 June 2011.

This funding was only one of several sources of funding for BECs. Eight of the nine BECs receive federal government funding and I am advised that current federal funding agreements will continue until 30 June 2012. The only BEC not receiving federal funding is Enterprise Adelaide, which is a business unit of Adelaide City Council.

BECs also receive funding from Local Government through independent funding agreements with their respective local councils. The Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy is continuing to work with BECs to become self sustaining and reduce their reliance on public funding.

### OCCUPATIONAL LICENCES

In reply to **Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel)** (16 February 2012).

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers):** I have instructed the Attorney-General's Department to begin a full investigation of how such licences are processed within Consumer and Business Services (CBS).

A specialist team will commence reviewing the process and methodology used in CBS when assessing trades licences, in the week beginning 5 March, 2012. This team will include independent expertise in process workflows and senior government employees specialising in Information Technology systems and administrative practices.

This team will report their findings to my Office.

All reasonable measures that need to be adopted to reduce processing times and improve efficiency will be undertaken immediately following the review.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (29 March 2012).

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts):** I am advised:

1. The figures Ms Chapman MP refers to in her questions are contained in the report produced by Aurecon, which was submitted to the Public Works Committee when the building of

the Adelaide Studios was being considered. The report does not state how many jobs will be created at the Glenside film studios, which is the question that has been asked, rather, it provides an estimated forecast figure of direct and indirect employment as an outcome of film production activity in the state.

While we are only nine months into the 2011-12 financial year, there have been no calculations of employment as a result of film production in the state. However, 720 people have been employed in feature film, television and digital media projects that are linked to the South Australian Film Corporation's activities in production investment, development and business support, in the 2011-12 year to date. While this figure is not a measure of full time equivalents, the fact that 720 people have been employed in some capacity in film and television projects that the Film Corporation has been involved in indicates a level of activity that is not insubstantial.

2. Similarly, the \$28.7 million figure contained in the report is an estimated figure of economic activity resulting from the investment in the Adelaide Studios for the 2011-12 financial year, and assumes a full year of business at the Adelaide Studios. Given that we are only three-quarters of the way through the financial year, commissioning an independent assessment of the economic impact to date has not been contemplated.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Remuneration Tribunal—

Determination and Report No. 2 of 2012—Conveyance Allowance—Court Officers,  
Judges and Statutory Officers

Determination and Report No. 3 of 2012—Travelling and Accommodation  
Allowances—Court Officers, Judges and Statutory Officers

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Rules made under the following Act—

Magistrates Court—

Amendment No 42

Civil—Amendment No 42

By the Minister for Business Services and Consumers (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Act—

Liquor Licensing—

Dry Areas—Long Term—

Goolwa Area 1

Mannum

Millicent

General

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Act—

Energy Products (Safety and Efficiency)—General

By the Minister for Transport Services (Hon. C.C. Fox)—

Regulations made under the following Act—

Local Government—Service Rates and Charges

### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:08):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** As a result of the public's concerns about ongoing instances of delays in ambulance turnaround times at Flinders Medical Centre, the Chief Executive of

SA Health, at my request, has appointed an emergency department expert from Western Australia to undertake an independent review of patient access—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** —procedures at Flinders Medical Centre. Dr Mark Monaghan, one of Australia's leading emergency physicians, will be assisted by an independent team comprising an inpatient care physician, an emergency department director and the Deputy Commissioner of the ACT Ambulance Service. Dr Monaghan is the Co-Director at Fremantle Hospital in Western Australia and is part of an expert panel which provides advice to the commonwealth government on emergency department and elective surgery strategies.

There will be a specific focus on resolving issues associated with the hospital's emergency department and ambulance delays. The review will also examine inpatient access across the hospital to ensure that those patients who need to be admitted receive timely access to beds. We understand that this is not just about the emergency department but the whole hospital.

Dr Monaghan's team will work with all parties involved in ambulance, emergency department and inpatient care to review any potential procedural, cultural or other issues that are impacting on decision-making and patient flow. The review team will also provide advice on new initiatives that could be introduced to improve access and reduce the impact of delays. The team will report back in early July 2012.

There have been significant investments at Flinders Medical Centre to expand the emergency department (\$23.8 million) and improve the flow of patients. Major redevelopment works are now complete and have provided space to care for 10,000 more patients each year (up to 70,000 patients), including an extra 21 cubicles (now 51 up from 30). In addition, \$5.7 million was invested to create a new 30-bed acute medical unit to provide faster specialist treatment for patients arriving at the emergency department. As well, there have been operational investments totalling more than \$11 million over the past three years to support better patient flows.

SA Health figures show that 61,574 people were treated in the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department in 2000-11. That is more than 1,000 fewer people than the previous year. While there was an increase in presentations leading up to 2007-08, there has been a 2 per cent decline (down from 62,513 in 2007-08) since that time compared to a 6 per cent increase in presentations across the metropolitan area. Seventy-one per cent of presentations at Flinders Medical Centre were 'seen on time' (according to the triage categories) to February 2011-12 compared to the state average of 72 per cent.

Over the past decade, the number of doctors working at Flinders Medical Centre has nearly doubled to 630, along with a 65 per cent increase in nurses and midwives and a 110 per cent increase in allied health and scientific professionals. I would like to commend doctors, nurses and all the others who work within the emergency department and the wider hospital, as well as our ambulance officers who work hard in sometimes very demanding circumstances to ensure appropriate care for South Australians. Emergency departments, as I am sure all members and the public would understand, can be very busy places at times and the presentation of patients is by its very nature unpredictable.

I also acknowledge Dr Di King who resigned her position as clinical director of Flinders Medical Centre's emergency department on Thursday 10 May. Dr King has overseen the hospital's emergency department since 1999 and has also provided strategic direction for emergency services in the southern region. I wish to thank Dr King for her leadership and contribution to the southern area local health network and particularly for overseeing the redevelopment of the ED.

## QUESTION TIME

### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Why was the former head of the Flinders emergency department, Dr Di King, expected to guarantee that there would be no more ramping at the Flinders Medical Centre before an independent review was conducted into patient access at the Flinders Medical Centre?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:14):** That is a statement that the Leader of the Opposition has made. I would like her to demonstrate the evidence of that.

### MINERAL RESOURCES

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:14):** My question is to the Premier. Why is it critical that the government fosters investment in South Australia, particularly in our resources sector?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:14):** I thank the honourable member for her question. Since the settlement of this state, South Australia has relied upon investors from across the nation and indeed the world to fund our economic development. Simply put: the savings that we have in this state are not adequate to fund the capital investments that are necessary to develop our state. So, yesterday morning, I opened the 2012 Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association Conference at the Convention Centre. This is a massive conference, and it represents energy producers for almost 98 per cent of Australia's oil and gas resources, and the conference has attracted over 2,700 registered attendees to hear about investment opportunities that are available in this state.

South Australia has a history of natural gas which extends back to a number of important pioneers in this field, including Reg Sprigg, who is one of the founders of Santos. He believed that our state could have access to affordable energy through the Cooper Basin, and that has certainly proved to be the case. As detailed in the 'Roadmap for unconventional gas projects', which the government released yesterday, there are a vast range of other projects worth hundreds of millions—if not billions—of dollars in investment opportunities to this state.

I was also pleased to have the opportunity to meet His Excellency Ali Al-Naimi, the Saudi Arabian Minister for Petroleum and Mineral Affairs, who was a plenary speaker. He wasn't actually in town to watch a horse race; rather, he was in town to be a speaker at this conference. I also had the opportunity to meet with the federal energy minister, Hon. Martin Ferguson. Also attending the conference was the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory. The conference attracted national and international industry leaders from companies including BHP, Santos, Woodside and Chevron, as well as banks, hedge funds and other investors. This interest in Adelaide matched the interest that I saw when I was in London last week.

There is a growing awareness that the centre of gravity is shifting to the southern part of Australia, in terms of mining and resources, and that was apparent with the people I met in London, including Altona Energy and Anglo American, a very large corporate player in the mining sector. A number of other companies that I met in London observed that South Australia's model for case management was a highly respected one.

The other thing they noted is that they saw an above-average amount of interest that elected officials pay in companies making personal representations, and that was a very important factor in their investment decisions. You have to remember that these companies are making big and long-term investment decisions. They need to understand that the political environment is a secure and welcoming one for them, and so directly meeting leaders is absolutely crucial for those opportunities.

The other thing that is of interest to members is that a number of defence companies that are attracted here because of South Australia's reputation for being a defence state is given an additional impetus because of the mining opportunities that exist in South Australia. Many of these defence contractors actually do things other than defence; they have a range of activities that spread into the mining services sector, and so they see this as not only a great place to try and win some defence contracts but then expand into the mining and resources sector, and also use South Australia as a hub for Australia and also the Asia-Pacific.

A number of these companies are winning contracts in New Zealand, have ambitions to win contracts in Indonesia, and so there is an increasing awareness of our state, which can only be—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —and that will only improve with the endeavours that we are taking at this important conference here in South Australia.

**FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE**

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Will the Minister for Health and Ageing guarantee that there will be no more ambulance ramping at the Flinders Medical Centre?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:19):** I thank the member for her question. As I said in my ministerial statement, what I have done is to ask the health department to investigate the concerns that have been expressed in the public arena on a number of occasions now, led principally by the ambulance union, which has raised these concerns about what has been described as 'ramping'.

I have investigated these on a number of occasions and I thought the delays associated with the ambulances turning around patients was associated with the redevelopment works there which, I have just indicated, have added an extra 10,000 patient capacity to that emergency department. I was surprised and concerned to discover that the issues associated with Flinders continued after that work had been done.

These issues are not brought to my attention at any of the other metropolitan hospitals or, indeed, any of our hospitals in the system. So, if this was a system-wide problem, you would expect to see it on occasions at different hospitals, but it is only occurring at Flinders. So, there was a particular issue at Flinders and I have asked the department to investigate it. There will always be occasions when the capacity issues at any hospital will be completely saturated. You can't always predict the flow of patients. It is not like any other operation or other organisation. There may be something that will happen.

In fact, during a radio interview I did a few weeks ago with Phil Palmer, who was the other guest, I put to him that, if there was a bus accident and 70 patients suddenly turned up, you would expect ambulance officers to take a role and he agreed that that would be what they would do in those circumstances. So, on rare occasions, you would accept ambulances and paramedics taking on part of that emergency care role. Indeed, if there was a car accident or a train crash or something like that in the country, the paramedics go there and they give that sort of emergency care. That is what they do, so they know how to do it.

So, in some circumstances it may occur, but the frequency and the nature of the circumstances in which it was recurring at Flinders was obviously problematic, so that is why I asked for that to be reviewed. I am not suggesting what the outcomes are: I just want a solution to what was happening at Flinders. How it gets resolved will be up to the clinicians working with this independent review.

It won't just be about the emergency department or the ambulances: it will be about how the whole flow of patients works through the hospital, because there are back-end and front-end issues about running emergency departments, such as how many patients come in, but it is also being able to move them on to beds. We want to make sure that that flow is working properly.

**SERIOUS FIREARMS OFFENDERS**

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:21):** Can the Attorney-General inform the house about proposed changes to sentencing for serious firearms offenders and why the tough new measures are needed?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:22):** I thank the honourable member for his question.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Madam Speaker: I think the question is disorderly in so much as it used the terminology or the phraseology 'tough new measures'. I think that is introducing argument into the question and it should be ruled out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I would ask the member to leave out 'tough' if it is a real issue for you. I don't see that that is an issue, but you are leaving out the word 'tough'?

**Mr BIGNELL:** I am happy to do so.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you—'new measures'. Attorney-General.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I again thank the honourable member for his question, without that word. I suspect the answer may be similar but, anyway, let's see.

Guns are the weapon of choice for organised crime and the government is attacking criminal organisations through the serious and organised crime (control) legislation, which is now, thankfully, through this parliament, and attached bills.

We are of the view that a targeted approach is needed to gun crime. This is something that has been a topic of discussion around the country and, indeed, a recent meeting of attorneys-general from around the country actually canvassed issues of guns but, more particularly, from the point of view of the manufacture or importation of weapons.

But at a state level here, we have decided that we are going to introduce a new classification of offenders who will be described as 'serious firearm offenders'. I want to explain very briefly who these people are going to be. These are people who commit an offence against the Firearms Act or the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, using a firearm in the following particular circumstances:

- first of all, the person is not permitted to possess a firearm, either through a condition of their liberty—for example, a bond, bail, licence or whatever it might be—or because there is a firearms prohibition order. That is the first category;
- second, the person is subject to a control order under the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act;
- thirdly, the offence is committed in connection with a serious drug offence;
- fourthly, the firearm is an illegal or automatic firearm; and
- fifthly, the firearm is an unregistered handgun and the person does not have a licence for a handgun.

The label 'serious firearm offender' basically tells everybody what we all need to know, that is, these offences are extremely serious and are viewed as such. Serious consequences will apply to these offenders. Serious firearm offenders will, in effect, be sent to gaol unless they can establish exceptional circumstances, which will be a matter for the court. A presumption would exist against bail, which is a complete reversal of the existing circumstances. Finally, two convictions for a serious firearm offence would mean the person is liable to be declared a serious repeat offender by the court.

This measure, which will contain obviously more detail than that, will be shortly before the parliament. This represents a major attack by the government on gun crime; something which I am sure all members of the parliament take extremely seriously. I hope that all members of the parliament on both sides give this legislation a speedy passage when it comes before the parliament shortly.

### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** My question is again to the Minister for Health and Ageing. If the head of Flinders emergency department resigned when she could not guarantee an end to ramping at that hospital, why won't the minister resign since he can't guarantee an end to ramping at the hospital?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:26):** It is highly speculative as to the reason that Di King resigned from that position. There have, as I have said, been continuing public issues about the operations in relation to turnaround times for ambulances at the hospital. On many occasions the ambulance officers, as I understand it, have looked after the patients inside the emergency department, and on a couple of occasions last week there were allegations that they were looking after patients—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Do I have to put up with this, Madam Speaker? She can ask me any number of questions you like and I will do my best to answer them, but if she continues to ask questions—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** It just shows an appalling lack of manners, apart from anything else, and it puts me off track. I was in the middle of something. The review will determine what the issues are, I would hope, and we will correct it. What we want to do is make sure the emergency department there and the ambulance officers work collaboratively. They are part of the one system. There are obviously some issues about how they work together around the management when the emergency department is very busy. I acknowledge that and I acknowledge it is difficult for all of the staff, and we want to work that through. Dr King made her own decisions.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary question.

#### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:27):** Given the minister's answer to the last question, which he elaborated on the inquiry, can he tell us how much the inquiry will cost, and why won't he extend it to include all emergency departments in the Adelaide Health Service?

**The SPEAKER:** I think I will count that as a question. Minister.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:28):** I am happy to try to answer the question. I think it is obvious why it is not being extended to all of the hospitals: because this is the only hospital where this issue has arisen. The point I make is, if it had arisen in all of our hospitals, we would know it was more than just a hospital-specific problem. All of our hospitals from time to time get very busy. There is no doubt about that. There are sometimes more people wanting to get into the emergency department than there are spaces. No matter how you design a hospital system, that will always be the case. That has always been the case. That is just a fact of life.

All of the other hospitals seem to manage that without the problems that are occurring at Flinders. I am not trying to find fault, I am trying to find a solution. I am not sure what the issue is that is specific—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** That is a very smart comment by the deputy leader, but it shows no insight at all. The issue is: how do we resolve this matter? As to the cost of it, I am happy to get an answer for the honourable gentleman when I have further information as to that. Can I just say that the member for Waite said on 8 May:

Paramedics are fed up with ambulances being left cab ranked on the ramp at city hospitals with patients suffering unattended due to mismanagement at emergency departments.

So, he has blamed the emergency department for the problem. That is what he said: 'mismanagement of the emergency department'. That is what the member for Waite said. He blamed the emergency department; I am not doing that. He also said—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** —on the same day that there needs to be a complete review of management arrangements in emergency departments. That is what he said on the same day. I said we only needed to do it at one place. When I announced that we were going to do it at the one place, he said, in a FIVEaa interview on 10 May, 'We [that's the Liberal Party presumably] don't see why it's necessary to bring an extra—'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I presume you're asking about—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The member is clearly debating the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** —a matter of debate. I am listening very carefully to the minister's answer. I was about to point it out to him. I think the minister has finished his answer now. The member for Ramsay.

**FEDERAL BUDGET**

**Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:30):** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms BETTISON:** My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house what impact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my right, also, I can hear you.

*The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister for Health, behave or you will leave the chamber. The member for Ramsay.

**Ms BETTISON:** My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house what impact the federal budget will have on South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:31):** I'm happy to take questions on the carbon tax as well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Last week the federal government released its 2012-13 budget. The budget contained a number of positive announcements for South Australia, including, of course, \$214 million for the next design stage of the state's future submarine project; \$232.1 million to commence an upgrade for the Goodwood and Torrens rail junctions; \$80 million for road safety projects; and \$350 million to local councils for the Roads to Recovery program.

The federal budget also included significant tax cuts to help ease the burden of everyday living pressures for low and middle income families. The other major announcement contained in the budget was that GST revenue to the states has significantly reduced. While the fundamentals of South Australia's economy remain strong, this state, like every other state, is faced with soft consumer spending—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —and an increase in people buying items that are currently not subject to GST. Compared to last year's budget, South Australia's total GST revenue grants have been revised down by \$1.3 billion over the next four years. The writedown to GST revenues comes on top of softer tax revenue collections such as property stamp duty revenue, with state taxes expected to be revised down in this year's budget by \$1.5 billion compared with the 2011-12 budget.

These tax and GST revenue hits combined mean that South Australia will be \$2.8 billion worse off than it was last year. To put that into perspective, \$2.8 billion is more than the state's entire yearly education budget. Total payments to South Australia for national partnerships that provide funding for specific projects, programs or reforms have also decreased over time and are estimated to decrease from just under \$2.1 billion in 2011-12 to \$892.9 million in 2012-13, a decrease of about 57 per cent.

These revenue falls are obviously beyond the government's control and place significant pressure on the state's finances. As a result of the recent revenue writedowns, I will be making some tough decisions when preparing this year's state budget, as this government is committed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!



**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —to producing a fiscally responsible and financially sustainable state budget. Like last year, there will be—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left, order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Like last year, there will be little capacity for major new spending initiatives, and the savings targets already in place will obviously need to be met. Despite the latest revenue writedowns the state government is committed to building for South Australia's future with our record commitment on infrastructure, and we are committed to ensuring that the effects of these reduced revenues are not passed on to South Australian families.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Waite.

#### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:34):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Why did he state that claims made by paramedics and hospital staff of instances of ramping at Flinders Medical Centre were not accurate? On 7 May, an elderly patient experienced internal bleeding while waiting in an ambulance outside the Flinders Medical Centre. The minister stated the patient was, 'brought into the hospital immediately. They weren't left in an ambulance.' However, the security video shows that the patient was taken back to the ambulance for up to 40 minutes.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:35):** I am pleased that the member for Waite asked this question. I assume he is talking about media interviews I did last week. I was providing the media with information that had been provided to me. My staff asked for the security tapes to be checked and the facts were as the member for Waite said, so you can imagine my annoyance that the advice that I got was not accurate. The media—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is an important question.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The media outlets were told of the error and the information was corrected. I will just go through the facts of this particular case.

The individual was brought in by ambulance and was due to go into the high dependency unit at the hospital—it had been an arranged admission into the high dependency unit. Unfortunately (and this is one of the things that I want the independent review to look at), that information was not passed on to the high dependency unit in the hospital so, as a default position, the ambulance took the patient to the emergency department but that is not where he should have gone. The emergency department was busy, the patient was brought into the hospital on one occasion and then—and this area I am not 100 per cent certain of—I understand, after being taken into the emergency department, they were instructed to take him back to the ambulance.

The bit of the information that had been passed on to me was the movement into the emergency department, which was accurate: I was not informed that they had been returned to the ambulance. But my staff member said, 'I want to check the CCTV to ensure what really did happen,' and, as a result of that, the information was made available to the public. It is fine for the member to make this point and criticise me, but it was actually my staff that determined the facts and passed them on to the media. I am very disappointed that the information that was given to me was not accurate, but as soon as I found out what was accurate I made it public.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! You will have another opportunity to ask questions. Member for Mitchell.

#### LAUNCHPAD PROGRAM

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Can the minister inform the house about employment and training programs assisting young people at risk and entering the juvenile justice system?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:38):** I was pleased to attend a recent awards night to acknowledge the achievements of participants in the LaunchPad program last week. The LaunchPad program began in July 2011 as a partnership between Whitelion, In2 Life and the state government. At the time, the state government provided a grant of \$100,000 to assist this program. LaunchPad engages young people aged 16 to 24 at risk of entering or re-entering the youth justice system by working with them to address barriers and challenges to employment, such as stable housing, mental health and drug and alcohol issues. Importantly, the LaunchPad program provides pre-employment and skills development training, as well as job matching and continued support whilst in employment.

While these measures are vital to preventing young people from entering the juvenile justice system and in steering them away from reoffending, it is even more important that participants themselves have chosen to walk a different path to the one on which they were travelling. I was privileged to meet two young men at the recent awards night who were acknowledged for their achievements with the LaunchPad program. One young man had moved from regional South Australia to Adelaide to be closer to his family. When he first moved to Adelaide he was unable to find work and life was getting on top of him. Since starting the LaunchPad program and receiving an individually tailored pre-employment program, he has now gained employment with Sodexo at Prominent Hill. Through hard work and determination he overcame a number of significant challenges and now has a bright future.

This is the kind of program that is really making a difference to people's lives, and that is why I am especially pleased to inform the house that the state government will provide a further \$100,000 for a 12-month extension to the LaunchPad initiative. This will help support an additional 25 young people to take part in the program.

I would like to acknowledge and thank those who have helped support and guide the participants of this life-changing program. These include: case managers, trainers, mentors, staff and management of Whitelion and In 2 Life; employers who chose to accept the challenge of taking on a LaunchPad participant; corporate sponsors wanting to help make a difference in young people's lives; and LaunchPad participants themselves who have overcome personal challenges and, through perseverance and hard work, have achieved their skills training and employment goals. I look forward to being able to report back to the house on the future success of this program.

#### **NYRSTAR**

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (14:40):** Has the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation been briefed by the EPA regarding any potential legal action against Nyrstar in the past 18 months?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:40):** I acknowledge the question from the member for Norwood. Quite simply, he would himself know that, with respect to the EPA, the appropriate section of the act (section 6) on compliance and enforcement is something they make up their own mind about.

However, what I have had over a period of time, as you would expect, is several briefings on issues that relate to the situation at Nyrstar with a specific view to looking at ways by which Nyrstar will be able to remedy some of the situations that relate to the fact that the levels of lead emissions there are not acceptable.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### **APY LANDS, ANANGU FAMILY SUPPORT**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:41):** Can the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation inform the house as to what steps are being taken to provide further support to Anangu families in the APY lands?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:41):** I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge her commitment to Aboriginal people and their communities. At the beginning of this month the

commonwealth and South Australian governments announced a number of collaborative initiatives aimed largely at supporting families in the APY lands.

The state government is working closely with the commonwealth and, very importantly, with the Anangu to boost and better target support for Anangu families in dealing with the challenges they face. For instance, the commonwealth is investing in a new intensive family-support service, which provides for additional social workers and Aboriginal family support workers who will work closely with parents in their homes to improve knowledge and skills about meeting the health, nutrition and educational needs of children.

The South Australian government's APY child protection team, which includes school-based and specialist child protection workers, will receive extra forensic training to assist them in the critically important task of protecting vulnerable children.

The new Mintabie lease and agreement that has been signed by the APY executive and the South Australian government will provide for the licensing of residential, commercial, community and other sites for Mintabie. The new arrangements under the lease, along with the implementation of the new APY stores policy, are expected to assist the APY executive in addressing a range of unscrupulous consumer and other practices.

Support will also be offered to the APY executive through a store compliance and education officer with responsibilities which will include monitoring adherence to the new lease and licence conditions and the reporting of breaches. A new family mental health support service will also be established in the APY lands, which will help in building capacity to respond to the needs of children and young people at risk of mental illness. The service will focus on working closely with families and community organisations to offer intensive practical assistance and early intervention.

In the area of family violence, the state government has agreed to partner the commonwealth, the Western Australian and the Northern Territory governments in establishing a cross-border information and intelligence service to be run by the police, which will facilitate improved information sharing between agencies and service providers in order to tackle domestic violence.

It is important to note that a lot of good work is being undertaken in the APY lands, a lot of it being driven by the Anangu themselves. That is not to say that there is not still a need to better coordinate the support and resources offered because there is, but, unlike the member for Morphett, I have a positive view for the future of the Anangu—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order: the minister is debating the answer to the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Minister, contain your remarks. Be careful, they are very sensitive.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I have a positive view about the future of the APY lands and that positive view is being underpinned by the fact that we need to work with Anangu front and centre with respect to what needs to be their vision for their lands. I was a bit confused about the opposition's position in relation to the APY lands—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order: I don't believe that the opposition's position has any relevance to the question that was asked.

**The SPEAKER:** No, there is no point of order there. You have not heard what the minister has said. Minister.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —in which the member for Morphett referred to artificial communities on the APY lands—artificial communities. The only thing artificial are the views of the member for Morphett about the lands.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order: the minister is—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, you do not need to state your point of order. Minister, you know better. Can you stick to your answer please and not reflect on others?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I promise not to respond to interjections, Madam Speaker, and I am happy, then, to offer the member for Morphett some briefings on the very good work that is being undertaken up there which may better inform his views. These initiatives—

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morphett, order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I will say this, you can't get a deep understanding by occasionally squeezing into moleskins, whacking on the R.M. Williams boots and making reckless statements from Yulara.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** You just can't do that. You would be better off spending a little bit of time up there. These initiatives—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will sit down until we have some order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is important that I hear the answer to this question; it is my area. Minister.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The initiatives that I have been speaking about build on the work that is already underway to assist Anangu meet the challenges that they face. This includes the three new family wellbeing centres which should be completed by the end of the year, additional housing delivered through the National Partnership on Remote Indigenous Housing, and additional police, police stations and staff accommodation. I look forward, in a bipartisan way I hope, to working with the opposition with respect to—

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, don't go out there and make stupid statements.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, your time has expired. Minister, your four minutes is up. Can you take a seat please?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### NYRSTAR

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (14:47):** My question is again to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conversation. When was the minister first made aware of the potential for legal action against Nyrstar, and what was the alleged breach of their licence conditions which led the EPA to provide briefings to the minister?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order: the question does contain argument. It asserts that there is some impending legal action.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Having been asked, it is very hard to withdraw, and I think it should give the minister some latitude in the answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There was some implication in that question that we don't know, but, minister, you may choose to respond to this.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:48):** The matter of any legal action that may or may not be undertaken is a matter for the EPA.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:48):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister update the house on mental health bed numbers in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:48):** I thank the member for Mawson for this really important question. I am very pleased to inform the house that, by June this year, it is expected that there will be an extra 74 mental health beds and places operating in our state compared to 2007 before the stepping up reforms were started. Those increases include an extra 24 beds and places in the combined acute and intermediate care category—they are the most serious categories—and 50 beds and places in the rehabilitation and supported accommodation categories. A further 18 beds and places will come on line before June 2014 and that will bring to 92 the number of extra places and beds that we are creating. These will include limited treatment beds in the country where people can be treated for acute episodes, negating the need for transfer to Adelaide. I acknowledge the member for Mount Gambier who is regularly talking to me about these issues.

I am delighted that the total of 92 extra beds and places is six higher than the 86 we originally announced in response to the Social Inclusion Board's Stepping Up report, supported with more than \$300 million of taxpayers' funds. SA Health has been able to build an extra six supported houses over and above the original bed plan, so that is a good outcome. In addition, the federal government is funding an extra 159 subacute beds and bed equivalents through a \$79.4 million investment over four years, and we are very pleased to be working with them. These services are expected to progressively come online by 2013.

As members are aware, the Stepping Up report recommended a move towards new steps of mental health care, including the inclusion of some adult acute care beds into a new level of intermediate care. The net gain of 74 mental health beds and places takes into account the existing and planned closure of a number of adult acute beds at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Howard House, Noarlunga Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre and Glenside. We are closing down a smaller number of beds and opening up a larger number of beds in other places.

Three new intermediate care centres, each with 15 places, are now operating in metropolitan Adelaide, and a small number of places are now operating in country South Australia as well. These centres cater for people who need a higher level of care than that provided by community mental health teams, or provide a step down from high acuity mental health services as people recover—the stepping up approach. Supported accommodation places have also been introduced to allow people to live independently in a community-type setting while still receiving the care that they need.

In addition to these developments in mental health care in this state, a number of aged extended care beds have been transitioned to the residential aged care sector. This is the responsibility, of course, of the commonwealth government and is consistent with the practices of other jurisdictions and the recommendations of the Social Inclusion Board's report. I commend to all members of the house the outstanding work done by the mental health team within SA Health.

**NYRSTAR**

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (14:51):** My question is again to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Is the government going to provide additional funding to Nyrstar to compensate for the carbon tax which will cost approximately \$16 million in the first two years?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:52):** I am happy to answer that question because on 11 May I had the opportunity to meet with Nyrstar and its Chief Executive Officer in London. We had a broad-ranging discussion about the future of Nyrstar but at no time was there a request made by the company for compensation for the effects of the carbon price. I am sure that they appreciate your special pleading on their behalf but I prefer to listen to the interests of the company as expressed by its chief executive. I find it a much more reliable way of working out what the company is interested in rather than listening to the opposition.

The discussion centred on Nyrstar's potential introduction of smelting technology to ensure its long-term commercial viability and to achieve world's best practice in relation to its operations. Obviously, this is an important plant not only for the people of Port Pirie but, indeed, the nation. Our principal obligation is to ensure that it operates in a healthy fashion but we are also very keen to ensure the future of this plant. It makes an important contribution to the South Australian economy and, indeed, to the regional economy of the northern areas of our state.

I will be working closely together with the company; we have a working party established within government that has been operating for some time now. This was a very important meeting and represented an important milestone in the discussions. We will involve the local member, the member for Frome. I have had an opportunity to brief him about the meetings that occurred in London and it is our hope that we will be able to make successful representations on behalf of the company both to our federal colleagues about a range of issues and also, obviously, the EPA which has an important interest here that will need to be addressed. These are very important negotiations both for the health of the residents of Port Pirie but also for the future prosperity of that region and, indeed, the state.

**CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE SAFETY RESEARCH**

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:54):** My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. Can the minister inform the house about the government's ongoing partnership with the Centre for Automotive Safety Research?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:54):** I thank the member for Light for his question. I am very pleased to be able to advise the house that the state government has signed an agreement with the Centre for Automotive Safety Research to extend its funding for a further five years to \$1.3 million each year until 2017.

Road trauma costs our community over \$1 billion a year. This money will be well spent and will be important if we are to bring our road toll down to 80 fatalities a year by 2020. CASR was established in 2002 through a deed between the state government and the University of Adelaide. This partnership has had a profound impact on road safety policy which has included providing evidence that lowering the urban default speed limit to 50 km/h will lead to a significant reduction in our road toll.

When this was introduced in 2003 our road toll was 153. This reduction has contributed significantly to lowering the number, so that by 2011 it was down to 103—50 less deaths on our roads. I am pleased that the future work of CASR will include monitoring young driver patterns, evaluating the effects of the graduated licensing scheme, and monitoring the implementation of South Australia's road safety strategy—all of which will be invaluable in helping to set the local road safety agenda.

CASR has developed a national and international reputation for high-quality, independent research. They work with interstate road transport authorities, Austroads, the federal Department of Infrastructure and Transport and, importantly, our car manufacturers. I had the honour of visiting their Kent Town laboratory and seeing firsthand the fascinating work they have underway. At the time they were conducting research on the impact vehicles have when colliding with pedestrians.

CASR is building on our state's growing reputation as a hub for world-renowned research. It has successfully collaborated internationally with organisations such as INRETS in France, the

Malaysian Road Safety Research Institute (MIROS) and the Nihol University in Japan. It is also the only research organisation of its kind in Australia that actually attends the scenes of road crashes to collect crucial data.

I want to thank Professor Mary Lydon, CASR's director, and her exceptional team of 20 for their life-saving work over the past 10 years. This ongoing funding means they can continue to locally develop and maintain the expertise and knowledge needed to undertake their internationally-recognised research. I wish the CASR team all the best and look forward to the government maintaining a close relationship with the centre for many years to come.

#### GOVERNMENT REVENUE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:58):** My question is to the Treasurer. Why did the Treasurer say last week that the state was facing its largest revenue fall in history (\$2.8 billion over four years) when former treasurer Foley announced in the 2009-10 budget that the state was facing a larger revenue fall of \$3.2 billion over four years?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:58):** Simply because that revenue fall that was anticipated by Kevin Foley never eventuated. It never eventuated because—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The reason—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I would be very happy, believe me. Believe me, there is no-one in South Australia who would be happier than me if the revenue fall didn't eventuate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Some of my colleagues on the front bench might also be quite happy if the revenue fall doesn't eventuate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The big difference between now and then is that the commonwealth government intervened; it had a massive stimulus package to ensure that the revenue falls that we anticipated after the global financial crisis didn't eventuate because of that massive stimulus. That was then; now, rather than putting stimulus into the economy the commonwealth is doing quite the opposite, in fact contracting its expenditure in order to get the federal budget back into surplus.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### UNCONVENTIONAL GAS PROJECTS

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Minister, can you inform the house how this government is working to secure the benefits of the state's vast unconventional gas players?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:59):** Yes, Madam Speaker, I can. I want to thank the member for his question and his keen interest in growing the state and creating wealth in this economy. This week, the government released a draft roadmap that maximises the potential of South Australia's unconventional gas resources in an environmentally sustainable way.

Launched to coincide with the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association annual conference being held here in Adelaide, the draft 'Roadmap for unconventional gas projects' is believed to be the first of its kind in South Australia. Even in its infancy, the unconventional gas sector has the potential to deliver hundreds of millions, if not billions, of investment dollars to this state and provide a new lease of life to the Cooper Basin. I know that the shadow minister agrees with me.

The draft roadmap lays out important information to all stakeholders involved in the growth of the state's unconventional gas sector and aims to start the conversation about the benefits of unconventional gas to the people of South Australia. I encourage members opposite to join with us in that conversation about unconventional gas.

The roadmap transparently lays out the factors that will be taken into account in considering whether or not to approve an unconventional gas project so as to ensure compatibility with coexisting natural, social and economic environments. With the release of the draft roadmap, we hope not only to inform South Australians but set a course for a sustainable way to develop this state's large endowment of unconventional gas.

In doing so, the roadmap also describes the state's nation-leading approach to the regulation of upstream petroleum operations and unconventional gas operations in particular. The roadmap will also act as a point of call for future investment. It is intended to inform the investor strategies, as well as build public confidence in the government's policies, programs and regulations of the unconventional gas sector.

The roadmap is open for public comment until 5pm on 27 July 2012 so that people and businesses can influence the final form of the document. I encourage all stakeholders to be engaged in that discussion. I am confident, and the government is confident, that the facts will stand up for themselves: that unconventional gas can provide a wealth of opportunities across a wide range of sectors of the economy in a way that spreads the benefit of the mining boom to all South Australians.

#### **CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING BOARD**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Is the government planning to take around \$4 million per year from the Construction Industry Training Fund into the department, and if so, why? Also, does the Construction Industry Training Board support the use of the levy in that way?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:02):** As part of the 2010-11 state budget, there was a requirement on the Construction Industry Training Board to make some savings—\$3 million in the next financial year (2012-13), and from 2013-14 it will be \$4.5 million. We are negotiating with the construction industry board about how to do that. Those negotiations are ongoing, and when we have a resolution I will be happy to inform the house and the member.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport has a supplementary.

#### **CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING BOARD**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:03):** Is the minister saying that the Construction Industry Training Board is looking at using the levy funds to meet their savings targets?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:03):** As part of the budget, there was a requirement on the CITB to help with savings. Now, that process is being negotiated, and that is the most detail I can provide to the house at this time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for MacKillop, you can ask a question if you choose to do so, but—

**Mrs Redmond:** We're gobsmacked.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Reynell.



### PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister inform the house what the government is doing to ensure a high performing executive service?

**The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:04):** I thank the member for Reynell for the question. The government is progressively developing a system designed to manage public sector professionalism for high performance. The strategy to achieve this was outlined in the Public Sector Performance Commission report to government in November 2010. This report acknowledged the need for:

...a dramatically strengthened induction, professional development and leadership program for the South Australian Executive Service.

A Leadership Capability Program has been designed in recognition of this requirement and to develop the government's South Australian Public Service executives, ensuring that they operate at a world-class level of performance.

To meet the increasingly complex challenges that public sector executives are facing in the current climate, the concept is to work to a system of management proven from reliable research to create high performance. The SAES induction program has been established to provide new SAES executives with the knowledge, tools, networks and mindset necessary to succeed as public sector leaders both now and into the future.

The program is based on a set of characteristics detailed in the high-performance framework and introduces new executives to a high-performance management system that integrates setting direction with developing capability and the ability to evaluate, monitor and to ensure assurance of outcome. The SAES induction program is held over four days and is aimed at new executives and those with less than 24 months' experience.

The government has held four programs per year since it commenced in 2009. A total of 105 SAES executives have attended the program and each program receives around 60 nominations. To ensure best value for each attendee, a maximum of 30 attendees are accepted at each. As of this year, the program is being run biannually to keep up with demand. I think this is indicative of an increasing professionalism at the senior levels of the South Australian Public Service.

The program is fortunate to attract high-profile guest speakers from the Australian government, state government and the Australian and New Zealand School of Government. Guest speakers have covered topics such as cabinet priorities, government strategy, policy direction for the state and skills required to be a successful SAES member.

Past guest speakers have included Warren McCann; Jim Hallion; Bruce Carter, former chair of the Economic Development Board; Dr Rachel Bacon, First Assistant Secretary of the Implementation Committee, Prime Minister and Cabinet; Kerry Colbung, former chairperson of the Premier's Aboriginal Advisory Council; Bill Cossey, Chair of the Audit Committee of the South Australian Strategic Plan; and Professor Mark Evans, Director, ANZSOG Institute for Governance.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### SCHOOL AMALGAMATIONS

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:07):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise when she visited the Renmark Primary and the Renmark Junior Primary schools in my electorate that will be forced to amalgamate? On 2 May, the minister told parliament and the media that she had visited every school earmarked for amalgamation except the Nicolson Avenue school in Whyalla.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:08):** That was opposed to amalgamation.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Port Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### **ROMA MITCHELL SECONDARY COLLEGE**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (15:08):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house about the opportunities available for students at the new Roma Mitchell Secondary College?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:08):** I would like to thank the member for Port Adelaide for this important question. I was delighted, just last week, that the member for Torrens and the Treasurer were able to join me for the official opening of the new Roma Mitchell Secondary College.

As members may be aware, the Roma Mitchell Secondary College is the final school to be officially opened under the state government's Education Works initiative, which has now seen the building of six brand new schools. This particular new school is an outstanding school with an outstanding school community. It caters for a wide range of students with a diversity of interests and skills. It does so because the school acknowledges that, in educating young people for the future, one size does not fit all.

I was delighted to see facilities including technology workshops, robotics and commercial kitchens and that students can gain nationally accredited, industry-standard skills while they are still at school. With the support of teachers, the students can learn the kinds of transferrable skills they will need for jobs and careers that may not have even been invented yet. What we do know is that rewarding careers of the future will require the capacity to think critically, be innovative and work effectively in teams. These are also the kinds of skills and abilities that South Australia needs for our new and emerging industries and for young people to actively take part in community life.

Being active is also a very big part of this new school. For example, there are a range of sporting opportunities and the school is working in partnership with Cycling SA, Hockey SA and Football Federation SA to offer specialist programs in cycling, hockey and, obviously, soccer for students in years 8 to 12. I have to say that the school is giving students outstanding opportunities across a range of academic, trade and sporting fields.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the commitment of the staff and school leadership, and to also particularly acknowledge the parents and other members of the former school communities which came together to create this new school. They were the Ross Smith Secondary School, Enfield High, Gepps Cross Girls High and Gepps Cross Senior Special School. I am absolutely confident that this new school will provide fantastic education for our children and for future generations of young South Australians.

### **TAFE SA, PORT PIRIE**

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (15:11):** My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Can the minister advise the house if there are any plans to dispose of, by way of sale or lease, the former Australian Technical College site, which TAFE SA has the care and control of in Port Pirie?

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr BROCK:** It is not a Dorothy. He doesn't even know it's coming. There you go, member for Finniss. TAFE SA Port Pirie has its main campus located on Mary Elie Street and also has the care and control of the former Australian Technical College (ATC) site on Wandearah Road. I understand this site was transferred to the state by the commonwealth sometime in the last three years. It has been brought to my attention that the certificate courses in the area of heavy vehicle mechanics, proposed for delivery at the former ATC site, will be relocated to the Mary Elie Street campus and delivered in a partitioned section of the car park.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:12):** I thank the member for Frome for his question. The site at Port Pirie is used intermittently, is my understanding of the situation. There is some heavy vehicle storage on it and, from memory, some of the land is leased by St Johns Ambulance and also by a radio station, Trax FM, I think it is. But I will find out more information and get a full answer for the member for Frome.

## APY LANDS, ACCOUNTS

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:13):** My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Is the minister aware of any appointment or proposed appointment of an administrator or receiver for the APY? The last viewable accounts for the APY were in 2009-10. They show a bank overdraft, despite APY having no power to borrow, and a qualified audit report. There are no subsequent viewable accounts for APY.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:14):** With respect to the specifics of the question, no, I am certainly not aware of any move to put an administrator into the APY. That has not been brought to my attention. The first I have heard about it, of course, is what the member for Morphett is saying. As in my response earlier, I would be delighted if he could shed some more information on where he might have ascertained that view.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:15):** A crisis is unfolding across the Adelaide health system in our emergency departments at each of our major metropolitan hospitals. It is time for the government to take action to fix that crisis and to put those emergency departments back on their feet. The house needs to note where we are at present with regard to performance in emergency departments. I draw members' attention to figures provided by national monitors and confirmed to the house in Answers to Questions about how our departments are going.

The hospital in question at the moment is Flinders Medical Centre where, in 2010-11, of emergency cases required to be seen within 10 minutes, only 74 per cent were so seen. Of urgent cases required to be seen within 30 minutes, only 67 per cent were seen. That means 33 per cent of casualties—urgent casualties—were not being seen within the required time. For semi-urgent, it was 60 minutes, and 78 per cent were being seen on time, and so on.

Of course, at the other end of the emergency story, that process whereby people are taken from emergency for their life-saving operation, we find that it takes 41.5 hours for a patient to so progress—almost two days. This failure flies in the face of statements by COAG's expert panel on surgery and emergency access, which insists that emergency surgery should be provided within 24 hours. So, you go into emergency with heart failure and it is taking nearly two days to get your triple bypass. No wonder our emergency departments are clogged up.

This is the problem. People are not being taken out of emergency to the main hospital into an acute bed on time. As a result, there is cab ranking in the emergency department, an array of casualties unable to be taken on for their life-saving operation. That problem cascades through the emergency department, fills up all the beds and moves out the front door into the car park into the ambulances that are ramped up treating patients because emergency cannot cope with demand.

Unless the minister gets a grip of the situation and ensures that there are enough acute beds for emergency patients to progress to the life-saving emergency, the problem will not be fixed. And it is not enough to establish so-called hot floors, an annex to the emergency department, to which patients are simply shuffled into suspended animation, where they are not getting their operation. They are just in there for observation waiting, and waiting, and waiting, and perhaps dying before they get that urgent surgery they so need.

This government has had 10 years to fix our emergency departments. This minister is in his seventh year. This is the ruin that has been delivered. Just this week, on Monday afternoon, of the hospitals in the Adelaide Health Service four were in code white, the other three were in code red. Code white is off the scale. They had patients awash throughout the department.

Hospitals like Flinders do not want to put emergency patients in corridors. As was said this morning by a prominent Adelaide doctor, who is an expert in his field, there is no oxygen, there are no resuscitation equipments, there is no instrumentation, there is no doctor and no nurse to care for them in the corridor, so they are not taking them. Why aren't they taking them? Because people have died unattended in these hospital corridors, and they are saying to the ambulance officers, 'We do not have the resources to cope.'

That raises the question: what is going on in our other hospitals? Are they being kept in the corridors unattended without the equipment they need? This is a crisis. By a COAG standard on

the four-hour rule of getting people out of emergency departments, we are the worst performing state in the country under this minister, with only 59 per cent of people complying with a four-year limit.

I found the minister's statement to the house today very unconvincing. He spends \$5 billion a year, he has 30,000 people, he has the resources to fix it, and instead he has to fly in experts from interstate at considerable cost to tell him what to do. He has had long enough; he has been the minister for seven years. He is delivering ruin. He is putting the lives of South Australians at risk in our emergency departments. People no longer have confidence that there will be an ambulance to pick them up—it may be ramped already at Flinders—and that, when they get to emergency, they will be seen on time. It is an utter disgrace.

If you cannot get the health system right, you are not fit to govern. This bloke is wasting money on financial mismanagement and other costly wasteful programs instead of targeting the health dollar to where it matters—

**The SPEAKER:** Member, your time has expired.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** —saving lives in our emergency departments. He should go.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member will sit down. Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Sorry, ma'am, I lost track of time.

**The SPEAKER:** You are lucky I did, also. The member for Reynell.

#### **BETTER TOGETHER CHRISTIE DOWNS**

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:20):** I rise today to commend a community group in my electorate, Better Together Christie Downs, for an excellent function that they held recently. Better Together Christie Downs is a group of residents and service providers who work in the Christie Downs area who decided that they wanted to do something about the sometimes bad reputation that Christie Downs has. Christie Downs is an excellent suburb. It is a little old now and some of the housing stock is not what it used to be. Some of the Housing SA houses, in particular, are on blocks that are a bit too big for the occupants to manage and it does need attention, and that is under consideration by the Urban Development Authority, which is meeting next week.

In the meantime, these residents decided that they have to promote what is good about Christie Downs, and there are very many things that are good about Christie Downs. It has a strong community spirit; it has excellent service provision within the area (it has a train station in the middle of it and it is next door to the Colonnades centre); and it is an ideal residential facility not very far from the beach. What was important about this day was the way both service providers and individual residents put on a fantastic day for the community to come out and enjoy. Fortunately, the weather decided it would behave itself, and this brought out about 500 people to enjoy the day.

The schools were represented—Christies Beach High School and Lonsdale Heights Primary School. Lonsdale Heights brought along an array of musical instruments for people to try as this little school is specialising in musical productions. Learning Together Christie Downs is a group that operates from Christie Downs Primary School where mothers and children can learn together. The ACH Group contributed, there was china painting with local resident Lee Sanders, and Liz's Little Layouts of miniature trains was contributed by another community resident.

Meals on Wheels conducted the barbeque and were very generous with the donation of a prize. I think they contributed the bike for the major children's raffle. The Smith Family from Morphett Vale provided assistance. The organisers particularly wanted to mention 605 Squadron Australian Air Force Cadets, who not only provided information during the day but also provided much unsolicited assistance to other stall holders, particularly during the pack-up. They are a group of young people who demonstrate what is really terrific in our community.

The day basically came out of thin air, with no funding and no paid employee solely dedicated to it, and was run particularly by Helen Ellis, a community leader in Christie Downs, and Linda Enright, who is a community development officer with the City of Onkaparinga, but people tell me she went well beyond her responsibilities and put in a lot of volunteer hours to make this event a success.

The Side Step Crew from Christies Beach High School were a particular attraction and ended up with a little squad of groupies afterwards, I am told, with people lining up to have their photos taken with them. This is very welcome, because all the members of the Side Step Crew are immigrants from non-Anglo countries. So it was quite clear that people—black, brown and brindled—are a welcome part of Christie Downs. In fact, a Sudanese family has been fairly prominent in the community centre, getting in and joining with community activities.

The supporters are really too numerous to fit in to this brief presentation, and I sincerely thank them all. Christie Downs is a wonderful place. It has great parks and recreation areas, good schools and good residents. It needs a bit of work, but it has the potential to be one of the leading suburbs of the state in the future.

### MATT GOLINSKI FUNDRAISER

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:25):** I want to talk to the house today about a fundraising event held on 4 May in Pinnaroo for Matt Golinski, the *Ready Steady Cook* chef who, sadly, lost his family on Boxing Day last year. Instead of Spudfest 2012, which celebrates the area's potato harvest, the organising committee in Pinnaroo held this year's event under the Plates for Mates banner in order to raise funds for Matt Golinski, who had been involved with Spudfest over the past four years. Matt was due to appear at the Spudfest for the fifth consecutive year this year but, on Boxing Day last year, a house fire tragically killed Matt's wife and three daughters in Noosa, Queensland. Matt himself was severely burnt and, although facing a long rehabilitation, he was released from hospital on 30 April.

The cooking competition, which is usually a staple of the Spudfest event, was this year replaced by a televised *Ready Steady Cook*-like event, with locals randomly selected to help the celebrities cook with local produce. The black tie event on 4 May was attended by 300 people. *Ready Steady Cook* chef, Dominique Rizzo, and Justin Miles, chef and owner of Windy Point Restaurant, cooked for the guests.

Entertainers and celebrity chefs for the evening included Manu Feildel (French celebrity chef of *My Kitchen Rules*, *MasterChef* and *Ready Steady Cook*); Chooka (*Australia's Got Talent* contestant 2011); Tom Price (*Australia's Got Talent* contestant 2011); Peter Everett (television presenter and past presenter of *Ready Steady Cook*); and Janelle Bloom (chef, author and most notable for appearances on *Ready Steady Cook*). Sponsors for the evening included Parilla Premium Potatoes and Zerella Holdings. Many thousands of dollars were raised on the night to assist Matt into the future.

A *Courier-Mail* article of 30 April headed 'Brave TV chef Matt Golinski is ready to start rebuilding' states:

Matt Golinski is looking forward to re-experiencing the 'simple pleasures in life' after being released from hospital, four months after the fire that claimed the lives of his wife and daughters. Mr Golinski was discharged from the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital on Friday but will need ongoing treatment for up to five years, his burns specialist says.

His father Keith said it was likely to be some time before the celebrity chef was able to venture back into a commercial kitchen, or work out how he was going to move forward with his life.

'He's looking forward to experiencing the simple pleasures of life, such as preparing his own meals and picking herbs and vegetables from the garden,' Keith said.

'After four harrowing months we are obviously delighted Matt has left hospital, although of course it is also incredibly sad as we remember that Rachel and the girls are no longer with him. It's been a rollercoaster of emotions.'

Matt's wife, Rachel, and daughters Starlia, 10, and 12-year old twins Sage and Willow, died in a Boxing Day fire at the family's Tewantin home, on the Sunshine Coast.

On the advice of his specialist medical team, the Golinskis have requested privacy for Matt so he can focus on his physical and emotional healing.

Keith said Matt, who turned 40 in hospital last week, was 'progressing well' after receiving burns to 40 per cent of his body in the fire but was still coming to terms with his loss.

'It's surreal to think that only seven weeks ago, Matt awoke from his medically induced coma,' he said.

...acting head [of the burns unit] Michael Muller said although Matt had been released from hospital, he faced further surgery and would undergo extensive rehabilitation with teams of health professionals in Brisbane and on the Sunshine Coast.

'This is like training for the Olympics because it is a Herculean task to maximise recovery,' he said. 'He will be stretching and strengthening and massaging his body all day, every day—no weekends off, no slackening off.'

We know he can do it, and we are delighted to be part of it.'

Associate Professor Muller said Matt's journey so far had been a painful one. 'He was really very, very sick but has pulled through and his wonderful attitude will make all the difference in his recovery,' he said. Six of Matt's celebrity chef mates, Manu Feildel, George Calombaris, Damian Heads, Janelle Bloom, Gary Mehigan and Alastair McLeod, have joined forces to raise funds for his recovery and for burns research.

It was a great event held at Pinnaroo the other night. My wife and I attended and everyone had a lot of fun. I must say Manu reported to the Pinnaroo Bakery the next morning that he thought he had never been to such a wild function, and that the Mallee women were quite aggressive, but I guess they do not often see a French chef. It was a very enjoyable evening, and we left about midnight, but I know that it went until at least 2.30am, but let us never forget why the event was held. It was such a tragic event for Matt and his family, and our thoughts certainly go to Matt.

### NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (15:30):** Nearly 20 years ago, Robert Putman published a widely influential work, *Bowling Alone*, in which he argued that social capital in the United States was in decline. To make his case he drew upon an apparent reduction in participation in sporting and other community clubs, and suggested that, as a result of this diminution in participation, the social fabric that enriches our lives is weakening. He argued that this spread across the western world.

There has been much debate since this work, both in support of Putman's thesis, and against, with many people arguing that social engagement has changed but not decreased. Even those who accept that there is still a wide range of social activity, would, I think, intuitively recognise that many people are experiencing increased social isolation and there is a sense that people all too easily can fall through the cracks.

My observation in my community is that people are extraordinarily active in social and community groups, and that they are very aware of the power of those groups in making their lives and those of their neighbours, more fulfilling, happier and safer. Many are concerned that the rise of socialising over the internet will threaten the traditional mechanisms of interaction, and they are acutely aware that their clubs and groups are precious and need to be invested in to keep them strong.

These opening remarks are by way of context for me to inform the house about the excellent evening I spent last night at the Western Adelaide Region Watch SA, or Neighbourhood Watch. The primary purpose of the evening was to honour and thank the long term contributors to their Neighbourhood Watch groups. We were able to celebrate the contributions of people who had been active for 10, 15, 20 and even 25 years in Neighbourhood Watch. We also thanked people who had logged 100 to up to 250 hours as volunteers in police stations, working mainly on triage of inquiries to the station.

The evidence of the strength of Neighbourhood Watch, and the commitment of the people honoured last night to care for their community and make it a safer place was inspiring, and suggests pretty powerfully that our community is in a healthy state. The secondary purpose last night was to celebrate the young and their future. Given the length of service we were commemorating, it is understandable that many of the people receiving badges were of retirement age. But lest we think that police outreach and Watch SA is just about the more mature in our community, there was also an excellent presentation by three primary school boys who had gone through a Living Skills course with the local police as part of the Watch SA effort.

Six students in all, from years 6 and 7, attending Westport Primary School, in my colleague Michael Wright's electorate, experienced a six-week-long program aimed at enhancing their skills to make smart choices as they transition to adulthood, and their report was glowing. The course was, in their words, 'fun', the police were 'fantastic role models' and they 'look forward to coming back in the future to show the police the responsible grown-ups they have become'.

Building relationships with youth, and caring for the safety of our neighbours is admirable, and the strength of Watch SA is clearly a sign that our community is in good health. I congratulate not just those honoured last night, but all who are active in Neighbourhood Watch across this state.

### SCHOOL AMALGAMATIONS

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:34):** It was with some degree of interest that I noted again today that the subject of amalgamations came up, and I would like to spend a few minutes today again talking about the position that the Victor Harbor R-7 School finds itself in after the spurious announcement by the minister a couple of weeks ago, and the consistently similar letters sent out to the number of schools that are to be amalgamated.

There is only one thing that this can be put down to and that is that it is purely budget driven. That is the only reason that this ridiculous situation was put into play. What has come to my attention from parents of children at the school since the announcement is a sense of despair about what the place is going to be like in a couple of years. They are getting a one-off grant but that is not going to suffice in the long term for the disruption to the school's program, the school's students, the school's staff—and the list goes on.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why the minister took it upon herself to travel around to each of the schools that oppose the amalgamations, as a token visit, but did not even bother to consult with or listen to the committee that the Victor Harbor R-7 School had put together, did not ask any questions of the committee and then sailed off into the sunset. I find this government's attitude and the minister's attitude a sign of absolute arrogance in the way it operates these schools.

It is unbelievable that the minister cannot even bring herself to speak to local members or inform local members when she is going to their schools. As an example of that, the minister visited the Victor Harbor R-7 School but I was not asked along. Local members regard these schools as their schools. They work with them regularly and it crosses the party divide. I was able to discuss school problems in my electorate quite openly with one former minister (Jane Lomax-Smith). However, last Monday night at 4 o'clock or so (a week ago) my office received an email from the minister's office which stated 'The minister is visiting a school in your electorate tomorrow.'

The supreme arrogance and the supreme stupidity of staff in doing that once again beggars belief. Surely the minister could have picked up the phone and said, 'Michael, I'm off down to Victor Harbor High tomorrow. If you are able to come'—but I could not have—'would you like to come along? I'm going there to discuss the groundbreaking program that was put in place by local doctors and health professionals at the Victor Harbor school.' I would have said, 'Yes, Grace, I'd love to come along. I've been involved with this program since the days of Alexander Downer, who put a lot of effort into making sure it got up and got some funding for it.' But, no, not this arrogant mob; they do not even have the decency or the courtesy to let local members know. I understand, from what I hear, that she does it to her own members, those on her own side. Really, it is absolutely ridiculous.

We may be on either side of the political divide but I would like to think that I came into this place for the right reasons. However, I am not quite sure that the Minister for Education did because she cannot bring herself to pick up the phone and ring local members and say, 'Look, we're going down to your school.' It is highly disappointing. This goes back to where I started with the amalgamation of the schools. This is not going to go away. The messages that I am getting around the place is that other schools are still quite distraught about it. I am concerned where this might lead in the future for staff, students and parents at the Victor Harbor R-7 School.

They might get through the first 12 months but be in no doubt that ultimately it will cost the students—and they are the most important people at the school. I think it is a dreadful mistake and one that this government will regret doing. I hope that the pressure is continued on the minister and the government on this matter.

### PORT PIRIE

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (15:39):** I would like to talk today about one of the ways that Port Pirie is attempting to promote and encourage employment growth opportunities in the region. Since being elected to this position, I have facilitated at regular monthly meetings with the major key stakeholders in the city, being Regional Development Australia Yorke & Mid North, the Port Pirie Regional Council and the federal member for Grey. These meetings are very beneficial as all major players talk and communicate information that we all share, and move in one direction, not in different directions.

On 14 May 2012, after many meetings between the above key stakeholders, a public meeting was held inviting interested persons from Port Pirie and the region to participate in a

community consultation looking at strategic priorities for the growth of Port Pirie. This meeting was attended by well in excess of 120 people and from this forum many ideas and suggestions for progressing the strategic direction of growth opportunities in Port Pirie were forthcoming. These ideas included looking at improved facilities and capability of the Port Pirie Airport and duplication or expansion of the current natural gas pipeline from Whyte Yarcowie leading into Port Pirie. This pipeline does not allow for the adequate growth of industries because the amount of gas coming through that natural pipeline is insufficient.

The group looked at further opportunities to maintain and assist the existing industries operating in our community whilst at the same time actively promoting the assets and the attractions that the city and the region already has. At the meeting last night we looked at private, public and tertiary educational opportunities and opportunities for our youth to stay in the region.

Skills training is a very important part of the future growth opportunities not only for Port Pirie and the region but for the whole state, and it is very high on the list for us to pursue. Also of importance is regional health (which all agreed last night was the best outside of Adelaide), recreational facilities and the need to consolidate and ensure that we have the best facilities for our youth to excel in their relevant sports.

We also looked at various opportunities to improve the entrance to the city, bearing in mind that Port Pirie has three major entrances to maintain. This is a challenge not only with regard to the cost factor and the improvements required at these entrances but also the challenge of the Native Vegetation Act which we may have some issues with.

The group last night looked at various opportunities to facilitate export of the ever-increasing resource minerals that are coming from all directions outside the city. This opportunity was looked at with a view to not imposing on the existing scenery of the waterfront and the Southern Flinders Ranges.

Whilst the community wholeheartedly endorse the prospects for employment opportunities, they were all in agreement to retain our historical heritage given the unique character of the city and the regions. Port Pirie has many heritage buildings which are unique and they need to be maintained and promoted. The main street of Port Pirie has the uniqueness of following the contour of the Port Pirie River which is only a stone's throw from the CBD.

From this small but very dedicated group of people it was obvious that they were all very enthusiastic about our opportunities. Even though the city has been promised so much but received little over many years, they still had a very optimistic attitude and were determined to promote the city and the region with all its attractions, using all their endeavours. It was also strongly supported that Port Pirie needs to work with the surrounding rural townships to enable us to survive the challenges. It was also highlighted that we all need to work together. Whether we are local, state, federal, or wherever we may be, we all have one thing in common: the future growth of our communities.

Port Pirie is ideally placed to take advantage of the mining and renewable sectors, as well as servicing the agriculture sector. The greatest asset that Port Pirie and the region has is its people: they are very resilient and very proud.

#### **CHARACTER PRESERVATION (BAROSSA VALLEY) BILL**

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** This committee stage will not be long, minister; I just want to ask a couple of general questions. One is: why has the government left the use of the major project status provisions available to be used in the townships? The bill abolishes it for the districts, but leaves it for the townships. Why has the government adopted that model?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you for that question; it is a very good and reasonable question.

**The CHAIR:** Are you surprised?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No, the honourable member has obviously given some thought to this, and that is good. The background to the original proposal was basically this: it was all very well for me to put forward a bill which created a protection zone, ostensibly for the purpose of defending that zone from a future minister acting without the consent of parliament, but if I then did



not explicitly remove the opportunity for major project declarations to occur within that zone, I might have left a back door for a future minister.

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No, just let me finish. I wanted to make it absolutely clear that I was not only removing my power to unilaterally, or after a process or whatever, sign off on a subdivision in that area through a normal channel, I was also excluding it through the extraordinary channel; that was the reason for that. I have to say—as I have said before in the parliament—I have no intention of doing either, and never have had.

However, when we get to the township, the reason it was not touched there was because, so far as I am concerned, in drafting the legislation there were a couple of priorities. The first one was basically to disturb the status quo as little as possible in order to achieve the purpose that we had set out. That was point No. 1. Point No. 2—and it follows from point no. 1—is that the townships, I think, are best understood as islands within the protection zone which are not actually disturbed.

If you follow that rationale through, I guess the question comes up as: why should those particular townships which are otherwise completely normal from the point of view of the planning arrangements—they have a boundary around them which is set by the act, but within that boundary they are just like any other township, and just like any other place. Why should those townships—amongst all the townships that are in South Australia, which are otherwise indistinguishable in that planning sense—receive an additional, differential planning treatment, namely, the major projects provisions would not apply only to those towns?

So, that was the reason: point No.1, for consistency because those towns, in as much as you are talking about the bit within the township zones, are practically indistinguishable from the point of view of the application of planning principles and law and so on, from any other township. Point No.2: the clear object of the act was to absolutely minimise the disturbance of the status quo. It was to do the minimum required to achieve the purpose, which was to prohibit subdivision in the region, but not otherwise to muck around with what normally would or would not go on in the townships.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Just so I understand it correctly, under your model, a future government could come in and use its major project status to arrange for intensive residential development in the existing townships.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** If any proposal within those townships met the criteria required by the act, then a future government could initiate those processes and it would be exactly the same as it is now. I make the point that, at the moment, absent this legislation, that could happen today or it could have happened at any time in the last 10 years. If this does not pass, it could happen at any time in the next 30 years, 50 years or whatever.

I am not proposing to disturb that at all but, as you would be aware, there are certain criteria that hang around that. I think I have made it clear that I personally cannot foresee a circumstance where it would be appropriate to invoke those provisions for residential development. I have to say that my own concept of the thing is that they are more for things like major port facilities or things of that type.

The solution to the problem of perceived inadequacies in residential development is to tackle the actual development policy documents, which is what we have done in the City of Adelaide. Rather than looking at the City of Adelaide from the point of view of whether there are particular projects that recommend themselves and, therefore, should be given this opportunity through that process, we have sought to turn that whole thinking on its head and say that what we are going to do is deal with the zoning so everybody is on a level playing field, irrespective of who they are and whether they have got a block here, there or anywhere else.

These townships will be indistinguishable from anywhere else but, as I said, there is nothing in this legislation which prohibits the council, or directs the council really, as to what to do within those township zones. Indeed, one of the criticisms that was forwarded to me of the original bill was that it tended to be a bit prescriptive about what sort of things the council might or might not do within those protection zones.

It was put to me, particularly by the Barossa Council, that they already had very strong rules about not allowing McDonald's to be in the middle of a heritage region and all that sort of stuff and I did not need to overlay it with more protection. I eventually said to them, 'Okay, but on your

own head be it. I am offering you the chance of preventing that with some statutory force. If you people and your community want to have the golden arches in the middle of a rustic German town or wherever it might be, then, I guess, on your own heads be it.'

That is where we have wound up here, but that was because I was asked to do that when the first bill was put out for consultation. So, they are in control of those townships, make no mistake about that.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** But just so I am clear, they are only in charge of those townships to the extent that a government does not use its major project status to override the DPAs that exist. So, for instance, if a government wanted to use its major projects powers to put in place a major development like the Dick Smith development or whatever it was on Kangaroo Island—the Kangaroo Island resort—in the township, that would be quite possible. So, the councils still do not necessarily totally control their townships. They are still subject to the major project status, aren't they?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** As I said, I cannot remember when those provisions were introduced. I think it was during the period of the Olsen government.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** Brown government.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The Brown government. So, that takes us back a little ways. From the moment it was introduced then, all those townships were potentially going to be subject to that sort of ministerial or government intervention. If this bill does not pass they will continue to be potentially open to that sort of intervention, and if this bill does pass they will continue to possibly be open to that sort of intervention. It does not touch it at all.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Can you explain to the house: what is the process to increase the size of the township under your model? How do the little islands, as you have described them, in the protected area become slightly bigger islands, if at all, or is that process simply not available?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Again, a good question. The answer to that is basically this: first of all, we need to look at the map that accompanies the bill. If you look at the map in detail, you will see that the townships within the map are drawn in conformity with the plan outlined in the 30-year plan for growth in that region. So, the 30-year growth projection for those towns is contained within those islands. To put it another way, not everything within the township island has a house or a building on it. There are elements of that township zone which are open land or vacant land. So, the townships already have the capacity for growth built in to that boundary.

If it turned out that there were greater growth pressures than that in any of those towns and if it was the view of those communities that they wished to change their boundaries of the town—bearing in mind that, in the case of many of those towns, that would be at the expense of vineyards or certainly agricultural activity of some sort, in most cases—the process would be this: they would go through whatever conversation they need to go through at a local level, they would form a view and they would take that view to the minister of the day.

The minister of the day, armed with the view of the community, would come in here and say, 'I have been asked by the community. I have discussed the matter with the community. They have asked me to extend the boundary in this fashion for this particular reason.' The process would be that it then goes through this house, goes through the Legislative Council and the boundary is changed. In the meantime, within the boundary, council just gets on with its current behaviour, because it is still controlling what goes on within that zone.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Therefore, minister, all the current development principles in place as part of the council's plan amendment report still have control within those township areas or those island areas that you are talking about. Building heights, design principles, if they have them, streetscape and all those sorts of things stay in place.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Absolutely. I think the only thing that we are requiring in this bill is that, as part of the whole DPA process, we are asking them to review whether those are all satisfactory. However, ultimately, you are exactly right: it will continue to be governed by the rules that the Barossa Council in particular generates for that zone. I need to emphasise again that the object of the exercise was to have as relatively light a touch as possible. The original bill, which was distributed last year, sought to provide a lot more particularity and guidance about how those exercises would be gone through. The current bill, as you have probably noticed by having a look at it, is an even thinner document than the original bill and does not contain all those detailed guideline principles that appeared in the schedules and all that sort of thing.

One of the criticisms I received of the original bill was, 'We think you're boxing us in too much with the guideline principles.' I did not think I was. I thought I was saying to them, 'These are things you might turn your mind to and how you come out of that is a matter for you.' In any event, I thought, 'Well, fair enough. I don't want to have an argument with them if, in essence, it's an argument about style rather than substance.' I hope it is fairly clear from this that we have left that very open to the councils to make their own minds up.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Can I ask the minister a question about the limitations on land division in the district (clause 8)? I pose this from the viewpoint of not speaking to any of the property holders there. It is a question about what restrictions that might place on people who have had plans in place for some time to develop, say, for their children a home as part of a subdivision that would occur on farming land where, I think, the principles of many other councils is that you can subdivide 100 acres, for example, and that could be developed and you could build a home on that. I note here that you talk about creating additional allotments to be used wholly or partly for residential development. For a home considered a residential development is that ability removed completely?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** A very good question. As I was trying to explain before, there are three different types of threat to these regions. One is the spilling over, if you like, of Gawler, probably into, first of all, the Cockatoo Valley and then progressively through to the Barossa. That is the threat from outside, which is why we have the perimeter around the protection zone.

The second threat is that if you allow the townships to be completely unregulated and to determine how big they are going to be at any given time without any sort of guidance, you could have them growing within the district. The third potential threat is that you might have a series of land divisions in the protection zone which are styled for a particular purpose—and let's say it is for farming activity or something else—but in substance are really a matter of subdivision by another name.

To give you a hypothetical example, if you have, say, a 100 acre property, or whatever it might be, and you have got one house on the property, you may be able to carve off a couple of acres around that house, create a new title, sell that title, then say, 'Oh, I've got 98 acres here without a house on it. I'd like a new house. It is not fair, I haven't got a house. I've got all this land, but I've got nowhere to live.' So, you go off and you build your house. Then, a little bit later, 'Oh, I'd like to have five hectares around this house. Do you mind, because cousin Bill wants to come and live here,' and so on, and so on. So, it is that sort of incremental happening.

I can tell you about places where that sort of thing has been underway. Cockatoo Valley is an example of where that has been underway for some time. I think the progression goes from viable farming property—whatever sort of farming. It might be grapes, it might be cattle, livestock, or any number of different things, but agricultural, call it.

Then, the next step down the slippery slope is a hobby farm (whatever that means). Then, the next bit down the slippery slope is, 'Oh, look, we've got all these hobby farms and they are useless now. They don't serve any viable agricultural purpose because of their size and whatever.' It is unreasonable not to permit them to be further subdivided to create a nice living ambience for these other people who want to have a hobby farm experience.

Cockatoo Valley is seriously at risk from that sort of thing and, indeed, there are parts of the southern area in the McLaren Vale district which have a threat as well from that type of behaviour. I think if we all calmly analyse what happened in and around Mount Barker historically, whatever might be said or not said—and I am not here to canvass the exact processes by which the current arrangements came to be—there is no question that a large amount of the land that was affected had already been the subject of that sort of incremental chop-up.

The reality is if you combine the incremental chop-up with insufficient resistance to subdivision, there is a tipping point at which it becomes almost irresistible. We are attempting to protect that, not in such a way that those people who currently hold those blocks are not able to develop the blocks as they would have under the existing rules been able to develop them, but so that they cannot look forward to a change to liberalise that further without bringing it here.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I understand the scenario the minister has put, completely, and, coming from a regional community, I am all about preserving the land for agricultural production also: there is no debate about that in my eyes. I am certainly aware of legitimate requests within families for multiple generations to occupy adjoining properties but to have some tenure of the land in their own name with the ability to subdivide a 100-acre property and still leave a substantial parcel of land. All I am about is trying to ensure that some equity and opportunity exists for those people where it is a

legitimate exchange of land title and ownership and, indeed, the opportunity exists for a family to continue to reside and to work the land for its original intention but to have more than one generation potentially doing it—because you do not always have the case where mum and dad are prepared to move into town: sometimes they want to be on the farm, too.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I understand your point and that was something that we were aware of and it is not prohibited. What we have done, though, is to say you have to look very carefully at this and be careful that this is what it says it is and it is not something else pretending to be what the member has just described.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister says it is not prohibited but my understanding is it becomes noncomplying. Can the minister explain to me: does the applicant in a noncomplying application have any appeal right? When you go to the council with a noncomplying development, the council says no, which 99 per cent of the time they will—

**Mr Griffiths:** No, they don't.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Come live in my council.

**Mr Griffiths:** No, sorry: there is no appeal right.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That's what I am asking: is there an appeal right? My understanding is there is no appeal right. The minister, I think, is being technically correct but a bit cute: it is not prohibited but if it is noncomplying and the council says no (which, in the vast majority of cases, they do), there is no appeal right for the applicant so it is effectively going to be prohibited.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I think as a matter of law that is correct, but can I just say this: that is the case now. Any noncompliant—

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** And they are not compliant as they are. We are talking about a change in use. They would still need to be approved by council, and they still would be approved, or not, as the case would be. Part of the argument that I understood most speakers from the opposition advanced before was that you should give the power to the council. They are the people who will be making that call, not me.

**Mr Griffiths:** We are just checking whether or not the process is the same.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Some of these pieces of land are presently in a position where people may have an expectation that in the future the rules will change and they will be able to divide them. We are not interested in changing that. The ones who presently would be able to change the land use in the way that you have described are still able to make that application, and I will just check who the determining authority is. The determining authority under section 8 is the Development Assessment Commission; but remember, that does not mean that the development policy is written by the Development Assessment Commission. I know that the member for Goyder understands—and I am sure that the member for Davenport understands—the distinction here. Some people unfortunately do not.

There is a distinction between the rulebook, which is the policy document, and who the umpire is, that is, who has got the whistle and the funny shorts running around the oval. I accept that it may be that the umpire in some of these cases stops being the DAP and becomes the DAC. This is to do with a change in land use or subdivision, and I understand that it also applies in the Hills Face Zone now and in relation to the River Murray flood plain. So, there are already circumstances where this type of development control regime exists.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** How many new titles have been created in the Hills Face Zone since that process has been in place? I can give you the answer, minister: none.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** He did gesture a zero. As I said, this does not prohibit land division. Can I give you an example? Let's say that you have 100 acres again and the owner of the property wants to sell half of it to somebody who wants to grow blueberries or whatever. They sell half of it and the bit they sell does not have a house on it. There is a plan attached to the whole application process: here is what we intend to do with the land and here are our plans and everything else. I would expect that that would not be anything that would cause any difficulty.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You know your own act. Your own act says that. Your own act says that it is subdivision for residential purposes that is prohibited, not for agricultural purposes. So, the example that you give us is irrelevant.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Exactly. That is my point. My point is simply this: not everything that purports to be a subdivision for agricultural purposes may in fact be that. It is shocking, but some people are prepared to call it something other than what it really is in order to make it get past the person who gets to put the red tick in the box. That is all this is about. It is not intended to impact on the current expectations people have under the current rules, irrespective of what they might do with the land.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I only have a couple more questions and then we can wrap this up. My understanding is—and I may have the figures the wrong way around—that in one area of the Barossa Valley about 800 allotments that are not built on will be impacted by this particular piece of legislation and, in the McLaren Vale area, about 700 allotments that have not been built on will be impacted by this legislation. Can you please explain to me the answer you just gave, where you said that there will be no impact, when those allotments can be currently built on and under your provision will not be able to be built on? How is that not an impact?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am not sure about the numbers. I do not know where you got those from, but I can tell you this: if you are talking about 700 or 800 blocks, you are talking about a rather diverse group of landholdings. I do not think it is appropriate to cluster them all as one type of landholding. Some of those will be clearly agricultural blocks which have no dwelling on them at present because the owner of that particular block either does not require a dwelling or has a block somewhere else on which they have a dwelling and they work that block.

I think it is pretty clear that the impact of this on those people is likely to be zero, even in terms of the regulatory thing, because if you have what is clearly operating as an agricultural property, which does not have a dwelling on it, and the owner wants to put a dwelling on it, then I do not see that there is any likelihood of that being a problem. You start getting into areas that require a lot of scrutiny when you have much smaller landholders. This is the three, four, five, 10 hectare-type landholdings where people want to crack them down even further. That is where this provision is intended to do its work, and it is simply saying—it is not prohibited—that you need to ask for permission to do it.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will leave that point but I will make this point to the minister. If the minister re-reads what he said, essentially what he is saying is—rest assured—first of all he told us that the council's powers would not be taken away. He actually accused the opposition of protecting the powers of councils, and then he said, 'That is exactly what we are doing.' With the next answer he got up and said, 'Well, actually, that's not quite right. Now the opposition has pointed it out, it is the Development Assessment Commission that will actually make the decision in relation to that question of subdivision for residential land, not the council, so the rules have changed.' So, the opposition's point was validated by the minister's correction to his own answer, all within two answers of each other.

The other issue, of course, is that the minister says, 'Don't worry, the council will be writing the rules.' Well, the rules are set out in the DPAs and the DPAs are signed off by the minister, and the minister can override the council any day he wants.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister said, 'and has been able to do so for years'. So, to use the analogy of the umpire that the minister uses, we have the minister writing the rules for the umpire and the minister appointing the umpire as well, because, ultimately, the minister appoints the DAC, the minister signs off on the DPA, so if the minister wants to more intensively develop the townships he can, no doubt about that, whether it be through major development status, project status or whatever.

The other question I have is that I would like to get on the record an answer we got yesterday from your officials, and I got the figure of 700 to 800 allotments from your officials briefing this week. I want to get on the record that there is no compensation payable. If the government rezones land that could have been subdivided, then cannot be subdivided for residential purposes, then under court cases that have already been decided in the South Australian courts there is no entitlement to compensation.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** First of all, in respect to the 700 to 800, I have clarified that matter. That is something to do with the current interim DPA only—it is nothing to do with the act—and the DPA process is actually being gone through now. The interim DPA, as you know, is subject to statutory consultations and so forth and, in the end, there will be a final document, which may or may not look like the existing document, and that is a matter for future discussion. The second thing is, can I say that, if I were determined to do so, I could actually go through a process now whereby I rezone the Barossa Valley for housing over the objections of the council, and over the objections of the people who live there. I do not know how many ways I can try to make it clear, I do not want to do that.

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Not from me there isn't. Absolutely not. But, if we look at it in the context of there being a city which perhaps will have half a million extra people in the next 30 years, and how much pressure is going to start building on those two regions which are reasonably proximate to the city, and reasonably well serviced by transport linkages, a point arises where, if you do not have something like this in place, the commercial value of the land for residential purposes overwhelms the existing use. I can also say that, many years ago, when the Hills Face Zone was determined, the same sort of argument that you are putting, could have been, probably was, and probably continues to be put about affected landholders. The question is: are we better off for having entered into the process of protection for the Hills Face Zone?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Come to the valleys and I will show you some properties, John. The last minister would not. Come to the valleys and I will show you some valleys in the Hills Face Zone and you tell me how those properties are in the Hills Face Zone.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am happy to have a conversation with you about particular matters. I have been up there (as you know) with you and had a look around parts of your electorate. We were looking, at that time, in the context of bushfires but I am familiar with the terrain. As with any planning decision, whether it is made by council or whether it is made by the parliament, or however it is made, the landholder holds the land subject to the law at whatever time it is they make an application. It is the case that a person who makes an application today may, by reason of that application being made today, be in a different position to a person who makes one tomorrow because the rules have changed, and that is all that would be happening here.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What about the court cases in relation to compensation? We were told there was no compensation available for change of zones as the court cases had established that no compensation was payable as a result of rezoning.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I would think that would be absolutely correct. If that is what you were advised, I have no reason to doubt it; I would assume that is correct. Government (at a state and local level) makes decisions about zoning all the time. For instance, a local government authority may say, 'We want to rezone this particular parcel of land here from agricultural to industrial, and the bit next to that we want to rezone from agricultural to urban development.' Those three parcels of land are going to have quite different values the moment that rezoning occurs.

In that particular example, two of them get an uplift which they are quite happy to pocket, and the reason they get the uplift is because there has been a change in use permitted by the rules; likewise, there are times when the rules change and adversely affect some people. In those circumstances, as I understand it—and I am happy to be corrected by those who advise me—that is not a matter which is compensable. I will come back to this again: subdivision in the region for legitimate agricultural purposes—or not for urban subdivision purposes, should I say, is not prohibited.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Just to make it clear: they will be able to subdivide (for industrial purposes and commercial purposes) areas that are currently under vineyard?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Subject to the council's development plan—again, can I explain: in the first draft of this legislation there was quite a bit of prescription built into the schedules to the legislation about what commercial and industrial activity might occur. The same people who are now saying that we have not talked to them, we have not consulted with them and we have not listened to them said, 'Look, we know more about what sort of commercial or industrial activities are consistent with the theme and the atmosphere of our district than you do. We have been managing this for 100 years.'

In fact, I can repeat the words that the honourable member for Bragg used and that you used: 'We have been doing this for 100 years. Why do you suddenly think we can't regulate these things any more? What's wrong with the way we're doing it?' We said, 'Fair enough. What you're saying is that you want a lighter touch in respect of those things.' Okay. We had hoped, in terms of the legislation, to give a bit more direction around those things but in the end we said, 'Look, our major priority is the subdivision bit.' I was persuaded by arguments about not wanting to stifle industrial activities—for example, associated with the wine industry in either of those districts where somebody wants to build a bottling plant or somebody wants to have a crushing plant or something else.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** Caravan park.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Maybe—that is what I am saying. So between the first version of this legislation and this one we have withdrawn from that in terms of setting rules and we have said to the councils, 'Okay, you reckon you can do it—you do it.' That means that the councils, with their communities, will be working up what they want to have in there. I anticipate another question: won't that also mean a DPA and won't that DPA have to go to the minister of the day? Yes, it will, just like it has for however many decades and just like it will if we do nothing from here to eternity. I cannot emphasise enough that we are trying to disturb as little as possible.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister has made the argument consistently about the pressure that the Barossa Valley, McLaren Vale and Willunga will come under because of the growing population and the new road infrastructure going into those areas. We need to protect our food bowl which is essentially the crux of the minister's earlier contributions. Why, then, does the minister not propose this for all the market gardens in Virginia? I declare to the house that I have uncles with property at Virginia (two of the biggest market gardeners in the state) and it seems to me that we are protecting the vineyards under this legislation while, closer to the city, closer to the population pressure and providing a far different food source are all the market gardens of Virginia. I am wondering, first, why you have not done it for them; and, secondly, are you proposing to do it to any of the other food-producing areas within the state?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** First of all, to be honest, I have not turned my mind to Virginia but if the opposition is asking me to do that I am happy to consult with them about whether we should be doing something similar there. The other point is that in this legislation we are trying to look at the 30-year plan to see where the outer reaches of the city are being demarked and we are trying to carve off regions which, in effect, block the city in the north and the south.

The closer you come to the city the more you have patchy bits where there is agricultural land and built-up land, so protection districts would have to start getting smaller and smaller the closer you got to the city. It is not like it is one cohesive parcel of land. The zones that we have picked to the north and the south represent the first large cohesive zones of undeveloped land (from a residential subdivision point of view) in the city, and that is why we are doing it. However, subsequent to seeing how this goes, if the opposition can raise a good case as to why other areas should be treated similarly, obviously I would be happy to have that conversation. Presently, there is no plan about that and I think we have enough on our plate with this.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 11), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (16:29):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **CHARACTER PRESERVATION (MCLAREN VALE) BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 April 2012.)

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (16:30):** The minister will be pleased to know I will not speak for long on this particular bill. It is essentially a rerun of the previous bill, but for the McLaren Vale district. In fairness to the Onkaparinga council, I think it is fair to say their position is a touch more lukewarm towards the proposal than the northern councils. A letter from the council, dated

4 May, sets out some concerns of the council which still need to be worked through. Just to briefly touch on some of those issues raised by the council, the letter states that:

...the bill removes an important statutory planning role for [the] Council by requiring the Development Assessment Commission...to be the relevant authority when a proposed development involves the division of land within the Character Preservation District. Our preference is that the Council retains this important governance role.

So, that is a matter for the Onkaparinga council. They also raise the issue of the character values of the district. They believe that 'they should be expanded to recognise some important environmental attributes of [the] ecosystem services provided within the district'. They also suggest some amendments to clause 6 to include the words:

- (f) natural landscapes of high visual amenity and environmental significance.

The council raises the issue that:

...it remains unclear as to who will be responsible for reviewing the Development Plan—the Minister or the Council? If this is to be the responsibility of Council, it seems inconsistent that the Bill proposes that the Minister will be responsible for any subsequent amendment to the Development Plan (Schedule 1 Part 2 Clause 5(1)). This is also inconsistent with your statement to the House of Assembly—

that is, the minister's statement—

on 5 April 2012 which states, in part, that '...affected councils must review their development plans to align zoning policy with the special character of the district.'

The council also raises the issue that they believe:

...it is important that Council has an active role in both updating the Planning Strategy and ensuring the subsequent consistency of the Development Plan. We therefore seek some formal confirmation in the Bill that council will have a role and responsibilities in both...

I ask the minister, maybe in his second reading response, to confirm that is the case. The council continues:

While not specifically referred to in the Bill, [the council] are also of the view that the previous in-principle rights to construct a dwelling on an allotment—

this sounds like a familiar argument from the previous debate—

should continue to prevail within all zones contained within the McLaren Vale District, regardless of the size of the allotment.

I will ask the minister confirm that the landholders in the Barossa Valley district will be treated exactly the same as the landholders in the McLaren Vale district. As long as the minister answers those two particular questions as part of his second reading response, we will have no need to go into committee.

The opposition's position on this is the same on both bills: we are reserving our right until we see the formal responses from the councils. So, the minister's assertion area that we are opposed to the bill is actually wrong; we are simply reserving our right, at this point, until we see the final submissions from the councils, and then we will be able to lay our position out properly when the matter is debated in the upper house.

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:34):** I rise, of course, to support this bill. It has been a long time coming and something that is very welcomed by the people of Mawson. I find it interesting that the opposition is waiting on what councils have to say rather than listening to the people and doing what is the will of people. If they actually got out a little bit more into the electorates and listened to people and found out what it was—I mean, it is no secret that the people of Mawson and the wider McLaren Vale area have been intent on getting preservation for our area. The people in the Barossa—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I remind members on my left that members on my left were heard without interruption. First of all, the member for Norwood, I do not think you actually sit there, if you want to be heard.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** If you can't hear him, you can't answer him.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Then he should not interrupt if he is not here then.



**Mr BIGNELL:** I will be making it very clear to the people of Mawson that members of the Liberal Party who are in here do not actually care about what it is that they have to say on this matter. They just care about some councils and the council staff. We heard it on the Barossa's—

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** That's a lie.

**Mr BIGNELL:** Well, it's not a lie.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** That is a lie.

**Mr BIGNELL:** It is not a lie, because you have come in here and you have said that you will reserve—

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Davenport, you are warned!

**Mr BIGNELL:** I have not heard, in any of your contributions you have made on either of these bills, you actually talk about the concerns of the public and the people. You have talked about the concerns of the councils.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** You won't release the submissions.

**Mr BIGNELL:** The submissions are available online, right?

**Mr Marshall:** They're not. Where are they available?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Norwood!

**Mr BIGNELL:** The submissions about these bills are available online—go online. My submission is on there, the McLaren Vale Grape, Wine and Tourism Association's is on there, Friends of Willunga Basin's is on there, Southern Coalition's. Just type in [www.sa.gov.au](http://www.sa.gov.au) and do a search and you will find that all of the submissions are there. So, to say that they are not there, and to just come in here and talk on behalf of councils in these areas, is just lazy politics. It is lazy politics and it just shows that you are out of touch.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** 'Keep Lying Leon', they call him.

**Mr BIGNELL:** Mr Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I just draw to the attention of the member for Davenport that to accuse somebody of lying is unparliamentary, I have been advised by the Clerk. If it happens again, you will have to leave the chamber.

**Mr BIGNELL:** He also just referred to me as 'Big Lying Leon'. I'd ask for that to be—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I didn't hear that, so I will have to give him the benefit of the doubt.

**Mr BIGNELL:** Well, I would ask for it to be withdrawn.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What I actually said, Mr Deputy Speaker, is "'Keep Lying Leon", they call him.' That's what I said.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Who is 'They' call him'? Your colleagues?

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** That might be true.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Alright. They are actually not allowed to say that, so they are unparliamentary as well.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, if the member for Mawson is so offended, I will withdraw the remark, but he should not put things in the *Hansard* that are simply false when he knows they are false.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That's right. Members actually have an opportunity to make a personal explanation. Member for Mawson, you can continue your comments, without interruption.

**Mr BIGNELL:** Yes, thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I said, it is actually a reflection of what the honourable member's contribution has been in this place on both bills today, and I will be making that very clear to the people of Mawson, because they actually really care. They care very

much about this preservation bill, they are very keen for it and they have spent years trying to get to this point.

We can go back to Greg Trott, the great Wirra Wirra grapegrower and owner, and look at the sort of standards he set for his colleagues and for other wineries in the area to actually preserve the area. We saw all the vineyards at Reynella put under housing and put under shopping centres. We saw the vineyards and the dairies at Woodcroft disappear.

People in the area have had enough and, as I said in my speech about the Barossa Valley bill, they do not necessarily trust politicians or local councils. They want the parliament to have the say on how this preservation will work, and they want any move to change what we hopefully will bring into this place as legislation to come back to the 69 members in this place to be changed if, indeed, it is necessary for a change 20, 30 or 40 years from now.

Unless we bring in this legislation, any minister who holds the responsibilities that the current minister does will be able to change the lines on maps. That is why, when I went to the local community in 2009 and told them that we had preserved Bowering Hill, and no longer would it be sold off to developers for 6,000 houses, they said, 'Yes, that's great while you are the local member and'—as Paul Holloway was the minister—'it's fine while Paul Holloway is the minister, but what happens when we have a change of government or a change of minister? That new minister can just pick up the pen and change the lines or change the decision not to allow housing.'

What these people want is certainty. It is not just the locals down there, it is investors in the area. People want some security in their investments. If you own a hotel chain, for example, and you want to put a hotel in McLaren Vale, in 20 years' time you do not want to have that hotel no longer surrounded by vineyards but by housing. There is a lot of pressure from developers to dig up this beautiful land that we have, that produces so much great wine in McLaren Vale which goes all around the world. There is great pressure from developers. They want to get every greenfield site they possibly can, carve it up and sell it off in housing blocks.

I have been confronted by a developer who wanted to convince the government to carve off a bit of McLaren Vale, that is on the outskirts of the township of McLaren Vale. I was in the office and I was being sworn at, fingers were pointed at me and I was pretty much threatened to go in and allow this to happen. If we had allowed that to happen on the outskirts of McLaren Vale, then the next year we allowed a bit more development on the outskirts of Willunga, and then the next year a bit more in McLaren Vale, within a few years we would have no agricultural land between McLaren Vale and Willunga. The two towns would be joined up.

This takes away all that sort of pressure from developers. It gives certainty to locals. It gives certainty to investors in the area. As I have said, it can only be changed with the agreement of both houses of parliament. Whether in five years, 10 years or 20 years' time, the people of the Barossa Valley and the people of McLaren Vale will be keeping a very keen eye on what is going to happen, and I am sure that the views that are held now will still be held in decades to come.

It will be very important for groups like Friends of Willunga Basin, the Southern Coalition and the McLaren Vale Grape, Wine and Tourism Association to keep an eye on this. They know that the battle could flare up again in years to come if someone brings it before the house to change the law, but they are very pleased to see that we are introducing this bill. As I have said, they have worked very hard on this.

Dudley Brown of the McLaren Vale Grape, Wine and Tourism Association has been one of the main instigators of this move. We have been in negotiations going back to 2006-07. In 2009, Dudley came on board with Jim Hullick from the Southern Coalition and David Gill from the Friends of Willunga Basin and worked in a very positive way. Then we joined forces with the Barossa Valley and a group of four people up there, including Sam Holmes, the head of the Barossa Grape and Wine Association, Margaret Lehmann, Jan Angas and Anne Moroney. That group came in here and met with the Hon. Paul Holloway. This is going back to 2009. We had meetings in Parliament House, up in the Barossa and down in the south. This bill is not something that has just come up overnight; it is something that has evolved through the community.

When the minister announced in May last year that we were going to introduce these bills and he put out a discussion paper, I went to several meetings held by the McLaren Vale Grape, Wine and Tourism Association at Penny's Hill Winery where we would sit with the butcher's paper and say, 'What is it that we want for this area? What is it that needs protecting? What is it that we want to see encapsulated in this bill?' That was fed in. I did my own submission. I know the

Southern Coalition did a submission. Friends of Willunga Basin did a submission. Lots of individuals did submissions.

I would say to the opposition: go through those submissions, see that the will of the people in the McLaren Vale area is for this type of legislation, and get on board. Do not wait and say, 'Well, we are going to wait and see what all the councils say.' I have to commend the Onkaparinga council, which has worked with this group that I have just discussed. I have sat down with Dudley Brown, Jim Hullick, David Gill and mayor Lorraine Rosenberg and the then CEO. We have had a couple of meetings with them over the years, and I know the minister had many more meetings with the mayor to work through the process in a quite sensible way to ask how it is that we can have legislation that will provide the protection that is required. This is the best that we could come up with.

People have mentioned to me that they are a little worried about their titles and having some of their proposals being judged as noncompliant. However, as the minister said, to be judged noncompliant is not to be judged that the development is prohibited. You can go through an added process, and that process is put in place to ensure that what is being proposed meets the very tight standards that will be put in place to stop our prime agricultural land being put under housing.

So far, six noncompliant development applications have been put up, and all six have been given the approval. The department is keeping a very close eye on things to make sure that things are being done properly and in accordance with what the vast majority of people in the south and in the McLaren Vale area would like to see.

People have become very angry over the years at decisions made by both levels of government, some recent and some made 30 or 40 years ago that have only just had an impact in more recent years, like the Seaford Heights subdivision. That land was rezoned and allowed for residential housing, but when it came time for the development to go ahead, the council was approached by the Land Management Corporation, which owned the land. The Land Management Corporation told the council that it had to be very sensitive to this parcel of land because it sits at the gateway of McLaren Vale. They suggested that the council put buffer zones on either side and shield housing from passing traffic on its way to the great tourism and wine region that McLaren Vale is.

Council decided to use the South Road part of that land for its bulky goods and industrial precinct, which is very ugly. We have 50 miles of South Road that does that; we do not need that in our prime tourism area. The effect of that was to push the houses up over onto Victor Harbor Road. So, we would have had both roads spoilt by the blight of industrial-sized buildings on one and the backyards of houses and Colorbond fences on the other. The state government was then required to step back in and fix that because of community angst.

The community is very sensitive to development that does not fit into the local area. It is one of the world's best wine regions and it overlooks the sea. We say that it is where the vines meet the sea, which is our catchcry in McLaren Vale. They would not meet the sea anymore if you allow 6,000 houses to be built on Bowering Hill. So, we stepped in and we stopped Bowering Hill, and we made Seaford Heights a more palatable proposition for the people. I appreciate that there are still some people who are not happy that Seaford Heights is being built. However, most people understand that that is the last subdivision that we will see thanks to this legislation that will protect 40,000 hectares of our area.

It was heartbreaking for many in the south to see the Onkaparinga council allow the site of John Reynell's original vineyard to go under housing a couple of years ago. This is where John Reynell, the founder of the wine industry in South Australia, planted his very first vines. Although the vines in there today obviously are not the same ones that he planted, it was still the site where he planted those lines. It is so important to the people in the south and it is so important to the wine industry, and now you drive past that site and there are two-year-old houses on there. We do not want to see any more crops like houses planted. We want to see some agricultural pursuit down there, whether it is vineyards, orchards or almond groves.

The people in the surrounding suburbs want that as well, because they are scared of South Australia becoming reliant on imported overseas fruit and vegetables. We have got prime agricultural land: let's not waste it and ruin it forever by building houses on it. The will of the people in Mawson, whether or not you listen to them, is for this bill to go through this house. Many say we have waited too long already and others are saying, 'Let's get it into the parliament and get it through as quickly as we can.'

I want to thank a few people. As I have mentioned before, Dudley Brown, originally from the United States, brought to my attention and that of many other people in McLaren Vale the Napa Valley protection legislation of 1968. He might have rubbed a few people up the wrong way over the years, as is Dudley's style, but we cannot take away from him and we must congratulate him for his tenacity and belief in the fact that McLaren Vale is worth saving and there has to be some way of saving it. So I take my hat off to Dudley for all the great work he has done.

I also acknowledge the wider association, the McLaren Grape, Wine and Tourism Association. David Gill and Richard Bennett from the Friends of Willunga Basin come with a different approach to the McLaren Grape, Wine and Tourism Association. Jim Hullick and Stephanie Johnston from the Southern Coalition, again, come with a different approach. These three groups came together with one common goal, and that is to preserve this beautiful part of the world.

I take my hat off to all those people and the other people who contributed through their own submissions or through the McLaren Vale Grape, Wine and Tourism Association, which was all aimed at protecting McLaren Vale—not only the beautiful area we have but also the economy in terms of the great wine that we make and sell throughout Australia and overseas. We also need to protect the area for tourists who come to our part of the state, whether they are from South Australia, other parts of Australia or, indeed, overseas. It is really important for those industries to be given the security that this bill provides so that they can make investments that they can be sure will be wise investments that will continue to pay dividends into the future. I support this bill.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (16:52):** I thank the member for Davenport for being succinct in his contribution and I will read his contribution with reference to both bills rather than simply what has been put in relation to this bill. I also thank the member for Mawson for his tireless advocacy for, in particular, his region, McLaren Vale, and also his great interest and support for the Barossa Valley.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:53):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### TAFE SA BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 May 2012.)

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:54):** I would like to continue my opening remarks from 3 May, when we last debated this bill. While the opposition and industry are generally supportive of the move to establish TAFE SA as a statutory body separate from DFEEST, a step which the industry itself feels is long overdue in a competitive environment, there are several issues that are unclear and that we feel could lead to inequity going forward with the Skills for All and VET training provisions into the future.

Most notably, the Skills for All Subsidy Calculator recently released reveals a chasm between the subsidies paid to the public provider (that is, TAFE) and those proposed for private providers, sometimes varying as much as double to three times higher for TAFE SA for the same qualification that may be offered by a private provider.

For example, the TAFE SA subsidy for a Diploma in Building and Construction is \$22,400, whereas the private provider receives \$13,800. For a Certificate III in Carpentry, TAFE SA receives a subsidy of \$20,700, while the private provider receives a subsidy of only \$11,500. So, you can see the pattern that is developing here. TAFE SA receives a subsidy of \$5,096 for a Certificate IV in Business compared with between \$1,880 and \$2,300 less than the current user choice levels for a private provider.

Another example is the TAFE SA subsidy for a Certificate IV in Occupational Health and Safety, which is \$5,413.07; the private provider receives \$3,230.57 less, which is a figure of \$2,182.50. I seek leave to insert into *Hansard* statistical data that illustrates further inequity or differences in the payments made to a TAFE provider as opposed to a private provider.

Leave granted.

Differences in payments made to TAFE and private providers:

Qualification	TAFE	Private	Difference
Certificate IV OH&S	\$5,413.07	\$2,182.50	-\$3,230.57
Diploma OH&S	\$4,792.73	\$2,057.50	-\$2,735.23
Certificate IV FLM	\$5,131.41	\$1,922.50	-\$3,208.91
Certificate IV TAE	\$3,003.41	\$1,602.50	-\$1,400.91
Certificate IV PM	\$3,414.98	\$1,195.00	-\$2,219.98
Diploma Management	\$5,366.77	\$1,930.00	-\$3,436.77
Diploma B&C (Building)	\$22,487.67	\$13,825.00	-\$8,662.67
Diploma B&C (Management)	\$10,412.73	\$5,380.00	-\$5,032.73
Certificate III Carpentry (Residential)	\$20,781.81	\$11,556.50	-\$9,225.31
Certificate III Carpentry (Commercial)	\$22,495.99	\$12,576.50	-\$9,919.49
Certificate IV B&C (Building)	\$10,176.54	\$4,965.00	-\$5,211.54
Certificate IV B&C (Site Management)	\$10,304.78	\$5,037.50	-\$5,267.28
Certificate IV B&C (Estimating)	\$8,861.51	\$4,210.00	-\$4,651.51

**Mr PISONI:** The reality is that this imbalance in subsidy will make it impossible for private providers to compete, resulting in them either making compromises affecting their service provision or going out of business. This issue was raised by almost every non-government provider, whether they be not-for-profit or profit providers. They are still having difficulty trying to understand why there is such a discrepancy between the subsidies given to TAFE and the subsidies given to non-TAFE providers.

It has in fact been suggested under the Fair Trading Act that a government body or statutory authority should not receive more funding for the same service provided by any non-government entity. There have been a couple of instances in the past where competitive neutrality complaints have been made against the government here in South Australia. It will be interesting to watch how this develops as the Skills for All money rolls out and TAFE moves in to compete with the private sector with that huge advantage of funding.

There is some suggestion by some providers that the main motivation for the government to have large discrepancies is actually to offset the inefficiencies in TAFE that it is not prepared to tackle itself. We know that TAFE has a large capital exposure. We also know that, per student, many of the private providers also have large overheads and capital exposures. We also know that TAFE has continually needed annual bailouts from DFEEST because it has not met its budgets.

I suppose the unfair thing about this for those students and participants in the Skills for All program is that we know that there is \$194 million in the Skills for All funding for students to access, but if we see more and more of those students accessing TAFE facilities as opposed to private sector facilities, we will see an enormous difference in the number of training places, and that will result in TAFE winning the lion's share of that training money. For example, TAFE provided the carpentry certificate and received \$20,700 for Skills for All funding, and the private sector received nearly half that at \$11,500. Of course, the effect of that is that we will see fewer people training if more people go to TAFE providers as opposed to non-TAFE providers. I will be interested to hear the minister's comments on that issue as we move through the debate, and we might even go there during the committee stage with some direct questions.

Overall, the biggest question with regard to this level of subsidy is: how will the government measure the productivity, the value for money, the efficiency and the quality of TAFE services for the public funding contributed? The new transparency in the levels of public funding needed to subsidise TAFE is welcome. However, it reveals what many have previously suspected; that is, there are obvious inefficiencies in the use of public funds in the TAFE system.

This was identified 10 years ago when the government commissioned the Kirby report. The Kirby report was very critical of the very same issues that the government is still trying to tackle 10 years down the track. Despite being extremely critical of their predecessors, the government, after being in charge of the levers at DFEEST, has failed to implement any of the improvements. It has moved a long way away from those initial recommendations and observations by Mr Peter Kirby in the report. One of the interesting points made by Mr Kirby about institutes and councils is on page 70 of the report:

The TAFE Institute should be made the primary focus of TAFE activity. The review believes that it would not be appropriate for this juncture to revert to a centralised department structure managing a large number of campuses, nor removed to a single institute of TAFE. However, it is important to realise, that no governance arrangement is permanent and proposals advanced by the review could evolve towards a centralised department if institutes are unable to manage themselves or their collegial functions successfully, or towards greater autonomy and management if the proposed arrangements work successfully. Equally, evolution to a single institute of TAFE remains a possibility.

I suppose it is no wonder, with that type of advice, that it has taken the government 10 years to make any move on TAFE. I have to say that we are supporting the bill, but that does not mean that we will not use this opportunity to point out areas which we are concerned about and areas which the industry is concerned about, in order to fully scrutinise the implications of the bill. It is our hope, on the opposition benches, that skills reform will start the process of addressing this inequity in the funding between the non-TAFE sector and the TAFE sector.

The new transparency in the levels needed to subsidise TAFE will, of course, make it easier for us to monitor that and for TAFE's competitors to monitor it. The good thing about any institution or any business having competitors is that it becomes almost self-monitoring because there are rules that businesses must comply with, whether they be training businesses like TAFE or private providers or not-for-profit providers. My experience has certainly been that those who are competing for the same dollar tend to keep one eye on the way their competitors are operating. It works as a very good way of keeping quality in check, on top of the official means of quality control through inspections or audits that have now become the role of the federal body.

Another area of concern for many in the private sector is that many courses are quarantined for TAFE only to receive a subsidy. In other words, TAFE not only receives much more generous subsidies for courses but others are locked out of competition in a number of areas. In these instances private providers are excluded completely, making it impossible for these businesses to deliver those qualifications using Skills For All or other government-type funding.

I have some tables of courses that are operated through South Australia, whether they be through TAFE or not. Some of them have been superseded and some of them are waiting for funding to be determined. My statistical data tells us the number of courses and highlights those courses that are available as fee-free courses for TAFE or private providers, or TAFE-only courses. I seek leave to insert my statistical tables into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Where funding for a course is yet to be determined, providers may be able to use information from an equivalent/superseded course to estimate prices. Providers must independently confirm delivery conditions for any course.

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
51691	Diploma of Interpreting (Lote/English)			Yes
12277SA	Diploma of Geoscience			Yes
15725SA	Advanced Diploma of Aviation			Yes
21677VIC	Certificate III in Farriery			
21774VIC	Certificate III in General Education for Adults		Yes	Yes
21821VIC	Certificate IV in Quality Management and Assurance			Yes
21822VIC	Diploma of Quality Management			Yes
22075VIC	Certificate II in Auslan		Yes	
22077VIC	Certificate III in Auslan		Yes	
22105VIC	Diploma of Sustainability			Yes
30772QLD	Certificate IV in Christian Ministry and Theology			
40169SA	Advanced Diploma of Translating			Yes
40356SA	Diploma of Building Design and Technology			Yes
40357SA	Certificate IV in Residential Drafting			Yes
40480SA	Diploma of Viticulture Management			Yes
40481SA	Certificate IV In Viticulture			Yes
40505SA	Advanced Diploma of Arts (Acting)			Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
40508SA	Advanced Diploma of Photography (Commercial)			Yes
40510SA	Advanced Diploma of Advertising and Graphic Design			Yes
40511SA	Diploma of Advertising and Graphic Design			Yes
40512SA	Certificate I in Introductory Vocational Education		Yes	
40525SA	Diploma of Garden Design			Yes
40527SA	Certificate IV in Justice Studies			Yes
40528SA	Diploma of Justice Administration			Yes
40529SA	Certificate III in Community Health: Food Services			Yes
40530SA	Certificate IV in Food Science and Technology			Yes
40531SA	Diploma of Food Science and Technology			Yes
40534SA	Certificate IV in Interagency Practice (Child Protection)			Yes
40535SA	Certificate IV in Environmental Technology			Yes
40536SA	Diploma of Environmental Management			Yes
40537SA	Certificate II in Electrotechnology (Career Start)		Yes	Yes
40538SA	Diploma of Electrical Engineering		Yes	Yes
40540SA	Certificate IV in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)			
40595SA	Diploma of Food and Wine Management and Operations			Yes
40596SA	Certificate IV in Food and Wine Operations			Yes
40598SA	Advanced Diploma of Policing			Yes
40599SA	Certificate II in Women's Education		Yes	
40600SA	Certificate III in Women's Education		Yes	
40601SA	Certificate IV in Women's Education		Yes	
40602SA	Certificate III in Police Studies			Yes
40603SA	Diploma of Engineering Drafting			Yes
406D4SA	Advanced Diploma of Engineering Design			Yes
40607SA	Certificate IV in Conveyancing			Yes
40620SA	Certificate I in English Proficiency		Yes	
40621SA	Certificate II in English Proficiency		Yes	
40622SA	Certificate III in English Proficiency		Yes	
40623SA	Certificate IV in English Proficiency		Yes	
40625SA	Certificate II in Education and Skills Development		Yes	
40629SA	Advanced Diploma of Arts (Professional Writing)			Yes
40633SA	Advanced Diploma of Oral Health (Dental Hygiene)			Yes
40634SA	Diploma of English Proficiency		Yes	
40637SA	Certificate II in Family Wellbeing		Yes	Yes
80928ACT	Certificate IV in Hyperbaric Operations (Aquaculture SSBA to 30m)			
80935ACT	Certificate IV in Hyperbaric Operations (Diver Medical Technician)			
80947ACT	Diploma of Hyperbaric Operations (Diving Supervision—SSBA to 30m)			
81017ACT	Certificate II in French		Yes	Yes
81021ACT	Certificate II in German		Yes	Yes
81032ACT	Certificate I in Italian		Yes	Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
81033ACT	Certificate II in Italian		Yes	Yes
81036ACT	Certificate I in Japanese		Yes	Yes
81037ACT	Certificate II in Japanese		Yes	Yes
81052ACT	Certificate I in Mandarin		Yes	Yes
81053ACT	Certificate II in Mandarin		Yes	Yes
81080ACT	Certificate I in Spanish		Yes	Yes
81081ACT	Certificate II in Spanish		Yes	Yes
91421NSW	Certificate I in Spoken and Written English		Yes	
91422NSW	Certificate II in Spoken and Written English		Yes	
91423NSW	Certificate III in Spoken and Written English		Yes	
ACM10110	Certificate I in Animal Studies		Yes	Yes
ACM20110	Certificate II in Animal Studies		Yes	
ACM30110	Certificate III in Animal Studies			
ACM30210	Certificate III in Animal Technology			
ACM30310	Certificate III in Captive Animals			
ACM30410	Certificate III in Companion Animal Services			
ACM30510	Certificate III in Farriery			
ACM40110	Certificate IV in Animal Control and Regulation			
ACM40210	Certificate IV In Captive Animals			Yes
ACM40310	Certificate IV in Companion Animal Services			Yes
ACM40410	Certificate IV in Veterinary Nursing			
ACM50110	Diploma of Animal Technology			Yes
ACIV50210	Diploma of Veterinary Nursing (Surgical)			Yes
ACM50410	Diploma of Veterinary Nursing (Emergency and Critical Care)			Yes
AGF10107	Certificate I in Agri-Food (Pathways)		Yes	
AHC10110	Certificate I in Conservation and Land Management		Yes	Yes
AHC10210	Certificate I in AgriFood Operations		Yes	
AHC20110	Certificate II in Agriculture		Yes	
AHC20210	Certificate II in Poultry Production Operations		Yes	
AHC20310	Certificate II in Production Horticulture		Yes	
AHC20410	Certificate II in Horticulture		Yes	
AHC20510	Certificate II in Arboriculture		Yes	
AHC20610	Certificate II in Parks and Gardens		Yes	
AHC20710	Certificate II in Production Nursery		Yes	
AHC20810	Certificate II in Retail Nursery		Yes	
AHC20910	Certificate II in Sports Turf Management		Yes	
AHC21010	Certificate II in Conservation and Land Management		Yes	
AHC21110	Certificate II in Irrigation		Yes	
AHC21210	Certificate II in Rural Operations		Yes	
AHC21310	Certificate II in Shearing		Yes	
AHC21410	Certificate II in Wool Handling		Yes	
AHC21510	Certificate II in Floriculture		Yes	
A C21610	Certificate II in Landscaping		Yes	
AHC30110	Certificate III In Agriculture			
AHC30210	Certificate III in Agriculture (Dairy Production)			
AHC30310	Certificate III in Horse Breeding			
AHC30410	Certificate III in Pork Production			
AHC30510	Certificate III in Poultry Production			
AHC306 0	Certificate III in Production Horticulture			
AHC30710	Certificate III in Horticulture			



Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
AHC30810	Certificate III in Arboriculture			
AHC30910	Certificate III in Landscape Construction			
AHC31010	Certificate III in Parks and Gardens			
AHC31110	Certificate III in Production Nursery			
AHC31210	Certificate III in Retail Nursery			
AHC31310	Certificate III in Sports Turf Management			
AHC31410	Certificate III in Conservation and Land Management			
AHC31510	Certificate III in Indigenous Land Management			
AHC31610	Certificate III in Lands, Parks and Wildlife			
AHC31710	Certificate III in Natural Area Restoration			
AHC31810	Certificate III in Vertebrate Pest Management			
AHC31910	Certificate III in Weed Management			
AHC32010	Certificate III in Beekeeping			
AHC32111	Certificate III in Commercial Seed Processing			
AHC32210	Certificate III in Commercial Composting			Yes
AHC32310	Certificate III in Conservation Earthworks			
AHC32410	Certificate III in Irrigation			
AHC32610	Certificate III in Rural Machinery Operations			
AHC32710	Certificate III in Rural Merchandising			
AHC32810	Certificate III in Rural Operations			
AHC32910	Certificate III in Shearing			Yes
AHC33010	Certificate III in Wool Clip Preparation			
AHC33110	Certificate III in Advanced Wool Handling			
AHC33210	Certificate III in Floriculture			
AHC33311	Certificate III in Feedlot Operations			
AHC40110	Certificate IV in Agriculture			
AHC40210	Certificate IV in Poultry Production			
AHC40310	Certificate IV in Production Horticulture			
AHC40410	Certificate IV in Horticulture			
AHC40610	Certificate IV in Production Nursery			
AHC40810	Certificate IV in Sports Turf Management			Yes
AHC40910	Certificate IV in Conservation and Land Management			Yes
AHC41010	Certificate IV in Agribusiness			
AHC41110	Certificate IV in Irrigation			Yes
AHC41310	Certificate IV in Wool Classing			Yes
AHC50110	Diploma of Agriculture			
AHC50210	Diploma of Pork Production			
AHC50310	Diploma of Production Horticulture			
AHC50410	Diploma of Horticulture			
AHC50510	Diploma of Arboriculture			
AHC50610	Diploma of Landscape Design			
AHC50710	Diploma of Parks and Gardens Management			
AFIC50810	Diploma of Production Nursery Management			
AHC51010	Diploma of Sports Turf Management			Yes
AHC51110	Diploma of Conservation and Land Management			
AHC51210	Diploma of Community Coordination and Facilitation			
AHC51310	Diploma of Pest Management			
AHC51410	Diploma of Agribusiness Management			
AHC51610	Diploma of Irrigation Management			Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
AHC51710	Diploma of Rural Machinery Management			
AHC60110	Advanced Diploma of Agriculture			
AHC60210	Advanced Diploma of Horticulture			
AHC60310	Advanced Diploma of Agribusiness Management			
AHC60410	Advanced Diploma of Conservation and Land Management			
AUM10108	Certificate I in Automotive Manufacturing (Passenger Motor Vehicle)	Yes		
AUM20108	Certificate II in Automotive Manufacturing (Passenger Motor Vehicle)		Yes	
AUM25108	Certificate II in Automotive Manufacturing (Bus/Truck/Trailer)		Yes	
AUM30108	Certificate III in Automotive Manufacturing-Manufacturing Specialist (Passenger Motor Vehicle)			
AUM35108	Certificate III in Automotive Manufacturing (Bus/Truck/Trailer)			
AUM40108	Certificate IV in Automotive Manufacturing-Automotive Development (Passenger Motor Vehicle)			
AUM45108	Certificate IV in Automotive Manufacturing (Bus/Truck/Trailer)			
AUM50108	Diploma of Automotive Manufacturing-Automotive Development (Passenger Motor Vehicle)			
AUR10105	Certificate I in Automotive		Yes	Yes
AUR20105	Certificate II in Automotive Administration		Yes	
AUR20205	Certificate II in Automotive Aftermarket Manufacturing		Yes	

Where funding for a course is yet to be determined, providers may be able to use information from an equivalent/superseded course to estimate prices. Providers must independently confirm delivery conditions for any course.

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
AUR20305	Certificate II in Bicycles	Superseded	Yes	
AUR20311	Certificate II in Bicycles	Funding to be determined	Yes	
AUR20408	Certificate II in Automotive Electrical Technology		Yes	
AUR20505	Certificate II in Automotive Vehicle Servicing		Yes	
AUR20605	Certificate II in Marine	Superseded	Yes	
AUR20611	Certificate II in Marine	Funding to be determined	Yes	
AUR20705	Certificate II in Automotive Mechanical		Yes	
AUR20805	Certificate II in Outdoor Power Equipment	Superseded	Yes	
AUR2D811	Certificate II in Outdoor Power Equipment	Funding to be determined	Yes	
AUR20905	Certificate II in Automotive Vehicle Body		Yes	
AUR21005	Certificate II in Motorsport	Superseded	Yes	
AUR21011	Certificate II in Motorsport	Funding to be determined	Yes	
AUR21105	Certificate II in Automotive Sales		Yes	
AUR21205	Certificate II in Automotive Warehousing/Distribution Operations		Yes	
AUR30105	Certificate III in Automotive Administration			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
AUR30205	Certificate III in Bicycles	Superseded		
AUR30211	Certificate III in Bicycles	Funding to be determined		
AUR30308	Certificate III in Automotive Electrical Technology			
AUR30405	Certificate III in Automotive Mechanical Technology			
AUR30505	Certificate III in Marine	Superseded		
AUR30511	Certificate III in Marine	Funding to be determined		
AUR30605	Certificate III in Automotive Specialist			
AUR30705	Certificate III in Outdoor Power Equipment	Superseded		
AUR30711	Certificate III in Outdoor Power Equipment	Funding to be determined		
AUR30805	Certificate III in Automotive Vehicle Body			
AUR30905	Certificate III In Motorsport	Superseded		
AUR30911	Certificate III in Motorsport	Funding to be determined		
AUR31005	Certificate III in Automotive Sales			
AUR31105	Certificate III in Automotive Warehousing/Distribution Operations			
AUR31205	Certificate III in Automotive Retail, Service and Repair			
AUR40105	Certificate IV in Automotive Management			
AUR40208	Certificate IV in Automotive Technology			Yes
AUR40305	Certificate IV in Motorsport			
AUR40405	Certificate IV in Automotive Performance Enhancement			
AUR50105	Diploma of Automotive Management			
AUR50205	Diploma of Automotive Technology			
AUR50305	Diploma of Motorsport			
AVI10108	Certificate I In Aviation (Foundation Skills)		Yes	
AVI20208	Certificate II in Aviation (Flight Operations)		Yes	
AVI20408	Certificate II in Aviation (Ground Operations and Service)		Yes	
AVI30208	Certificate III in Aviation (Flight Operations)			
AVI30408	Certificate III in Aviation (Ground Operations and Service)			
AVI30510	Certificate III in Aviation (Rescue Crewman)			
AV140108	Certificate IV in Aviation (Commercial Pilot Aeroplane Licence)			Yes
AV140208	Certificate IV in Aviation (Commercial Pilot Helicopter Licence)			
AVI40508	Certificate IV in Aviation (Leadership and Supervision)			
AVI40610	Certificate IV in Aviation (Aircrewman)			
AVt50308	Diploma of Aviation (Air Traffic Control)			
AVI50408	Diploma of Aviation (Instrument Flight Operations)			
AVI50510	Diploma of Aviation (Grade 2 Flight Instructor)			
AVI60110	Advanced Diploma of Aviation (Flight Instruction)			
BSB10107	Certificate I in Business		Yes	
BSB20107	Certificate II in Business		Yes	
8SB20207	Certificate II in Customer Contact		Yes	
1351330110	Certificate III in Business			
BSB30207	Certificate III in Customer Contact			
BSB30307	Certificate III in Micro Business Operations			
BSB30407	Certificate III in Business Administration			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
BSB30507	Certificate III in Business Administration (International Education)			
BSB30607	Certificate III in International Trade			
B51330707	Certificate III in Occupational Health and Safety			
135830807	Certificate III in Recordkeeping			
B5B30907	Certificate III in Business Administration (Education)			
BSB31007	Certificate III in Business Administration (legal)			
BSB31107	Certificate III in Business Administration (Medical)			
5SB40107	Certificate IV in Advertising			Yes
1351340110	Certificate IV in Legal Services			Yes
BSB40207	Certificate IV in Business			
BSB40307	Certificate IV in Customer Contact			
65B40407	Certificate IV in Small Business Management			
BSB40507	Certificate IV in Business Administration			
BSB40610	Certificate IV in Business Sales			
BSB40707	Certificate IV in Franchising			
BSB40807	Certificate IV in Frontline Management			
BSB40907	Certificate IV in Governance			
BSB41007	Certificate IV in Human Resources			
BSB41107	Certificate IV in International Trade			Yes
BSB41307	Certificate IV in Marketing			
BSB41407	Certificate IV in Occupational Health and Safety			
BS841507	Certificate IV in Project Management			
BSB41607	Certificate IV in Purchasing			Yes
BSB41707	Certificate IV in Recordkeeping			Yes
BSB41807	Certificate IV in Unionism and Industrial Relations			
BSB41910	Certificate IV in Business (Governance)			Yes
BSB50107	Diploma of Advertising			Yes
BSB50110	Diploma of Legal Services			Yes
BSB50207	Diploma of Business			
85850307	Diploma of Customer Contact			Yes
BSB50407	Diploma of Business Administration			
BSB50507	Diploma of Franchising			
BSB50607	Diploma of Human Resources Management			
BSB50710	Diploma of Business (Governance)			
BSB50807	Diploma of International Business			Yes
BSB51107	Diploma of Management			
BSB512D7	Diploma of Marketing			
851351307	Diploma of Occupational Health and Safety			
35851407	Diploma of Project Management			
1351351507	Diploma of Purchasing			Yes
BSB51607	Diploma of Quality Auditing			
BSB51707	Diploma of Recordkeeping			
BSB51807	Diploma of Unionism and Industrial Relations			
B5660110	Advanced Diploma of Advertising			Yes
BSB60207	Advanced Diploma of Business			
BSB60307	Advanced Diploma of Customer Contact			
B5B60407	Advanced Diploma of Management			
BSB60507	Advanced Diploma of Marketing			Yes
BSB60607	Advanced Diploma of Occupational Health and Safety			
BSB60707	Advanced Diploma of Project Management			
BS660807	Advanced Diploma of Recordkeeping			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
851360907	Advanced Diploma of Management (Human Resources)			
CHC10108	Certificate I in Work Preparation (Community services)		Yes	Yes
CHC10208	Certificate I in Active Volunteering		Yes	Yes
CHC20108	Certificate II in Community Services		Yes	
CHC20208	Certificate II in Active Volunteering		Yes	Yes
CHC30108	Certificate III in Community Services Work			
CHC30208	Certificate III in Aged Care			
CHC30308	Certificate III in Home and Community Care			
CHC30408	Certificate III in Disability			
CHC30508	Certificate III in Social Housing			
CHC30608	Certificate III in Active Volunteering			Yes
CHC30708	Certificate III in Children's Services			
CHC30808	Certificate II in Education Support			
CHC30908	Certificate III in Employment Services			
CHC31008	Certificate III in Telephone Counselling Skills			
CHC40108	Certificate IV in Aged Care			
CHC40208	Certificate IV In Home and Community Care			
CHC40308	Certificate IV in Disability			
CHC40408	Certificate IV in Alcohol and Other Drugs Work			Yes
CHC40508	Certificate IV in Mental Health			
CHC40608	Certificate IV in Leisure and Health			
CHC40708	Certificate IV in Community Services Work			
CHC40808	Certificate IV in Community Development			
CHC40908	Certificate IV in Social Housing			
CHC41008	Certificate IV in Community Services Advocacy			Yes
CHC41108	Certificate IV in Pastoral Care			Yes
CHC41208	Certificate IV in Children's Services (Outside school hours care)			
CHC41308	Certificate IV in Children's Contact Services Work			
CHC41408	Certificate IV in Child, Youth and Family Intervention (Residential and out of home care)			
CHC41508	Certificate IV in Child, Youth and Family Intervention (Child protection)			
CHC41608	Certificate IV in Child, Youth and Family Intervention (Family support)			Yes
CHC41708	Certificate IV in Education Support			
CHC41808	Certificate IV in Youth Work			
CHC41908	Certificate IV in Youth Justice			Yes
CHC42008	Certificate IV in Employment Services			
CHC42108	Certificate IV in Career Development			Yes
CHC42208	Certificate IV in Telephone Counselling Skills			
CHC42308	Certificate IV in Mediation			
CHC42408	Certificate IV in Relationship Education			
CHC42508	Certificate IV in Community Services (Information, advice and referral)			
CHC42708	Certificate IV in Volunteer Program Coordination			Yes
CHC42810	Certificate IV in Community Services (Development and/or Humanitarian Assistance)			
CHC50108	Diploma of Disability			
CHC50208	Diploma of Community Services (Alcohol and other drugs)			Yes
CHC50308	Diploma of Community Services (Mental health)			Yes
CHC50408	Diploma of Community Services (Alcohol, other drugs and mental health)	Yes		

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CHC50508	Diploma of Leisure and Health			Yes
CHC50608	Diploma of Community Services Work			Yes
CHC50708	Diploma of Community Development			Yes
CHC50808	Diploma of Social Housing			
CHC50908	Diploma of Children's Services (Early childhood education and care)		Yes	
CHC51008	Diploma of Children's Services (Outside school hours care)			
CHC51108	Diploma of Children's Contact Services Work			
CHC51208	Diploma of Child, Youth and Family Intervention			
CHC51308	Diploma of Education Support			
CHC51408	Diploma of Youth Work			
CHC51508	Diploma of Youth Justice			
CHC51608	Diploma of Employment Services			Yes
CHC51708	Diploma of Counselling			
CHC51808	Diploma of Family Intake and Support Work			Yes
CHC51908	Diploma of Relationship Education			
CHC52008	Diploma of Community Services (Case management)			
CHC52108	Diploma of Community Services (Financial counselling)			

Where funding for a course is yet to be determined, providers may be able to use information from an equivalent/superseded course to estimate prices. Providers must independently confirm delivery conditions for any course,

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CHC52208	Diploma of Community Services Coordination			
CHC52310	Diploma of Community Services (Development and/or Humanitarian Assistance)			
CHC60108	Advanced Diploma of Disability Work			
CHC60208	Advanced Diploma of Children's Services		Yes	
CHC60308	Advanced Diploma of Community Sector Management			
CPC10108	Certificate I in Construction	Superseded	Yes	
CPC10111	Certificate I in Construction	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CPC20108	Certificate II in Construction	Superseded	Yes	
CPC20111	Certificate II in Construction	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CPC20208	Certificate II in Construction Pathways	Superseded	Yes	Yes
CPC20211	Certificate II in Construction Pathways	Funding to be determined	Yes	Yes
CPC20308	Certificate II in Steelfixing	Superseded	Yes	
CPC20311	Certificate II in Steelfixing	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CPC20408	Certificate II in Concreting	Superseded	Yes	
CPC20411	Certificate II in Concreting	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CPC20508	Certificate II in Stoneworking	Superseded	Yes	
CPC20511	Certificate II in Stoneworking	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CPC20708	Certificate II in Drainage	Superseded	Yes	
CPC20711	Certificate II in Drainage	Funding to be determined	Yes	

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CPC20808	Certificate II in Metal Roofing and Cladding	Superseded	Yes	
CPC20811	Certificate II in Metal Roofing and Cladding	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CPC20908	Certificate II in Urban Irrigation	Superseded	Yes	
CPC20911	Certificate II in Urban Irrigation	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CPC30108	Certificate III in Bricklaying/Blocklaying	Superseded		
CPC30111	Certificate III in Bricklaying/Blocklaying	Funding to be determined		
CPC30208	Certificate III in Carpentry	Superseded		
CPC30211	Certificate III in Carpentry	Funding to be determined		
CPC30308	Certificate III in Concreting	Superseded		
CPC30311	Certificate III in Concreting	Funding to be determined		
CPC30408	Certificate III in Demolition	Superseded		
CPC30411	Certificate III in Demolition	Funding to be determined		
CPC30508	Certificate III in Dogging	Superseded		
CPC30511	Certificate III in Dogging	Funding to be determined		
CPC30608	Certificate III in Painting and Decorating	Superseded		
CPC30611	Certificate III in Painting and Decorating	Funding to be determined		
CPC30708	Certificate III in Rigging	Superseded		
CPC30711	Certificate III in Rigging	Funding to be determined		
CPC30808	Certificate III in Roof Tiling	Superseded		
CPC30811	Certificate III in Roof Tiling.	Funding to be determined		
CPC30908	Certificate III in Scaffolding	Superseded		
CPC30911	Certificate III in Scaffolding	Funding to be determined		
CPC3 008	Certificate III in Solid Plastering	Superseded		
CPC31011	Certificate III in Solid Plastering	Funding to be determined		
CPC31108	Certificate III in Steelfixing	Superseded		
CPC31111	Certificate III in Steelfixing	Funding to be determined		
CPC31208	Certificate III in Wall and Ceiling Lining	Superseded		
CPC31211	Certificate III in Wall and Ceiling Lining	Funding to be determined		
CPC31308	Certificate III in Wall and Floor Tiling	Superseded		
CPC31311	Certificate III in Wall and Floor Tiling	Funding to be determined		
CPC31408	Certificate III In Construction Waterproofing	Superseded		
CPC31411	Certificate III in Construction Waterproofing	Funding to be determined		
CPC31508	Certificate III in Formwork/Falsework	Superseded		Yes
CPC31511	Certificate III in Formwork/Falsework	Funding to be determined		Yes
CPC31608	Certificate III in Paving	Superseded		
CPC31611	Certificate III in Paving	Funding to be determined		
CPC31708	Certificate III in Low Rise Structural Framing	Superseded		
CPC31711	Certificate III in Low Rise Structural Framing	Funding to be		

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
		determined		
CPC31808	Certificate III In Shopfitting	Superseded		
CPC31811	Certificate III in Shopfitting	Funding to be determined		
CPC31908	Certificate III in Joinery	Superseded		
CPC31911	Certificate III in Joinery	Funding to be determined		
CPC32008	Certificate III in Carpentry and Joinery	Superseded		
CPC32011	Certificate III in Carpentry and Joinery	Funding to be determined		
CPC32108	Certificate III in Signage	Superseded		
CPC32111	Certificate III in Signage	Funding to be determined		
CPC32208	Certificate III in Joinery (Stairs)	Superseded		
CPC32211	Certificate III in Joinery (Stairs)	Funding to be determined		
CPC32308	Certificate III in Stonemasonry (Monumental/Installation)	Superseded		
CPC32311	Certificate III in Stonemasonry (Monumental/Installation)	Funding to be determined		
CPC32408	Certificate III in Plumbing	Superseded		
CPC32411	Certificate III in Plumbing	Funding to be determined		
CPC32508	Certificate III in Plumbing (Mechanical Services)	Superseded		
CPC32511	Certificate III in Plumbing (Mechanical Services)	Funding to be determined		
CPC32608	Certificate III in Roof Plumbing	Superseded		
CPC32611	Certificate III In Roof Plumbing	Funding to be determined		
CPC32708	Certificate III in Gas Fitting	Superseded		
CPC32711	Certificate III in Gas Fitting	Funding to be determined		
CPC32808	Certificate III in Fire Protection	Superseded		
CPC32811	Certificate III in Fire Protection	Funding to be determined		
CPC40110	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Building)			
CPC40208	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Contract Administration)			
CPC40308	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Estimating)			
CPC40408	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Sales)			
CPC40508	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Site Management)			
CPC40608	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Specialist Trades)	Superseded		
CPC40611	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Specialist Trades)	Funding to be determined		
CPC40708	Certificate IV in Building and Construction (Trade Contracting)			
CPC40808	Certificate IV in Swimming Pool and Spa Building			
CPC40909	Certificate IV in Plumbing and Services	Superseded		
CPC40911	Certificate IV in Plumbing and Services	Funding to be determined		



Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CPC50108	Diploma of Building Surveying			
CPC50210	Diploma of Building and Construction (Building)		Yes	
CPC50308	Diploma of Building and Construction (Management)		Yes	
CPC50408	Diploma of Plumbing and Services			
CPC50509	Diploma of Fire Systems Design			
CPC50609	Diploma of Hydraulics Services Design	Superseded		
CPC50611	Diploma of Hydraulic Services Design	Funding to be determined		
CPC60108	Advanced Diploma of Building Surveying			
CPC60208	Advanced Diploma of Building and Construction (Management)		Yes	
CPP10107	Certificate I in Security Operations		Yes	
CPP20111	Certificate II in Surveying and Spatial Information Services		Yes	Yes
CPP20211	Certificate II in Security Operations		Yes	
CPP20307	Certificate II in Technical Security		Yes	
CPP30111	Certificate III in Surveying and Spatial Information Services			
CPP30211	Certificate III in Property Services (Agency)			
CPP30311	Certificate III in Property Services (Operations)			
CPP30411	Certificate III in Security Operations			
CPP30507	Certificate III in Technical Security			Yes
CPP30607	Certificate III in Investigative Services			Yes
CPP40109	Certificate IV in Surveying			Yes
CPP40211	Certificate IV in Spatial Information Services			Yes
CPP40307	Certificate IV in Property Services (Real Estate)			
CPP40407	Certificate IV in Property Services (Stock and Station Agency)			
CPP40507	Certificate IV in Property Services (Business Broking)			
CPP40611	Certificate IV in Property Services (Operations)			
CPP40707	Certificate IV in Security and Risk Management			
CPP40811	Certificate IV in Access Consulting			
CPP41110	Certificate IV in Home Sustainability Assessment	Funding to be determined		
CPP50107	Diploma of Surveying			Yes
CPP50211	Diploma of Spatial Information Services			Yes

Where funding for a course is yet to be determined, providers may be able to use information from an equivalent/superseded course to estimate prices. Providers must independently confirm delivery conditions for any course,

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CPP50307	Diploma of Property Services (Agency Management)			
CPP50409	Diploma of Property Services (Business Broking)			
CPP50511	Diploma of Property Services (Asset and Facility Management)			
CPP50611	Diploma of Security and Risk Management			Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CPP50711	Diploma of Access Consulting			
CPP60109	Advanced Diploma of Spatial Information Services			Yes
CPP60211	Advanced Diploma of Property Services (Asset and Facility Management)			
CSC20107	Certificate II in Justice Services		Yes	
CSC30107	Certificate III in Correctional Practice			
CSC30207	Certificate III in Correctional Practice (Custodial)			
CSC30307	Certificate III in Correctional Practice (Community)			
CSC40107	Certificate IV in Correctional Practice			
CSC50107	Diploma of Correctional Administration			
CUE20103	Certificate II in Live Production, Theatre and Events			
CUE30203	Certificate III in Live Production, Theatre and Events (Technical Operations)			
CUE30303	Certificate III in Venues and Events (Customer Service)			
CUE40303	Certificate IV in Live Production, Theatre and Events (Technical Operations)			Yes
CUE40403	Certificate IV in Venues and Events (Customer Service)			
CUE50303	Diploma of Live Production, Theatre and Events (Technical Production)			Yes
CUE60103	Advanced Diploma of Design for Live Production, Theatre and Events			Yes
CUE60203	Advanced Diploma of Live Production, Theatre and Events (Technical Production)			Yes
CUE60303	Advanced Diploma of Stage Management			Yes
CUE60403	Advanced Diploma of Venues and Events			
CUF10107	Certificate I in Creative Industries			Yes
CUP20107	Certificate II in Creative Industries (Media)			
CUF30107	Certificate III in Media			
CUF30207	Certificate III in Broadcast Technology			
CUF30307	Certificate III in Scenery and Set Construction			
CUF40107	Certificate IV in Screen and Media			Yes
CUF40207	Certificate IV in Interactive Digital Media			Yes
CUF40307	Certificate IV in Broadcast Technology			
CUF40407	Certificate IV in Make-up			
CUF40507	Certificate IV in Costume for Performance			Yes
CUF40607	Certificate IV in Scenery and Set Construction			Yes
CUF50107	Diploma of Screen and Media			Yes
CUF50207	Diploma of Interactive Digital Media			
CUF50307	Diploma of Broadcast Technology			
CUF50407	Diploma of Specialist Make -up Services			
CUF50507	Diploma of Costume for Performance			Yes
CUF50607	Diploma of Scenery and Set Construction			Yes
CUF60107	Advanced Diploma of Screen and Media			Yes
CUL20104	Certificate II in Library/Information Services		Yes	
CUL20204	Certificate II In Museum Practice		Yes	
CUL30104	Certificate III in Library/Information Services			
CUL30204	Certificate III in Museum Practice			
CUL40104	Certificate IV in Library/Information Services			Yes
CUL50104	Diploma of Library/Information Services			Yes
CUS20109	Certificate II in Music		Yes	
CUS30109	Certificate III in Music			
CUS30209	Certificate III in Technical Production			
CUS30309	Certificate III in Music Business			
CUS40109	Certificate IV in Music			
CUS40209	Certificate IV in Sound Production			Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CUS40309	Certificate IV in Music Business			Yes
CUS50109	Diploma of Music			

Where funding for a course is yet to be determined, providers may be able to use information from an equivalent/superseded course to estimate prices. Providers must independently confirm delivery conditions for any course.

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CUS50209	Diploma of Sound Production			Yes
CUS50309	Diploma of Music Business			Yes
CUS60109	Advanced Diploma of Music			Yes
CUS60209	Advanced Diploma of Sound Production			
CUS60309	Advanced Diploma of Music Business			
CUV10103	Certificate I in Visual Arts and Contemporary Craft	Superseded	Yes	
CUV10111	Certificate I in Visual Arts	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CUV10203	Certificate I in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Superseded	Yes	
CUV10211	Certificate I in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CUV20103	Certificate II in Visual Arts and Contemporary Craft	Superseded	Yes	
CUV20111	Certificate II in Visual Arts	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CUV20203	Certificate II in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Superseded	Yes	
CUV20211	Certificate II in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Funding to be determined	Yes	
CUV20303	Certificate II in Opal Cutting and Polishing	Superseded	Yes	Yes
CUV20311	Certificate II in Opal Cutting and Polishing	Funding to be determined	Yes	Yes
CUV30103	Certificate III in Visual Arts and Contemporary Craft	Superseded		
CUV30111	Certificate III in Visual Arts	Funding to be determined		
CUV30203	Certificate III in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Superseded		
CUV30211	Certificate III in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Funding to be determined		
CUV30403	Certificate III in Arts Administration	Superseded		Yes
CUV30411	Certificate III in Arts Administration	Funding to be determined		Yes
CUV40103	Certificate IV in Visual Arts and Contemporary Craft	Superseded		Yes
CUV40111	Certificate IV in Visual Arts	Funding to be determined		Yes
CUV40203	Certificate IV in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Superseded		
CUV40211	Certificate IV in Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Cultural Arts	Funding to be determined		
CUV40303	Certificate IV in Design	Superseded		Yes
CUV40311	Certificate IV in Design	Funding to be determined		Yes
CUV40403	Certificate IV in Photoimaging	Superseded		Yes
CUV40411	Certificate IV in Photo Imaging	Funding to be determined		Yes
CUV40603	Certificate IV in Opal Cutting and Polishing	Superseded		Yes
CUV40611	Certificate IV in Opal Cutting and Polishing	Funding to be determined		Yes
CUV60307	Advanced Diploma of Creative Product Development	Superseded		Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
CUV60311	Advanced Diploma of Creative Product Development	Funding to be determined		Yes
DFD10110	Certificate I in Food Processing		Yes	Yes
DFD10210	Certificate I in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing		Yes	
DFD20110	Certificate II in Food Processing		Yes	
DFD2021,0	Certificate II in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing		Yes	
DFD20310	Certificate II in Food Processing (Sales)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
DFD20510	Certificate II in Retail Baking Assistance		Yes	
DFD20903	Certificate II in Food Processing (Sales)	Superseded	Yes	
DFD30110	Certificate III in Food Processing			
DFD30210	Certificate III in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing			
DFD30303	Certificate III in Food Processing (Plant Baking)	Superseded		
DFD30310	Certificate III in Food Processing (Sales)			
DFD30510	Certificate III in Retail Baking (Cake and Pastry)			
DFD30610	Certificate III in Retail Baking (Bread)			
DFD30710	Certificate III in Retail Baking (Combined)			
DFD30810	Certificate III in Plant Baking	Funding to be determined		
DFD40110	Certificate IV in Food Processing			Yes
DFD40210	Certificate IV in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing			
DFD50110	Diploma of Food Processing			Yes
DFD50210	Diploma of Pharmaceutical Manufacturing			
FNS10110	Certificate I in Financial Services		Yes	Yes
FNS20110	Certificate II in Financial Services		Yes	
FNS30110	Certificate III in Financial Services			
FNS30210	Certificate III in Personal Injury Management (Claims Management)			
FNS30310	Certificate III in Accounts Administration			
FNS30410	Certificate III in Mercantile Agents			
FNS30510	Certificate III in general Insurance			Yes
FNS30610	Certificate III in Insurance Broking			
FN530710	Certificate III in Life Insurance			
FNS40110	Certificate IV in Credit Management			
FNS40210	Certificate IV in Bookkeeping			
FN540310	Certificate IV in Personal Injury Management (Claims Management)			
FN540410	Certificate IV in Personal Injury Management (Return To Work)			
FN540510	Certificate IV in Personal Injury Management (Underwriting)			
FNS40610	Certificate IV in Accounting			
FNS40710	Certificate IV in Financial Practice Support			Yes
FNS40810	Certificate IV in Finance and Mortgage Broking			Yes
FNS40910	Certificate IV in Superannuation			
FN541010	Certificate IV in Banking Services			
FNS41110	Certificate IV in Financial Markets Operations			
FN541210	Certificate IV in Mobile Banking			
FN541310	Certificate IV in Personal Trust Administration			
FN541410	Certificate IV in General Insurance			Yes
FNS41510	Certificate IV in Life Insurance			
FNS41610	Certificate IV in Loss Adjusting			
FN541710	Certificate IV in Insurance Broking			
FNS50110	Diploma of Personal Injury Management			
FNS50210	Diploma of Accounting			
FNS50310	Diploma of Finance and Mortgage Broking			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
FN550410	Diploma of Conveyancing			
FN550510	Diploma of Personal Trustees			
FN550610	Diploma of Financial Planning			Yes
FN550710	Diploma of Superannuation			
FN550810	Diploma of Financial Risk Management			
FNS50910	Diploma of Banking Services Management			Yes
FN551010	Diploma of Financial Markets			
FNS51110	Diploma of General Insurance			
FNS51210	Diploma of Insurance Broking			Yes
FNS51310	Diploma of Life Insurance			
FNS51410	Diploma of Loss Adjusting			
FNS51510	Diploma of Credit Management			
FNS51610	Diploma of Securitisation			
FN560110	Advanced Diploma of Insurance Braking			
FNS60210	Advanced Diploma of Accounting			Yes
FNS60310	Advanced Diploma of Conveyancing			Yes
FNS60410	Advanced Diploma of Financial Planning			
FN560510	Advanced Diploma of Superannuation			
FNS60610	Advanced Diploma of Banking Services Management			
FN560710	Advanced Diploma of Financial Licensing			
FNS60810	Advanced Diploma of Financial Risk Management			
F13110105	Certificate I in Forest and Forest Products		Yes	
FPI20105	Certificate II in Forest Growing and Management		Yes	
FP120205	Certificate II in Harvesting and Haulage		Yes	
FPI20305	Certificate II in Sawmilling and Processing		Yes	
FP120405	Certificate II in Wood Panel Products		Yes	
FP120505	Certificate II in Timber Manufactured Products		Yes	
FPI20605	Certificate II in Timber Merchandising		Yes	
FPI20710	Certificate II in Timber Truss and Frame Design and Manufacture		Yes	
FP130105	Certificate III in Forest Growing and Management			
FPI30205	Certificate III in Harvesting and Haulage			
FPI30305	Certificate III in Sawmilling and Processing			
FP130405	Certificate III in Wood Panel Products			
FPI30505	Certificate III in Timber Manufactured Products			
FP130605	Certificate III in Timber Merchandising			
FP130705	Certificate III in Sawdoctoring			
FPI30805	Certificate III in Woodmachining			
FPf30910	Certificate III in Timber Truss and Frame Design and Manufacture			
FPI40105	Certificate IV in Forest Operations			
FPI40310	Certificate IV in Timber Truss and Frame Manufacture			
FPI40410	Certificate IV in Timber Truss and Frame Design			
FPI50105	Diploma of Forest and Forest Products			
FP150310	Diploma of Timber Truss and Frame Manufacture			
FPI50410	Diploma of Timber Truss and Frame Design			
FPI60111	Advanced Diploma of Forest Industry Sustainability	Funding to be determined		
FPP20110	Certificate II in Pulpig Operations	Funding to be determined	Yes	
FPP20210	Certificate II in Papermaking Operations	Funding to be determined	Yes	
HLT20907	Certificate II in Population Health		Yes	
HLT21007	Certificate II in Indigenous Environmental Health		Yes	
HLT21107	Certificate II in Emergency Medical Service First		Yes	

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
HLT21207	Certificate II in Health Support Services		Yes	
HLT21307	Certificate II in Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health Care		Yes	
HLT30207	Certificate III in Non-Emergency Client Transport			
HLT31107	Certificate III in Sterilisation Services			
HLT31407	Certificate III in Hospital/Health Services Pharmacy Support			
HLT31507	Certificate III in Nutrition and Dietetic Assistance			
HLT31807	Certificate III in Dental Assisting			
HLT31907	Certificate III in Ambulance Communications (Call-taking)			
HLT32007	Certificate III in Mortuary Theatre Practice			
HLT32107	Certificate III in Prosthetic/Orthotic Technology			
HLT32207	Certificate III in Population Health			
HLT32307	Certificate III in Indigenous Environmental Health			
HLT32407	Certificate III in Allied Health Assistance			
HLT32507	Certificate III in Health Services Assistance			
HLT32607	Certificate III in Pathology			
HLT32707	Certificate III in Dental Laboratory Assisting			
HLT32807	Certificate III in Health Support Services			
HLT32907	Certificate III in Health Administration			
HLT33107	Certificate III in Basic Health Care			
HLT33207	Certificate III in Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health Care			
HLT40307	Certificate IV in Massage Therapy Practice			Yes
HLT40407	Certificate IV in Health Supervision			Yes
HLT40507	Certificate IV in Hospital/Health Services Pharmacy Support			
HLT41007	Certificate IV in Health Care (Ambulance)			
HLT41107	Certificate IV in Ambulance Communications			
HLT41207	Certificate IV in Ayurvedic Lifestyle Consultation			
HLT41307	Certificate IV In Audiometric Assessment			
HLT41407	Certificate IV in Cast Technology			
HLT41507	Certificate IV in Hyperbaric Technology			
HLT41607	Certificate IV in Mortuary Theatre Practice			
HLT41707	Certificate IV in Neurophysiology Technology			
HLT41807	Certificate IV in Pathology			Yes
HLT41907	Certificate IV In Sleep Technology			
HLT42007	Certificate IV in Operating Theatre Technical Support			
HLT42107	Certificate IV in Cardiac Technology			
HLT42307	Certificate IV in Population Health			
HLT42407	Certificate IV in Indigenous Environmental Health			
EILT42507	Certificate IV in Allied Health Assistance			
HLT42607	Certificate IV in Anaesthetic Technology			
HLT42707	Certificate IV in Aromatherapy			Yes
HLT42807	Certificate IV in Kinesiology			
HLT43007	Certificate IV in Dental Assisting			Yes
HLT43207	Certificate IV in Health Administration			
HLT43307	Certificate IV in Medical Practice Assisting			
HLT43407	Certificate IV in Nursing (Enrolled/Division 2 nursing)			
HLT43507	Certificate IV in Optical Dispensing			Yes
HLT43607	Certificate IV in Rehabilitation and Assistive Technology			
HLT43707	Certificate IV in Optical Technology			

Where funding for a course is yet to be determined, providers may be able to use information from an equivalent/superseded course to estimate prices. Providers must independently confirm delivery conditions for any course.

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
HLT43807	Certificate IV in Sterilisation Services			
HLT43907	Certificate IV in Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health Care (Practice)			
HLT44007	Certificate IV in Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health (Community Care)			
HLT50107	Diploma of Traditional Chinese Medicine Remedial Massage (An Mo Tui Na)			
HLT50207	Diploma of Shiatsu and Oriental Therapies			
HLT50307	Diploma of Remedial Massage			Yes
HLT50407	Diploma of Paramedical Science (Ambulance)			
HLT50507	Diploma of Dental Technology			Yes
HLT50607	Diploma of Paramedical Science (Anaesthesia)			
HLT50707	Diploma of Hyperbaric Technology			
HLT50907	Diploma of Sleep Technology			
HLT51007	Diploma of Population Health			
HLT51107	Diploma of Indigenous Environmental Health			
HLT51307	Diploma of Hearing Device Prescription and Evaluation			
HLT51407	Diploma of Aromatherapy			Yes
HLT51507	Diploma of Kinesiology			
HLT51607	Diploma of Nursing (Enrolled/Division 2 nursing)			
HLT51707	Diploma of Reflexology			Yes
HLT51907	Diploma of Mortuary Theatre Practice			
HLT52007	Diploma of Practice Management			
HLT52107	Diploma of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health Care (Practice)			
HLT52207	Diploma of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health (Community Care)			
HLT60107	Advanced Diploma of Western Herbal Medicine			
HLT60307	Advanced Diploma of Paramedical Science (Ambulance)			
HLT60407	Advanced Diploma of Dental Prosthetics			
HLT60507	Advanced Diploma of Naturopathy			
HLT60607	Advanced Diploma of Homoeopathy			
HLT60707	Advanced Diploma of Ayurveda			
HLT60807	Advanced Diploma of Neurophysiology Technology			
HLT60907	Advanced Diploma of Aromatic Medicine			
HLT61007	Advanced Diploma of Nutritional Medicine			
HLT61107	Advanced Diploma of Nursing (Enrolled/Division 2 nursing)			
HLT61207	Advanced Diploma of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health Care (Practice)			
HLT61307	Advanced Diploma of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health (Community Care)			
ICA10111	Certificate I in Information, Digital Media and Technology		Yes	
ICA20111	Certificate II in Information, Digital Media and Technology		Yes	
ICA30111	Certificate III in Information, Digital Media and Technology			
ICA40111	Certificate IV in Information Technology			
ICA40211	Certificate IV in Information Technology Support			
ICA40311	Certificate IV in Web-Based Technologies			Yes
ICA40411	Certificate IV in Information Technology Networking			
ICA40511	Certificate IV in Programming			Yes
ICA40611	Certificate IV in Information Technology Testing			
ICA40711	Certificate IV in Systems Analysis and Design			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
ICA40811	Certificate IV in Digital Media Technologies			Yes
ICA40911	Certificate IV in Digital and Interactive Games			
ICA41011	Certificate IV in Computer Systems Technology			
ICA50111	Diploma of Information Technology			
ICA50211	Diploma of Digital and Interactive Games			
ICA50311	Diploma of Information Technology Systems Administration			
ICA50411	Diploma of Information Technology Networking			Yes
ICA50511	Diploma of Database Design and Development			
ICA50611	Diploma of Website Development			Yes
ICA50711	Diploma of Software Development			Yes
ICA50811	Diploma of Systems Analysis and Design			Yes
ICA50911	Diploma of Digital Media Technologies			Yes
ICA60111	Advanced Diploma of Information Technology			
ICA60211	Advanced Diploma of Network Security			Yes
ICA60311	Advanced Diploma of Information Technology Business Analysis			
ICA60411	Advanced Diploma of Information Technology Project Management			
ICA60511	Advanced Diploma of Computer Systems Technology		Yes	
ICP20110	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (General)		Yes	
ICP20210	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Desktop Publishing)		Yes	
ICP20310	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Digital Printing)		Yes	
ICP20410	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Print Production Support)		Yes	
ICP20510	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Screen Printing)		Yes	
ICP20610	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Converting, Binding and Finishing)		Yes	
ICP20710	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Sacks and Bags)		Yes	
ICP20810	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Cartons)		Yes	
ICP20910	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Corrugating)		Yes	
ICP21010	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Mail House)		Yes	
ICP21110	Certificate II in Printing and Graphic Arts (Ink Manufacture)		Yes	
ICP30110	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Graphic Design Production)			
ICP30210	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Graphic Pre-press)			
ICP30310	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Multimedia)			
ICP30410	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Digital Printing)			
ICP30510	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Printing)			
ICP30610	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Screen Printing)			
ICP30710	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Print Finishing)			
ICP30810	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Sacks and Bags)			
ICP30910	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Cartons and Corrugating)			
ICP31010	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Mail House)			
ICP31110	Certificate III in Printing and Graphic Arts (Ink Manufacture)			
ICP40110	Certificate IV in Printing and Graphic Arts (Graphic Pre-press)			
ICP40210	Certificate IV in Printing and Graphic Arts (Multimedia)			
ICP40310	Certificate IV in Printing and Graphic Arts (Printing)			
ICP40410	Certificate IV in Printing and Graphic Arts (Print Finishing)			
ICP40510	Certificate IV in Printing and Graphic Arts (Mail House)			
ICP40610	Certificate IV in Printing and Graphic Arts (Management/Sales)			
ICP40710	Certificate IV in Printing and Graphic Arts (Process Leadership)			Yes
ICP50110	Diploma of Printing and Graphic Arts (Digital Production)			Yes
ICP50210	Diploma of Printing and Graphic Arts (Multimedia)			
ICP50310	Diploma of Printing and Graphic Arts (Printing)			



Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
ICP50410	Diploma of Printing and Graphic Arts (Management/Sales)			
ICP50510	Diploma of Printing and Graphic Arts (Process Improvement)			
ICT20110	Certificate II in Telecommunications Technology		Yes	
ICT20210	Certificate II in Telecommunications		Yes	
ICT20310	Certificate II in Telecommunications Cabling		Yes	
ICT20410	Certificate II in Telecommunications Digital Reception Technology		Yes	
ICT20510	Certificate II in Telecommunications Rigging Installation		Yes	
ICT30110	Certificate III in Broadband and Wireless Networks Technology			
ICT30210	Certificate III in Telecommunications		Yes	
ICT30310	Certificate III in Telecommunications Cabling		Yes	
ICT30410	Certificate III in Telecommunications Digital Reception Technology		Yes	
ICT30510	Certificate III in Telecommunications Rigging Installation		Yes	
ICT30610	Certificate III in Broadband and Wireless Networks			
ICT40110	Certificate IV in Optical Networks			
ICT40210	Certificate IV in Telecommunications Network Engineering			

Where funding for a course is yet to be determined, providers may be able to use information from an equivalent/superseded course to estimate prices. Providers must independently confirm delivery conditions for any course.

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
ICT40310	Certificate IV in Telecommunications Radio Communications			
ICT40410	Certificate IV in Radio Frequency Networks			
ICT40510	Certificate IV in Telecommunications Network Planning			
ICT40610	Certificate IV in Telecommunications Networks Technology			
ICT50110	Diploma of Optical Networks			
ICT50210	Diploma of Telecommunications Network Engineering			Yes
ICT50310	Diploma of Telecommunications Management			
ICT50410	Diploma of Radio Frequency Networks		Yes	
ICT50510	Diploma of Telecommunications Planning and Design			
ICT60110	Advanced Diploma of Optical Networks			
ICT60210	Advanced Diploma of Telecommunications Network Engineering			
LGA10104	Certificate I in Local Government		Yes	
LGA10204	Certificate I in Local Government (Operational Works)		Yes	
LGA20104	Certificate II in Local Government		Yes	
LGA20204	Certificate II in Local Government (Operational Works)		Yes	
LGA30104	Certificate III in Local Government			
LGA30208	Certificate III in Local Government (Health and Environment)			
LGA30304	Certificate III in Local Government (Operational Works)			
LGA30404	Certificate III in Local Government (Regulatory Services)			
LGA40104	Certificate IV in Local Government			Yes
LGA40204	Certificate IV in Local Government Administration			Yes
LGA40308	Certificate IV in Local Government (Health and Environment)			
LGA40404	Certificate IV in Local Government (Operational Works)			
LGA40504	Certificate IV in Local Government (Regulatory Services)			Yes
LGA40708	Certificate IV in Local Government (Planning)			Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
LGA50104	Diploma of Local Government Administration			Yes
LGA50208	Diploma of Local Government (Health and Environment)			
LGA50304	Diploma of Local Government (Land Management)			
LGA50508	Diploma of Local Government (Planning)			Yes
LMF10108	Certificate I in Furnishing		Yes	Yes
LMF20102	Certificate II in Floor Covering and Finishing	Superseded	Yes	
LMF20202	Certificate II in Furniture Finishing		Yes	
LMF20309	Certificate II in Furniture Making		Yes	
LMF20402	Certificate II in Glass and Glazing		Yes	
LMF20502	Certificate II in Mattress and Base Making		Yes	
LMF20602	Certificate II in Picture Framing		Yes	
LMF20702	Certificate II in Soft Furnishing		Yes	
LMF20802	Certificate II in Upholstery		Yes	
LMF20908	Certificate II in Flooring Technology		Yes	
LMF21008	Certificate II in Blinds and Awnings		Yes	
LMF21108	Certificate II in Security Screens and Grills		Yes	
LMF21208	Certificate II in Stained Glass and Lead Lighting		Yes	
LMF21308	Certificate II in Coopering		Yes	
LMF30102	Certificate III in Floor Covering and Finishing	Superseded		
LMF30202	Certificate III in Furniture Finishing			
LMF30302	Certificate III in Furniture Making			
LMF30402	Certificate III in Furniture Making (Cabinet Making)	Superseded		
LMF30502	Certificate III in Furniture Making (Wood Machining)			
LMF30602	Certificate III in Glass and Glazing			
LMF30702	Certificate III in Mattress and Base Making			
LMF30802	Certificate III in Picture Framing			
LMF30902	Certificate III in Soft Furnishing			
LMF31002	Certificate III in Upholstery			
LMF31102	Certificate III in Production Upholstery			
LMF31208	Certificate III in Flooring Technology			
LMF31408	Certificate III in Musical Instrument Making and Repair			
LMF31508	Certificate III in Piano Technology			
LMF31608	Certificate III in Security Screens and Grills			
LMF31708	Certificate III in Stained Glass and Lead Lighting			
LMF31808	Certificate III in Blinds and Awnings			
LMF31908	Certificate III in Interior Decoration (Retail Services)			
LMF32009	Certificate III in Kitchens and Bathrooms (Client Services)			
LMF32109	Certificate III in Cabinet Making			
LMF40308	Certificate IV in Musical Instrument Making and Repair			
LMF40408	Certificate IV in Interior Decoration			Yes
LMF40609	Certificate IV in Design of Kitchens, Bathrooms and Interior Spaces			
LMF50308	Diploma of Stained Glass and Lead Lighting			
LMF50408	Diploma of Interior Design and Decoration			Yes
LMF50508	Diploma of Furniture Design and Technology			Yes
LMF60102	Advanced Diploma of Furnishing Management			
LMF60208	Advanced Diploma of Interior Design			
LMT11107	Certificate I in Textiles Clothing and Footwear		Yes	
LMT20107	Certificate II in Textile Production (Intermediate)		Yes	
LMT20207	Certificate II in Textile Production (Complex or Multiple Processes)		Yes	
LMT20407	Certificate II in Cotton Ginning	Funding to be determined	Yes	
LMT20507	Certificate II in Textile Fabrication		Yes	

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
LMT20607	Certificate II in Clothing Production (Intermediate)		Yes	
LMT20707	Certificate II in Clothing Production (Complex or Multiple Processes)		Yes	
LMT20807	Certificate II in Millinery		Yes	
LMT20907	Certificate II in Footwear Production (Intermediate)		Yes	
LMT21007	Certificate II in Footwear Production (Complex or Multiple Processes)		Yes	
LMT21107	Certificate II in Footwear Repair		Yes	
LMT21207	Certificate II in Leather Production		Yes	
LMT21410	Certificate II in Laundry Operations		Yes	
LMT21510	Certificate II in Dry Cleaning Operations		Yes	
LMT21607	Certificate II in Technical Textiles and Non-wovens		Yes	
LMT21707	Certificate II in Applied Fashion Design and Technology		Yes	
LMT30107	Certificate III in Textile Production			
LMT30407	Certificate III in Textile Fabrication			
LMT30507	Certificate III in Clothing Production			
LMT30607	Certificate III in Millinery			
LMT30707	Certificate III in Footwear Production			
LMT30807	Certificate III in Footwear Repair			
LMT30907	Certificate III in Leather Production			
LMT31110	Certificate III in Laundry Operations			
LMT31210	Certificate III in Dry Cleaning Operations			
LMT31407	Certificate III in Applied Fashion Design and Technology			
LMT31807	Certificate III in Technical Textiles and Non-wovens			
LMT31909	Certificate III in Engineering—TCF Mechanic			
LMT40407	Certificate IV in Custom made Footwear			Yes
LMT41007	Certificate IV in Applied Fashion Design and Technology			Yes
LMT41207	Certificate IV in Fashion and Textiles Merchandising			
LMT50307	Diploma of Applied Fashion Design and Technology			Yes
LMT50607	Diploma of Fashion and Textiles Merchandising			
LMT60307	Advanced Diploma of Applied Fashion Design and Technology			Yes
LMT60507	Advanced Diploma of Fashion and Textiles Merchandising			
MEA20410	Certificate II in Aeroskills		Yes	Yes
MEA20510	Certificate II in Aircraft Line Maintenance		Yes	
MEA20610	Certificate II in Aircraft Surface Finishing		Yes	
MEA30110	Certificate III in Aircraft Surface Finishing			
MEA30310	Certificate III in Aircraft Life Support and Furnishing			
MEA40610	Certificate IV in Aeroskills (Avionics)			
MEA40710	Certificate IV in Aeroskills (Mechanical)			
MEA40810	Certificate IV in Aeroskills (Structures)			
MEA40910	Certificate IV in Aircraft Surface Finishing			
MEA41110	Certificate IV in Aircraft Life Support and Furnishing			
MEA41210	Certificate IV in Aeroskills (Armament)			
MEA50110	Diploma of Aeroskills (Avionics)			
MEA50210	Diploma of Aeroskills (Mechanical)			
MEA50310	Diploma of Aviation Maintenance Management (Avionics)			
MEA50410	Diploma of Aviation Maintenance Management (Mechanical)			
MEA60110	Advanced Diploma of Aviation Maintenance Management (Avionics)			
MEA60210	Advanced Diploma of Aviation Maintenance Management (Mechanical)			
MEM10105	Certificate I in Engineering		Yes	
MEM10205	Certificate I in Boating Services		Yes	

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
MEM20105	Certificate II in Engineering		Yes	
MEM20205	Certificate II in Engineering—Production Technology		Yes	
MEM20305	Certificate II in Boating Services		Yes	
MEM30105	Certificate III in Engineering—Production Systems			
MEM30205	Certificate III in Engineering—Mechanical Trade			
MEM30305	Certificate III in Engineering—Fabrication Trade			
MEM30405	Certificate III in Engineering—Electrical/Electronic Trade			
MEM30505	Certificate III in Engineering—Technical			
MEM30605	Certificate III in Jewellery Manufacture			
MEM30705	Certificate III in Marine Craft Construction			
MEM30805	Certificate III in Locksmithing			
MEM30905	Certificate III in Boating Services			
MEM31010	Certificate III in Watch and Clock Service and Repair			
MEM40105	Certificate IV in Engineering			
MEM40205	Certificate IV in Boating Services			
MEM50105	Diploma of Engineering—Advanced Trade			
MEM50211	Diploma of Engineering—Technical			
MEM60105	Advanced Diploma of Engineering	Superseded		
MEM60111	Advanced Diploma of Engineering	Funding to be determined		
MSA10107	Certificate I in Manufacturing (Pathways)	Funding to be determined	Yes	Yes
MSA10207	Certificate I in Process Manufacturing		Yes	
MSA20107	Certificate II in Process Manufacturing		Yes	
MSA20208	Certificate II in Manufacturing Technology	Funding to be determined	Yes	Yes
MSA20510	Certificate II in Recreational Vehicle Service and Repair	Funding to be determined	Yes	
MSA20610	Certificate II in Recreational Vehicle Manufacture	Funding to be determined	Yes	
MSA21108	Certificate II in Competitive Manufacturing		Yes	Yes
MSA30107	Certificate III in Process Manufacturing			
MSA30208	Certificate III in Manufacturing Technology			
MSA30309	Certificate III in Surface Preparation and Coating Application			
MSA30510	Certificate III in Recreational Vehicle Service and Repair	Funding to be determined		
MSA31108	Certificate III in Competitive Manufacturing			
MSA40108	Certificate IV in Manufacturing Technology			Yes
MSA41108	Certificate IV in Competitive Manufacturing			
MSA50108	Diploma of Manufacturing Technology			
MSA51108	Diploma of Competitive Manufacturing			
MSA60108	Advanced Diploma of Manufacturing Technology			
MSA61108	Advanced Diploma of Competitive Manufacturing			
MSL20109	Certificate II in Sampling and Measurement		Yes	
MSL30109	Certificate III in Laboratory Skills			
MSL40109	Certificate IV in Laboratory Techniques			
MSL50109	Diploma of Laboratory Technology			
MSL60109	Advanced Diploma of Laboratory Operations			
MSS40111	Certificate IV in Sustainable Operations	Funding to be determined		
MSS40211	Certificate IV in Environmental Monitoring and Technology	Funding to be determined		

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
MSS50111	Diploma of Sustainable Operations	Funding to be determined		
MSS50211	Diploma of Environmental Monitoring and Technology	Funding to be determined		
MTM10107	Certificate I in Meat Processing (Smallgoods)	Superseded	Yes	
MTM10111	Certificate I in Meat Processing (Smallgoods)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
MTM10207	Certificate I in Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	Superseded	Yes	Yes
MTM10211	Certificate I in Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	Funding to be determined	Yes	Yes
MTM20107	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Abattoirs)	Superseded	Yes	
MTM20111	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Abattoirs)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
MTM20207	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Smallgoods)	Superseded	Yes	
MTM20211	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Smallgoods)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
MTM20307	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	Superseded	Yes	
MTM20311	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
MTM20407	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Food Services)	Superseded	Yes	
MTM20411	Certificate II in Meat Processing (Food Services)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
MTM30107	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Boning Room)	Superseded		
MTM30111	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Boning Room)	Funding to be determined		
MTM30207	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Food Services)	Superseded		
MTM30211	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Food Services)	Funding to be determined		
MTM30307	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Meat Safety)	Superseded		
MTM30311	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Meat Safety)	Funding to be determined		
MTM30407	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Rendering)	Superseded		
MTM30411	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Rendering)	Funding to be determined		
MTM30507	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Slaughtering)	Superseded		
MTM30511	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Slaughtering)	Funding to be determined		
MTM30607	Certificate III in Meat Processing (General)	Superseded		
MTM30611	Certificate III in Meat Processing (General)	Funding to be determined		
MTM30807	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	Superseded		
MTM30811	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Retail Butcher)	Funding to be determined		
MTM30907	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Smallgoods—General)	Superseded		
MTM30911	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Smallgoods—General)	Funding to be determined		
MTM31007	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Smallgoods—Manufacture)	Superseded		
MTM31011	Certificate III in Meat Processing (Smallgoods—Manufacture)	Funding to be determined		
MTM40107	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (Leadership)	Superseded		
MTM40111	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (Leadership)	Funding to be determined		
MTM40207	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (Meat Safety)	Superseded		Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
MTM40211	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (Meat Safety)	Funding to be determined		Yes
MTM40307	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (Quality Assurance)	Superseded		
MTM40311	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (Quality Assurance)	Funding to be determined		
MTM40407	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (General)	Superseded		
MTM40411	Certificate IV in Meat Processing (General)	Funding to be determined		
MTM50107	Diploma of Meat Processing	Superseded		Yes
MTM50111	Diploma of Meat Processing	Funding to be determined		Yes
MTM50207	Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	Superseded		Yes
MTM50211	Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	Funding to be determined		Yes
MTM60107	Advanced Diploma of Meat Processing	Superseded		
MTM60111	Advanced Diploma of Meat Processing	Funding to be determined		
NWP10107	Certificate I in Water Sustainability (Superseded by NWP10110)	Superseded	Yes	
NWP10110	Certificate I in Water Sustainability	Funding to be determined	Yes	
NWP20107	Certificate II in Water Operations		Yes	
NWP30107	Certificate III in Water Operations			
NWP40107	Certificate IV in Water Operations			
NWP50107	Diploma of Water Operations			
PMA20108	Certificate II in Process Plant Operations		Yes	
PMA30108	Certificate III in Process Plant Operations			
PMA40108	Certificate IV in Process Plant Technology			
PMA50108	Diploma of Process Plant Technology			
PMA60108	Advanced Diploma of Process Plant Technology			
PMB20107	Certificate II in Polymer Processing		Yes	
PMB30107	Certificate III in Polymer Processing			
PMB40107	Certificate IV in Polymer Technology			Yes
PMB50107	Diploma of Polymer Technology			Yes
PMB60107	Advanced Diploma of Polymer Technology			
PMC20110	Certificate II in Manufactured Mineral Products		Yes	
PMC30110	Certificate III in Manufactured Mineral Products			
PMC40110	Certificate IV in Manufactured Mineral Products			
PMC50110	Diploma of Manufactured Mineral Products			
PMC60110	Advanced Diploma of Manufactured Mineral Products			
PRM10104	Certificate I in Asset Maintenance (Cleaning Operations)		Yes	
PRM20104	Certificate II in Asset Maintenance (Cleaning Operations)		Yes	
PRM20406	Certificate II in Asset Maintenance (Fire Protection Equipment)		Yes	
PRM20509	Certificate II in Asset Maintenance (Waste Management)		Yes	
PRM20604	Certificate II in Asset Maintenance (Carpet Cleaning)		Yes	
PRM30104	Certificate III in Asset Maintenance (Cleaning Operations)			
PRM30204	Certificate III in Asset Maintenance (Pest Management—Technical)			
PRM30406	Certificate III in Asset Maintenance (Fire Protection Equipment)			
PRM30509	Certificate III in Asset Maintenance (Waste Management)			
PRM30604	Certificate III in Asset Maintenance (Carpet Cleaning)			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
PRM40109	Certificate IV in Asset Maintenance (Cleaning Management)			
PRM40209	Certificate IV in Asset Maintenance (Pest Management)			
PRM40509	Certificate IV in Asset Maintenance (Waste Management)			
PRM40704	Certificate IV in Asset Maintenance (Fire Safety Systems Inspection)			
PSP20104	Certificate II in Government		Yes	
PSP30104	Certificate III in Government			
PSP30204	Certificate III in Government (Border Protection)			
PSP30304	Certificate III in Government (Court Compliance)			
PSP30404	Certificate III in Government (Land Administration)			
PSP30504	Certificate III in Government (Security)			
PSP30604	Certificate III in Government (School Support Services)			
PSP30704	Certificate III in School Support Services			
PSP40104	Certificate IV in Government			
PSP40204	Certificate IV in Government (Border Protection)			
PSP40304	Certificate IV in Government (Court Compliance)			
PSP40404	Certificate IV in Government (Court Services)			
PSP40504	Certificate IV in Government (Financial Services)			
PSP40604	Certificate IV in Government (Fraud Control)			
PSP40804	Certificate IV in Government (Injury Claims Administration)			
PSP41004	Certificate IV in Government (Land Administration)			
PSP41104	Certificate IV in Government (Occupational Health & Safety)			
PSP41204	Certificate IV in Government (Project Management)			
PSP41304	Certificate IV in Government (Procurement)	Superseded		
PSP41404	Certificate IV in Government (Statutory Compliance)			Yes
PSP41504	Certificate IV in Government (Investigation)			Yes
PSP41604	Certificate IV in Government (Security)			
PSP41704	Certificate IV in Government (Personnel Security)			
PSP41804	Certificate IV in Government (Road Transport Compliance)			
PSP41904	Certificate IV in Government (School Support Services)			
PSP42010	Certificate IV in School Support Services			
PSP42410	Certificate IV in Government (Procurement and Contracting)			Yes
PSP50104	Diploma of Government			
PSP50604	Diploma of Government (Fraud Control)			
PSP50704	Diploma of Government (Service Delivery)			
PSP50804	Diploma of Government (Human Resources)			
PSP50904	Diploma of Government (Injury Management)			
PSP51104	Diploma of Government (Management)			
PSP51204	Diploma of Government (Occupational Health & Safety)			
PSP51304	Diploma of Government (Project Management)			
PSP51604	Diploma of Government (Recordkeeping)	Superseded		
PSP51704	Diploma of Government (Investigation)			Yes
PSP51804	Diploma of Government (Security)			
PSP51904	Diploma of Government (Workplace Inspection)			
PSP52008	Diploma of Government (Rail Safety Regulation)			
PSP52310	Diploma of Translating			
PSP52410	Diploma of Interpreting			
PSP52510	Diploma of Government (Procurement and Contracting)			Yes
PSP60304	Advanced Diploma of Government (Financial Management)			
PSP60404	Advanced Diploma of Government (Human Resources)			
PSP60504	Advanced Diploma of Government (Management)			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
PSP60604	Advanced Diploma of Government (Occupational Health & Safety)			
PSP60904	Advanced Diploma of Government (Workplace Inspection)			
PSP61010	Advanced Diploma of Translating			
PSP61110	Advanced Diploma of Interpreting			
PUA10106	Certificate I in Public Safety (Defence Force Cadets)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA20110	Certificate II in Public Safety (Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Community Policing)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA20200	Certificate II in Public Safety (Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Police Liaison)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA20310	Certificate II in Public Safety (Police Liaison)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA20410	Certificate II in Public Safety (SES Rescue)		Yes	
PUA20510	Certificate II in Public Safety (SES Operations)		Yes	
PUA20601	Certificate II in Public Safety (Firefighting and Emergency Operations)		Yes	
PUA20701	Certificate II in Public Safety (Firefighting Operations)		Yes	
PUA20810	Certificate II in Public Safety (Explosive Ordnance)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA20910	Certificate II in Public Safety (Communications Operations)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA21010	Certificate II in Public Safety (Aquatic Rescue)		Yes	
PUA21110	Certificate II in Public Safety (Military Skills)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA21210	Certificate II in Public Safety (Explosive Ordnance Manufacture)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
PUA21310	Certificate II in Public Safety (SES)		Yes	
PUA30410	Certificate III in Public Safety (SES Rescue)			
PUA31310	Certificate III in Public Safety (Aquatic Search and Rescue)			
PUA41004	Certificate IV in Public Safety (Leadership)			
PUA50904	Diploma of Public Safety (Search and Rescue—Coordination)			
PUA51004	Diploma of Public Safety Community Safety)			
PUA51709	Diploma of Public Safety (Test and Evaluation)	Funding to be determined		
PUA60110	Advanced Diploma of Public Safety (Emergency Management)			
PUA60604	Advanced Diploma of Public Safety (Search and Rescue—Management)			
PUA60704	Advanced Diploma of Public Safety Community Safety)			
RGR10108	Certificate I in Racing (Stablehand)		Yes	Yes
RGR20108	Certificate II in Racing (Stablehand)		Yes	
RGR20208	Certificate II in Racing (Kennelhand)		Yes	Yes
RGR20308	Certificate II in Racing Services (Racing Administration)		Yes	
RGR20408	Certificate II in Racing Services (Track Maintenance)		Yes	
RGR30108	Certificate III in Racing (Trackrider)			
RGR30208	Certificate III in Racing (Advanced Stablehand)			
RGR30308	Certificate III in Racing Services (Racing Administration)			
RGR30408	Certificate III in Racing Services (Cadet Steward)			
RGR40108	Certificate IV in Racing (Racehorse Trainer)			Yes
RGR40208	Certificate IV in Racing (Jockey)			Yes
RGR40608	Certificate IV in Racing Services (Steward)			Yes
RGR50108	Diploma of Racing (Racehorse Trainer)			Yes
RII10109	Certificate I in Resources and Infrastructure Operations		Yes	



Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
RII20109	Certificate II in Resources and Infrastructure Work Preparation	Superseded	Yes	
RII20111	Certificate II in Resources and Infrastructure Work Preparation	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII20209	Certificate II in Surface Extraction Operations	Superseded	Yes	
RII20211	Certificate II in Surface Extraction Operations	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII20309	Certificate II in Underground Coal Mining	Superseded	Yes	
RII20311	Certificate II in Underground Coal Mining	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII20409	Certificate II in Underground Metalliferous Mining	Superseded	Yes	Yes
RII20411	Certificate II in Underground Metalliferous Mining	Funding to be determined	Yes	Yes
RII20509	Certificate II in Resource Processing	Superseded	Yes	
RII20511	Certificate II in Resource Processing	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII20609	Certificate II in Mining Field/Exploration Operations	Superseded	Yes	
RII20611	Certificate II in Mining Field/Exploration Operations	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII20709	Certificate II in Civil Construction		Yes	
RII20809	Certificate II in Bituminous Surfacing		Yes	
RII20909	Certificate II in Drilling Operations	Superseded	Yes	
RII20911	Certificate II in Drilling Operations	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII21009	Certificate II in Drilling Oil/Gas (Off shore)	Superseded	Yes	
RII21011	Certificate II in Drilling Oil/Gas (Off shore)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII21109	Certificate II in Drilling Oil/Gas (On shore)	Superseded	Yes	
RII21111	Certificate II in Drilling Oil/Gas (On shore)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
RII30109	Certificate III in Surface Extraction Operations	Superseded		
RII30111	Certificate III in Surface Extraction Operations	Funding to be determined		
RII30209	Certificate III in Underground Coal Operations			
RII30309	Certificate III in Underground Metalliferous Mining	Superseded		
RII30311	Certificate III in Underground Metalliferous Mining	Funding to be determined		
RII30409	Certificate III in Resource Processing	Superseded		
RII30411	Certificate III in Resource Processing	Funding to be determined		
RII30509	Certificate III in Mining Exploration	Superseded		
RII30511	Certificate III in Mining Exploration	Funding to be determined		
RII30609	Certificate III in Small Mining Operations	Superseded		
RII30611	Certificate III in Small Mining Operations	Funding to be determined		
RII30709	Certificate III in Mine Emergency Response and Rescue	Superseded		
RII30711	Certificate III in Mine Emergency Response and Rescue	Funding to be determined		
RII30809	Certificate III in Civil Construction Plant Operations			
RII30909	Certificate III in Civil Construction			
RII31009	Certificate III in Bituminous Surfacing			
RII31109	Certificate III in Bridge Construction and Maintenance			
RII31209	Certificate III in Civil Foundations			
RII31309	Certificate III in Pipe Laying			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
RII31409	Certificate III in Road Construction and Maintenance			
RII31509	Certificate III in Road Marking			
RII31609	Certificate III in Trenchless Technology	Superseded		
RII31611	Certificate III in Trenchless Technology	Funding to be determined		
RII31709	Certificate III in Tunnel Construction			
RII31809	Certificate III in Drilling Operations			
RII31909	Certificate III in Drilling Oil/Gas (Off shore)			
RII32009	Certificate III in Drilling Oil/Gas (On shore)			
RII32109	Certificate III in Timber Bridge Construction and Maintenance			
RII40109	Certificate IV in Surface Extraction Operations	Superseded		
RII40111	Certificate IV in Surface Extraction Operations	Funding to be determined		
RII40209	Certificate IV in Surface Coal Mining (Open Cut Examiner)	Superseded		
RII40211	Certificate IV in Surface Coal Mining (Open Cut Examiner)	Funding to be determined		
RII40309	Certificate IV in Metalliferous Mining Operations (Underground)	Superseded		
RII40311	Certificate IV in Metalliferous Mining Operations (Underground)	Funding to be determined		
RII40409	Certificate IV in Underground Coal Operations	Superseded		
RII40411	Certificate IV in Underground Coal Operations	Funding to be determined		
RII40509	Certificate IV in Resource Processing	Superseded		
RII40511	Certificate IV in Resource Processing	Funding to be determined		
RII40609	Certificate IV in Civil Construction Operations			
RII40709	Certificate IV in Civil Construction Supervision			
RII40809	Certificate IV in Civil Construction Design			
RII40909	Certificate IV in Drilling Operations			
RII41009	Certificate IV in Drilling Oil/Gas (Off shore)			
RII41109	Certificate IV in Drilling Oil/Gas (On shore)			
RII50109	Diploma of Surface Operations Management			
RII50209	Diploma of Underground Metalliferous Mining Management			
RII50309	Diploma of Minerals Processing			
RII50409	Diploma of Civil Construction Management			
RII50509	Diploma of Civil Construction Design			
RII50609	Diploma of Drilling Operations	Superseded		
RII50611	Diploma of Drilling Operations	Funding to be determined		
RII50709	Diploma of Drilling Oil/Gas (Off shore)	Superseded		
RII50711	Diploma of Drilling Oil/Gas (Off shore)	Funding to be determined		
RII50809	Diploma of Drilling Oil/Gas (On shore)	Superseded		
RII50811	Diploma of Drilling Oil/Gas (On shore)	Funding to be determined		
RII50909	Diploma of Underground Coal Mining Management			
RII60109	Advanced Diploma of Metalliferous Mining			
RII60209	Advanced Diploma of Extractive Industries Management			
RII60309	Advanced Diploma of Underground Coal Mining Management			
RII60409	Advanced Diploma of Drilling Management			
RII60509	Advanced Diploma of Civil Construction Design			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
RII60609	Advanced Diploma of Civil Construction			
RII60709	Advanced Diploma of Surface Coal Mining			
SFI10104	Certificate I in Seafood Industry (Aquaculture)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI10111	Certificate I in Aquaculture	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI10204	Certificate I in Seafood Industry (Fishing Operations)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI10211	Certificate I in Fishing Operations	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI10504	Certificate I in Seafood Industry (Seafood Processing)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI10511	Certificate I in Seafood Processing	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI20104	Certificate II in Seafood Industry (Aquaculture)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI20111	Certificate II in Aquaculture	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI20204	Certificate II in Seafood Industry (Fishing Operations)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI20211	Certificate II in Fishing Operations	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI20404	Certificate II in Seafood Industry (Fisheries Compliance Support)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI20411	Certificate II in Fisheries Compliance Support	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI20504	Certificate II in Seafood Industry (Seafood Processing)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI20511	Certificate II in Seafood Processing	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI20604	Certificate II in Seafood Industry (Seafood Sales and Distribution)	Superseded	Yes	
SFI20611	Certificate II in Seafood Industry (Sales and Distribution)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SFI30104	Certificate III in Seafood Industry (Aquaculture)	Superseded		
SFI30111	Certificate III in Aquaculture	Funding to be determined		
SFI30211	Certificate III in Fishing Operations	Funding to be determined		
SFI30311	Certificate III in Seafood Industry (Environmental Management Support)			
SFI30404	Certificate III in Seafood Industry (Fisheries Compliance)	Superseded		
SFI30411	Certificate III in Fisheries Compliance	Funding to be determined		
SFI30504	Certificate III in Seafood Industry (Seafood Processing)	Superseded		
SFI30511	Certificate III in Seafood Processing	Funding to be determined		
SFI30604	Certificate III in Seafood Industry (Seafood Sales and Distribution)	Superseded		
SFI30611	Certificate III in Seafood Industry (Sales and Distribution)	Funding to be determined		
SFI31204	Certificate III in Seafood Industry (Fishing Operations)	Superseded		
SFI40104	Certificate IV in Seafood Industry (Aquaculture)	Superseded		Yes
SFI40111	Certificate IV in Aquaculture	Funding to be determined		Yes
SFI40211	Certificate IV in Fishing Operations	Funding to be determined		
SFI40311	Certificate IV in Seafood Industry (Environmental Management)			
SFI40404	Certificate IV in Seafood Industry (Fisheries Compliance)	Superseded		

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
SFI40411	Certificate IV in Fisheries Compliance	Funding to be determined		
SFI40504	Certificate IV in Seafood Industry (Seafood Processing)	Superseded		Yes
SFI40511	Certificate IV in Seafood Processing	Funding to be determined		Yes
SFI40604	Certificate IV in Seafood Industry (Seafood Sales and Distribution)	Superseded		
SFI40611	Certificate IV in Seafood Industry Sales and Distribution	Funding to be determined		
SFI41204	Certificate IV in Seafood Industry (Fishing Operations)	Superseded		
SFI50104	Diploma of Seafood Industry (Aquaculture)	Superseded		Yes
SFI50111	Diploma of Aquaculture	Funding to be determined		Yes
SFI50204	Diploma of Seafood Industry (Fishing Operations)	Superseded		
SFI50211	Diploma of Fishing Operations	Funding to be determined		
SFI50404	Diploma of Seafood Industry (Fisheries Compliance)	Superseded		
SFI50411	Diploma of Fisheries Compliance	Funding to be determined		
SFI50504	Diploma of Seafood Industry (Seafood Processing)	Superseded		
SFI50504	Diploma of Seafood Industry (Seafood Processing)	Superseded		
SFI50511	Diploma of Seafood Processing	Funding to be determined		
SFL20110	Certificate II in Floristry (Assistant)		Yes	
SFL30110	Certificate III in Floristry			
SFL40110	Certificate IV in Floristry			Yes
SIB20110	Certificate II in Retail Make-up and Skin Care		Yes	
SIB20210	Certificate II in Nail Technology		Yes	
SIB30110	Certificate III in Beauty Services			
SIB40110	Certificate IV in Beauty Therapy			Yes
SIB50110	Diploma of Beauty Therapy			Yes
SIB50210	Diploma of Salon Management			
SIF20108	Certificate II in Funeral Operations		Yes	
SIF30108	Certificate III in Cemetery and Crematorium Operations			
SIF30208	Certificate III in Gravedigging, Grounds and Maintenance			
SIF30308	Certificate III in Funeral Operations			
SIF40108	Certificate IV in Funeral Services			
SIF40208	Certificate IV in Embalming			
SIF50108	Diploma of Mortuary Management	Funding to be determined		
SIH20111	Certificate II in Hairdressing	Funding to be determined	Yes	
SIH30111	Certificate III in Hairdressing	Funding to be determined		
SIH40111	Certificate IV in Hairdressing	Funding to be determined		
SIR10107	Certificate I in Retail Services		Yes	
SIR20107	Certificate II in Community Pharmacy		Yes	
SIR20207	Certificate II in Retail		Yes	
SIR20307	Certificate II in Wholesale		Yes	
SIR30107	Certificate III in Community Pharmacy			
SIR30207	Certificate III in Retail			
SIR30307	Certificate III in Wholesale			
SIR40107	Certificate IV in Community Pharmacy			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
SIR40207	Certificate IV in Retail Management			
SIR50107	Diploma of Retail Management			
SIR50207	Diploma of Visual Merchandising			Yes
SIS10110	Certificate I in Sport and Recreation		Yes	
SIS20110	Certificate II in Community Activities		Yes	
SIS20210	Certificate II in Outdoor Recreation		Yes	
SIS20310	Certificate II in Sport and Recreation		Yes	
SIS20410	Certificate II in Sport Career Oriented Participation		Yes	
SIS20510	Certificate II in Sport Coaching		Yes	
SIS30110	Certificate III in Aquatics			
SIS30210	Certificate III in Community Activity Programs			
SIS30310	Certificate III in Fitness			
SIS30410	Certificate III in Outdoor Recreation			
SIS30510	Certificate III in Sport and Recreation			
SIS30610	Certificate III in Sport Career Oriented Participation			
SIS30710	Certificate III in Sport Coaching			
SIS40110	Certificate IV in Community Recreation			
SIS40210	Certificate IV in Fitness			
SIS40310	Certificate IV in Outdoor Recreation			
SIS40410	Certificate IV in Sport and Recreation			
SIS40510	Certificate IV in Sport Coaching			Yes
SIS40610	Certificate IV in Sport Development			Yes
SIS50110	Diploma of Facility Management			Yes
SIS50210	Diploma of Fitness			Yes
SIS50310	Diploma of Outdoor Recreation			Yes
SIS50410	Diploma of Sport and Recreation Administration			Yes
SIS50610	Diploma of Sport Development			Yes
SIT10107	Certificate I in Tourism (Australian Indigenous Culture)		Yes	
SIT10207	Certificate I in Hospitality		Yes	
SIT10307	Certificate I in Hospitality (Kitchen Operations)		Yes	
SIT20107	Certificate II in Tourism		Yes	
SIT20207	Certificate II in Hospitality		Yes	
SIT20307	Certificate II in Hospitality (Kitchen Operations)		Yes	
SIT20407	Certificate II in Hospitality (Asian Cookery)		Yes	
SIT20509	Certificate II in Holiday Parks and Resorts		Yes	
SIT30107	Certificate III in Tourism			
SIT30207	Certificate III in Tourism (Retail Travel Sales)			
SIT30307	Certificate III in Tourism (Tour Wholesaling)			
SIT30407	Certificate III in Tourism (Visitor Information Services)			
SIT30507	Certificate III in Tourism (Guiding)			
SIT30607	Certificate III in Events			
SIT30707	Certificate III in Hospitality			
SIT30807	Certificate III in Hospitality (Commercial Cookery)			
SIT30907	Certificate III in Hospitality (Asian Cookery)			
SIT31007	Certificate III in Hospitality (Catering Operations)			
SIT31107	Certificate III in Hospitality (Patisserie)			Yes
SIT31209	Certificate III in Holiday Parks and Resorts			
SIT40107	Certificate IV in Tourism (Guiding)			Yes
SIT40207	Certificate IV in Tourism			
SIT40307	Certificate IV in Hospitality			
SIT40407	Certificate IV in Hospitality (Commercial Cookery)			Yes
SIT40507	Certificate IV in Hospitality (Asian Cookery)			
SIT40607	Certificate IV in Hospitality (Catering Operations)			
SIT40707	Certificate IV in Hospitality (Patisserie)			Yes

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
SIT40809	Certificate IV in Holiday Parks and Resorts			Yes
SIT50107	Diploma of Tourism			Yes
SIT50207	Diploma of Events			Yes
SIT50307	Diploma of Hospitality			
SIT50409	Diploma of Holiday Parks and Resorts			
SIT60107	Advanced Diploma of Tourism			Yes
SIT60207	Advanced Diploma of Events			Yes
SIT60307	Advanced Diploma of Hospitality			Yes
TAE40110	Certificate IV in Training and Assessment			
TAE50310	Diploma of International Education Services			
TDM10107	Certificate I in Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations)		Yes	
TDM10207	Certificate I in Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations—Shore-based Linesperson)		Yes	
TDM20107	Certificate II in Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations)		Yes	
TDM20207	Certificate II in Transport and Distribution (Marine Engine Driving—Grade 3)		Yes	
TDM20307	Certificate II in Transport and Distribution (Coastal Maritime Operations—Coxswain)		Yes	
TDM30107	Certificate III in Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations)			
TDM30207	Certificate III in Transport and Distribution (Marine Engine Driving—Grade 2)			
TDM30307	Certificate III in Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations—Integrated Rating)			
TDM30407	Certificate III in Transport and Distribution (Coastal Maritime Operations—Master Class 5)			
TDM40107	Certificate IV in Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations)			
TDM40207	Certificate IV in Transport and Distribution (Marine Engine Driving—Grade 1)			
TDM40307	Certificate IV in Transport and Distribution (Coastal Maritime Operations—Master Class 4)			
TDM50107	Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations)			
TDM50207	Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Marine Engineering—Engineer Watchkeeper)			
TDM50307	Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations—Deck Watchkeeper)			
TDM50407	Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Coastal Marine Engineering—Engineer Class 3)			
TDM50507	Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Coastal Maritime Operations—Master Class 3)			
TDM60107	Advanced Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations)			
TDM60207	Advanced Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Marine Engineering Class)			
TDM60307	Advanced Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Marine Engineering Class)			
TDM60407	Advanced Diploma of Transport and Distribution (Maritime Operations—Master Unlimited)			
THC20104	Certificate II in Recreational Vehicle Manufacturing	Superseded	Yes	
THC20204	Certificate II in Recreational Vehicle Servicing	Superseded	Yes	
THC30204	Certificate III in Recreational Vehicle Servicing	Superseded		
TLI10410	Certificate I in Transport and Logistics (Rail Operations)		Yes	

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
TLI11210	Certificate I in Warehousing Operations		Yes	
TLI11310	Certificate I in Logistics		Yes	
TLI20410	Certificate II in Transport and Logistics (Rail Operations)		Yes	
TLI21210	Certificate II in Driving Operations		Yes	
TLI21310	Certificate II in Rail Infrastructure		Yes	
TLI21410	Certificate II in Stevedoring		Yes	
TLI21510	Certificate II in Furniture Removal		Yes	
TLI21610	Certificate II in Warehousing Operations		Yes	
TLI21710	Certificate II in Road Transport Yard Operations (Freight Handler)		Yes	
TLI21810	Certificate II in Logistics		Yes	
TLI30410	Certificate III in Transport and Logistics (Rail Operations)			
TLI31210	Certificate III in Driving Operations			
TLI31310	Certificate III in International Freight Forwarding (Operator)			
TLI31410	Certificate III in Rail Driving			
TLI31510	Certificate III in Stevedoring			
TLI31610	Certificate III in Warehousing Operations			
TLI31710	Certificate III in Mobile Crane Operations			
TLI31810	Certificate III in Rail Track Surfacing			
TLI31910	Certificate III in Mechanical Rail Signalling			
TLI32110	Certificate III in Rail Structures			
TLI32310	Certificate III in Electric Passenger Train Guard			
TLI32410	Certificate III in Logistics			
TLI32510	Certificate III in Rail Infrastructure			
TLI40410	Certificate IV in Transport and Logistics (Rail Operations)			
TLI40710	Certificate IV in Transport and Logistics (Rail Infrastructure)			
TLI41210	Certificate IV in Transport and Logistics (Road Transport—Car Driving Instruction)			
TLI41310	Certificate IV in Transport and Logistics (Road Transport—Heavy Vehicle Driving Instruction)			
TLI41410	Certificate IV in Transport and Logistics (Road Transport—Motorcycle Riding Instruction)			
TLI41510	Certificate IV in Materiel Logistics			
TLI41610	Certificate IV in International Freight Forwarding (Senior Operator)			
TLI41710	Certificate IV in Stevedoring Operations			
TLI41810	Certificate IV in Warehousing Operations			
TLI41910	Certificate IV in Mobile Crane Operations			
TLI42010	Certificate IV in Logistics			
TLI50210	Diploma of Materiel Logistics			
TLI50310	Diploma of International Freight Forwarding			
TLI50410	Diploma of Logistics			
TLI50510	Diploma of Deployment Logistics			
TLI60110	Advanced Diploma of Materiel Logistics			
TLI60210	Advanced Diploma of Deployment Logistics			
TLIPC107	Certificate I in Transport and Logistics (Pathways)	Superseded	Yes	
TLIPC110	Certificate I in Transport and Logistics (Pathways)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UEE10110	Certificate I in ElectroComms Skills		Yes	
UEE20107	Certificate II in Air-conditioning Split Systems	Superseded	Yes	
UEE20111	Certificate II in Split Air-conditioning and Heat Pump Systems	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UEE20207	Certificate II in Business Equipment Servicing		Yes	
UEE20407	Certificate II in Winding and Assembly		Yes	

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
UEE20507	Certificate II in Computer Assembly and Repair	Superseded	Yes	
UEE20510	Certificate II in Computer Assembly and Repair	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UEE20607	Certificate II in Custom Electronics Assembly and Setup		Yes	
UEE20707	Certificate II in Data and Voice Communications		Yes	
UEE20810	Certificate II in Electrical Wholesaling		Yes	
UEE20907	Certificate II in Electronic Assembly		Yes	
UEE21007	Certificate II in Fire Alarms Servicing		Yes	
UEE21107	Certificate II in Gaming Machines Servicing		Yes	
UEE21207	Certificate II in Antennae Equipment		Yes	
UEE21310	Certificate II in Remote Area Essential Service		Yes	
UEE21407	Certificate II in Remote Area Power Supply Maintenance		Yes	
UEE21510	Certificate II in Renewable Energy		Yes	
UEE21610	Certificate II in Security Assembly and Setup		Yes	
UEE21707	Certificate II in Technical Support	Superseded	Yes	
UEE21710	Certificate II in Technical Support	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UEE21810	Certificate II in Appliance Servicing—Refrigerants		Yes	Yes
UEE21907	Certificate II in Electronics	Superseded	Yes	
UEE21910	Certificate II in Electronics	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UEE22010	Certificate II in Electrotechnology (Career Start)		Yes	
UEE22107	Certificate II in Sustainable Energy (Career Start)		Yes	
UEE30107	Certificate III in Business Equipment			
UEE30207	Certificate III in Computer Systems Equipment	Superseded		
UEE30210	Certificate III in Computer Systems Equipment	Funding to be determined		
UEE30310	Certificate III in Custom Electronics Installations			
UEE30407	Certificate III in Data and Voice Communications		Yes	
UEE30510	Certificate III in Appliance Servicing	Superseded		
UEE30607	Certificate III in Electrical Machine Repair			
UEE30707	Certificate III in Switchgear and Control Gear			
UEE30807	Certificate III in Electrotechnology Electrician		Yes	
UEE30910	Certificate III in Electronics and Communications			
UEE31007	Certificate III in Fire Protection Control			
UEE31107	Certificate III in Gaming Electronics			Yes
UEE31210	Certificate III in Instrumentation and Control			
UEE31307	Certificate III in Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning	Superseded		
UEE31410	Certificate III in Security Equipment			
UEE31507	Certificate III in Rail—Communications and Networks		Yes	
UEE31710	Certificate III in Hazardous areas—Electrician			
UEE31810	Certificate III in Hazardous areas—Instrumentation			
UEE31910	Certificate III in Explosion-protected equipment overhaul			
UEE32010	Certificate III in Renewable Energy ELV			
UEE321111	Certificate III in Appliance Service	Funding to be determined		
UEE32211	Certificate III in Air-conditioning and Refrigeration	Funding to be determined		
UEE40110	Certificate IV in Computer Systems			Yes
UEE40210	Certificate IV in Electrical-Data and Voice Communications		Yes	
UEE40310	Certificate IV in Electrical Installation Inspection and Audits			
UEE40410	Certificate IV in Electrical—Instrumentation			
UEE40510	Certificate IV in Electrical—Air-Conditioning Systems			
UEE40610	Certificate IV in Electrotechnology—Systems Electrician			Yes
UEE40710	Certificate IV in Electronics and Communications			Yes



Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
UEE40810	Certificate IV in Electrical—Fire Protection Control Systems			
UEE40910	Certificate IV in Industrial Electronics and Control			
UEE41010	Certificate IV in Energy Management and Control			
UEE41110	Certificate IV in Electrical—Lift Systems			
UEE41210	Certificate IV in Electrical—Rail Signalling			
UEE41310	Certificate IV in Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Servicing	Superseded		Yes
UEE41510	Certificate IV in Video and Audio Systems			Yes
UEE41610	Certificate IV in Renewable Energy			
UEE41710	Certificate IV in Rail—Communications and Network Systems			
UEE41910	Certificate IV in Electrical—Renewable Energy			
UEE42010	Certificate IV in Electrical—Photovoltaic Systems			
UEE42110	Certificate IV in Electrotechnology-Electrical Contracting			
UEE42210	Certificate IV in Instrumentation and Control			
UEE42310	Certificate IV in Air-conditioning Energy Management and Control	Superseded		
UEE42410	Certificate IV in Hazardous areas—Industrial control			
UEE42510	Certificate IV in Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Systems	Superseded		Yes
UEE42610	Certificate IV in Hazardous areas—Electrical			
UEE42711	Certificate IV in Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Servicing	Funding to be determined		Yes
UEE42811	Certificate IV in Air-conditioning Systems Energy Management and Control	Funding to be determined		
UEE42911	Certificate IV in Refrigeration and Air-conditioning Systems	Funding to be determined		Yes
UEE50110	Diploma of Computer Systems Engineering			Yes
UEE50210	Diploma of Electrical and Instrumentation			
UEE50310	Diploma of Electrical and Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning	Superseded		
UEE50410	Diploma of Electrical Engineering		Yes	Yes
UEE50510	Diploma of Electronics and Communications Engineering			Yes
UEE50610	Diploma of Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Engineering	Superseded		
UEE50710	Diploma of Renewable Energy Engineering			
UEE50810	Diploma of Research and Development			
UEE50910	Diploma of Industrial Electronics and Control Engineering			
UEE51010	Diploma of Instrumentation and Control Engineering			
UEE51111	Diploma of Engineering Technology—Refrigeration and Air-conditioning	Funding to be determined		
UEE51211	Diploma of Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Engineering	Funding to be determined		
UEE60110	Advanced Diploma of Electrical Engineering	Superseded		Yes
UEE60210	Advanced Diploma of Electronics and Communications Engineering			Yes
UEE60410	Advanced Diploma of Computer Systems Engineering			Yes
UEE60610	Advanced Diploma of Industrial Electronics and Control Engineering			
UEE60710	Advanced Diploma of Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Engineering	Superseded		Yes
UEE60910	Advanced Diploma of Renewable Energy Engineering			
UEE61110	Advanced Diploma of Automated Systems Maintenance Engineering			
UEE61210	Advanced Diploma of Engineering—Explosion protection			
UEE61307	Advanced Diploma of Electrical—Technology	Superseded	Yes	Yes
UEE61410	Advanced Diploma of Engineering—Explosion protection—Industrial control			

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
UEE61510	Advanced Diploma of Instrumentation and Control Engineering			
UEE61710	Advanced Diploma of Engineering Technology—Electronic			
UEE61810	Advanced Diploma of Engineering Technology—Computer Systems			
UEE61910	Advanced Diploma of Engineering Technology—Refrigeration and Air-conditioning	Superseded		Yes
UEE62010	Advanced Diploma of Engineering Technology—Renewable Energy			
UEE62110	Advanced Diploma of Engineering Technology—Electrical	Funding to be determined	Yes	Yes
UEE62211	Advanced Diploma of Electrical—Engineering	Funding to be determined		Yes
UEE62311	Advanced Diploma of Electrical Engineering—Coal Mining	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UEE62411	Advanced Diploma of Engineering Technology—Air-conditioning and Refrigeration	Funding to be determined		Yes
UEE62511	Advanced Diploma of Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Engineering	Funding to be determined		Yes
UEG10106	Certificate I in Utilities Industry Operations		Yes	
UEG20106	Certificate II in Utilities Industry Operations		Yes	
UEG30106	Certificate III in Gas Industry Operations			
UEG40106	Certificate IV in Gas Industry Operations			
UEG40206	Certificate IV in Gas Industry Transmission Pipeline			
UEG50106	Diploma of Gas Industry Operations			
UEG60106	Advanced Diploma of Gas Industry Operations			
UEP20106	Certificate II in ESI Generation (Operations Support)	Superseded	Yes	
UEP20110	Certificate II in ESI Generation (Operations Support)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UEP30106	Certificate III in ESI Generation (Systems Operations)			
UEP30206	Certificate III in ESI Generation (Operations)			
UEP40106	Certificate IV in ESI Generation (Systems Operations)			
UEP40206	Certificate IV in ESI Generation (Operations)			
UEP40306	Certificate IV in ESI Generation Maintenance (Mechanical)			
UEP40406	Certificate IV in ESI Generation Maintenance (Fabrication)			
UEP40506	Certificate IV in ESI Generation Maintenance (Electrical/Electronic)			
UEP50106	Diploma of ESI Generation (Systems Operations)			
UEP50206	Diploma of ESI Generation (Operations)			
UEP50306	Diploma of ESI Generation (Maintenance)			
UEP50406	Diploma of ESI Generation (Electrical/Electronic)			
UET20109	Certificate II in ESI—Vegetation Control	Superseded	Yes	
UET20110	Certificate II in ESI—Vegetation Control	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UET20209	Certificate II in ESI—Transmission Line Assembly		Yes	
UET20511	Certificate II in National Broadband Network Cabling (Electricity Supply Industry Assets)	Funding to be determined	Yes	
UET30109	Certificate III in ESI—Transmission		Yes	
UET30209	Certificate III in ESI—Distribution		Yes	
UET30309	Certificate III in ESI—Rail Traction		Yes	
UET30409	Certificate III in ESI—Cable Jointing		Yes	
UET40109	Certificate IV in ESI—Power Systems		Yes	
UET40209	Certificate IV in ESI—Substation		Yes	
UET40309	Certificate IV in ESI—Network Infrastructure		Yes	
UET50109	Diploma of ESI—Power Systems		Yes	

Course Code	Course	Course Status	Fee Free Courses	TAFE SA Only
UET60109	Advanced Diploma of ESI—Power Systems		Yes	
WRH20109	Certificate II in Hairdressing	Superseded	Yes	
WRH30109	Certificate III in Hairdressing	Superseded		
WRH40109	Certificate IV in Hairdressing	Superseded		

**Mr PISONI:** It is of concern that there is no transparent time line for reduction in public subsidies or this underpinning corporate support. Perhaps the minister could elaborate on that in his response to the second reading speeches.

Obviously, our private providers deliver recognised VET training with the same salaries as TAFE; however, they do not enjoy the same economy of scale, benefits, the enormous subsidies, or the underpinning of the public sector corporate support. This is an issue for all small businesses. Twenty years ago there were many more small businesses that operated in South Australia, such as small supermarket chains. I can remember that Tom the Cheap on John Street in Salisbury was one of the very—

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr PISONI:** Another one in Gawler, did you say? Tom the Cheap was very, very popular. I can remember those ads on television as well. I think they almost had weekly talkback radio debates about how annoying they were but they were effective. Of course, as we saw the expansion of Coles and Woolworths we saw many of those smaller operators not being able to compete.

We also saw that in the furniture industry where many furniture businesses were small family businesses and then the large companies from the Eastern States came over (whether they be Nick Scali or Harvey Norman or whatever) with much greater ability to get their message out. They used economies of scale to always have something in stock and, of course, always be able to sell it at a better price.

It is ironic that many of the smaller providers have raised with me their concern about the corporate conglomerate, if you like, that TAFE will become with its unfair advantage of higher subsidies for courses compared to the smaller businesses. The smaller operators here in South Australia are actually at a market disadvantage yet if you listen to the AEU and the correspondence that they have been sending to members of parliament they would lead you to believe that TAFE is at risk from the small providers because of the competition.

I would not like to think that any organisation, particularly one the size of TAFE, was going to be damaged because of competition. I would have thought that any organisation that stood by the services it provided and that stood by the quality and the delivery of those services would relish the ability to take on competitors, particularly with such an advantage as government funding.

We hope to see TAFE become responsive to industry needs and to become more flexible with when it begins courses and how it constructs those courses. I think that is important; it is important for the future workforce and it is important for TAFE to be competitive. As and when the economy picks up, it will not be the size of the subsidy that will matter as to whether TAFE will survive or not, it will be how quickly and effectively they can deliver their services.

Private providers must also bear the heavy cost of ever-increasing compliance, administration and reporting. We know that with every business red tape and bureaucracy is a cost. We need to ensure that we have a strong and vibrant VET business community here in South Australia, so we need to ensure that we have strong auditing in place so that we can stand by our product as South Australians encouraging those interstate, overseas or even those living here to stay and conduct their studies and their training at our own institutions, whether government institutions such as TAFE or non-government sector institutions. In addition there are cases where businesses have to wait months to receive subsidies for training delivered and there are serious cash-flow difficulties, more difficult to overcome without government backing when the need arises, so that is another test for the government's delivery of funding.

One of the points that some of the providers have raised with me is that it is a long time between drinks for government subsidies for training. They have costs that they need to meet weekly or fortnightly, particularly when it comes to wages and salaries. They have rents and taxes

they need to pay, and these tend to be monthly commitments, yet sometimes they need to wait until the completion of a course before they get money or, alternatively, several months prior before they are paid for the work that they have delivered through the process.

There is no doubt that up until now the TAFE system has not been subject to the same level of scrutiny as private providers. In the main, private providers—particularly those represented by ACPET—have worked hard to raise quality and compliance among VET providers, and it is not unreasonable to expect that, under Skills for All, this will also now be the case in the public system. I have some questions that the minister might wish to consider in concluding the debate. What criteria were used to calculate and determine the Skills for All subsidy levels for TAFE SA and private providers, and what was the time frame for achieving parity in these subsidised levels, if there was a time frame? What is the time frame for reducing other government support to TAFE? How will the government measure the productivity, value for money, efficiency, quality and TAFE services for the public funding contributed? Who will set the rate that TAFE will charge for the use of their public provider facilities? Will it be market driven or will it be some other mechanism?

Some providers have told me that, when they have enquired about using dormant TAFE facilities, they may be offered times that are simply not commercial for access to that facility. I think that is another area that could be explored in order to make full use of the enormous capital assets that TAFE is holding in the way of buildings, machinery and other assets needed in a training environment.

It does not make a lot of sense to me that, on long Christmas breaks, for example, the buildings are closed and not accessible for the use of others, even if they want to pay a fee to use them. Other opportunities include school holidays (where there is a break between the four terms), evenings and weekends. We know that the private sector is very adaptable. It can work around penalty rates and other areas in order to use facilities effectively or in order to deliver training when the customer wants it. We see this all the time with the private sector.

The government sector tends to have some difficulty in understanding that the customer is right and the customer should be considered in order to deliver those services: the customer's needs, the convenience for the customer and the timing. All these things are important in the private sector, and I hope that we will see TAFE moving towards that type of an attitude in the near future. Hopefully, it will not take as long as it took Qantas, after they were privatised, to understand the importance of customers.

I think Qantas got there in the end, but I think it took them close to 20 years to understand, after being a government-owned institution, that people really had very little choice but to use them. Under the two-airline system we saw that customer service was quite often a bit rough-and-ready, but I have to say that it is much better these days. The market has done its job when it comes to the airline industry.

Another question I pose to the minister is: will there be any guarantees regarding the times when TAFE premises will be available and will these times suit the needs of private providers? For example, we were recently made aware—and these are the specifics of the detail I raised earlier—by the private sector of a TAFE manager telling them the facilities would be available on Tuesday and Thursday nights from 8 to 11pm. The point made there by the private provider, of course, was that is not very user-friendly.

When will TAFE-only qualifications be opened up to the private sector providers and what is the plan for managing the quality of training, should there be an influx of interstate providers to take advantage of funding and training opportunities that, until now, have not been available to the private sector? I can understand why there are some local providers who are concerned, to a certain degree. They are relishing the competition but, of course, there are some pretty big providers.

Because we have been one of the last states to move on this process of opening up funding for VET beyond TAFE, there are companies in Victoria and other states—Queensland and elsewhere—that have grown to be quite substantial and quite large. We are already seeing many of those on the move here into South Australia, opening up branch offices. I know that, certainly, branch offices are always welcome here in South Australia, but there is nothing like a home-grown head office in South Australia. I hope that we can see the growth of our home-grown companies in South Australia as well.

It is interesting that the minister has decided to placate the AEU by transferring the terms and conditions that exist with TAFE as DFEEST employees—the TAFE employees—without any change into the new bill. As a matter of fact, I think there is even a schedule attached to the new bill that transfers those, yet minister Kenyon is on record as acknowledging that, in order for TAFE to be competitive, there may need to be changes to the EBA so that it is more in line with the private sector. Nothing in this bill addresses that and that may be part of the reason why there is no time line on the differences in the subsidies to reduce those differences and there is no time line as to when we will see more of the courses that are funded opened up to full contestability.

We know that this could be seen as a great opportunity for TAFE. We know that DFEEST, for example, has a shocking reputation for being top heavy and inefficient. You just need to refer to the annual report in 2009 and compare that to the annual report in 2010, when we look at the DFEEST senior executive salary scale from the annual report in 2010-11. In 2009, we had 194 full-time employees earning more than \$100,000 and up to \$380,000, amounting to \$22.8 million in salaries. Then in 2010, just one year later, we saw that rise to a figure of 265 full time employees, which also saw the top salary in 2010 at \$280,000. The very next year the top salary in DFEEST was \$380,000, a \$100,000 increase in salary. We also saw new salary brackets introduced of \$290,000, \$300,000, \$320,000, \$330,000, \$340,000 and \$350,000. In that grouping we have 14 staff earning more than \$280,000 a year, which I believe is more than what the minister earns. That has happened in just a 12-month period.

You can see that there seems to be a culture of entitlement in DFEEST, and people that obviously feel that they are worth a substantial amount of money. When one looks at DFEEST reports, documents that analyse DFEEST programs and some of the outcomes that DFEEST has been achieving, one has to ask: what is the justification to taxpayers in South Australia to see such a dramatic increase in salaries in just one year? That is 194 staff earning more than \$100,000 in 2009, with the top salary being \$280,000, then the following year there are 265 staff earning up to \$380,000.

We often see restructures within DFEEST that sees more managers and fewer people actually delivering services. I am hoping that by decoupling TAFE from DFEEST we will see a culture of service and a culture that relates to industry develop in our TAFE system. I know from my country colleagues that the TAFE system is very important in regional South Australia, and I am sure there will be a number of regional members of parliament that will speak very favourably of TAFE. In my own experience, as a former student at Marleston TAFE, it was an opportunity for me to move into self-employment once I was given those formal skills that TAFE gave me, along with the on-the-job training I received during my apprenticeship.

TAFE traditionally has had a good reputation certainly in delivering apprentice training. Things have become more complicated over the last 10 years or so, and I concede that, as more and more is being delivered by TAFE. However, it is important that we have that distinction between the department who are delivering funding and TAFE who are a competitor for receiving that funding. We see that they are now two separate bodies. I understand it will be the same minister administering both departments, but I do not have a problem with that.

On our side of politics we are certainly hoping that we will see good training and educational outcomes out of TAFE. We hope that we see some fair and increased competition through the non-government providers in South Australia in delivering VET services. We certainly hope that the minister does meet the very ambitious promise of 100,000 training positions in South Australia with the use of the Skills for All funding and that we do not see it simply used to prop up a TAFE system that has refused to acknowledge that it is now on its own.

We do need to be concerned that we might not see the delivery of those training places, and we also need to be concerned that those training places might not be delivered in areas that the industry needs. My understanding, from speaking to industry representatives—skill training boards, for example—is that there has been very little consultation on this bill or Skills for All in delivering industry-driven or industry-required skills through the Skills for All funding. We know that the focus at a federal government level for university funding is student-centric and we know that Skills for All is student-centric. I think there is a responsibility for a government that, when it is handing out taxpayers' money like this, in the end there is an outcome not just for the student but also for the community.

We have enormous skills shortages in South Australia, if not immediately, certainly into the future. It is imperative that when government money is being spent on skilling our own citizens in South Australia they are skilled in areas where they are going to get jobs, where they are going to

be able to provide for their families and where they are going to be able to contribute to the state economy—pay their taxes—because they have a skill that is in demand.

I would not like to see money being spent skilling up our young people, who, in particular, will be the vast beneficiaries of this funding, and then either to be misled into taking on skills for which there is no demand or feeling that they are not being guided into areas where there is demand. That is why it is important that industry continually has a guiding hand in VET training in South Australia. It is so important that funding decisions are made with strong consultation with those who are in the box seat to employ South Australians who have developed those skills. With those remarks, I shall return with questions during the committee stage.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:33):** I too rise to support this TAFE SA Bill. In doing so I would like to think that this bill might help to ensure that private registered training organisations will be placed on a more even playing field with TAFE in terms of attracting students whose training is publicly subsidised.

In the electorate of Chaffey I am fortunate to have a new TAFE campus, which is located at the Glossop High School senior campus in Berri. Just recently I attended the opening of that facility, and it really is a great facility and a great asset to the electorate because, in some cases, it provides preliminary skills or accreditation for the young ones—and not just the young ones; middle-aged people also attend the facility.

The TAFE facility at Berri provides courses that are more relevant to the area, particularly horticulture, hospitality, winemaking and viticulture, management and administration. Of course, what piggybacks those skills and those specialty areas is the need for good accounting and finance, automotive, welding and IT. All that makes a really good package for the area.

I attended the opening, and the Hon. Bob Sneath in another place was there to open the facility. He was quite amazed at some of the native bush food that the students presented to all comers, and that was just an example of what the training there can do. It is something outside the square. It is not just about presenting the standard food and the standard training line. It gives an opportunity for all to come along and see something new. I think in food production we are always looking at something new that will grab the eye and the attention and, when students later move into the private sector or the world of employment, it gives them a wider capacity to present.

The region also has a GrowSmart training program, and they are in a partnership with the PICSE program in the region and they provide a wide range of training programs specific to the region's needs and, naturally, many are horticulture and agriculture driven. Again, I have been to some of the grading nights through the GrowSmart training program, in partnership with PICSE, and it is really great to see that some of those private training organisations can step up to the plate and, I think, put pressure on TAFE. I think this bill will put TAFE under a little bit of pressure to perform and have a cost-effective training regime. I think the GrowSmart team has worked really well in addressing regional needs, particularly in the electorate of Chaffey.

The GrowSmart team has lobbied me, and the previous member for Chaffey, for a number of years to allow them to perform, for instance, a firearms training program. To date, the government has resisted allowing them to do that. I think, perhaps with a new minister and this bill now to be put in place, that we might see some more flexibility with the government allowing a private training facility to come on board and offer what I would consider is a more relevant training program that suits the needs of primary food production, particularly with regard to vermin control.

It also has been revealed to me that this program would be much more flexible for trainees, as well as being a much more cost-effective program. I have seen the TAFE program for firearms training and it is quite expensive and rigid in its time lines as to when students and people can go along and perform those programs. The GrowSmart training program is ready to go and it has the accredited trainees in place. Obviously, some legislation would allow them to perform that training.

Unfortunately, as I said, to date, the government has blocked GrowSmart from providing this training and I am hoping, again, that this bill will give them the mechanism to provide firearms training. I have a letter with the minister's office to give this training organisation some consideration to be able to perform firearms training, and I will be waiting on a reply from the minister's office.

Again, we have the Flinders University medical training facility at Renmark, and it is a fantastic training facility. It trains medical students for nursing and is now about to step up and train third-year doctors. It gives them an opportunity to be trained in a regional post. To date, the training

facility up at Renmark has been very successful. It allows young country trainees to train locally. It does not put added pressure on them to have to travel, to have to find accommodation, to be away from home. Ideally, it could give city trainees a country experience. I think that is very valuable for those who want to be medical professionals. I think it gives them a rounding experience.

I note that the Flinders training facility is looking for some RDA funding that will upgrade the facility to be able to do much more comprehensive training, not just in the third year but trainees will be able to complete their training at the Renmark hospital, which is in partnership with the Flinders Medical Centre. It will mean that regional trainees will not have to travel, they will not have that extra cost burden and it will leave them in a much more comfortable environment so that they can actually perform their training. It also gives the region a much better opportunity to retain some of those trainees when they become qualified.

As we all know, attracting doctors and nurses to regional areas is a very hard job. It is an exceptionally hard job to attract them and it is just as hard to actually retain them. By giving country trainees an opportunity to train and get their qualifications in their backyard gives the region a better chance to retain those trainees or those qualified students so that they can contribute back into the community. It also assists in the development of local industries, and I think that is very important, particularly for the regions.

As many of my regional colleagues here today would acknowledge, we are seeing a slow exodus of skilled doctors and nurses in particular. We are seeing an exodus of a lot of skilled labour into the mining industry, and that is putting pressure on skilled labour, skilled employees, to perform their duties, particularly in the electorate of Chaffey. The Riverland is known as the food bowl of South Australia, and we need research and development to stay within the region. We need those skills to stay in the region so that we can move with the times, so that we can progress, so that we can produce more with less. I think those training facilities up in the regions lend a hand in doing that.

Again, it is very important that these regional training facilities and programs improve the prospects of growth in regional communities. I was a trainee through TAFE in the early days and I then moved into an apprenticeship. It really does give young people a great opportunity to be trained, and skilled to go out into the workforce.

I think this amendment bill will give all registered training organisations a more level playing field. In particular, I think the TAFE facility up in Berri, in the Riverland, is a great asset to the region, but so are the other training programs. As I have said, the PICSE GrowSmart program really highlights what the region needs, and it addresses that. It addresses horticulture and agriculture in particular, food production and, food presentation and what revolves around them. So, in saying that, I think TAFE and the training programs that are in the regions, are a necessity and I would like to think that they will be enhanced as time goes on.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:45):** Like my colleagues, I rise to speak in support of this bill, and the shadow education minister, the member for Unley, has gone into many aspects of this bill in great detail, as he usually does, and very well. I would like to touch on a few regional aspects. TAFE in regional South Australia is incredibly important, as educational opportunities are everywhere. The ability for our people in regional South Australia to get to go to small schools often—sometimes big schools in regional centres—but the importance of small primary schools, potentially with only 20 kids in them, and for them to flow through high school and be able to undertake tertiary education in regional areas, is vitally important.

In the region that I live in and represent, the Upper Spencer Gulf, there are four key TAFE campuses—not all of them in the electorate of Stuart—but Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla and Roxby Downs are vital institutions, and it is important to say that there are TAFE campuses all over regional South Australia.

They are particularly important because they provide a wide variety of educational opportunities, which I think country kids probably need access to perhaps even more than city kids do. We have just as many smart kids who would like to be doctors or lawyers, or pursue more academic paths. We have just as many of them proportionally in regional South Australia, but we probably have more young people—whether they be young or middle-aged adults who would like to pursue more hands-on educational opportunities that take them towards trades, and with our impending mining growth coming in South Australia, and we all know that both sides of this house are extremely supportive of what we hope will be a mining boom in the future for South Australia, this is going to be even more important.

I would also like to say that with TAFE and educational opportunities in general—but certainly TAFE—I think the value of these institutions in addition to their primary purpose of educating people is often undervalued. The value that a TAFE campus provides by being located in a regional town or a regional city is extremely important.

Of course, the primary purpose always has to be there—they must be good education facilities—but there is the additional value that they offer these communities with regard to employment opportunities, with regard to retention of young people, with regard to attraction of young people from outside the region, and with regard to the ability for older people to stay and grow and learn and be productively involved, for whom it may not openly lead towards an income earning opportunity but may well lead to a greater quality of life and a greater ability for them to contribute as volunteers to the community. All of those values are often overlooked. Now, never once would I say that the primary purpose of course is not the most important, but in regional areas those extra opportunities are very important.

So I hope that this TAFE SA Bill 2012 will allow those opportunities to grow and not diminish them. There is, of course, the fear by some people that the marketisation of TAFEs, while offering great competition and potentially creating the opportunity for some courses to be cheaper and some courses to be more swiftly tailored to the market, might also take away that public component, and that public conscience that TAFEs have had under governments of both persuasions for decades now. If it becomes a market rules situation, we might find that we have cheaper courses tailored to the demand that is there on the spot for graduates but there may not be the same sort of foresight and opportunities, if those institutions—whether they be TAFE or other registered training organisations—do not have more of a community mandate.

The broader values of TAFEs that I just discussed may be diminished somewhat and also I fear that the opportunity for timing the delivery of TAFE courses in line with future demand may not be done quite as well as it could if the trainer, the training organisation—whether it be TAFE or another one—is essentially there trying to make money. I am not suggesting that TAFE's only desire will be to make money but if it is in a competitive market it will be forced to compete and it will be forced to justify itself in that way.

The example which I used and which I have seen in Port Augusta in two cycles now was that, when there is a downturn in the economy, when there are fewer jobs, when there are fewer opportunities for people, often fewer training opportunities are provided as well. I think that is a great mistake because at a time when there are fewer employment opportunities for people that potentially is the time to create more training opportunities for people. Whether it is a six-month course or a three-year course, the reality is that it is going to take a certain amount of time to get through your training and if there is an assumption that when demand for job placements returns we will just ramp up the delivery of training so that people can get those jobs, things are out of whack because you have lost the opportunity to train people before the job opportunities are there.

That is a concern I have with this marketisation. As I said, I have seen that happen for two cycles now in the northern part of the state. I am also particularly concerned because I saw the demise of the Australian Technical College (ATC) which, to my mind, was an absolutely outstanding institution. It was set up across three Upper Spencer Gulf campuses, plus Roxby Downs, and it gave young people particularly the opportunity to complete their high school diploma at ATC, or to complete a trade (an apprenticeship essentially) at ATC, or to do both at ATC. That was a fantastic model but it was disbanded. There are people in the area that I represent who are still dreadfully disappointed about that. I hope that the outcome of this bill which, as I have said, I do support overall (as do all of my opposition colleagues) does not lead to that sort of short-sighted decision, because unrealistic commercial expectations are put on TAFE when it is put into a more competitive market.

Like my colleagues, I support competitive markets. We believe that those sort of commercial realities lead to good outcomes. However, there are some things that governments are obliged to do on behalf of people and one of the greatest reasons we have governments is to provide services and to provide opportunities that the markets on their own would not provide. We can debate in this house about how far that should go but we all believe that at some level that is what government does, and I know that is currently what TAFE does. That must be kept front of mind as the government progresses after, presumably, this bill passes successfully.

Another example of a concern here is the astounding revelation that we had in question time today (which was very swiftly picked up by the shadow treasurer, the member for Davenport) that the Labor government is now considering using the construction industry training levy to meet



budget savings targets. I hope it does not but if somehow this marketisation of TAFE leads to those sorts of decisions then, of course, we will all be very sad about that outcome.

I have spoken about the value of TAFE, the flexibility and the wide range of courses (and the member for Chaffey touched on that as well) that TAFE offers a wide range of people. Let's not beat around the bush here: the sort of people who can attend TAFE may be rich, may be poor, may be men, may be women and also come from a very wide range of intellectual horsepower—and that is fantastic. To provide opportunities to improve their lives, to get access to the workforce and to contribute to their communities is vitally important to a very wide range of people, and I think vitally important in regional areas where we fight so hard to retain our communities and where we fight incredibly hard to even try to attract people to grow our communities as well.

I have another issue which I will touch on now but it is probably more for the minister in the committee stage of the bill. It is the issue that has been floating around Port Augusta of the lease of the cinema at Port Augusta to the people who currently lease it and have felt incredibly under threat. They operate the cinema in a TAFE facility and I have always said both publicly and in private discussions that if TAFE has a need for that facility for an educational TAFE purpose that is where it should go and unfortunately the cinema would have to miss out.

If that is not the case—and the minister has assured us that it is not the case, TAFE does not need that cinema—then the current operators, Roger and Michelle Cole, should be able to continue to use it. The minister has been true to his word. Things have dragged on a bit and time has taken a lot longer than everybody wanted but I give the minister credit. He has said that he will lease the cinema on a long-term basis to the Coles. They will be obliged to meet the necessary maintenance costs to the structure of the building associated with that lease but they will get a long-term lease to operate that business.

I say this now so the minister can think about it and I am happy to address it again in committee. I would like to be sure that this bill, with regard to the arm's length relationships that it establishes, will not in any way interfere with the commitment that the minister has given to Roger and Michelle Cole. I do not suggest for a minute that the minister would do that deliberately but sometimes unexpected things come up and I would like to be absolutely sure that that will not happen through this bill. Those people have a commitment from the minister and from TAFE as it currently stands that they can lease that facility so I will allow the minister to come back to me when he is ready on that issue, but without that I cannot support this bill.

I am happy to leave it at that. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bill and, as my colleagues have said, to support the bill.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (17:57):** I will formally start my conclusion on the second reading.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is the minister aware that he will be closing the debate?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Yes. I formally start my second reading reply and I undertake to get back to members with full answers on the next day of sitting, which is tomorrow. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### **PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION (BASIC SALARY) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Wednesday 16 May 2012 at 11:00.