

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 19 June 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LADY KINTORE COTTAGES (TRUST PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (10:31):** I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

#### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ELECTIONS) (VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June 2014.)

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (10:32):** I would like to, firstly, begin today by commending the member for Goyder for this amendment that he has introduced to the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999. Of course, the member for Goyder has extensive experience in local government. I dare say he probably has more experience in local government than almost anyone here, having been a hardworking CEO of a local council for many years, and he has actually run elections as well, as a returning officer.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** Geoff Brock and Tony Piccolo.

**Mr TARZIA:** Yes, I understand the member for Frome has also had extensive experience in local government.

##### *Members interjecting:*

**Mr TARZIA:** And the member for Light, but the member for Goyder has certainly been an esteemed fellow in that field. He understands the needs and wants of local government and he understands what needs to be done to improve local government, and I commend him on his initiative here in the house today. As we have heard, following changes in 2009, if you are a landlord, a business, a lessee, a non-resident property owner or a resident non-Australian citizen, you are no longer automatically included on the council's voting roll. I have to say, I was one of the councillors who was elected to local government on these rules. However, I do believe that there is time to improve this bill.

In my time as a local councillor I witnessed firsthand the apathy that does exist, unfortunately in this day and age, among certain people in regard to local government elections. Of course, I was elected to the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council, where the turnout, like for many councils, is somewhere around 25 per cent. I am looking at the member for Bright, the former deputy mayor of the City of Marion, who I note was also elected under the old rules. We come from council areas where the turnout has historically been quite low: 25 per cent, 30 per cent, 35 per cent.

I think anything that encourages a better turnout for local government elections is a good thing, because we live in Australia where we should be proud of our democratic principles and our Westminster system where we do have the ability to elect members of local, state and federal governments. We should make the most of this, and we should make it as easy as possible for people to be able to be on that roll.

I note that the member for Goyder has also offered a good opportunity for consultation and he has consulted with Ms Wendy Campana, the CEO of the LGA, who seems supportive of the amendment. It certainly has the support on this side of the house and it also has support, I am pleased to say, in the conversations that I have had through other councillors as well. It is a good bill. Any bill which goes to the heart of our democratic principles and which allows more people to be able to vote and to get people more involved in the process of electing their local government representatives is a good thing and I am happy to support the bill.

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (10:35):** I also rise today to support the amendment which is proposed. I think that, like the member for Hartley said, anything which increases involvement and engagement with local government is incredibly important and, like the member for Hartley said, the voter turnout in local government elections does leave a lot to be desired. I have often said that local government has the capacity to be the best tier of government in its ability to affect the day-to-day lives of residents who live in South Australia's communities, but equally, because of that closeness with communities, if local government is dysfunctional it also has the ability to be the worst tier of government, and dysfunction can be rapidly felt by the communities which it seeks to serve.

I represented Coastal Ward in the City of Marion for three years and was elected with voter turnout of around 30 per cent, which was one of the higher turnouts in the City of Marion. I look to the south of me in the City of Onkaparinga, where turnout in the local government elections there (perhaps due to the fact it is a lower socioeconomic area) sits at around 20 per cent and in the teens in some of the wards there.

I think that is something that is of great concern, to have people elected to make such significant local decisions, as are required by local councillors, and to manage large budgets. I know at the City of Marion we managed a budget of about \$65 million a year, and to have people elected onto essentially board positions to govern that council on just a few hundred votes is not something that we should be particularly proud of in this state. While I am not advocating that we move towards a compulsory voting agenda in local government, I would like us to look at any ways which encourage people who are interested in being involved in local government to actually get onto the roll and be able to make a decision towards who they vote for.

I remember in the lead-up to the 2010 local government elections held in November there was some concern that landlords, business owners and non-residents within the council area who still owned properties and businesses in those areas were not made aware of the fact that they could get onto the electoral roll. Local councils were required to promote this, but apart from a couple of ads in the Messenger—and I actually noted that the City of Holdfast Bay had an ad in the Messenger this week encouraging non-residents, business owners and landlords to register now to get onto the electoral roll. I think the date of registration that was required was August, but, as you can imagine, people who are not in the area and people who are landlords in the area may not be looking at the *Guardian Messenger*, or whatever the local newspaper the council has decided to advertise in.

We need to, I think, look at as many ways as possible to get these people onto the roll. I remember when I stood for local government, I got a list of people who were nonresident voters and there were only about 35 for the whole of Coastal Ward. There were 12,000 people on the voter roll in Coastal Ward in the City of Marion and only about 30 who were nonresident landlords.

That showed very, very few, because there were obviously many more than 30 people who were landlords in the area, and only a tiny proportion had taken the opportunity to register to vote in the local government elections. That automatically meant that there were many hundreds of people who had been disenfranchised—people who still own assets in the area and who still have a great stake and interest in the area being looked after and well-governed by the local council. Obviously people who have an investment (often mum and dad investors) may actually be even keener, because it is a financial investment in ensuring that the local community is kept in good working order.

I strongly support the member for Goyder's amendment to the Local Government Elections Act 1999 and urge all other members to also get on board and support this strategy to get more people involved in local democracy in South Australia.

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (10:41):** I rise to speak in support of the bill. Basically, what this will do is take the roll back to the provisions that were there before the government's amendments in 2009, that enabled all businesses, once they were on the roll, to remain on that roll. It is vitally important

that businesses and business people that participate in their local communities through employing South Australians and sponsoring local clubs (for example, the football club, cricket club or netball club), and that may very well be seeking input from council for projects and so forth, are encouraged to participate, and that it is easy for them to do so. It should be no different for them to participate in the democratic process at a local government level than what it is for residents, and apply to be on the roll once only.

This is streamlining the process for businesses and property owners so that they can participate in the democratic process. The fact that, in 2009, this government put another bureaucratic barrier in place and made it more difficult for businesses to participate in the democratic process only confirms the public view that this government does not like business. In my view, this was certainly deliberate discrimination of businesses in favour of other people who are able to participate in the democratic process of local government elections.

It is not as though we are giving new rights to people who never had rights before. It is not as though it is ground-breaking legislation that we are talking about today; we simply want to restore the balance that was there prior to 2009, before it was removed by this government. Those who have run businesses know that there is so much to do every day, particularly if you are a small business. It is an unnecessary task to ask businesses to go back to their local council and ask for another set of enrolment papers just so they can participate in the election after they had already done it for the previous election.

This will streamline the process and enable the participation of more people who actually do contribute to their local community. They may not live there, but they certainly spend a good part of their week and their day in that area. Their customers, clients and professional community live there. They pay council rates and, in many instances, they pay council rates at a much higher level than residential council residents may very well pay. Many councils still have a differential rate in the dollar for businesses, which is generally higher than it is for non-businesses. I remember when I was on the Prospect council, from 1991 to 1993, it was very heavily debated whether that was a fair and just thing to do, considering that, at that time, Prospect Road, for example, was full of empty shops. I can remember that I was on the council with the Hon. Russell Wortley at the time. He was described as the—

*Mr Speirs interjecting:*

**Mr PISONI:** —extreme left. He was a member of the Duncan left, I think, at the time, and I was described as a lunatic right on the Prospect council. It was quite a time, but we did, in fact, accomplish something significant together when it was a combination of the left and the right. A couple of the older, more conservative members of the council were on leave; they were obstructing the more progressive members of the council in their view that they should eliminate backyard burning. So, there was an affiliation of the left and the right on the Prospect council, and we managed to get a ban on backyard burning to come into play during that 1991 to 1993 period. It was a great success.

Also, for those who enjoy the street trees on Main North Road, that was another accomplishment of the work of the Prospect council from 1991 to 1993. I think that that is an example of where it was very important to have business input in that it had an impact on a council project that lifted the amenity of the entire community. Main North Road is not what you would call a model strip shopping centre, but its impact has been softened tremendously by these now 20-year-old trees, which certainly have a decent canopy and do soften the impact of some of the architecture on Main North Road.

To get back to the reason I strongly support the member for Goyder's bill this morning, and that is that it is about community participation. We know that businesses do have a strong philanthropic vein, and they are very keen to participate in their local communities. Why would we want to make it any harder, why would we want to have an extra burden for them that residents do not need to go through in order to participate in a democratic process at a local government level? I commend the bill to the house, and I congratulate the member for Goyder for his foresight and for his support for small business and property owners who are not residents within their council districts.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (10:48):** First, I congratulate the member for Goyder for bringing this matter to the attention of the house. It is a matter that the opposition has argued previously; in fact, I understand that, back in 2009, the government changed this particular part of the Local

Government Act to basically, I would suggest, disenfranchise a significant number of electors from being able to vote in their local council elections by making it more difficult for them to remain on the roll. The opposition argued at the time that that was a retrograde step, and nothing has changed.

I was at a meeting only last week, when the Leader of the Opposition and I met with a number of councils in the South-East. We were at the Robe council, and this matter was raised with us as a problem. The Robe council has more absentee property owners than any other council in the state, they told us.

**Mr Griffiths:** 60 per cent, or something like that.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes, over 50 per cent of their property owners do not live within the council area. Of course, Robe is a very popular seaside resort—amongst other things—with a normal permanent residential population of about 1,500 people, but during the summer months that population swells to about 15,000 people. A significant number of those people who come to Robe own property in Robe and obviously, as contributing ratepayers, want to have some say—some representative input—into the way that community and that council operates. We were told that a significant number of those people reside outside of South Australia. There is a large number of people who own property in the township of Robe who live as near as the Victorian border to as far across as Ballarat. It is a very popular place.

As the member for Unley just said, the reality is that this is not about conferring any more rights. These people have—and everybody agrees that they should have—a right to participate in the democratic elections within their council area. That right has always been held by people who own property in a council area even though they do not reside in the council area. It is a right that is not in dispute here. What is in dispute here is the ease with which they can exercise that right. One has to question why a government would make it more difficult for a citizen to exercise their democratic right.

I draw the parallel between the government's actions with regard to the Local Government Act and the electoral system that is operating at the council level, and the Constitution Act of South Australia which controls the state's electoral matters. The reality is that we have an electoral system in South Australia which does not reflect the basic principle of democracy, and that is that every citizen has an equal right to elect a government of their choice or, just as importantly—and maybe even more importantly—to throw out a government that they do not want. That is something that we do not have in South Australia and that is a question I have been posing to some of the political scientists in this town: what level of response should you require from the community to get rid of a government that you do not want? Because in South Australia at the state level that is obviously over 53 per cent. I think this Labor government has a very, very poor record when it comes to democracy.

**Mr Pengilly:** And within their own party.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** We know that they have no semblance of democracy within their own party. Their fundamental philosophical position is not one that is founded on the principles of democracy, unlike that which we enjoy in the Liberal Party. They have a very poor record when it comes to democracy, democratic elections, at both the state and the local government level.

One can only speculate that this was a deliberate ploy by this government back in 2009 in an attempt to disenfranchise those people whom they believed would not naturally support their candidates. That is the only logical explanation for making it more difficult for people who have every entitlement to vote at a council election, to make it more difficult for them to exercise that vote, because that is what this is about.

We all know, from a whole myriad of functions that occur in our society, that people forget. Since we no longer issue registration stickers for motor vehicles, how often have we heard that people forget to register their motor vehicle, particularly if they do not get the renewal notice? That is an issue that comes up. It certainly comes up in my electorate—

**Mr Pengilly:** Particularly the older ones.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** —on a regular basis. And as my colleague, the member for Finnis says, particularly older citizens.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Even businesses.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Even businesses, the member for Stuart reminds me. The reality is that when you put up a barrier such as this where people have to go back on an annual basis and reregister their right to vote at a council election, a significant number of them fail to do so. It was pointed out to me at Robe recently that the Robe council is very concerned about this. As a council they are concerned about this because a significant portion of their electorate falls into this category and it makes it very difficult for them to exercise, as a council, in a democratic fashion, when they are fully aware that a significant portion of the people who are eligible to vote in their council elections are just not on the roll.

There is a council election coming up later this year and we will have the debate both before and after the election about the poor turnout of electors at council elections. That is just the turnout of those who are actually on the roll. It ignores the fact that there are a significant number of people who are not on the roll, not by their choice. They are not on the roll because in 2009 their government—the Labor government in South Australia—made it more difficult for them to be on the roll and that is the problem.

I come back to the point I made. It is my earnest belief that the Labor government made it more difficult because they believe that those people who own property in a council area where they do not reside would be more likely not to vote for a Labor candidate. I honestly believe that that is the circumstance. That is no reason to manipulate an electoral system, just like as I said we have an electoral system at the state level that mitigates against conservative voters. It mitigates against the majority of South Australians who want a different government and have almost constantly wanted a different government for almost the last 20 years.

This is a very good bill brought by the member for Goyder. I commend it to the house and I sincerely hope that the Labor government comes to its senses and understands that democracy is a principle that should not be toyed with for its own benefit.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:57):** This is an excellent bill and I commend the member for Goyder, as others have, for bringing it forward to the house. To the casual reader of *Hansard*, I commend all the speeches that have come so far. I agree with pretty much everything that has been said by the members for Hartley, Bright, Unley and MacKillop and, indeed, the member for Goyder in introducing the bill in the first place. I just wish to add probably three things in my contribution that have not been focused on to this point.

The first is that I appreciate that a number of the country members, in particular, deal with councils with very high levels of non-residential voters in council elections or in fact potential voters in council elections, whether they be business owners or property owners or holiday house owners or whatever else. Although I have some regional bits in my electorate, I am looking at it more from the perspective of the city parts of my electorate where we have significant numbers of people who may own a business or may own property, potentially (but I am particularly worried about business owners in this case) in a different council electorate from that in which they live.

As a metropolitan MP—and I imagine there are people on the government benches who, if they think about it, have encountered the same issue—it is very frustrating for people, especially if they are not receiving favourable treatment (or even fair treatment, as many of them would think it) from the local council where their business is, to then have to go to that council and try to get representation. Some ward councillors are better than others and that is the nature of the beast, but I think it was Paul Keating who said, 'If it is a two-horse race, always back the horse with self-interest involved,' and it is not in a council's best interests in terms of getting re-elected to focus on the group that is less likely to come out and vote because they are not actually enrolled in the same way.

I will speak a bit more about the difference between automatic enrolment and the non-automatic enrolment and what that does to democracy. The point is that a business owner's rights in being represented are naturally going to be less powerful in seeking advocacy if they are part of the group that is not automatically enrolled. That said, as a local MP you often get the business owner coming to you, whether they are looking to try to get help from the Norwood, Payneham & St Peters council or the city council, or wherever their business may be located.

They might live in Rostrevor or Newton, and they will therefore come to me as their local member, where they live, so we try to help them. This happens on a regular basis. It is really an area where, if someone is automatically enrolled because their property or business is in the council area, then they are going to get better representation from local council, and that is the way it should be.

We understand that the act allows people to enrol themselves, as long as they do it with, I think it is three months' notice required at the moment, prior to the election. That is their right. The government, even in changing the act in 2009, did not try to take that right away; the government seems to acknowledge that these people have the right to vote.

It is not the same as state elections. We have the electoral roll where everyone gets one vote in forming government in South Australia, but councils are different. They are about seeking to represent the rights of those with an interest in the area, whether that be by living there or by owning property or business there or whatever else. So the things are not equivalent.

The point is that in council elections, if we are going to have a democratic process, then that democratic process should be fair and equal for all those involved in participating in that process. It is clear that once you have this discrepancy, where some people, by nature of being on the state electoral roll, are automatically enrolled and others are not, there is going to be a discrepancy in the way the representation occurs. That is not fair.

I think the member for MacKillop put his finger right on the issue. I imagine that the government will probably vote against this bill; it will probably vote against it because it is in its best interest to do so as a political party, not in the best interests of the people of South Australia or those they seek to represent.

We are in this position where the minister for local government is an Independent member of the cabinet, and I think that as a rural member, and one who represents people in Port Pirie and the larger townships of his electorate as well, he would appreciate exactly the points that have been raised by members on this side. Perhaps he has spoken to the Local Government Association and has had similar commentary.

It is critical that this bill be dealt with, it is critical that we vote on this matter. I think the member for Goyder has done a great job in bringing it forward, and I look forward to voting on it. I think we should vote on it today and get it to the upper house, so that we can move on and pass this bill through the parliament.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:02):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:02):** I would like the right of reply, actually, to bring the matter to a vote, if I may.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Newland has the call; we usually go from side to side.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....	22
Noes .....	19
Majority.....	3

#### AYES

Bedford, F.E.  
Brock, G.G.  
Digance, A.F.C.  
Hildyard, K.  
Key, S.W.  
Piccolo, A.  
Rau, J.R.  
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Caica, P.  
Gee, J.P.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Snelling, J.J.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Close, S.E.  
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.  
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Rankine, J.M.  
Vlahos, L.A.

#### NOES

Bell, T.S.  
Griffiths, S.P.  
McFetridge, D.  
Pisoni, D.G.

Evans, I.F.  
Knoll, S.K.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Redmond, I.M.

Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)  
Marshall, S.S.  
Pengilly, M.R.  
Sanderson, R.

## NOES

Speirs, D.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.  
Wingard, C.

Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Treloar, P.A.  
Williams, M.R.

## PAIRS

Koutsantonis, A.  
Chapman, V.A.

Goldsworthy, R.M.

Weatherill, J.W.

Majority of 3 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

**CITY OF ADELAIDE (CAPITAL CITY COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 May 2014.)

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:10):** I stand in support of the member for Adelaide in the moving of this bill. As we have spoken in this chamber only a very few short minutes ago about the opportunity for democracy to work, I think that, very clearly in this case, it was extremely disappointing when the member for Adelaide made the Liberal Party aware of the fact that, by virtue of holding that very important position, she was not granted, as the representative of the people, the opportunity to be on the Capital City Committee.

As I understand it, the bill is relatively easy to understand, and I would hope that the government indicates what its position will be on this. I know that it has not supported it in the past, which is extremely disappointing, but the member for Adelaide, to be the wonderful advocate that she is for the people who live in the city and come to the city, needs to be involved in the decisions that are made that impact upon the city.

I believe that the bill provides the opportunity for the Premier, or his deputy, and two other ministers to be on the committee, with the Lord Mayor, or the deputy, and two other elected members. By virtue of increasing the number by one person, as I understand it, the bill provides the right in perpetuity for the member of Adelaide to be a representative no matter what political party they are a member of or, indeed, if they are a minister. To ensure that that local representation is there is absolutely the right step forward.

It is extremely frustrating that a similar bill from the member for Adelaide, in the previous parliament, was not supported, and I just cannot understand it. If you want to be prepared to open yourselves up to a level of scrutiny, review of decisions and involvement of a bipartisan nature, it seems to me that this is an absolute example of where agreeing to this bill would allow the representative to be involved and have an input.

At the end of the day, the 30,000 people or thereabouts who live in the member for Adelaide's electorate, and the 23,000 or so voters, are excluded from having their direct representative actually being involved in those decisions. Yes, they vote for other people who might be in the city of Adelaide; that is a much smaller number and, because it is a voluntary system, a lot less people actually vote in local government elections.

Here we have a person who, by virtue of hard work and commitment to the community over a second term now, is being denied the opportunity to represent and be the voice of the people who actually decided to support her candidacy. I think it is an extremely disappointing decision. I know that the Liberal Party is absolutely positive about the fact that, no matter what occurs in the future, the member for Adelaide needs to be involved in this committee.

I am sure that other members on this side will speak in support of it. It is a positive step forward. It is a way of ensuring that democracy still has the opportunity to be exercised to its absolute

fullest extent, as it should be. This is a way to ensure that the member for Adelaide, and future members for Adelaide, are involved in those key decisions that are made.

Yes, there will be some issues that might have to remain confidential—I understand that. I am sure that the present member and future members will commit to do that, but that person has to be allowed to be involved in those discussions. I look forward to the passage of the bill through the parliament.

I hope that the Minister for Local Government, as an Independent member who is all about democracy, has been involved in local government before and enjoys being involved in decisions made on behalf of communities, will respect the fact that this is not a political issue: this is purely a representative one about the ability to exercise that voice, and it is one that deserves to be supported.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:13):** I also rise in support. I think it is small-minded and shortsighted to oppose this particular bill, and that it should be supported. The member for Adelaide has worked expeditiously for her electorate since taking over, after the complete thrashing inflicted on her predecessor, the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith, who took on a ministry two seconds after arriving here and went out in two seconds flat as well.

So what it proves to me is that as the current member for Adelaide has done an outstanding job and knows her electorate inside out, it is indeed petty if the government rejects this particular motion, and I feel that it would be done on purely political grounds. I have no doubt that if the President of the Local Government Association Mayor O'Loughlin had won, the government would have gone out of its way to incorporate that person on to the capital city committee. However, because it happens to be a Liberal member who, as I said, knows her electorate inside out, the government seeks not to have the member for Adelaide included.

This may well set a precedent for other funny little things to go on in this place, with commissioners and little committees that are appointed at will—but I think this is a fine way forward. I am interested to see whether the member for Waite and the member for Frome support this. It is about time that we flushed them out on a couple of things so we will wait to see what happens. However, I have great pleasure in supporting this particular motion.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:16):** I rise to speak on the City of Adelaide (Capital City Committee) Amendment Bill brought to this house by the member for Adelaide, which is entirely appropriate. The government's seeming objection to this bill by the member for Adelaide is purely based on politics. At present the City of Adelaide Act 1998 allows for the establishment of a capital city committee made up of the Premier or deputy, and two ministers, together with the Lord Mayor or deputy and two councillors. The objective of the act is to recognise, promote and enhance the special, social, commercial, cultural and civic role the city of Adelaide place as the capital city and heart of South Australia.

There is no-one here who would disagree with that very sensible and very rational objective. However, it is nonsense and irrational that the duly elected member for Adelaide would not have a place on that committee. If the member for Adelaide is not in government then there is not one person from state government on that committee who has been elected by the people of the city of Adelaide—that does not make sense at all.

If you imagine a situation where the member for Adelaide was in government, and whether that person was a minister or not, if the government chose to put different ministers and not the member for Adelaide on that committee, that would be crazy, too. Can you imagine if the member for Adelaide right now happened to be a government member but the government chose not to make that member one of its representatives on the committee? Members opposite would say that was crazy; members opposite would say that it was absolutely ridiculous that the member for Adelaide was not on the committee. We say that the same principle is true when the member for Adelaide is in opposition—it is crazy that the member for Adelaide is not on that committee.

This is an amendment bill that was passed in the upper house in the last parliament so there was a broad selection of members of parliament, none of whom are the member for Adelaide, who believe that this is a very good idea. It is just common sense, and I am sure that if this was the City of Port Adelaide (city committee) bill, the government would say it was absolutely sensible that the member for Port Adelaide would be on that. I am sure that if this was the city of Port Pirie (city



committee) amendment bill, the minister for regional development would be saying that it was absolutely fundamental that he, as the member for Frome, be on that committee.

I can assure you that if this was the City of Port Augusta (city committee) bill, I would be saying the member for Stuart should be there. The member for Port Adelaide would want to be on it if it was about Port Adelaide, the member for Frome would want to be on it if it was about Port Pirie, and the member for Mount Gambier if it was Mount Gambier, etc. If it was Elizabeth there might be a bit of a stoush between which one of the members opposite would want to be the representative, but I can guarantee you every one of them would want to be. They would be fighting it out to make sure that one of them was going to be there, even if they did not happen to be a minister they would be saying we need an amendment bill because this only allows for the Premier and two ministers, but none of us are a minister at present, so we have to change it because it is fundamental that we are there. That is what members opposite would say and they would be right to say that.

The member for Adelaide is right to say that she should have the right to be on this committee, and if the member for Adelaide were not on our side we would agree with exactly the same principle. It is sensible and logical, and very importantly the member for Adelaide would probably be the only state parliament representative who would not have a conflict of interest in taking a place on this Capital City Committee, because it is very likely that issues discussed would be solely in the interests of the city of Adelaide and the Premier might have a conflict of interest with other issues that the Premier is involved in. The two other ministers might have conflicts of interest with other work that those ministers are involved in. They would all have a conflict of interest with the committee specifically for the city of Adelaide at some stage.

However, the one and only state government elected member of parliament who would not ever have a conflict of interest with the work of the Adelaide Capital City Committee would be the member for Adelaide because the member for Adelaide's first and foremost interest in his or her work is always going to be the electorate of Adelaide, the city of Adelaide and that area. There are many good reasons why all members of this parliament should support this bill. I commend the member for Adelaide for bringing it forward. It is common sense. If the shoe were on the other foot, everyone opposite would use exactly this same logic and, regardless of who is in government, the sitting member for Adelaide would be the only member of the South Australian parliament who will never have a conflict of interest with this Capital City Committee.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:22):** This is a very fine measure that has been brought to the house's attention this morning by the member for Adelaide, I commend her for it, and I support the sentiment expressed in the bill that she presents. As my colleague the member for Stuart has so eloquently put, the member for the seat of Adelaide which encompasses the city should, irrespective of which party or political affiliation they have, have the opportunity to sit on the committee which is charged with looking after the city of Adelaide on behalf of all South Australians.

There is often the argument about the uniqueness of the city of Adelaide. The city council which manages a lot of the things that happen in the city only represents those people who are resident in the city of Adelaide but the city of Adelaide is obviously the place which all South Australians gravitate to for a whole range of functions, whether it be retail or business-related or to interact with government services. It is important to all of the people of the state. I could say the government's lack of support for this measure is one of churlishness because they were beaten at the previous election in the seat of Adelaide by the current member but I think it is even worse than that. This again is a deliberate ploy by this Labor government to mess with democracy in this state.

They do not want the elected member for the state seat of Adelaide to have any platforms at all. Anything they can do to undermine the authority of the member for the seat of Adelaide simply because the current member is on the opposite side of the political divide to the government, they will take those steps to undermine the authority. The electors of that seat want the elected member to represent them and their interests which includes the interests which are dealt with within the Capital City Committee.

I think it is important and imperative that whomever is elected to the seat of Adelaide, as the member for Stuart so eloquently put it, should be represented on that committee. I think it is also incredibly important that this house and this parliament gets beyond messing with democracy in this state, which has become commonplace under this government. It is time this parliament recognised that democracy is a fundamental of our society.

I am reminded of what I say to school groups when I bring them on visits to the parliament. I take them through the parliament and I talk them through the procedures and the happenings that occur in this building, but I also remind them that the democratic institution that we enjoy here in Australia, and particularly in South Australia, is probably amongst the finest, if not the finest to be found anywhere in the world. I remind them it was not founded via a bloody revolution. I remind them it works because the people of our community believe in it, and the people of our community will only believe in it when they believe that it is fair, when they believe that they all have an equal say, and when they believe that it is working for them not against them.

That is what underpins our democracy in this state and that is what underpins our form of government, which I would argue is the best in the world. The reality is that a government in such a state that seeks to disenfranchise a duly-elected member for a state seat from serving on a very important committee which is all about a significant part of that seat is beyond churlishness, it attacks our democracy and our democratic principles.

I think this is a very important matter. I think the Labor Party needs to grow up and move on. It needs to be prepared to face up to the people of South Australia rather than hide behind artificial barriers which they have sought to implement to help keep them in office against the wishes of the people of South Australia. It is time the Labor Party got over that and was game to face up to fair electoral fights, whether they be at the local government level or the state government level. That is a problem that this Labor Party has inflicted upon the people of South Australia.

I have pledged to myself and to my leader that I am going to spend the next four years fighting this very important battle because I think democracy is a very important institution and I believe that everything good that occurs in our society is founded on that very fundamental principle. Under a democratic system everybody should have equal rights, be that an equal right to elect a government that they want or, indeed, to get rid of a government that they do not want, and unfortunately the people of South Australia do not enjoy those rights at this stage.

Unfortunately, this government is using its power to prevent a duly-elected member for a seat from fulfilling their duty to the people who put them in that position. That is what this is about. This is about allowing the people of the electorate of Adelaide to have their duly-elected member fully represent them and their interests. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would like to acknowledge that in the gallery today we have Station Officer Bryant, Mrs Bryant, and their son, and Commander Lindsay. The member for Morphett.

*Motions*

#### **BRYANT, MR MALCOLM**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:31):** I move:

That this house congratulates Station Officer Malcolm Bryant who, on 2 March 2014, achieved the distinction of being the longest serving firefighter in the 150-year history of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, when he celebrated 50 years of service to the South Australian Fire Brigade.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I have known Malcolm personally for many years. Malcolm also worked with my father, Malcolm McFetridge, who was in the Metropolitan Fire Service for nearly 30 years. Malcolm worked with him for about 25 years. Malcolm has had a distinguished career in the Metropolitan Fire Service. I will read into *Hansard* some of his achievements; and it has been a long and fruitful career in the Metropolitan Fire Service, a service that all South Australians should be very proud of, and I know they are, particularly the member for Colton.

Malcolm commenced service on 2 March 1964 as a recruit firefighter with the Adelaide Fire Brigade in Wakefield Street at the age of 18. He recently celebrated 50 years of service when, on 2 March 2014, he achieved the distinction of being the longest serving firefighter in the 150-year

history of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. During this time he has served under 11 chief officers.

Prior to joining the MFS, Malcolm was a probationary constable in the South Australian police department. He undertook two years of national service with the army in the Royal Australian Engineers from 1965 to 1967, gaining a number of skills, including: wildfire firefighting techniques; urban, rural, civil and military aircraft firefighting techniques; extinguishing fires involving ordinance; civil and military aircraft personnel rescue; heavy and light petroleum fire suppression; heavy and light vehicle retrieval; and human and animal rescue techniques.

Malcolm currently holds the roles of: fire training officer; shift duty officer; fire safety officer; and station officer, operations. He was awarded the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Exemplary Service Medal on 14 December 2012. During his extensive service with the SAMFS, he started as the chief fire officer's aide and fire brigade board chairman's driver. He graduated from firefighter to senior firefighter to station officer, fire safety officer, fire training officer (recruit training) and public relations. He has worked in fire equipment services, on reception, in corporate heritage, in development and planning, and in research and development during his 50 years with the SAMFS.

Malcolm has been stationed at MFS headquarters and at North Adelaide, Glen Osmond and St Mary's fire stations as well as in skills maintenance at Angle Park. As a fire training officer at Angle Park, Malcolm has been involved in researching and writing information manuals on different aspects of operational firefighting, including safety awareness. He has also taken on the administrative role of maintaining an efficient workplace and security of maintenance at the Angle Park Training Centre complex. As a duty officer, Malcolm's role has been to ensure that the highest operational and administrative efficiency is maintained at all times. Malcolm also has a fantastic knowledge of our state's history through the extensive research he has undertaken, particularly relating to the corporate heritage of the emergency services, including:

- collating historical photographs and records of the emergency services;
- historical and architectural overview of fire stations in the City of Adelaide;
- researching and recording in detail the history of the emergency services from 1836 to 1882; and
- supporting and providing detailed historical data to: the Country Fire Service, the National Trust, State Records, the State Archives, the Commonwealth Archives, the Land Services Group (Historical), the Adelaide City Council Archives, the Aboriginal Education Unit, the Australian Army, the Police Historical Society, Heritage South Australia, the History Trust of South Australia, the South Australia Tourism Commission, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service staff, students and the general public.

As a fire safety officer, Malcolm was also involved with public education in the fire safety department of the South Australian Fire Service, including researching, writing and providing fire and life safety prevention, protection, environment and hazard reduction information, awareness programs for commercial and industrial building employees, health care professionals, students and the general community, both rural and urban.

Malcolm has also been involved in providing objective technical opinion to government departments, councils, the construction industry and the community of South Australia to minimise the impact of fire on individuals and organisations. Over the years Malcolm has been involved in a number of research projects, including:

- assisting and researching writing the history of the British Imperial Troops in South Australia, which included the location of military barracks;
- boxing and labelling all the historical records and photographs and historical negatives of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service for State Records and Archives;
- scanning all the historical photographs of the MFS and other brigades from 1836 to 2012 for the 150<sup>th</sup> celebration of the MFS on 5 November 2012;
- researching the history of families in a publication that received the South Australian Genealogy and Heraldry Society Award;

- writing the SAMFS Electrical Hazards Manual;
- writing the Operational Assessment Manual;
- writing the Australian Inter-Service Incident Management System, which was nationally accredited;
- writing information for the City of Adelaide buildings, including architectural history, fire stations, military forts and barracks, police stations, schools and churches;
- writing the corporate heritage of the Country Fire Service; and
- writing the corporate heritage of the State Emergency Service.

In 1977 Malcolm assisted Donald Newton and Keith Bailey to research and write a social history of the brigade's men and their four-footed fires, entitled *When the Bells Drop*—a very interesting read. In 1979 he assisted Keith Bailey in researching for the publication *Brass Amongst the Copper*. In 1989 he assisted Steven Schueler with a publication on the history of the appliances of the MFS.

Over a period of many years Malcolm researched and assisted in writing *Muscle and Pluck Forever*, which included the history of the South Australian fire services, 1840 to 1982, and which involved a significant personal financial contribution, as well as designing the dust jacket of the publication.

Malcolm's involvement in researching aspects about the social and pioneering history of South Australia concluded in 2012, assisting other authors with a total of 23 publications during this time. He also undertook a personal family genealogy project dating back to 259 AD.

Malcolm has been a member of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Services Public Relations Council and the Fire Brigade Board's Centenary Committee. Along with four others, Malcolm was responsible for establishing the Firefighters Association (Firefighters Branch) South Australia, which was registered on 4 June 1971, now known as the United Firefighters Union of South Australia, and for 10 years was a committee member.

I place on the record my sincere gratitude to Malcolm for his long-standing public service to the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, and to the state of South Australia, and congratulate him for achieving the distinction of being the longest-serving firefighter in the history of the fire service of South Australia.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:38):** On behalf of the government I inform the house that we wholeheartedly support the opposition motion regarding station officer Malcolm Bryant, and I, too, acknowledge Malcolm's attendance here today, along with his wife Helen, son Andrew and, of course, Commander Colin Lindsay, representing the fire service as well to pay its tribute to Malcolm here today.

The Metropolitan Fire Service, much like the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service, is full of individuals who have protected their community for significant periods of time, often at great personal risk to their own safety. The risk they willingly take on board is not always recognised and appreciated by the community, but is very well understood by the families, friends and colleagues of such firefighters, and that is why I acknowledge Helen and Andrew here today, because Malcolm certainly would not have served 50 years if it was not for the support provided by his family, and indeed the support provided by his colleagues.

I first met Malcolm soon after I joined the fire service in 1983—all those years ago. I can tell members that when Malcolm joined in 1964 I was seven years old, and I think Malcolm—

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** At least I don't look as old as you, mate. I apologise for replying to interjections—I should not, I digress. Madam Deputy Speaker, I would ask them to pay due respect to Malcom here today and not interject in any way whilst I am talking. I do not think 50 years of service is a record that will ever be broken—and Malcom has had a great deal of time in the training department—unless we start recruiting people who were my age in 1964, or 10 years old, or thereabouts. No-one in the future will serve 50 years. It is a record that will not ever be beaten.

As I said, I met Malcolm soon after I joined in 1983 and, also, I met his brother Leith who, along with Malcolm, had served in the United Firefighters Union South Australian branch. There was some dispute early in the piece, and there is no use denying the fact, at the time of the amalgamation of the officers' association and the firefighters' association. It was not such a pleasant time for anyone during that period, but the right thing prevailed and we became a consolidated union representing all ranks within the service. As you would expect, at any emotional time in a union's life, there were circumstances that we wish today might not have happened; but the result is one that Malcolm has, since, always supported, and that is the true representation of all firefighters by the union across all ranks within the service.

I also want to pay tribute to the many brave firefighters Malcolm has worked with, mentored and had an impact upon during his 50 years. The member for Morphett read out all the areas in which Malcolm has been involved, and there is not a firefighter working today and not a firefighter who has worked over the last 50 years who has not, in one way or another, had some involvement with Malcolm.

Indeed, the two publications I best remember, of the many he has been involved with, are, as the member for Morphett said, *When the Bells Drop* (which is a very good read) and *Muscle & Pluck Forever*. I have to be honest: I find parts of it a little bit tedious but it is a history that will never be forgotten and would not have been recorded if it was not for the work that Malcolm Bryant has done. I think any person who served in the fire service can thank Malcolm for that history.

During his 50 years in service, as was said, Malcolm has worked in the emergency services library, the fire safety department, Adelaide Station B shift and Angle Park Training Centre, where he continues to work today with great dedication and professionalism. There are so many other areas of the fire service in which Malcolm has worked and they were detailed by the member for Morphett so I will not again detail any of those.

We had a training booklet, and I remember well the member for Morphett's dad, and I think they were divisional senior superintendents at that stage and, of course, as you would expect, with a name like Morphett, he was fondly called Jock—Jock McFetridge, sorry. I was confused with the then chief officer Colin who, again, you would be very familiar with. Jock McFetridge was a very, very good senior commanding officer within our fire service and I recognise him in this contribution today. I guess the point I am making is there are so many people Malcolm has worked with who deserve that type of recognition as well, because Malcolm would not be here today without the support he has had from a whole host of people within the fire service.

This is interesting, I think. Malcolm received the Australia National Medal in 1979. I am pleased to say that I have one of those, but what I do not have is the first clasp that Malcolm got in 1989, and he received a second clasp in 1998 and a third clasp in 2008. I am not sure they have a clasp for 50 years of service—they tell me they have. I am pleased to say there is going to be at least one, but I understand it is the second.

I say that because, according to the available Metropolitan Fire Service records—and we can thank Malcolm, again, for those records being intact as well as they are—Malcolm's service surpasses the 50 years of outstanding service to the Metropolitan Fire Service by retained station officer John Elliott, who retired in 2010 after serving the Mount Gambier community with great dedication and professionalism for so many years. I trust that John is enjoying his retirement, and we wish him well.

Today, of course, the government and the parliament congratulate Malcolm Bryant for becoming the longest serving member of the Metropolitan Fire Service in its proud 150-year history. Who can believe it? A 150-year history and we have one man who has served a third of that time. As I said, I think that we will in the future only be able to recognise retained station officer John Elliott and station officer Malcolm Bryant as those who have served for 50 years.

I do not know how much time you have left. I do not bet, because I am a former gambling minister and my advice is, 'Don't bet,' but on this occasion I think it is safe for others to bet that there will not be another 50 years, Malcolm. Whatever it is that you decide to do, I wish you all the very best in retirement and know that you will spend time with your family. I also acknowledge that Malcolm and Helen's daughter, Alison, would have liked to be here today, but she is gainfully employed in Canberra as we speak and could not make the trip. I am sure in two years, or whatever

it is that you have left, whenever you decide to retire, that you will spend that time with your loving family, but also reflecting on the many good experiences you have had with the fire service.

Malcolm, I personally thank you. On behalf of this parliament, I thank you for your distinguished service to your community, some of which has been spoken about today. Of course, we could go on and on, which politicians often do, but we are not going to today, because I only have three minutes left. We wish you well for the remainder of your career. I personally wish you all the best beyond your retirement. We also, as I said earlier, thank the many other members of the Metropolitan Fire Service and other emergency services in general who put themselves at great risk every day to protect our communities and make them safer and better places because of the work that they do. Congratulations, Malcolm; well done.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Morphett, I would just like to add my recognition of station officer Bryant's remarkable career and contribution. I wonder if he still has time to be in the firefighters' calendar. The member for Morphett.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:47):** I will leave that decision about appearing on the calendar and in which month to station officer Bryant. I thank the government, particularly the member for Colton and also minister Piccolo, who came down and we had a photograph with the minister and station officer Bryant in the members' lounge, for their kind remarks in support of this motion. I particularly thank Malcolm's family, Helen, Andrew and Alison (although Alison cannot be with us), for their support for station officer Bryant, their husband and father for many years.

As I have said in this place before, firefighters are rushing to the danger when others are running away. This is something that we all acknowledge in this place, not just the MFS but the CFS and other emergency services. Malcolm is just one of many there, but in his case it is a particularly long and exemplary career. I do not know how much longer it is, Malcolm. You could retire tomorrow and feel very satisfied with what you have done for South Australia. I congratulate you on that, and I ask the house to support the motion.

Motion carried.

### REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUSTRALIA

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:48):** I move:

That this house strongly urges the regional development minister, in conjunction with the state government to—

- (a) provide adequate core funding for the ongoing operations of the seven Regional Development Australia (RDA) committees in South Australia;
- (b) ensure that the operational funding of the RDA network is provided annually on an uncontested basis; and
- (c) ensure that the federal government commitment of \$80.9 million in operational funding to the RDA network across the nation is recognised.

It is a pleasure to bring this motion before the house. I hope that the Minister for Regional Development contributes to the debate. The genesis of the motion goes back some time, and for me it all stems from a decision made, I believe, in the 2010 budget, which was some months after the state election, when it was flagged that from June of 2013 additional funding would not be provided by the state government to the Regional Development Australia network.

It is fair to say that that created a lot of frustration with me, as a person who has lived in the regions all their life, who has been involved with several of the regional development boards, as they were then, and who is supportive of the Regional Development Australia network as it exists now. The critical component of funding, which was part of a tripartite agreement where there were federal, state and local government contributions towards it, I believe was placed at risk by deciding to withdraw that one critical component, which I believe was equal to \$4.083 million per year.

During estimates in this very chamber, I asked the Hon. Michael O'Brien, as the minister responsible at that time, questions about this budget. We went for some time, asking questions about the decision that was made—there was a fair level of warning, and I can understand that—to remove that dollar figure. After about 15 minutes (and I think this is a direct quote), I had to use the words, 'It's time for us to move on, minister, because if we don't my brain is going to explode out of frustration.' I could sense in him that, as the minister responsible, he had to act upon instructions,

but that he might have held a slightly different position and was unable to get the dollars required to do it. I understand how those things work, too.

Since that time, the RDA network (as it has become since the RDAs were created from the RDBs when the member for Colton was minister, actually), the area consultative committees (as the federal government arm of it was called), and the regional development boards and their support from local government have merged into the one organisation, and I think it has done some great work. There was a reduction in number from 13 to seven. There is a metropolitan-based RDA also, which is entirely funded by the federal government and the state does not contribute towards that.

The RDA is that really critical organisation out in regional South Australia which has the absolutely vital job of, to put it simply, connecting the dots and ensuring that visions and opportunities actually become a reality as far as humanly possible. Sometimes they do not succeed, but often they do. I think there is a commitment and dedication of those who put the proposals forward, who invest their own dollars and put in significant capital to grow their business, or to look for augmentation opportunities for infrastructure required to grow their business, or many simple things the RDA network does to give the skillset required to our workers out in regional areas.

A wide variety of roles are undertaken by really not a lot of people who commit an enormous number of hours and who have worked exceptionally hard in the period they have been employed by the RDAs to create the networks of people required to ensure they know who to speak to. Whether it be within government operations, within local community operations or within local government operations, they steer people who have ideas for opportunities through the minefield in order to get a positive outcome.

I know that the member for Frome (the Minister for Regional Development) and I think very similarly in this regard—I believe we do. Indeed, the minister and I have had discussions about the fact that, in the allocation of any state dollars to anything, there need to be some really strong KPIs attached. There need to be some exceptionally strong outcomes from that, which are measurable and which can ensure that, where dollars are provided, there is an assurance given and a reporting against that and that it is not just a matter of continuing on and, if it does not work, too bad, and all that sort of stuff, but that everybody focuses on what the outcomes need to be, that there is a report against the plan that is put forward for the dollars to be provided in the first case, and then we get some strong outcomes.

Pre 30 June 2013, the Hon. Gail Gago, as the previous minister for regional development, did create a bit of a structural change, and I recognise that. What used to be a \$3 million Regional Development Fund was broken up into two streams. Stream 1 was \$1.4 million, which was allocated on the basis of \$200,000 for each of the RDAs, to provide them with a set of dollars, but still not necessarily core funding entirely but that level of capacity to fund part of their operations, to progress applications and to be involved in things.

The key thing, though, is the difference factor. Before, it used to be \$4.083 million, which had had very little inflationary growth since the RDBs and RDAs had been created. I think when the Hon. Karlene Maywald was minister there might have been 2.5 per cent or something like that (I have that figure in my head) for them to have that opportunity.

As part of the political process and the election commitment, the Liberal Party quite proudly announced a \$3 million fund of core funding to go to the RDA network to ensure that continuity of staff members was able to exist. Yes, there was going to have to be some consolidation of what they might do: there might have been some operations to move some of their aspects together. It was less than the \$4.083 million previously provided, but it allowed those dollars to be there to give them some really strong financial future and some surety for employees so they did not lose good people. Minister Gago at the time committed \$1.4 million. It reduced what was available for regional development funding, predominantly for infrastructure, down to \$1.6 million.

I am aware, as we all are in this place, that since the election and minister Brock's elevation to that cabinet position there has been some change, absolutely. With the \$15 million, which is the new figure of the old \$1.6 million, there are five separate components. Expressions of interest have been sought for two of those component funding areas, and that is over certainly the 2014-15 financial year, but the minister is also confirming for me for the forward estimate period, for the four years of the electoral term.

I know—and I am sure the minister has spoken to these people because I have had feedback from RDA networks, some who ring a little bit more often than others—that it is that core funding area where there is no contestability attached to it that is a key for them. When the minister first announced the \$1.4 million was being increased to \$3 million, the key word I picked up in the press announcement was 'contestable' funding. Yes, I can support in principle the fact that it is not just a matter of giving money and that it has to be measured, but where indeed there are contestable dollars in essence it means 'based on priority of applications proposed by the different RDAs and depending on if it gets support', and that alarmed me.

I appreciate the fact that the minister made available Mr Don Frater, who is the deputy CE of PIRSA, to come and brief me on this and the five components of the \$15 million, and I am aware that in recent weeks there has been some movement forward and some improvements on that. But even as of yesterday, an RDA contacted my office and is continuing to talk to us.

The minister wants to get some strong outcomes, absolutely, but from an RDA perspective, it is vitally important for them as they approach 30 June to ensure that they have continuity of staff. It is those people who I think are potentially impacted by it directly, but it is the wider community that is impacted by it in the longer version of it if they are lost because they have the skillset to ensure that some good outcomes nearly immediately when proposals are put to them or when training is required or on how best to use dollars because they have a level of experience in it.

It is an absolute desire of mine to ensure that a sufficient level of core funding is provided to the RDA networks to give them that surety and that the minister wants to ensure that the RDA network survives and works strongly—and rightly so because he wants to preside over an important policy area where there are some good challenges out there, and we have seen figures come out today that concern me significantly about employment issues.

That is why the purpose of the motion is to enforce not really in a political way—even though we use the political world to provide the opportunity for the argument—but from the Liberal perspective we want great outcomes, too. We want to ensure that the dollars are there and that the people on the ground actually benefit. When I say 'people on the ground', it is the people who live in regional communities, no matter how large those communities are.

The member for Frome lives in a reasonable-size town—I believe it is 14,000 or 15,000 people. I live in a community of 1,000 people, and there is a lot less than 1,000—

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** It's a big place!

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Well, yes. The member for Stuart says it is a big place; he lives in Wilmington, which is probably—

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Around 200.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Two hundred. They are all great places and they all deserve a strong future, but they need some level of support to ensure that that occurs. It requires an individual to have a vision, to have a commitment to what they want to do, but it requires a level of support to exist for them and also the communities in which they live and operate, to actually go through those sometimes insurmountable challenges that are presented to them, where, in reality, there is a solution at hand. But, the solution at hand needs a level of experience to actually cultivate it.

In moving this motion, it is just to enforce the fact that it requires dollars, and it requires a very conclusive announcement quite soon which, while improvement has been made in the last week, actually allows the network to operate. They all bring a variety of skills and they all have a great passion and commitment to it. I know of some RDAs where they have had to create some significant structural changes in how they have done things to try and reduce their costs.

The thing that I absolutely believe in is the commitment to what they do. I know the amount of hours they spend in their cars driving to appointments, the times of the day that they are on the telephone, and the weekend commitments that they have, to be involved in community growth activities, really demonstrate to me that this is an area of support that the state government has previously committed to and currently does, but there are some questions being asked that are absolutely vital.

I just want to finish up by saying that, due to fact that there was some unsurety that existed, there was a bit of a debate federally about what to do financially. I know the minister certainly made



the statement that I think there were two states where there was a voice, apparently, that there was unsurety about state government funding, and therefore what that would do with the feds. It was so pleasing to me when, on 19 May, as part of the federal budget announcement, it was announced that there would be \$80.9 million provided across the RDA network in the future to actually support the network. I think there are something like 60 or so—the minister might correct me on the number of RDOs—

**Mr Treloar:** Fifty-five.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Fifty-five—that exist across the whole nation. But, no matter where you are in regional Australia, the same desperate need exists. From a federal perspective, it is absolutely key that they do it. I know, in contact that I and the Leader of the Opposition had via approaches made to the Hon. Jamie Briggs and the Hon. Warren Truss, for us it was a key that the feds continued to support it financially, and I am so pleased that they did that; it is an important one.

The basis of the motion is to enforce that from a state perspective. Yes, the funding has been brought up to \$3 million. There are still some questions asked about the core principal of that, and if there is a level of contestability or a level of national allocation. I know in the older days when it was a little bit over \$4 million, the average worked out to be \$585,000 per RDA; it has come back a bit. Yes, they have trimmed their operations; yes, I think in the ones that I have certainly spoken to, they have used every bit of accumulated funding that they might have had to ensure they have had a continuance since 1 July 2013 to this year on the basis that no matter what occurred at the time of the election there would be commitments that would come through.

I think it is fair to say that from a regional South Australian perspective, there was great disappointment with the original commitment by the Labor Party. The Hon. Gail Gago, as the previous minister, was not prepared to increase that; it is only the uniqueness of the parliament as it sits now that has created the opportunity for minister Brock to get some additional dollars allocated to that.

But, from the Liberal Party perspective, yes, we want that, yes, we want to ensure those \$3 million are available to be used, and not in a contestable way, and yes, the strong outcomes and principles that I believe the RDA has achieved over its lifetime—and indeed that of its predecessor from the RDB—are supported, and that we continue to have a very strong network of seven RDAs out there where great people are given that opportunity to make visions become reality.

That is what the parliament is challenged to do. Yes, we announce policies, and yes, we commit dollars in various ways, but you have got to give people a heart, and I think this is a great way of actually demonstrating it. Thank you, minister.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:04):** I rise today in support of this motion, and expect that most members of this place should also rise, because they owe a lot to the regions. Indeed, they owe a lot to the role that the RDA plays in our state's regions. RDAs are a vital resource to regional communities across this state. The RDA in my electorate of Schubert (the Barossa RDA, which takes in areas not only the Barossa but further out towards Mallala, Gawler and other areas within Light) does important and irreplaceable work for the community and its people, and the organisations in the community. It facilitates connections, with the goal of driving economic development and jobs growth. By their own description, they collaborate with industry, community and government. Offering assistance for business investment, advocacy and business case development for regional infrastructure, career development and skills training access.

It is not the role of the RDA Barossa to deliver each and every priority articulated there; rather, it is the role of the RDA to test possibilities, advocate strategically, build partnerships and articulate the rationale and benefits of these priorities to encourage and support relevant collaborations to implement them.

The regions bring more than their fair share to the table. They contribute more with less over and over again. The core funding that we are discussing today would be gratefully received, but delivering money on a contestable basis and not core operations is disingenuous and I think weakens our RDAs.

RDAs, when left to their own devices, will facilitate jobs growth. RDAs, with sufficient ongoing funding, can garner infrastructure, which begets industrial development. Industrial development begets jobs, a stronger local economy and, especially important to my electorate, greater visitation and tourism growth. Let the RDAs build the programs and projects that they and their communities

deem most appropriate. Big government interference in this way is not useful; in fact, it is a detriment to job creation. It is a cruel counterintuitive initiative that holds back jobs.

In their rush to be seen as a job-creating government, this government, which we know empirically does not care for the state's regions, is, in fact, stymying job growth in regional areas. It is not enough to be seen to be creating jobs, you must be actually creating jobs on the ground, where they are most needed. In the last 12 months, unemployment in the Barossa-Mid-North-Yorke region has almost doubled. There is an immediate need to stop this decline. In the last 12 months, the unemployment rate has risen from 5.2 per cent to 9.5 per cent—that is in just 12 months. It is close to being double the national average, which sits at 5.8 per cent. For the youth of our area, that figure is much steeper.

In April, the Minister for Regional Development was happy to announce this \$3 million in funding for the state's RDAs, but this is not new money; it is simply reinstating money that was previously cut by the Weatherill Labor government.

Since the previous cuts to their operational budget, RDAs across the state have been struggling to retain staff and the programs they run. Councils have been lobbying for funding to continue and to be increased, and I fear their calls have fallen on deaf ears. I await the result of today's budget with bated breath, but knowing this government's poor record on looking out for the regions, which contribute so much to the state's bottom line, I do not have much hope. In fact, I have a fear, a fear that the communities that contribute so much to the bottom line of this state's finances and rarely see an acknowledgement, let alone support, from this government will be forgotten.

My fear is that today's budget will completely ignore the communities that do so much and rarely are given kudos. They lag behind in support, infrastructure and jobs, and they do not deserve to be held back anymore. This Labor minority government lags far behind what the regional areas of this state could have experienced under a Liberal government, \$100 million further behind to be exact. That is the difference in price tag between what the Liberal government offered (\$139 million) when we went to the March election and the deal struck with minister Brock after the election, which only came to a paltry \$39 million. I say to the member for Frome that he needs to go back and ask for more money, and we are certainly here to give him support in doing that.

Yesterday, we heard in this place that the Weatherill government is going to have an increased focus on South-East Asia. It was announced by the minister yesterday, in a ministerial statement, that the government is pinning its hopes on the state's renaissance coming from South-East Asia—and, can I say, in this endeavour, the regions are required to be at the table.

Indeed, when the minister opposite, in his statement, listed the exports that come out of South Australia into South-East Asia, every single one of them was an export that came from regional South Australia—every single one of them, from agricultural exports to mining exports to wine exports, which would very much come out of my electorate. They need to look at the regions, and here is a way, through this motion and this motion being taken up as government policy, that we can support our regions further. If we look after them, they will pay us in spades. The regions and the RDAs have always had to do more with less, but with more, they can do so much more. We should not leave them wanting.

In my maiden speech I talked about an alternative service delivery model for services into our regions. I talked about collaborative community organisations that can help to provide a more efficient, more in-tune way of delivering services to our regions and the RDA is a prime example of that. In fact, to my mind, it is the most prime example. My RDA is linked to all sectors of the community. They are a collaborative body. I have sat in on a number of meetings with people from the food industry, the tourism industry, the SA Wine Industry Council, and other organisations, all sitting around together, all working in a collaborative fashion with the RDA at the heart of the table and at the heart of the discussion.

The RDA is fantastic in my region at being able to pull groups together. To get an idea to work and to get buy in from across the community, the RDA has been front and centre at pulling people together to get everybody on the same page. I think the most important role that the RDA currently plays—especially when so much is being pulled back from our regions—is its ability to continue to retain institutional knowledge. Governments, by their nature, create churn in programs, and so often I have seen regional programs come and go where good work was built up and lost, especially in the tourism sector of late where everything collapses when funding is pulled. The RDA

is the one body that has been able to stand the test of time and be the one that can be there so that, when the next program comes along and picks up and starts again, they have some institutional knowledge that helps us not to start back at square one.

I give an example within PIRSA of a food industry officer who I would say came to visit me about two years ago. The conversation I had with her was perhaps not the most pleasant in her life, but I gave her a history of the position that she currently fills. I said to her, 'You are the fifth person with the fifth different job title doing the same job that I have seen over my last 10 years.' Now I am only 31 years old, but I should not have been around long enough to see the same position occur under the fifth different guise. I gave her the history of where her position was at. It was very clear from our discussion that she was motivated and energetic, but she did not know of what she spoke. The difficulty was that she was starting from scratch with no knowledge base and no support. This was merely, in my view, spending taxpayer money that could otherwise be redirected into organisations that have proven themselves over a long time, and the RDAs are very much part of that.

Prior to getting elected one of the first groups that I engaged—and one that I continue to engage—was the RDA. In fact, I am going to talk about a number of their priorities that they have listed in their road map, in their 10 game changers for the broader Barossa and RDA Barossa region. Can I say that these priorities mirror very closely what I hear in the community. In fact, when I went through this document with the CEO of RDA Barossa, I was struck by how closely aligned and how in tune RDA was with the broader community.

The first project—and there is no particular order, I am only picking out the ones that are attributed more so to my electorate—is the World Heritage listing for the Mount Lofty Ranges Agrarian Landscape. This is a project that would bring international focus and recognition to our area. It would not increase regulation for planning processes to stop agricultural industries, but is a great way to get recognition for some of the pristine unique environments that we have in the broader Schubert electorate.

The second issue on the RDA road map game-changer project is something that the member for Light should take heart in, and that is the rejuvenation of the Gawler Main Street as a community centre. As somebody who has to traverse the Gawler Main Street on too often an occasion, can I say that the work here is very much needed. High speed broadband is another priority which is holding back regional economic growth from becoming more modern. Modern farming needs internet and it needs solid broadband. The amount of people who have come to my electorate office wanting to discuss poor broadband services—and sometimes it is merely less than a kilometre from a regional town centre—shows that our regional communities are held back by this not being addressed.

Last on the list, and can I say for my mind most prominently on the list, is the backing for a regional hospital for the Barossa. The RDA is on board with the project, realising that it is integral to building a more modern community and building a prosperous community in the Barossa, and I commend them for that. I commend this motion to the house and thank the member for Goyder for bringing it to our attention.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:14):** I rise to support the motion. They are very tough shoes to fill, and I commend the member for Schubert for an outstanding speech. I have an interest to declare and I will do that straight up. My wife is a member of the RDA of the Limestone Coast, so I come with a fair bit of knowledge about how RDAs work as well as the value of RDAs to the region.

On that note, I commend the member for Frome for at least bringing regional interests onto the table for the government to consider, but I fear that over its past 12 years the government has really shown its true colours. People might be amazed to know that the Premier has not visited the Limestone Coast in an official capacity since, in my recollection, December 2011. Here we are in 2014, and December 2011 was the last time the Premier visited our region. If I need to be corrected I will be, but that is my recollection.

Looking at RDAs and the national charter, I was staggered to pull out two very important, key points. In the national charter it talks about a partnership between federal, state and local government. It also talks about developing and strengthening the regional communities of Australia. That is the type of thing that we need for regional South Australia and we have the mechanism, with RDAs, at our disposal.

Instead of embracing that and funding them properly—and when I say funding them properly I am talking about continual funding, not contestable funding—the government, in its wisdom, runs off and creates different organisations like partnership brokers and cluster initiatives, which are all able to be facilitated through RDAs. So RDAs play a very important role in regional communities and, in terms of developing and strengthening regional communities, if they are funded correctly they will be able to achieve their task.

I can give a couple of examples. One business in our region—a major employer of about 200 people—was looking to leave our region. You have to realise, Madam Deputy Speaker, as I am sure you do, that we are very close to the Victorian border in the seat of Mount Gambier, so there is this continual incentive from the Victorian government to attract many of our businesses 25 kilometres over an imaginary line, which sets up different conditions under which they would operate.

Those conditions are normally cheaper power, lower WorkCover rates; basically, the cost of doing business. If it were not for our RDA at a local level, working with that business to overcome some of its barriers with HR, in particular, and associated costs, we would have lost that business to our Victorian counterparts, who put on the table a whole range of incentives and attractions to garner that employment opportunity for residents of Victoria.

If it were not for the RDA many of the strategic planning operations would not be occurring at a local level which, when funding is available, gives rise to the option for our region to apply for that funding and, hopefully, be successful in that funding to stimulate our economy and develop and strengthen our community. With that, I commend the motion.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:19):** I rise to wholeheartedly support the member for Goyder in this motion. His motion is very, very genuine and I know it comes from the bottom of his heart. There are a few of us here on this side who have, at different times, had the shadow ministry for regional development, and every one of us—and others on our side who live and work in regional areas—live and deal with this issue all the time, so I believe the member for Goyder without any hesitation when he says that this is not about politics, this is not about wedging anybody, this is not about trying to create an issue that does not exist. This is actually about continuing to press the same very genuine issues home to the government.

These are vitally important issues and I am an incredibly strong advocate of the three-tiered system where local government, state government and federal government all jointly contribute to regional development in each part of the state. I think that is just common sense. You cannot separate those and say, 'Well, it's only local and federal,' or 'It's only local and state,' or whatever anybody else might like to say. All three levels really must contribute because you are dealing with the real nitty-gritty of small business development (and trying to help somebody get a small business off the ground with the details that go along with that), all the way through to significant major infrastructure development that just cannot proceed without federal government support, so it only makes sense that that happens.

I was very happy to publicly support and thank the state government when it, with the federal government—state Labor and federal Labor—jointly set up that three-tiered funding about six years ago. I was not in parliament then, but it gave me no concern whatsoever, although I was a Liberal candidate, to say that Labor had done a good job. After becoming a member of parliament, I did not hesitate to say that Labor had set up a good system to make that happen. But, unfortunately, I also had to say very clearly and very strongly how disgraceful I thought it was that, less than a year after establishing that system, the state Labor government, which helped create it, withdrew from that system.

I thought that was a terrible thing to do for many reasons—because there was a good system in place, to start with, so it just does not make sense to pull it apart but also because so many of the people who work in regional development (what were regional development boards and became Regional Development Australia organisations) had worked so hard to reorganise themselves to fit into this new world. Any corporate or organisational restructure is difficult for the people who are involved in it, even when they know they are heading the right way, but there is uncertainty in jobs. Not everybody stays; new people come in. Geographic boundaries are adjusted and where you might have dealt with a state organisation, you start dealing with a federal organisation or vice versa.

People went through all of that believing they were going to come out the other side with a better structure, and they did. They did come out the other side with a better structure that had funding contributions from all three levels of government. They had structured term financial contributions from all three levels of government and they had representation on their governing boards from all three levels of government. Less than a year after that was established, the state government said, 'Oh well, we're going to pull out,' and it was disgraceful.

It really was a dreadful kick in the guts for the people who work in regional development across our state, but they stuck with it. Good people have done a fantastic job, doing everything they possibly could to continue doing that good work. Then, the state government said, 'We're going to fix it. We're going to fix it all. We're going to replace the funding.' I will not go through in all the detail the contributions I have made on exactly this topic before but, suffice to say, they did not replace all the funding and the funding that was replaced was given under competitive grants, not core funding.

Deputy Speaker, you know that I believe in competition. You know that I think healthy competition where you have a level playing field and not a monopoly is great. I really do believe the cream rises to the surface when people have equal opportunity, but this is a different kettle of fish. You cannot have six-months by six-months, or one-year by one-year, or even two-year by two-year government funding for people to do work in regions, because you cannot then attract good people to stay and do the work in regions. Certainly, the competition will make sure that the regional areas or the RDA that has the best projects to put forward will get the funding, and that is positive; I support that, but you have to have a component of core funding so that you can attract and keep good people working in regional areas.

You will not get one of the best people working in regional South Australia, wherever it happens to be, to stay doing what they do if another organisation that can give that person permanent employment or potentially a five-year contract on likely more money says, 'How would you like this?' They will say, 'Well, I don't really want to leave what I'm doing, but yes, I've got a family, I've got a mortgage, I've got kids, I've got the normal pressures that families have.'

You cannot keep the best people doing this work and you cannot attract the best people by saying, 'We'd love you to come and work. We've got some great projects, fantastic regions, we think we make a significant contribution to the state's economy and we'd like to give you a 12-month contract because that's the only funding that we get from the government.' It is not practical and it is unfair on the people who work in regional South Australia and it is unfair on the regions and it diminishes the productivity of the regions.

The government said, 'We're going to replace the funding', but actually did not. They were still \$4.1 million per year short in total on what they had taken away and the component that they did replace was competitive funding, not core funding, so there is not money to pay rent, to pay electricity, to keep people on longer term contracts so that there is some security in the work, because we all know the vast majority of work that is done in regional development takes several years to show benefits. You cannot get benefits from work that takes several years to do when you can only offer people one and two-year contracts and so, I think that was disgraceful.

I think, without trying to put words in his mouth, that is largely what is behind the member for Goyder's very positive motion: to try to encourage this government to understand that they have to do more; to try to encourage the government to know that if they want to continue to get the benefits that regional South Australia contributes to our entire state, they have to give regional South Australia some security; that the support the state government gives them will be there for the long run as well, and certainly that is not here at the moment.

Let me say very clearly that this is not about the member for Frome. This is not about the situation that he is in. If he was on our side, or if he was on the government's side, or if he was an Independent as he was for the last four years, as everybody else who is here was here for the last four years, he would have heard me talk about exactly these same things. It is not about him. He has the opportunity now to contribute more than he ever did before to this debate. I urge him to do that. I know he wants the best for his region. I know he wants the best for regional South Australia. He now has a better position than he has ever had before to make a difference here, but we do not bring this forward because he is in that position; we have been saying the same thing for years. We have known it is true and we will continue to fight for regional South Australia.

This is not regions asking for money. This is not regions just putting their hand out and saying, 'Please support us, give us money so we can create jobs', this is an investment. This is an investment of taxpayer money in regional South Australia; regional South Australia which contributes 54 per cent of our state's exports. It is only sales to other states and other nations that bring real money into our state, and 54 per cent of overseas exports comes from regional South Australia. What better place to invest taxpayer money so that people can continue to do that work.

There are four RDAs that share geography with Stuart: the Far North, Yorke and Mid-North, the SA Murray-Darling Basin, and the Barossa. They are the ones that, as the member for Stuart, are first and foremost in my mind, but I know that the other three that work across the state do exceptionally good work as well, and I urge this government to do everything they can to support them in that work.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:29):** I too rise to support this motion by the member for Goyder. I think on this side of the house we have had first-class contributions in support of the RDA organisations and, of course, as everyone has said, we do have seven RDAs in the state.

In my electorate of Chaffey, the Murraylands & Riverland is the branch of the RDA that I am most focused on, although the RDAs right across the state do great work. I would like to congratulate them, their boards and their staff for the work they have done. I hope that, after today's budget announcement, the Minister for Regional Development has been successful in attaining core funding for the continuation of the RDAs.

Sadly, for quite some time now, the RDAs have been almost hamstrung by their capacity to get on with the job and do what they are designed to do; that is, they are there for the benefit of their regions and to lay foundations for business development and business initiatives. For too long, they have looked over their shoulder as to whether they are going to have a job tomorrow or the week after, or as to exactly what the future holds for them. As the member for Stuart has just said, it is unfair for anyone who is going to put their heart and soul into a job not to know whether they have a job the following week or not knowing if they can put food on the table in a month's time because their future is so unclear.

On 15 April, the member for Frome announced an agreement with the Premier to deliver annual funding of \$3 million. Delivery of that funding is still unclear and, while the additional \$1.6 million is welcomed, there are concerns that funding on a contestable basis threatens the viability of the RDA network.

The member for Frome continues to ignore calls from the RDA, Rob Kerin, the LGA and regional councils to reinstate core funding of the \$3 million a year that is not project-based. I say that because I feel that we will get an announcement today, and I hope, for this state, that the minister is successful. In saying that he is ignoring these calls, what I mean is that the minister continues to say, 'Wait and see. We will see after the budget.' So, again, today will be a telling day.

I would just like to touch on my space, which is the RDA Murraylands & Riverland. My local RDA, which is, as I have said, one of the seven, is critically important to investment and growth in local business, particularly with the readjustment of the electorate and particularly around irrigation with the current drought that has seen the absolute trashing of many of the businesses. It has seen a financial draining of many of the small businesses and the family businesses that have been affected financially, socially and mentally over the last eight years with the drought and the rebuilding after the drought.

This is where the RDAs have been critically important in reassuring businesses and helping restructure, but also helping businesses to be able to adjust to the way that they had been dealt with, their financial drain, their financial loss, market loss and particularly their capacity to survive on the economies of scale that they once did. Without the core funding, there is no certainty on leases of offices and vehicles and the staff, as I have said, have no certain future.

Again, it is about that continuity and that familiarisation so that those staff members understand that region they are working in. It is about them having the contacts, it is about them having the go-to people so that they can actually perform their duties. At the moment, many of them are filling out funding applications. They are spending more energy on survival than on being the compliant RDA conduits that they have to be within their region.

What I would also like to say is that, as I understand it, my RDAs staff are living on a week-by-week basis. They do not know whether they will still be in existence next week; they do not know whether they will be in existence the week after. How can that be good for business? How can that be good for the viability of the region they represent?

Projects are still planned but there are very few resources to carry out that planning, there are very few resources to carry out the longevity of many of these projects that, in some instances, are one step or two steps through, partway through. Again, it is about the certainty that not only the RDA needs but it is the certainty that the regions they represent need.

We cannot underestimate the importance of what the RDAs do. While there is a lot of work that is commercial-in-confidence, the RDAs are building core networks with local businesses so that funding can be leveraged from that network. The RDAs are helping to change the culture of business to grow and diversify, particularly in the Murraylands and Riverland. As I have said, they are presenting collaboration and clustering to businesses at the moment.

One of the initiatives that the RDA was involved in during my first term was the BHP Roxby Downs project. It was a great disappointment to South Australia that the BHP Roxby Downs project did not go through but, prior to that announcement, I invited BHP to the Riverland to give us an overview of how their tendering process works, how the contract legitimacy would work and the tier process for businesses to put a tender forward to be a part of what was going to be one of the state's biggest stimulus packages in history. Sadly, after that, BHP's decision was not to go ahead with it. The RDAs brought those businesses together and demonstrated how those businesses could diversify away from being a tier 1 or a tier 2 business looking for tenders and how they could work together in a collaborative process and tender for tier 3, even up to tier 5 and 6, so that they could go for bigger projects, and they could work together. I think that was one of the great initiatives and great benchmarks that the RDA, particularly in the Riverland and Mallee, achieved. They have formed a group called The Grid and that business cluster is now tendering for bigger projects, they are working together collaboratively, and I think it is a great example of what can be achieved.

As the member for Schubert has said, in today's business world to grow and diversify we need the digital age and we need to have businesses that are up-to-date with information. We need to have feedback to farmers on their tractors. We do not have to go back to the office these days. For a primary producer, farmer or horticulturist to have his finger on the pulse, know what his markets are doing and know where he needs to be on any particular day of the week, he needs to have that digital connection. That is something that is sadly lacking in regional South Australia. It is another initiative that the RDAs are looking at and I think it is a great one.

In some of the other projects, for example, they are looking at taking almond hulls and extracting sugars from them to make that another industry in the Riverland. I think that is a great initiative. A researcher has been engaged and is looking into how to utilise the product which is being discarded at the moment for feed. Investment and trade underpin South Australia's economy. It is a broad portfolio for which I am very happy to be the shadow minister. The RDA's role is vital as a conduit to provide guidance from paddock to ship to plane into those trade markets to guide producers on value-adding, guiding business on a pathway to gaining knowledge and contacts, and giving them guidance on their tenders. Madam Deputy Speaker, did you know that the food sector is the largest employer in manufacturing? South Australia's exports are vital to this state's economy, as are the RDAs.

Time expired.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:39):** I rise today to support the motion from the member for Goyder, a very well-intentioned and well-supported motion. For the sake of the *Hansard* I will read the motion:

That this house strongly urges the regional development minister, in conjunction with the state government to—

- (a) provide adequate core funding for the ongoing operations of the seven Regional Development Australia (RDA) committees in South Australia;
- (b) ensure that the operational funding of the RDA network is provided annually on an uncontested basis; and

- (c) ensure that the federal government commitment of \$80.9 million in operational funding to the RDA network across the nation is recognised.

We have heard many contributions from this side about the critical nature of this core funding and that it remain core funding rather than contestable funding simply because the RDAs are so critically important throughout the regions of South Australia. There are seven across South Australia, and there are 55 similar organisations right across South Australia.

It will be for this government an investment into the future development and sustainability of the regions. I have been a great advocate of regional development boards in the past, and I have had a good working relationship with the Eyre Peninsula and Whyalla Regional Development Australia board. Unlike the member for Stuart, the electorate of Flinders falls entirely within the boundaries of one Regional Development Australia board. In fact, it is an amalgamation of two previously existing boards: the Eyre Peninsula board and the Whyalla board came together in 2009, I think, to form the one agency.

It has become critical, I believe, in strengthening partnerships between the three levels of government, and we have heard discussion about that today. Like it or not, we have three tiers of government in Australia: federal, state and local. All are important, all are critical, and the links between the three are critical. One of the things the RDA does particularly well is provide links between those three tiers. It also provides critical links between government and business.

Ultimately, the role of the RDA is to foster and assist business in their ventures and in their sustainability. There is often disparity between where businesses are and where government is—that is not the fault of either, it is just the way it is. Over past years, the RDAs have provided a vital link between those, and it needs to be ongoing.

We have heard today in the contributions about the significant importance of the regions to the South Australian economy—over 50 per cent of the state's export income comes from the regions. In fact, with the indulgence of the house, I will talk a little about the importance of the Eyre Peninsula and the Regional Development Australia board in Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula and its contribution to the state's economy.

We do things like manufacturing, agriculture, mining, fishing and aquaculture, tourism, commerce and retail, building and construction, and in all these major industries the RDA in Whyalla and Port Lincoln have played a critical role. We have 11 council areas across Eyre Peninsula, plus small outback areas, mainly west of Ceduna, and one of the slogans our regional development board works towards is, 'Developing an Eyre of prosperity', and 'Eyre' in this case is spelled as in Eyre Peninsula. Its mission statement is:

To develop a globally competitive economy for the communities in the region through fostering environmentally sustainable business and industry development, export initiatives and positive support for development.

That is quite a mouthful and it sums up a lot of the ambition and intentions of the Eyre Peninsula board, and I have no doubt that the boards right across the state have similar mission statements. I would like to talk a little bit about the staff I have known who have worked within the regional development boards, and to a person they are extraordinarily dedicated, they are extraordinarily capable, and I have found that they have immersed themselves in the communities in which they work.

This makes them part of the community, and it gives them a good understanding of the communities they work in and of the challenges and the opportunities that exist. They are extraordinarily hardworking, as I said. Also, the board members are community members who give their time for the future development and prosperity of their own local communities. They deserve some certainty, and that certainty—the certainty of employment, the certainty of their projects—will only come if core funding is available.

The regional development boards provide a vast range of services to the community and business sector. On Eyre Peninsula, there are three set units within the board; one deals with economic development, and another deals with business services. Amongst other things, they provide free and confidential advice to start-up businesses or businesses with ideas for development, and they also, very importantly, have an employment and skills unit, and a big part of their work is



making available the opportunity for younger people mostly, but also the broader population, to upgrade their skills and increase and improve their employment opportunities.

Obviously, a lot of the focus of the debate and discussion this morning has been on the Minister for Regional Development. Ultimately, his agreement with the government comes to mind with this discussion because he has the opportunity now to really stand up and show his commitment and, to demonstrate the opportunity he has towards, the regions with some core funding. Today is budget day, so we are looking for and expecting an announcement. If the minister and the government today fail to provide adequate core funding and operational funding to the RDA network, ultimately, and unfortunately, his agreement with the Premier to form government on the basis of a renewed focus on regional development will sadly ring hollow.

The minister and government must also ensure that the federal government's commitment of \$80.9 million in operational funding to the RDA network across the nation is recognised. This has to be a collaborative partnership between the federal government, the state government and local government, and it is the only way that economic and regional development can deliver projects and strategic outcomes which result in growth.

In closing, I believe that the potential for economic growth in the regions is enormous, but there has to be a focus on the right infrastructure projects to ensure industries can flourish and grow. The RDA committees provide that focus. They provide the strategy and the intellectual property for communities and regional sectors to grow.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:48):** First, the motion by the member for Goyder has basically already been put in place. I can confirm that, as a direct result of my negotiations with the government, regional communities across South Australia will now receive funding of \$3 million per annum through their regional development associations—that is, the RDAs.

I met on 10 June with all the chairs (with the exception of Whyalla mayor, Jim Pollock, who could not attend) of South Australia's seven RDA boards, where I reaffirmed that the \$3 million in funding for the seven RDAs will continue next financial year as part of my agreement with the Premier.

The Executive Chair of Regional Development SA (Rob Kerin) was also at that meeting, and afterwards Mr Kerin said that good progress had been made at that meeting and that he was looking forward to working towards a positive outcome from the discussions in the coming months. The meeting we had that particular day was very honest and frank with lots of discussion, and I believe that is the way we should have gone in the first place. Senior staff in my department—that is, PIRSA and Regions SA—also met with the RDA chief executives on the same day to clarify arrangements for accessing the funding.

Without the agreement reached with the government, RDA funding from 1 July would have remained at \$1.4 million. In a tight budgetary environment this is a significant investment of taxpayers' money, as much of it needs to be used for growing regional economies, which means creating jobs that can be quantified. The member for Goyder has already indicated that he and I shared the same issues during the last parliament, and we also want to have KPIs and outcomes, not just people sitting in positions without reaching outcomes.

At the meeting it was agreed that each RDA would submit to my department individual project management plans or requests for staff to pursue projects across each RDA. All RDAs have met and agreed to that request. The member for Chaffey indicated that I have not been liaising with Rob Kerin or the LGA. I have had discussions with the LGA and also with Rob Kerin regarding that.

This funding is exclusive to the seven RDAs in regional South Australia. It is made up of the \$1.6 million (excluding GST) in new moneys that I negotiated, and it is in addition to the existing \$1.4 million (excluding GST) that is currently available. The \$3 million is also over and above funding that other state government agencies, local councils, and the federal government provide to the seven RDAs across South Australia. The new \$1.6 million will be available from 1 July 2014, and RDAs can access it in the same way that they have accessed the \$1.4 million.

I note the past successes of this outcome-based funding arrangement and the funding provided to RDAs to date, with \$2.725 million already allocated to RDAs for programs that cover 2013-14-15. I have to acknowledge the member for Chaffey, who talked about the issue of almonds

and value adding. I consider that that is the way that this state and industries across all of regional South Australia need to go. I have been across all of the regions and I am finding great optimism out there. There are lots of challenges, but certainly there is great optimism and a lot of initiatives and innovative ways to go.

I also acknowledge and appreciate the continued funding to RDAs provided by local councils as part of the tripartite MOU between the commonwealth and state and local governments to establish RDAs. Sometimes local councils seem to be forgotten in the discussion of funding for the RDAs across all of South Australia. In addition, RDAs will be able to access grant funds from the expanded \$15 million Regional Development Fund which has been negotiated with the government.

Importantly, I also asked at that meeting that the RDA chairs and Regions SA work together to establish a new framework for regional collaboration beyond 30 June next year. This will be based on proposals and program-driven initiatives. I want to reinforce that: we all agreed at that particular meeting, including Mr Kerin, that we need to have a working relationship for all the chairs of the RDAs, Region SA, and myself, to work together for new regional collaboration beyond 30 June next year. I think that is what I am trying to get across to all here: we need that time to be able to develop that collaboration and find a new direction.

We agreed that they should aim to have a working document prepared within three months, so that new arrangements can be put in place before 1 July next year. As the member for Goyder and others on his side have indicated, everybody in this chamber, including me, and everybody in regional South Australia should want the best outcomes for regional communities from this funding, which will support the government's efforts to facilitate economic growth, improved infrastructure and job creation opportunities out there. It is what we in this chamber are all here for: looking at job creation opportunities in a positive and collaborative manner moving forward.

Finally, I do recognise the federal government's involvement in the national RDA network, and I am pleased to see, contrary to the Commission of Audit recommendations, that the federal government has maintained its funding commitment to RDAs through the 2014 federal budget.

I stand to be corrected, but I am not too sure how far after the contract the agreement is going on. However, the figure cited by the member for Goyder indicated in his notice of motion that \$80.9 million relates to the whole of Australia. The motion gets a bit confusing when people may look at \$80.9 million for South Australia, but when people look at things they look at first lines and may not see the rest. I reinforce to this house that it is across the nation for the period of time. As the member for Flinders has indicated, that will cover 55 RDAs across the whole of Australia. I wanted to get that in *Hansard*.

I also understand that in South Australia the federal government contributes approximately \$1.5 million per year to RDAs. They have very clear KPIs and they want some outcomes, as we will want to have here—a collaborative approach between the state government, the federal government, local councils and also the RDAs to ensure we have the best opportunity going forward. However, the 2014-15 federal budget, handed down on 13 May 2014, included a raft of budget measures that will impact on local communities in South Australia.

It is extremely disappointing to see supplementary local road funding for South Australia not reinstated. This decision results in a reduction of around \$18 million per annum in funding to maintain road networks across the state, including regional roads. Again, that will put more opportunities and more pressure on local councils across regional South Australia, and we do not want that. As I have indicated before, we want a lot more stuff out there for the regions.

In addition, local governing authorities have been further hit with Local Government Financial Assistance Grant indexation (FAGs), a combination of CPI increases and relative adjustments to state population movements. The CPI increases have been frozen for three years.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker: I sincerely appreciate the minister standing and addressing the chamber about this key important issue of regional and rural funding, but I think it is fair to ask about the matter of relevance at the moment. He is talking about other issues which, yes, relate to the federal budget but are not on the basis of my motion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** So, your point of order is relevance: the chair is listening to the minister and I am sure he will confine his remarks to the debate.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** What I am trying to get across is that there are lots of challenges there. The meeting we are having with the RDA chairs to form a new collaborative approach for the continuation and the best opportunities from RDAs will be based on how we can work better in the future going on after this year.

However, I will close by saying that the funding package I have negotiated for regional South Australia as part of my agreement with the Premier now comes into real focus because of the impact on the challenges and cuts that will come across. I will finish there.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

#### *Bills*

### **BUDGET MEASURES BILL 2014**

#### *Message from Governor*

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Budget Measures Bill 2014.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to Parliament House students of the Meridian School, who are guests of the member for Fisher, and also members of the Vietnam Veterans Association, who are guests of the member for Taylor.

### **PAPERS**

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Education and Care Services National Law Amendment Regulations 2014

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:03):** I bring up the report of the committee entitled Emergency Services Levy 2014-15.

Report received and ordered to be published.

#### *Question Time*

### **GILLMAN LAND SALE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:03):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Does the minister stand by his statement yesterday in relation to whether the Gillman land deal with ACP requires part of the subject land to be developed into a resources hub, and he stated:

We don't control that industry and that would be a matter for private players to negotiate out.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:04):** I said yesterday, and I say again, that there has been never any secret that the government has aspirations that the opportunity for development of a mining hub will occur in that site. There is no question about that. That has been very much front and centre of everything that has been said about this project. I was simply making the point yesterday that ultimately whether that comes to pass is not something over which the government has control.

**GILLMAN LAND SALE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** I have a supplementary question, again for the Deputy Premier. Did the former minister for urban development, now Treasurer, mislead the people of South Australia when he stated in February:

The agreement with ACP includes a series of performance targets focused on employment and economic development, with a target specifically requiring part of the land to be developed into a resources hub...?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:05):** There presently is what I think is technically to be called an option deed, or a deed of option. That option deed has a number of conditions precedent built into it, and as I have been trying to explain to the parliament, those things are being worked through.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** All I am saying to the deputy leader is that the Treasurer, former minister in this portfolio, has said on many occasions—and I think more than him; the Premier and others of us have said this on many occasions—that the desire of the government is that if this project is to proceed, it proceeds to facilitate a hub which could be a centre for the mining industry. There is nothing about that that has changed.

My point is simply this: it is one thing to create the opportunity for a mining hub to proceed. It is another to have the third parties in this context, who are any number of miners or mining engineering companies, or whoever they are, participate in the agreement. I am simply saying, as I have said before, that that is a matter over which we have no control, 'we' being the government.

**GILLMAN LAND SALE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** I have a supplementary for the Premier. As the person who signed the Gillman option deed, as described by the Deputy Premier, will the Premier confirm who is correct regarding this as being a requirement of a resources hub: the Treasurer or the Deputy Premier? The Deputy Premier is saying it is an option; the Treasurer is saying it is a requirement. You signed the deed; what is the answer?

**The SPEAKER:** Well, I didn't actually sign any deed and I call the deputy leader to order.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:07):** I've had the document that presently exists described to me—and I think this is probably the correct legal description—as an 'option deed', which says that if a certain number of things happen at certain times, then further steps will unfold. I have said also in the parliament on a couple of occasions—and the deputy leader would be very aware of this—that there is presently litigation proceeding in the Supreme Court.

It would seem to me that the appropriate way for the parties to that litigation to go about obtaining material relevant to their proceedings in the Supreme Court is to use what we used in the old days to call 'discovery' or 'interrogatories'—I know they have new names now, but I am a bit of a traditionalist and that's what we used to call them—and that this is not the forum for that sort of inquisition to occur.

**GILLMAN LAND SALE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** I have a supplementary for the Premier. Given the answers of the Deputy Premier, will the Premier table a copy of this agreement—this option—with the ACP, so that the parliament and the people of South Australia can confirm whether it is a requirement, as expressed by the Treasurer, that there be a provision for a resources hub or whether it is something to be negotiated by others as set out by the Deputy Premier?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:09):** There is no inconsistency in this, and I have to say again: there is no question that the public statements made by my predecessor in this portfolio, and by the Premier and others, have made it crystal clear that the aspiration of the government is that there will be—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is called to order and I call the member for MacKillop to order.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** There will be, by reason of a development opportunity in the Gillman area, an opportunity for a resources hub to proceed. Now, I have to say again—and for reasons of the commercial nature of the matters at the present time, I am not in a position to go further than this, other than to say—there are a number of conditions precedent which are being worked through. At some point in time, when those conditions precedent have been worked through, it will be possible for ACP and others to say more about the particular details of the matter, but at this point in time that is not appropriate.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Has the Deputy Premier made inquiries in respect of the 2010 sale of land at Gillman to members of ACP, as he indicated he would and, if so, what did they pay per square metre for the said land?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:11):** Yes, I have made inquiries in relation to that matter and I do not yet have a complete answer to that, other than to say that I do believe there was an earlier purchase of some property in that vicinity by ACP. I believe it was a much smaller parcel. That is as much as I am able to explain to the parliament presently, but I am pursuing that inquiry.

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Sorry, deputy leader. My apologies.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I was shocked!

**The SPEAKER:** My apologies. I call myself to order!

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** That's alright. When you concede the seat of Croydon and we win the election, I'll be happy with that. Thank you, sir. My question is to the Premier. Under the deed signed by the Premier and Adelaide Capital Partners, is the government going to receive \$25 per square metre, as stated by the Premier and by the Treasurer, or \$30 per square metre, as stated by Mr Fred Hansen?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:12):** I will take that question on notice and I will endeavour to give an answer to the parliament as soon as possible.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:13):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about the redevelopment of the Modbury Hospital emergency department and waiting times?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13):** I thank the member for Florey for her question. She is, of course, a champion of the Modbury Hospital. In fact, I would say that the Modbury Hospital has no greater champion than the member for Florey, of course going back to her days campaigning against the privatisation of the Modbury Hospital. The National Health Performance Authority—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** There's a voice somewhere at the back there—recently released a report into time spent in emergency departments in 2012 and 2013. The report was far from

comprehensive. It did not include the Women's and Children's and Noarlunga hospitals and only focused on the four-hour discharge target. It did not present any results on time taken to be seen by a doctor or a nurse—a target that I would argue is more relevant from a patient perspective. On this measure, South Australian hospitals were the second best in the nation in 2012-13.

While the report showed the Lyell McEwin Hospital had improved the percentage of people leaving within four hours, the performance of Modbury Hospital, however, had not improved. It should be said that during the reporting period the Modbury Hospital emergency department was undergoing a complete redevelopment. This significantly reduced the physical space in the department because, in order to ensure that patient safety was not compromised, large areas had to be sealed from dust and noise. Just like roadworks can cause a temporary increase in traffic congestion before motorists are able to enjoy a better road, it is impossible to avoid these inconveniences when carrying out capital works on an existing hospital. However, the end result was easily worth it.

The \$17.4 million redevelopment almost doubles the treatment and assessment bays, from 23 to 40. The department includes a secure, dedicated paediatric area and a low-stimulation area to improve health outcomes for mental health patients. Also, a new 20-bed rehabilitation ward will be open soon to provide much needed rehabilitation services in the north-eastern suburbs. I have visited the previous emergency department at Modbury Hospital many times, both as minister and also as a dad with a sick child, and I can say the new department is much improved, giving patients greater privacy, confidentiality and dignity.

Can I take the opportunity to thank the staff at Modbury Hospital for their patience during these works. I am told by my department that since the new emergency department opened in January, there has already been an improvement in patients being seen on time. This is similar to the progress we have seen at the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department waiting times.

These improvements are seriously under threat from the GP co-payment introduced by the federal Liberal budget. By taxing South Australians every time they see a GP, Joe Hockey and Tony Abbott have made it harder to get proper treatment earlier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** If even a small number of people shift from seeing their GPs and instead present at our emergency departments, there could be a massive increase to waiting times as well.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the deputy leader, I call the member for Schubert to order and the member for Finniss to order and I warn the member for Heysen for the first time. Deputy leader.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** My question is to the Premier: did DMITRE evaluate the Gillman land deal with Adelaide Capital Partners?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:17):** I am not aware of the answer to that question, but I will take it on notice.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** To the Premier: why did the Premier sign the option deed when the member for West Torrens, as minister for housing and urban development, had carriage of the matter and Renewal SA was the legal owner of the subject land?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:17):** I have done a little bit of research since yesterday, and my understanding of the matter from my inquiries so far is along these lines: because of the nature of Renewal SA and because the property was actually their property, it was not necessary for the execution of any document to be done by a minister on their behalf. It was adequate that Mr Hanson

did that. My understanding is also that there was a signature from the Premier, but not in that capacity. It was in the capacity of minister for state development.

#### **BUNDALEER FOREST**

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:18):** My question is to the Minister for Forests. Can the minister inform the house about plans to replant the Bundaleer Forest?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:18):** I thank the member for his question. The week after the recent election, I headed up to the Mid North to check out the area after the Bangor fires, which obviously burnt for so long and caused so much devastation for so many. There is a great deal of uncertainty in the area about the future, not just in terms of forestry but in terms of tourism, horticulture and other agricultural pursuits. The member for Frome and the member for Stuart have both, of course, had a very keen interest in their local area, and I want to thank both members for the way they have engaged with me in terms of looking at what we can do for the future.

ForestrySA's initial reaction, I guess, was a little pessimistic on the future for the area, and they are completing a report to have a look at the long-term future. I accompanied the Minister for Regional Development and the member for Stuart a few weeks ago, and we visited the Morgans—for four generations they have been running a sawmill in the area, since the early 1960s.

We met with Ed Morgan and his son Luke, and they had a much more optimistic view of what can happen up there. One of the things that they really wanted to see was—well, they understand that a lot of the timber in the Wirrabara Forest has to be salvaged, and we have to get that out and make that area safe before replanting can begin.

In the Bundaleer Forest, which unfortunately suffered an enormous amount of damage (450 hectares) in January last year, they knew that there were some areas there that were ready to be replanted. I am pleased to inform the house today that 60 hectares of Bundaleer Forest will be replanted in the next few weeks; 80,000 seedlings will be planted in the area, which I think is a very good thing for the future of the area.

As we explained to the Morgans, the Minister for Regional Development and the member for Stuart, we will still be looking at the long-term future of Wirrabara. But, I must say I was buoyed by the conversation that we had with the Morgans and to look at the operation that they have got there. The amount of timber that they put through their mill which goes all around Australia, and indeed overseas as well, is fantastic, so we want to help them. They employ around 40 staff, and the flow-on effects to the local community are very important as well.

I also want to thank the member for Stuart for organising a meeting with the local beekeepers. They are very important, not just for producing honey, but also for the pollination of our crops right around South Australia. We listened to their concerns; they would have liked things done differently immediately after the fire. We want to work with them and other government departments to ensure things are made better in the future.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, member for Stuart.

#### **BUNDALEER FOREST**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:21):** Would the minister please share with us what percentage of the total area that was burnt the 60 hectares represents?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:21):** Four hundred and fifty hectares were burnt, and there are 390 hectares that I understand are still being salvaged at the moment. A decision on that will be made at a later date. We are talking 60 hectares out of 450, so 390 are still to be decided.

#### **BUNDALEER FOREST**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:21):** Supplementary, sir: given that the salvage must be completed within approximately 12 months, can you tell us please when the decision about replanting the remaining area will be made?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:22):** I thank the member again for this important question. We will be doing that as soon as possible, but we need to take into account all the different views. If, at the end of the day, there is a differing view, we might actually get someone in to have another look at it as well. You were at the meeting with the Morgans, and they had a suggestion of someone, perhaps ex-ForestrySA, who might be a good person to have a look at that review.

I am still awaiting the report from ForestrySA, and I think until we see that and have a good look at that, we will—but what I will do is continue to involve you, the Minister for Regional Affairs and the local community up there. We also have wider implications than just what we take out of the forest; these were the first commercial forests planted anywhere in Australia back in the 1870s, so they are an important part of our history. They are also really important to our tourism operators in terms of cycling and walking paths that we have through there as well, and other recreational pursuits.

We are taking this very seriously. We cannot give an answer this week, but we will give an answer as soon as we have all the information in front of us. I give you this assurance: just as we have had discussions in the months that I have been the minister, we will continue to have those discussions with you and the wider community.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Planning. Has the minister made inquiries with Renewal SA regarding what infrastructure upgrades are required under the ACP contract for land at Gillman, as he told the house he would do on 7 May?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:23):** I don't really know whether the question is fairly framed, and I do not really know whether it is a matter for Renewal SA. I am not in a position to use information which is commercial-in-confidence relevant to the particular option deed, for the reasons that I have already explained. I will make further enquiries as to whether there is anything in the general public domain that I can say about infrastructure in that space, but I suspect whatever it is I can say is something that is already well and truly in the public domain.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** A supplementary, if I may. During the two months that Renewal SA was discussing the purchase of land at Gillman with ACP—that is, before ACP provided a detailed proposal—did Renewal SA provide ACP with any information that was not available publicly?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:25):** These questions, which are very, very open-ended and capture potentially everybody, are impossible for me to answer. I am not able to say exactly who in Renewal might have said what to whom—

**Ms Chapman:** That's why you should ask.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the deputy leader for the first time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —so I am not able to answer that question. But can I say this: I imagine, in the nature of some commercial conversations between elements of the government and ACP leading up to the preparation of the deed, there may have been, for the reason I have already explained, commercial-in-confidence IP-type material which would have been provided to the government by ACP. I don't believe there is anything that would have been provided in the other direction which would not have been available to anyone else.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** May I ask a further supplementary?



**The SPEAKER:** Alright, a further supplementary.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Thank you, sir. To the Minister for Planning: did the state government discuss helping Incitec Pivot move to land at Gillman with Renewal SA during the Gillman master plan process?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:26):** There are a number of questions in there and there are a number of time lines, so let me start off with the time lines. If I am not mistaken, the agreement to commence the Gillman master plan process was the subject of a tender process which would have begun, I think, in about May of last year. I think that there was a contract signed early in June, maybe around 6 June, last year. I think that the actual starting date of the master planning process was on about 10 June or thereabouts, and also, if I am not mistaken, in November of last year, my predecessor, as minister, indicated that a draft master plan document was being presented to the public for evaluation and feedback and suchlike.

So, having regard to that, the real question that I am being asked, as I understand it, by the deputy leader is: at any time since about May 2013 and the present time and continuing, has there been any conversation with Incitec Pivot and Renewal? I do not know the detail of any such conversation, but I expect the answer to that is probably yes because, as the deputy leader would be aware, there has been a longstanding issue about Incitec Pivot down in the Port.

I think members would be aware that there was a restriction on the type of development that might occur in the Port Adelaide region, which was a consequence of the activities conducted by Incitec Pivot in their premises down in the Port. They were storing there a product which, although I think for 99.99 per cent of the time everyone would say is absolutely safe, there was a very small risk that that product could become unstable. In those circumstances, there was an exclusion zone, which was related to the nature of that product and the fact that that activity was occurring there, and that had a direct bearing on the type of development that might conceivably occur in that area around the Port dock region.

Members can imagine the area there where the lighthouse is. You move east of there, and you get to a certain point where there is no more construction going on. Part of the reason that's been the case historically is because of the fact that this building was there and they were storing material there.

I don't have any particular knowledge of conversations but I would think it highly likely that Renewal SA had some conversations with Incitec Pivot during the period between May or thereabouts of last year and the present time and continuing, for the reason that I have just explained. Being that, Incitec Pivot finding another place to go about their business is one of the important elements in the renewal project that we are undertaking in Port Adelaide, because for us to be able to have the Port realise the sort of potential that the Port undoubtedly has there is a need for some transitioning types of activities that are occurring in some parts of the Port, and Incitec Pivot is one such activity.

### **REGIONAL MINING AND INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN**

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:30):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house on the recent release of the state government's Regional Mining and Infrastructure Plan?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:30):** I thank the member for Newland for his question. I know he retains an ongoing interest in this area. Last Thursday I was very pleased to release the Regional Mining and Infrastructure Plan. The plan was funded by the state and commonwealth governments and work on it commenced in 2012. The plan identifies the current and prospective minerals and energy opportunities in South Australia and also sets out the infrastructure requirements necessary to bring these developments to fruition.

In particular, the plan outlines infrastructure that could service multiple mining developments in three defined regions. These regions are the Far North region, the Eyre and Western region and the Yorke, Mid North and Braemar region. The plan also uses economic and scenario modelling to

determine likely production outputs across these three regions. The plan outlines growth projections for production rising from 15 million tonnes per year average over the period 2013-17 to an average of 95 million tonnes for the period 2023-32. It also suggests that mining sector development could add \$22.5 billion in gross state product and generate 5,750 full-time equivalent jobs between 2013 and 2032.

These figures are extraordinary numbers indeed. A six-fold increase in mining production in under 20 years demonstrates both the potential and also the absolute importance of the minerals and energy sectors to the future of this state. This government recognises that the right infrastructure must be in place to facilitate this growth, and now through the plan we have a better understanding of those future infrastructure needs. These include ports, freight links, power, water and road infrastructure requirements.

This government also recognises that to maximise our state's true potential in the minerals and energy sector we need to focus our efforts to meet these infrastructure needs. To do this, the government is establishing the Resources Infrastructure Taskforce. The task force will be jointly chaired by Paul Heithersay, Deputy Chief Executive of the Department of Manufacturing, Innovation Trade, Resources and Energy, and Mark Elford, Executive Director of Infrastructure in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

The task force will effectively be version two of the highly regarded Olympic Dam Expansion Taskforce. It will have all the horsepower of government invested in it with senior executives from all relevant agencies to cut through bureaucratic processes and red tape and ensure we move as quickly as possible to facilitate these infrastructure needs.

To assist the task force and also to advise cabinet, the government is also establishing an advisory committee to be chaired by Bruce Carter. The advisory committee will be available to assist in identifying and testing the commercial validity of projects put to the task force and government by proponents of mining infrastructure and will include representatives from the Economic Development Board and the Resources and Energy Sector Infrastructure Council.

With the leadership of Paul Heithersay, Mark Elford and Bruce Carter I am confident that the government is providing the best framework to facilitate the necessary infrastructure. This government will work to grow the minerals and energy sectors in South Australia and deliver on the significant potential identified in the Regional Mining and Infrastructure Plan.

*Ms Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is warned for the second and final time. The member for Little Para.

### ARTS FESTIVALS

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:34):** My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Can the minister inform the house about some of the festivals taking place in Adelaide this winter?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:34):** The Adelaide Cabaret Festival, which started on 6 June and goes until this Saturday, is the most comprehensive cabaret festival in the world. Under the guidance of the fabulous and very talented artistic director, Kate Ceberano, this year's program has featured over 470 artists and 173 performances. There are 71 international artists from across the world as well as the best from Australia.

The 2014 festival showcases 21 world premieres, 13 Australian premieres, 19 Adelaide premieres, as well as Adelaide exclusives. Last year, the Cabaret Festival launched their roadshow, which went to Port Pirie. I am pleased to report that they have built on this great event this year, adding a show in Mount Gambier. I understand that both the Mount Gambier and Port Pirie shows were sold out and by all accounts were huge success. I also have had the pleasure of meeting with the director of the 2015 Cabaret Festival, the renowned Barry Humphries. I can assure the house the festival is in very good hands.

I urge all members of the house to get along to a show, or even just the Winter Garden on the Festival Centre terrace, before it ends this weekend. If members are unable to get along to a show this weekend, the Adelaide International Guitar Festival, the most significant festival of its kind

in the southern hemisphere, will take place from 17 to 20 July and will see 58 events, with over 300 local, interstate and international artists.

Curated by internationally renowned Australian guitarist Slava Grigoryan, who I also met with recently, this unique music event not only provides our audiences a chance to see some of the best national and international guitarists but also has a strong focus on local artistic development. This year, the Guitar Festival is embarking on a partnership with the Spanish Córdoba Guitar Festival, with Slava Grigoryan performing at their festival in early July, followed by one of Córdoba's greatest flamenco exports, José Antonio Rodríguez, performing at the Festival Theatre on the final night.

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Do you think so? I understand the Spanish Ambassador to Australia, Mr Enrique Viguera, has announced his intention to attend the festival in 2014. Building on the success of our Fringe and Adelaide festivals, the Cabaret Festival and the Adelaide International Guitar Festival contribute to cementing South Australia as Australia's festival state, creating a vibrant Adelaide not just for mad March but all year round. I encourage all members to go along and support these great events.

**Mr Pisoni:** What about the Feast Festival?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is called to order. The member for Mitchell.

#### MILLSWOOD RAILWAY STATION

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. With 1 July looming and no sign of any upgrade of the work at the Millswood train station, will the minister confirm that Millswood station will reopen by 1 July, as promised before the state election?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:38):** Thank you to the member for Mitchell for his question and his kind concern about transport matters; it's not something that we're used to from members opposite. In fact, I am particularly glad they are showing such interest in our election commitment, given that it was one of the very few election commitments involving transport. I say few because we were the only side to put any commitments to the electorate, leading up to the election, that involved the transport portfolio. They completely ignored transport services and public transport services in the lead-up to the last election. Sixty million passenger transport services provided every year, 200,000 people nearly every day catching it, and not one policy.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: the question was specific to Millswood railway station and the government's promise before the election to have it open by 1 July.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the point of order is made. The minister is not receiving any protection from the chair because he is acting as a provocateur.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** He's filling an obvious gap.

**The SPEAKER:** He is, yes. That's a good point, member for Stuart. Minister.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can I also thank the member for Unley for injecting himself into this debate, given that neither he nor anybody else raised anything to do with Millswood despite it being adjacent to his electorate.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order. The minister is defying your ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** No, actually I did not make a ruling.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** You did, that you would not give him any protection. You said that you would not give him any protection and he—

**The SPEAKER:** And neither I am giving him any protection. Minister.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I apologise, Mr Speaker. I, unfortunately, got that wrong. I understand that it is actually in the member for Unley's electorate, not adjacent to it. Mr Speaker, we are very concerned with providing better public transport services to South Australians. The

responsibility falls to us because nobody else is game to take it up in this chamber, apparently. We made this commitment very specifically because we want to make sure that we continue to expand our services to people who might want to take up the option of using rail services in South Australia. We are committed to providing a 12-month trial at the Millswood train station. We will meet that commitment.

Can I just say, it is not our intention to provide a reopening of this train station before the necessary works to make sure that it is safe and appropriate for people to use. So, we will be meeting the commitment and we will be meeting it in such time as it is safe and appropriate for people who want to use those services.

**The SPEAKER:** You would like more then: a supplementary.

#### **MILLSWOOD RAILWAY STATION**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:41):** I can't stop laughing, sir. When will this work start, so that it is safe and disability friendly at the Millswood station?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:41):** It's not just a matter of it being disability friendly: it's a matter of it being suitable for all patrons of public transport to use. I am advised that the current platform is some 38 centimetres, which is 15 inches, I understand, lower than where it should be for a train to be servicing that station. I am advised that departmental officers, or indeed officers who may have been engaged by the department, have been out there undertaking early works to determine how best to raise the platform. These works that are necessary to enable us to return services to the Millswood station to be undertaken.

At the same time, we are also working on developing a timetable which will provide not just stopping at the Millswood train station but also some other benefits to users of the Belair rail line. We will do that as expeditiously as possible, but we certainly won't be hurrying the process and risking the safety of people who may want to use these services. This project will be delivered. That's our commitment. We will deliver our commitment, just as we will continue improving public transport services throughout metropolitan Adelaide, because nobody else in this chamber, particularly over that side, seems to be interested in doing the same.

**The SPEAKER:** Before we come to the member for Mitchell's second supplementary, I warn the member for Unley for the first and for the second time, and I call to order the members for Hartley, Mount Gambier, Morphett and Stuart. Member for Mitchell.

#### **MILLSWOOD RAILWAY STATION**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:43):** Given this was meant to be finished by 1 July but you are having to push the date back, has there been any scoping on pricing for the raising of the platform to allow passengers to get on and off for a 12-month trial period?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:43):** Once the detailed engineering and design works have been done for the platform raising and the removal of the existing shelter and replacement with a new shelter, lighting and other upgrades that are required, we will bring back a final pricing. We did release an amount of some \$400,000 or so. We would like to be able to deliver the upgrade and the opening of the station within that budget, but we will have to wait and see the extent of the works that are required.

**The SPEAKER:** I have allowed the member for Morialta to interject with impunity today because, having reviewed *Hansard* yesterday, he did have something of a point about the Premier's answer but, as they say in the classics, 'Sometimes one man must suffer for the people.' The member for Colton.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR CHANGE PROJECTS**

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:44):** My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister inform the house about the Change@SA program?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:44):** Change@South Australia is about renewal and driving the government's commitment to improving public sector performance. Change@South Australia is part of the Office for Public Sector Renewal, currently being amalgamated into the new Office for Public Sector, demonstrating this government's integrated approach to reforming the South Australian public sector.

Change@South Australia is an innovative program designed to unlock the tremendous potential of the public sector workforce. The program focuses on achieving a set of values defined through consultation with public sector employees. The values in action are demonstrated through a series of 90-day change projects. Through this program, public sector employees are empowered to create innovative and dynamic workplaces, and foster deeper and more productive relationships with the community and business.

I am pleased to provide the house with information on a recent and very successful example of a 90-day project, affordable housing. The project was nominated by Junction Housing, an organisation external to government, which saw the 90-day change projects as a gateway to collaboration.

The purpose of the project was to bring community housing providers into the design and planning phase of affordable housing, creating a partnership of collaboration and co-production. The project partnership between government and non-government organisations was one of equals, and this is testified to by all parties. There were significant improvements needed within government which originated from misaligned planning and policy, and the impact of government policy on community providers was made clear through a co-design process.

An agreement was reached to determine ongoing partnerships between the two sectors for the delivery of affordable housing. The introduction of national regulation and the subsequent separation of regulatory policy and funding roles at the state government level, along with the increasing participation of cross-jurisdictional providers, sees the new evolution in the relationship between government and this sector.

This places greater emphasis on the delivery of affordable housing supply through partnerships between government and the non-government sector. The opportunity to be involved in the Change@South Australia initiative provided the ideal opportunity for government and these providers to collaboratively review current practice with a view to identifying ways to strengthen co-production and collaboration.

The Change@South Australia project structure provided a safe space for conversations about the complexities associated with the development of affordable housing from both the government and not-for-profit provider perspectives. It was refreshing how quickly people divested themselves of their individual or organisation's positions and quickly took on a collective and collaborative approach to creating meaningful change.

The participants recognised that, while government and the not-for-profit sector may have different roles and responsibilities in affordable housing, they all understood that they shared a common aspiration—that South Australia be the most liveable place in the nation where people enjoy a high quality of life regardless of income and are supported and enabled to make choices to ensure the control that they have over their lives. Recognising that stable affordable housing is fundamental to this shared aspiration, there is a joint commitment to ensure a wide range of affordable homes are made available for purchase or rental, catering for different types of households.

#### INDONESIA TRADE

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:47):** My question is to the Minister for Trade. Did the minister invite the head of Indonesia's Chamber of Commerce, Suryo Sulisto, to meet with him while he was in Australia earlier this month?

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:48):** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, member for Chaffey.

### INDONESIA TRADE

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:48):** Minister, why did you not, considering that you have just announced your Asia policy and the \$275,000 annual commitment to the South East Asia strategy, in today's state budget?

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:48):** I thank the honourable member for his question. It is nice to know that he is looking into these matters. I will seek a briefing from the agency. I will find out whether the person to whom he refers did come to South Australia at that time, whether he was invited by my predecessors for a meeting, whether he chose (if invited) to accept it or whether he had other things that filled his diary. I will get the right information and come back to the member once the agency is advised of the facts. Earlier this month, I seem to remember, it was quite a busy time.

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:49):** My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Can the minister update the house on the status of housing projects that are being delivered to both metropolitan and regional South Australia?

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:49):** In June 2013, the Premier announced the state government's \$220 million Affordable Housing Stimulus Package (AHSP), which involved the acceleration of Housing SA's existing social housing projects and the delivery of additional properties in both metropolitan and regional areas over the 18 months that followed.

Included in the package are 16 housing projects that have been fast-tracked. The stimulus package includes \$50 million in new funding redirected towards the construction of social housing and \$20 million for a community housing capital grant program for providers to deliver 130 new rental properties, of which \$5 million is dedicated to regional based projects and \$30 million to constructing 104 new social housing properties on already existing service land allotments owned by the South Australian Housing Trust, which will mainly be targeted to category 1 applicants of Housing SA's waiting list, meaning that they are either homeless or at risk of homelessness.

The AHSP has set a total target of 660 properties and to date tenders have been completed for 609 dwellings, including 344 where construction has commenced and 57 that have achieved practical completion. A total of 182 contracts have been released to the market for 609 tenders, and a total of 85 builders have been invited to tender.

It should be noted that some builders have been provided with more than one opportunity to tender, due to their capacity to achieve the building requirements of multiple projects within specific time frames and their willingness to work in certain geographical areas. Of these dwellings released to tender, 490 have so far been awarded to 26 individual builders and close to 141 of the 182 contracts.

The community housing capital grant program, which I mentioned earlier, is also progressing at a similarly impressive rate, and I can confirm to the house that land has now been secured for 130 of the dwellings that will be constructed under the program. In addition, nine legal agreements have been finalised with the community housing providers who have been approved for funding. Two of the dwellings have been completed, 31 are under construction, 74 are contract and the remaining 23 have progressed to tender stage.

An additional 135 homes are being constructed in a partnership between the state government and the Unity Housing Company. Again, this program is split between metropolitan and regional areas. Of these, 80 affordable homes are being constructed in regional South Australia, including Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Booleroo Centre, Peterborough, Gladstone, Melrose, Laura, Jamestown, Saddleworth and Burra. These are very exciting projects for the community housing sector, which will assist our more vulnerable communities in both metropolitan and regional South Australia to acquire access to more affordable housing options.

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister for Social Housing. In providing the update of the properties that you have built, commenced or tendered in the last 12 months, as you have provided to the house, could you tell us how many properties the government has sold?

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Not as many as you did when you were in government.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Police is called to order. The Minister for Social Housing.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:53):** A total of 414.

**MARINE PARKS**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:53):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister confirm, based on briefings he has received from recreational fishers, the professional fishing industry and departmental staff in the three months that he has been the minister, the latest figures on jobs already lost and negative dollar impact on the state's economy, and the predicted figures following the full implementation of the marine parks and the 84 sanctuary or no fishing zones?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:53):** As the minister for fisheries, I have had discussions with the Southern Rock Lobster Association and the Northern Rock Lobster Association about their fears about marine parks. They seem to be fairly comfortable with a lot of the stuff. They have some concerns about the zones between Port MacDonnell and the Victorian border.

What I have asked them to do is to wait for these zones to come into place, in October, and see how it goes. There is always a lot of fear before things are introduced and then sometimes it comes in and it is not as bad as everyone predicted it would be. We see that not just in the fishing industry: we see it right throughout our society, right through lots of different things that happen to people over time. Change is never easy, but this is change for the good of the fisheries. This is change that will be for the good of the industry as well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The science backs that up, and I think it would be wise for everyone to wait and see how it all goes. We only have to wait until October when things are introduced and see how it goes from October for the next 12 months.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Oh, come on, ease up! There has been 10 years of debate on this issue. We are at the point where we are about to introduce these marine parks. The rest of the world is watching. They like what we are doing in terms of having sustainable fishing.

*The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health is called to order.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It was an idea first put forward by those on the opposite side of this house, and it is one that we have persevered with. We have had endless consultation. The time has come to implement the marine parks and continue to listen after we have implemented these marine parks as to how they are going. As I said before, there is always a lot of fear about change. When change actually happens, some of that fear is often unfounded.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, member for Goyder.

**MARINE PARKS**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:56):** I refer to the comment from the minister about different industry groups being comfortable—and I think that was the word that he directly used. Is the minister therefore aware of the EconSearch company research that has been done on Marine Park Regional

Impact Statements Main Report, which refers on page 11 to an estimate of 124 job losses in the commercial fishing sector alone from the introduction of marine parks, and does he still think that people are comfortable with that amount of job losses?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:56):** I again thank the member for the question. I have not actually read that report, but the fishing groups that have come to me, as I said, have not mentioned any jobs in that sort of number. There may well be some changes that need to be made as a result of the marine parks but, as I said, we have been out there consulting for 10 years and we have listened to communities from Port MacDonnell to Ceduna. It is time, in October, for these marine parks to be introduced and we will see how they will go. We will keep talking. We will be out and about in the regions, as we so often are, listening to what people have to say about them.

#### FORESTRY SALE

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Forests. Was the revenue that the government previously earned on its timber harvests enough to cover the interest on \$670 million—the amount the harvests were actually sold for?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:58):** This is a budget question and, sadly, we don't have our Treasurer with us at the moment, but he will be here shortly. Can I say that the decision in relation to the forestry sale was one that was in South Australia's best interests, and a premium price was achieved for that asset.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I don't think there is any doubt. Indeed, given the risks associated with managing such a large estate—and we have seen, sadly, with the evidence before our eyes in relation to the Wirrabara Forest—the ever-present risk of bushfire means that the South Australian government would not have the asset or balance sheet capability to restore a forest in the event of a fire. It is in the long-term economic security interests of the South-East for that to be backed up by somebody with much greater balance sheet capacity. So, it is in the long-term interests of that forest.

It is in the long-term interests of the South-East that there was somebody that had the ambition and the balance sheet capacity to grow that business. The truth is, if we decided today, at this point, would we be in the business of forests, we would not take that step. It did make sense back at the turn of the century for state governments to take those steps, but it does not make sense for the government to apply its relatively rare balance sheet capacity to a business, essentially—the business of forestry.

It was a sensible measure. It had made good, prudent financial sense to engage in the sale, and we stand by that decision, but we also accept that the South-East has many opportunities as well as challenges. That is why I think \$17 million has been allocated to future industry development in the South-East, carved out from the sale.

There has been some fantastic work done to realise some opportunities to add value to fibre in the South-East in a way which will create the jobs of the future based on advanced manufacturing opportunities. I think the best days are ahead of the South-East, and we think that there is a secure future for its forestry industry as part of that mix.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Supplementary, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, member for MacKillop.

#### FORESTRY SALE

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:00):** Given the Premier's answer to the question suggesting that the state could not manage the risk—and he particularly cited the case of the recent fires in the forests in the northern part of the state—can the Premier explain to the house what has changed over the last 30 years, given that the state managed that particular risk post the 1983 bushfires, which did in fact destroy substantial portions of the forests in the South-East, but the state post that



time was able to manage the replanting and increase the forest estate and go on to develop or keep going a very viable industry in the South-East?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:01):** This probably does reflect one of the difficulties that the Liberal Party of South Australia suffers: that they are stuck in past decades and they are unable to adjust their perspective about what is needed now for the future of our state in the light of current, contemporary circumstances. The truth is we do need to unlock balance sheet room from time to time to meet new challenges for our state. We have to meet the challenges associated with a community that wants to keep the level of resources which it puts forward for its various public services at the minimum possible level. We also need to have prudent levels of borrowings to make sure that we are able to maintain credibility in international financial circles.

To balance all those things and also our ambition to grow the state through increased investment in public infrastructure, we have to always re-evaluate our balance sheet to consider whether something is appropriate to be on that balance sheet today, as opposed to whether it may have been appropriate to be there in decades past.

So, this is the regular process of evaluation of our state government finances. I know those opposite think that nothing should ever happen for the first time, but we are a progressive government that believes you should continue to challenge yourself, to continue to imagine new futures for South Australia, and to continue to ask ourselves the question of what the future should look like.

#### FORESTRY FIRE INSURANCE FUND

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. When the cash from the \$19 million forestry fire insurance fund was transferred back to Treasury, was there an agreement that a self-insurance arrangement would remain, despite the cancellation of the dedicated fund?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:03):** I will take that question on notice.

#### HASSAD AUSTRALIA

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Has the Minister for Agriculture met with the Qatari government-owned Hassad Australia since becoming minister?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:03):** I thank the member for his question. The answer is no.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### BUDGET PAPERS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:04):** I lay on the table the following 2014-15 budget papers:

- Paper 1 Budget Overview
- Paper 2 Budget Speech
- Paper 3 Budget Statement
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 1
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 2
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 3
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 4
- Paper 5 Capital Investment Statement
- Paper 6 Budget Measures Statement

I move:

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

Motion carried.

*Bills*

**APPROPRIATION BILL 2014**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:05):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the year ending 30 June 2015, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:05):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr Speaker, 13 May 2014 will be remembered as a defining day for Australia. It will mark the day the commonwealth Liberal government walked away from healthcare and education funding. It will mark the day the commonwealth Liberal government decided signed contracts and guarantees are not worth the piece of paper they are written on.

These reckless decisions will have profound ramifications across the nation and unfortunately South Australia is not immune.

No government around the nation could have predicted this unprecedented move by the commonwealth Liberal government. Nobody could have predicted that in this day and age the Prime Minister and the Treasurer would walk away from an iron-clad guarantee between the states and the commonwealth. These cuts are real and the commonwealth Liberal government's own budget papers have them in black and white.

There is no way for us to quarantine our citizens from these brutal cuts. In fact, there is no state in the commonwealth that could absorb these brutal cuts without reparatory measures or asset sales. Over the next four years South Australia will lose \$898 million because of cuts by Prime Minister Tony Abbott. Over the next 10 years hospital and school funding cuts equate to a whopping \$5.5 billion. These cuts include a \$655 million reduction across the forward estimates in health spending alone.

The reduction in National Health Reform payments will be more than \$4.6 billion across the next 10 years compared to what was contained in the commonwealth's 2013-14 Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook. Other cuts and broken promises include:

- \$123 million in funding for pensioner concessions over four years;
- \$47 million in funding for skills and vocational education by 2017-18; and
- \$45 million in schools funding under the Gonski funding agreement, which will rise to a reduction of more than \$200 million in 2019.

Given the size and magnitude of the cuts, the state cannot afford to replace those funds and, if the commonwealth does not reverse its decision, drastic savings will be necessary. Mr Speaker, it is clear the commonwealth Liberal government no longer believes healthcare, education, training and welfare are core areas of government responsibility and have thrown them onto the scrap heap. It is a clear strategy of the commonwealth government to transfer the heavy lifting to the states. They want their budget issues to be someone else's problem. These cuts are immoral and are based on Liberal Party ideology.

Our Premier and this Labor government will fight these cuts. The commonwealth Liberal government has completely overstepped the mark and their cuts will have long-term detrimental impacts on our state. The Premier will lead this response and we will have more detail about this soon. However, if these decisions are not reversed we will be forced to make a suite of budgetary changes. We will be forced to make these changes to fill the current black hole left by the

commonwealth and to prepare us for the future cuts they have outlined toward the end of the decade and beyond.

These dramatic cuts by the commonwealth will force us to rethink the way we fund and deliver core services for our citizens. Passing on the entire \$655 million worth of cuts in health funding cannot be sustained and it would have a devastating impact on services across our healthcare system. We have taken a more balanced approach in our response to the commonwealth's attack on hospitals and the sick. It is an approach that requires savings of \$332 million to our healthcare system over four years and the removal of emergency services levy remissions to cover the remainder.

Given the lack of consultation and the short time between the commonwealth and state budgets, we will not be rushed into how to tackle the healthcare reconfiguration the commonwealth government has forced upon us. We will work with stakeholders in the health sector and other affected groups over the coming months to determine how best to deal with these devastating cuts. However, it must be stressed that the nature of the commonwealth's withdrawal means the health system is no longer viable in its current state.

Let me be absolutely clear about the impacts of the Prime Minister's cuts: bed cuts or hospital closures may be necessary, but we want to work with the health community to prevent this from happening. To manage the process, major hospital redevelopment works that have not yet commenced will be suspended. These funds will be retained in the budget and directed into the Health Capital Reconfiguration Fund which will be used to ensure capital funds are invested in the areas of the health system that best deliver the services and complement the outcomes of the health system review.

This restructure has been forced upon us by the commonwealth Liberal government and their belief that the health of the nation is not their responsibility. The government will be in a position to announce our future plans and allocate the associated capital within the Health Capital Reconfiguration Fund sometime this year.

The forced rationalisation of our healthcare system only reflects 50 per cent of the cuts the commonwealth has imposed on South Australia. As such, the state will make the necessary changes to remissions to the emergency services levy to help fill the health budget hole left by the commonwealth Liberal government. Proceeds from the emergency services levy go into the Community Emergency Services Fund.

Since the year 2000, the state government has provided remissions to fixed and mobile property owners, with the total value of those remissions being nearly 50 per cent of the funds required by the Community Emergency Services Fund. The state government paid for these remissions, making contributions into the Community Emergency Services Fund.

This fund pays for emergency services such as MFS, CFS, SES and some ambulance and SAPOL activities. Because of the commonwealth budget, the state is no longer able to provide these general remissions for the emergency services levy. This money is now required to be spent on health care to ensure we can still deliver high-quality health care now and into the future.

Changes to fixed property ESL contributions will take effect on 1 July 2014, and mobile property changes will apply from 1 August 2014. Eligible pensioners and concession cardholders are exempt from these changes for their principal place of residence, keeping the Premier's pledge to protect pensioners.

Actual increases in fixed property ESL will vary based on the capital value of property, the regional area the property is located within and the property's land use. For the median household in metropolitan Adelaide this increase will equate to about \$150 per year. For cars and large motorcycles the increase will equate to \$8, and for historic vehicles it will be \$2. The removal of the emergency services levy fixed and mobile property remissions for non-concession recipients will raise \$357 million over the forward estimates. This was not an easy decision, because we know full well the impact this will have on households. This is an unfortunate result of the commonwealth's cuts and them transferring their budget repair onto the states.

Other response measures to the commonwealth budget the state has been forced into include removing expenditure under the national partnerships which the commonwealth government

has cancelled in the areas of health, skills and education. This will result in a reduction in spending of \$115 million over the forward estimates.

The Abbott Liberal government has also slashed \$30 million per year from concessions, dishonouring another national partnership agreement with South Australia. This is a cut we will not stand for. This Labor government respects and understands the contribution that our senior citizens have made growing this state and realise we must support South Australians in most need.

Nothing highlights the stark contrast between Labor and Liberal than this. That is why Labor will be protecting pensioners and low income earners. If the commonwealth Liberal government does not reverse this decision the state will be forced to remove local government rate concessions from 2015-16. This is a decision we have not made lightly, and our clear message to the Local Government Association and welfare groups is to partner with us in fighting these Liberal cuts.

We want to bring a united front to Canberra calling on the Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, and all of his South Australian Liberals to end their assault on South Australia's pensioners and low-income earners. In total, the full value of the commonwealth cuts to the state budget over the forward estimates equals \$897.6 million. Our response measures equate to \$897.5 million over the forward estimates.

It gives me no pleasure coming into this chamber today and informing the house about what we are forced to do in response to the devastating impact of commonwealth Liberal cuts. However, these are the measures we must adopt to ensure our budget remains sustainable and has the capacity to manage the next round of cuts Mr Abbott and Mr Hockey have already flagged. If the commonwealth backs down on these horrific cuts I will gladly come back to this place and change our position.

As Treasurer I must formulate a budget based on the decisions and policies of the commonwealth government, a commonwealth Liberal government that has publicly ripped up guarantees between the states and has broken promise after promise after promise. While we cannot ignore these cuts, we will not follow the same path as the commonwealth and walk away from commitments we made before the election.

We went to the election with a series of commitments to build a stronger South Australia. I can inform the house today that all funding commitments have been honoured, as have our commitments to the member for Frome. We have honoured these commitments because Labor understands the importance of being true to your word. Unlike the Prime Minister, we are not willing to say one thing before an election and then do the complete opposite after it.

This budget delivers all our election commitments and maintains our prudent fiscal targets. In particular, we return to surplus in 2015-16 with a surplus of \$406 million. That surplus is projected to grow to \$776 million in 2016-17 and \$883 million in 2017-18. Furthermore, we will ensure we meet our fiscal targets of a level of general government net debt that remains affordable over the forward estimates.

Previously this target has stood at a ratio of net debt to revenue of 50 per cent. In both our pre and post commonwealth budget outlooks we were achieving these targets, with the exception of the financial year 2015-16 when the new Royal Adelaide Hospital comes online. This ratio of net debt to revenue of 50 per cent will be reduced to 35 per cent in response to a SA Water gearing change. Our current gearing ratios within SA Water are out of line with its statutory water corporation counterparts.

Furthermore, this discrepancy has also led to our general government sector debt figures being inconsistent with our interstate counterparts on a like-for-like basis. To rectify this and ensure South Australia is more comparable with other states, the government will increase the debt to asset gearing ratio of SA Water from 27 per cent to 45 per cent. This move will see \$2.7 billion worth of debt shifted from the general government sector to the public non-financial corporation sector.

I am advised this adjustment will have no impact on pricing to water consumers, as the level of actual debt held by SA Water plays no part in water pricing determinations by ESCOSA. To ensure we still maintain fiscal discipline, the new target of net debt to revenue of 35 per cent will be enforced. To meet our fiscal targets the government will constrain expenditure growth in a responsible and achievable manner. Expenditure as a share of the economy will reduce to below 15 per cent, for the first time in recent memory.

This expenditure constraint is important in the context of fluctuating revenues. Since the pre-election update in January 22, there has been a reduction of \$312 million in key state taxes such as payroll, property and gambling taxes over the forward estimates, before policy measures announced in this budget. It has been offset by an increase of \$355 million in GST receipts over the forward estimates.

That is why we have made a point of ensuring all election commitments were appropriately balanced by responsible and proportionate savings measures. This methodology has been extended to other expenditure since the election, including expenditure associated with the agreement with the member for Frome. Savings include:

- further efficiency dividends on government agencies to the tune of 1 per cent in 2015-16 and a further 1 per cent in 2017-18;
- only appropriately, pay freezes for executives and ministerial advisers in 2014-15;
- merging the departments of DMITRE and DFEEST to create a new Department of State Development;
- reducing expenditure on non-service consultants and contractors; and, of course
- procurement efficiencies.

Furthermore, wages growth within the public sector will be contained to 2.5 per cent. If this is not met, corresponding savings will be required. It should be noted these measures would have been in place regardless of the commonwealth budget. These measures ensure we meet our fiscal metrics. These measures are prudent and they appropriately balance where we need to cut our own cloth to ensure our election commitments are delivered sensibly.

Our election commitments are based on building a stronger South Australia. Labor fundamentally believes that by investing in our community we enjoy dividends both economically and socially. Our election commitments have been targeted across a wide range of sectors in the state. In the area of education we are committing \$85 million for a new city high school, \$64.1 million of which will be spent over the next four years. A second city high school will be built on the existing—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That's my daughter; behave yourself. Pull your head in—quickly.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Don't mention my children again.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Just don't. A second city high school will be built on the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital site, with the capacity for 1,000 students, and it will become operational in 2019.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley, if his lips move again, will be the only member thrown out of the budget speech.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The second city high school will be the centrepiece of a \$166.3 million spend on education infrastructure over the next four years. Other education investments include:

- \$77 million over four years to fund our share of the Gonski commitments;
- \$13.7 million over four years for additional family services coordinators and allied health officers to provide for expanded services in children's centres;
- \$7.7 million for 'Be Active' vouchers for primary school children to receive an annual voucher for \$50 toward their sports club fees;
- \$6 million for preschool outdoor learning areas;

- \$2.3 million to establish a specialist advanced manufacturing school at Seaview High School;
- \$18 million over four years in additional resources to maintain levels of service for employment and volunteer screening applications to ensure full and thorough assessments under the Children's Protection Act; and
- \$15 million for discretionary payments to some teachers whose long service leave entitlements will be brought into line with other public sector employees following amendments to the Education Act 1972.

Despite the commonwealth's view on health care, Labor is still committed to delivering world-class services. The new Royal Adelaide Hospital is on track to deliver a quantum leap in health care from 2016. Furthermore, the budget provides:

- \$17.5 million to be spent over the next three years to redevelop and expand the neonatal unit at the Flinders Medical Centre, consolidating all of the hospital's neonatal intensive care, special care and isolation requirements to be provided in one location;
- \$15 million per annum from 2017-18 for the operating costs of the consolidated neonatal unit at the Flinders Medical Centre;
- new ambulance stations will be built at Northfield and Seaford;
- \$8.4 million over four years to establish an independent Mental Health Commission in South Australia;
- \$7.4 million over the next two years to establish a City Disability Respite facility;
- \$5.8 million over four years for the Health@Home initiative which establishes a pilot program for community paramedics working in our community to prevent hospital admissions; and
- \$10.5 million over four years to establish regional dialysis services at Gawler.

Over the past 12 years this Labor government's commitment to law and order has been unparalleled. This budget builds on that approach with:

- \$5.3 million over three years for a new Henley Beach police station;
- \$9.7 million over three years to provide increased payments from the Victims of Crime Fund. This will help ensure victims have better access to compensation payments;
- \$8.9 million over four years for GPS-based electronic monitoring bracelets for the intensive monitoring of serious violent offenders and child sex offenders;
- \$2 million over four years to reinvigorate the role of the Neighbourhood Watch program;
- \$2 million over four years for grants to local councils to install CCTV systems, security lighting and other technologies to improve safety; and
- \$1.5 million over four years for facial recognition technology.

Before the election we made commitments to our senior citizens. Unlike the commonwealth, we will not back away from them and as such we will honour our commitments by funding:

- \$41.7 million over four years to provide for a \$50 increase in the annual energy and medical heating and cooling concessions paid to eligible recipients from 1 July 2014;
- \$32 million to protect pensioners from the commonwealth Liberal government cuts in 2014-15; and
- \$14 million over two years to introduce an \$8,500 grant for people over 60 years of age to purchase a new age-appropriate home to live in.

This government understands the importance the regions play in growing the prosperity of our state. Regional South Australia accounts for 29 per cent of the state's population, produces nearly half of our merchandise exports and contributes around 25 per cent of gross state product. We are

committed to growing the economic output of our regions, and Labor is proud to partner with the member for Frome to deliver an expansive regional package. This includes:

- \$70 million over four years to establish a jobs accelerator fund to support a jobs creation package in regional areas and increase the funding available to the Regional Development Fund and regional development associations to \$15 million per annum and \$3 million per annum respectively;
- \$35.5 million to be spent over the next four years for the continuation of rural road safety measures including, improved signage and delineation, minor junction improvements and removal, and modification and shielding of roadside hazards and median centreline treatments;
- a \$7.5 million grant in 2014-15 towards the Motorsport Park at Tailem Bend;
- \$6 million over four years for the Agribusiness Accelerator Program;
- a \$4 million grant in 2014-15 to upgrade the Innamincka airstrip for both the community and mining and exploration industries; and
- \$6 million over four years for the Remote Areas Energy Supplies Scheme.

This state government is the very definition of an infrastructure government. When you look across the state it is hard to find a piece of infrastructure this government has not invested in and improved productivity for the state. From the new Adelaide Oval, to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and the duplicated Southern Expressway, there are projects that have already helped transform Adelaide or will do so when they come online in the near future.

Labor has a proud infrastructure record, but we do not want to rest on our laurels. That is why the government continues to maintain a strong commitment to infrastructure investment with \$10.1 billion being spent across the forward estimates. Our infrastructure spend will support 4,700 jobs per annum on average.

New infrastructure projects coming online include the partnership between the state and the commonwealth to work on both ends of the north-south corridor. This budget includes provision for the \$620 million upgrade of a 2.3-kilometre section of road between the Southern Expressway and Ayliffes Road at Darlington and upgrades to intersections at Marion and Sturt roads, South and Daws roads.

This project will be undertaken concurrently with the \$896 million Torrens Road to River Torrens upgrade announced in last year's budget—in your very own electorate, sir. The state government welcomes the commonwealth government's commitment to complete the entire north-south corridor within a decade. Other major infrastructure projects include:

- \$160 million will be spent over the next three years to extend the O-Bahn guided busway, including a tunnel below Hackney Road from near Plane Tree Drive to connect with the cross-city bus lanes;
- \$152.5 million, including \$60 million to be spent within the forward estimates, to electrify the Gawler line from the city to Salisbury;
- \$27 million over two years for the Mount Barker interchange, which is jointly funded by the state, commonwealth and local government; and
- \$7.5 million over three years from 2015-16 to build more park-and-ride facilities to provide additional commuter car parking and passenger facilities.

This government is committed to transport infrastructure, because we know the important role it plays in decongesting our city. We went to the election with the commitment to bring in a transport development levy, and we will honour that approach. We know congestion is an issue, and the TDL will help alleviate that problem with the appropriate and productive infrastructure.

We invest in infrastructure because we know the role it plays in supporting and growing our economy. It is not just on the infrastructure front where this state government looks to support our business community. The Premier has called on all ministers to reconnect with business to ensure South Australia's business environment is as competitive and attractive as possible. We want to

support businesses because we know the crucial role they will play in helping grow our economy and deliver prosperity into the future.

The latest Pitcher Partners report finds that South Australia is either the lowest or the second lowest taxing state of the five states surveyed, depending on the size of the reference business that is used for comparison. That is a reputation we want to keep on developing into the future. In the last state budget, we announced payroll tax concessions for small businesses, which effectively halved the payroll tax rate for businesses with a taxable payroll of less than \$1 million. I can confirm that despite commonwealth cuts these tax cuts remain in place in 2014-15.

Since 2004, Labor has progressively cut the payroll tax rate from 5.67 per cent to 4.95 per cent and increased the tax-free threshold from \$504,000 to \$600,000. We are undertaking the most significant reform of workers' compensation in more than 25 years and, which will save registered businesses in South Australia about \$180 million per year.

The government understands that every dollar we save in business costs not only acts as an incentive to overseas and interstate investment but also allows local business to grow. This government will also continue to invest in the economy to ensure we transition our manufacturing base to more resilient and diverse industries.

In South Australia jobs were built on traditional manufacturing but, with the commonwealth decision to withdraw support for the car industry, we need a stronger focus on transitioning our economy. We need to support our component manufacturers so they can re-tool and find new markets when General Motors Holden closes down. As such, Labor commits \$60 million towards the 'Our Jobs Plan', which will revitalise and rebuild the state's economy in light of these changes.

Furthermore, we are investing in sectors that will grow and create future employment and prosperity. Over the next 16 years we know our resources sector will create 35,000 jobs. We want to ensure that this happens and in the quickest timeframe possible, and that is why we are committing \$44 million over four years.

Investments will see the construction of a new state drill core reference library and a mining and petroleum services centre of excellence at Tonsley. We will expand our world renowned PACE scheme and defer royalties for those who develop unconventional gas wells. Furthermore, we will invest \$52 million over two years in addition to \$11 million in 2013-14 towards the Skills for All initiative, to ensure industry training needs are met. This will fund an extra 20,000 VET students. Other initiatives we are funding to help grow and transition our economy include:

- \$9 million over three years to establish Green Industries SA to work with the business, government and the environmental sector to realise the full potential of the green economy, and
- \$3 million toward Health Industries SA, a body that will seek to leverage investment from the health sector on the back of our \$2 billion health precinct, anchored by the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and the SAHMRI.

Separate to the commonwealth budget and separate to our own savings initiatives, the state government has made the decision to no longer have the Motor Accident Commission write new compulsory third party insurance policies and commence running off its claims against policies issued up to and including 30 June 2016. We are doing this in the interests of reducing debt but also preparing ourselves for a future economic response, depending on what happens in future commonwealth budgets.

Writing third party insurance policies is not an essential service that should be delivered by government. I am advised that this approach follows a previous recommendation made by the Motor Accident Commission. Money from investments that reside within the Motor Accident Commission will be returned to government and placed into the Highways Fund to allow for future road developments. This initiative will allow the Motor Accident Commission to pay \$500 million in surplus net assets to the government by the end of 2016-17.

Mr Speaker, the 2014-15 Budget has been framed around difficult challenges for South Australia. South Australia's economy grows, Mr Speaker. The South Australian economy has experienced increases in housing construction activity and, at \$12.3 billion, our exports are at record highs. That is why the aim of this budget is to help foster prosperity instead of delivering austerity.



Now is not the time to follow the commonwealth and introduce measures that destroy confidence within the economy.

Furthermore, in relation to the cuts required by the commonwealth budget, let me make this point very clear. We are not an island state. Commonwealth decisions have big impacts on South Australia and its people. The decision to cut commonwealth support for the car industry from Holden will cost 13,000 jobs. The \$5.5 billion cuts to hospitals and schools cannot be absorbed. If this commonwealth budget passes the Senate, it will seriously affect South Australian families and households. Now is the time to fight these cuts. I am calling on all sectors of our community to work with us as we fight these cuts and work out how to deliver services into the future in the light of drastic commonwealth measures.

Finally, I would like to thank my ministerial and parliamentary colleagues for all their assistance in delivering our budget. I would like in particular to thank my Under Treasurer and all departmental staff who have worked tirelessly to prepare this budget. In essence, they have prepared two budgets. It is often a thankless task, but these people have worked around the clock to help deliver for our state again. I have often said that the work done by our public servants is not seen, but it is important work, and they are a credit to our state. I would also like to thank my ministerial staff for all their efforts and labour, in particular, my chief of staff, Rob Malinauskas, and my media adviser, Lucy Hood. Lucy has put in a Herculean effort over the past month, and I thank her for her labour and her dedication.

Of course, I would like to thank my family: my wife, Anthea, who has been a rock of support during this process, and my daughters, Tia and Helena, who are a gentle reminder to sometimes take a breather and enjoy the simpler things in life. I also want to thank my brother, who has taken time out from very important work at the University of Western Australia to come down and witness his baby brother's first budget. I commend this budget to the house, and I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

##### 2—Commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2014. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

##### 3—Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

##### 4—Issue and application of money

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

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

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

##### 6—Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

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

##### 7—Additional appropriation under other Acts

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

##### 8—Overdraft limit

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

Schedule 1—Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 2015

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr van Holst Pellekaan.

### **BUDGET MEASURES BILL 2014**

#### *Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:38):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to introduce a bill forthwith.

Motion carried.

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:39):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to enact legislation in relation to the 2014 state budget so as to impose a levy on parking spaces within the central business district of the City of Adelaide in order to raise revenue to be used to provide or support programs designed to improve transport services and transport safety within the state and to provide for related matters; and to make amendments to various acts for the purposes of the 2014 state budget. Read a first time.

**Ms Redmond:** Shame, shame, shame!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is on two warnings.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:40):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### *Explanation of Clauses*

This Bill introduces legislative amendments required to implement budget measures that have been announced as part of the 2014-15 Budget.

This Bill amends the *Taxation Administration Act 1996*, *Education Act 1972*, *First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000*, *Mining Act 1971*, *Passenger Transport Act 1994* and establishes legislation for a Transport Development Levy (the 'Levy') in the Adelaide central business district (CBD) from 1 July 2014.

Adelaide has more car parks per capita than any other major Australian capital city, and congestion is increasing on the roads leading into the city. As South Australia's population increases, the congestion will only increase. Adelaide has far and away the cheapest CBD parking of all mainland states.

The Levy will make using public transport more attractive and will importantly provide significant resources to be reinvested into public transport. It will initially be used to pay for new park 'n' ride and passenger facilities at various locations around suburban Adelaide.

The Bill sets the Levy at \$750 per annum per car park space in 2014-2015 and will be indexed annually to movements in the Adelaide Consumer Price Index. The Levy will apply to car parking spaces owned during the 2014-15 financial year, as assessed on 1 January 2015.

As the Levy is considered to be an exempt tax under subsection 81-5(2) of the *A New Tax System (Goods and Services Tax) Act 1999*, no GST will be payable when the Levy is remitted by the owner or operator of a car park to the Government.

However when the Levy is passed on to a third party, for example by a landlord to a tenant, the amount passed on will constitute a taxable supply and will be subject to the GST.

The Levy will apply to parking spaces which are subject to a fee or charge or the provision of some other value benefit or consideration on a regular basis, parking spaces that are set aside or used for the parking of a fleet vehicle on a regular basis, and parking spaces that are set aside or used for employee parking on a regular basis. The

Levy will also apply to parking spaces set aside or used for the parking of a car used by a Minister or other Members of Parliament, but does not apply to any area that is part of the South Australian Parliament.

The Levy area includes car park spaces located within the Adelaide City Council area south of the River Torrens and the parkland side of Hackney Road, Dequetteville Terrace, Greenhill Road, the train line bordering the west parklands and Port Road. The Levy will not apply in North Adelaide.

The legislation details a number of exemptions to the Levy including residential car park spaces, car parking spaces provided to customers of businesses free of charge, short term parking by the general public on a hospital site and spaces located at sites that do not contain more than five car parking spaces where the owner does not own more than five car parking spaces in total in the CBD.

The Bill contains provisions which allow the owner of a car park space to pass on the cost of the Levy to third parties.

Extensive consultation has occurred in relation to the technical and administrative details of the Levy and the government is confident that the Levy can be efficiently and effectively administered under the provisions of the Bill.

This Bill also amends the *Education Act 1972*.

On 29 February 2012 the High Court of Australia found that the mechanism used by successive governments for the appointment of temporary teachers was not authorised under the *Education Act 1972*.

The practical effect of the mechanism that is available for these appointments is that some temporary teachers with service from 1972 potentially have access to an allowable break in service of up to 2 years for the purposes of long service leave accrual, compared to 3 months break in service that applies to other public sector employees.

It was not the intention of successive governments to provide a more generous entitlement for accrual of long service leave to temporary teachers than are available to other public sector employees. The potential implications have significant financial consequences for the State and provide a benefit to temporary teachers not available to other public sector employees.

This Bill will retrospectively extinguish the 2 year rule for temporary teachers bringing long service leave accruals for temporary teachers in line with other public sector employees.

This Bill also introduces an \$8,500 Senior Housing Grant for people 60 years of age and over who want to purchase a new home to live in that better suits their needs.

Under the scheme, a once-off \$8,500 grant will be available for eligible homes valued up to \$400,000 and will phase out for eligible homes valued up to \$450,000. The grant will be available for eligible new home contracts entered into between 1 July 2014 and 30 June 2016. The scheme will be reviewed after that time.

The grant is only available to natural persons, can only be claimed once by each household and will not be available to first home buyers claiming the \$15,000 First Home Owner Grant.

The new grant is estimated to cost \$7 million per annum and delivers on the government's election commitment.

The Bill includes changes to the *Mining Act 1971* to increase the extractive minerals royalty rate to 55 cents per tonne, commencing on 1 July 2014. Extractive minerals include sand, rock and clay used as construction materials.

Currently the royalty payable on extractive minerals in South Australia is 35 cents per tonne, with 25 cents per tonne allocated to the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund and 10 cents per tonne allocated to the Consolidated Account. The extractives royalty rate has not changed since 1 January 2006.

The increase in the extractive royalty rates will not affect the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund, with all additional royalty revenues paid to the Consolidated Account.

South Australia's extractive royalty rate will still be competitive compared with other jurisdictions, with the new rate the third lowest rate charged by all states.

The *Mining Act 1971* is also being amended so that proprietors and operators of private mines will be required to pay royalties on minerals recovered from the mine upon the first change to the owner or operator of a mine from 19 June 2014. Private mines already pay royalties on extractive minerals.

Together, these measures are expected to raise around \$3.2 million per annum over the forward estimates.

This Bill also amends the *Passenger Transport Act 1994*.

The Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure is currently forecasting the need to provide special event public transport services each year to approximately 100 special events with over one million journeys made on these services.

Special events in Adelaide are categorised as either community or commercial events. Community events are not-for-profit events where there is no charge for entry, for example the Credit Union Christmas Pageant, Carols by Candlelight, Anzac Day and the City to Bay Fun Run, while Commercial events are those organised for profit and charge attendees for entry, participation or membership, for example sporting events and the Royal Show. It is

anticipated that of the special events that will require special public transport services approximately 86% will be commercial and 14% will be community.

Special events often generate large numbers of participants who want to travel at the same time, and for whom there is insufficient capacity on existing public transport. Dealing with this increase in travellers may require additional transport and possible detours and disruptions to regular services.

Currently, there is no requirement to notify DPTI of an event that may require special public transport services; or where the event is a commercial activity, to discuss the cost of providing the services and how much should be borne by those profiting from the event. South Australia is the only mainland state that does not have legislation or a policy dealing with public transport services to special events which is supported by major event venues and organisers.

This measure will ensure the best public transport solution is delivered for the community and where possible, ensure the appropriate level of service by improving the planning and communication between venue managers, event organisers and DPTI.

The new measure will apply to any event in Metropolitan Adelaide attracting 5,000 or more people, where special public transport services may be needed.

It sets clear requirements for 6 months notification of an event, and for consultation about what public transport services are needed for the benefit of the public. In the case of commercial events, this Bill provides for negotiating a contribution towards the cost of the services and enables the Minister to recover the agreed fee as a debt. If there has been no notification or consultation regarding a commercial event, the Minister may still recover the cost of the services.

This will not only benefit those who travel to and from a special event, it will also benefit those travelling in the vicinity of the event regardless of their choice of transport, either by public transport or in a private car. By allowing more time to plan, a better transport solution can be developed that will be easy to use, more attractive and affordable. This in turn will reduce road congestion along with air and noise pollution and minimise disruption to everyday public transport services.

Community events requiring public transport services will continue to be supported by the Government and no fee will be charged; however notification and consultation on the public transport needs will be required, for transport planning purposes.

In the case of commercial events, this Bill provides a mechanism to recover costs for the provision of additional services or the use of existing services provided free of charge to event ticket holders.

It is estimated that there are between 12 to 20 different venue managers who currently meet the threshold of 5,000 attendees for an event. The major and most frequent venues for commercial events of this size in Metropolitan Adelaide are the Adelaide Convention Centre; Adelaide Oval; Adelaide Entertainment Centre; the Adelaide Show Grounds; Hindmarsh Stadium; AAMI Stadium; the Adelaide Park Lands and the Morphettville Racecourse.

The obligation to notify DPTI of planned events is placed on venue managers as they are in the best position to know when an event is booked to take place, however the Bill provides that an event organiser may notify the event, if the venue manager agrees. This will simplify the process and reduce administration where an event organiser is using multiple venues, for example the Tour Down Under.

Venue managers of commercial events will also be ultimately responsible for paying the negotiated fee, or if there have been no negotiations, paying what the Minister considers appropriate. The responsibility will sit with the venue manager to negotiate with the event organiser how this fee will be included in any venue hire contract established between them. It is expected that both the venue manager and event organiser will be involved in the consultation about the public transport needs for the event and this will assist in ensuring the requirements of both parties are considered.

Once proclaimed, venue managers will be required to notify DPTI of planned events. The Bill also provides the Minister capacity to waive fees for special services and this power will be used, where appropriate, to allow arrangements for events that were made prior to the commencement of the Bill to proceed.

Most venue managers and event organisers already cooperate with DPTI to ensure special public transport services are provided for their event. They also engage in discussions about how the services are to be paid. This Bill will create a framework that places this obligation on all managers and organisers equally, and provides for the Minister to recover unpaid costs as a debt. Better planned public transport for special events enables participants to get to their event efficiently, and with minimum cost and disruption to the rest of the community.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

#### Part 1—Preliminary

##### 1—Short title

##### 2—Commencement

##### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

#### 4—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure.

#### 5—Calculation of parking space numbers

This clause sets out the manner in which the number of parking spaces on premises is to be calculated for the purpose of the measure if the parking spaces are not individually delineated by permanently marked lines.

#### 6—Application of Act

This clause provides that the measure applies to parking spaces within the area specified in the clause.

#### 7—Taxation Administration Act

This clause provides that the measure is to be read together with the *Taxation Administration Act 1996*.

### Part 2—Transport development levy

#### 8—Imposition of levy

This clause provides for the imposition of a transport development levy on 1 January in each financial year on each leviable parking space. A person who, as at 1 January in any financial year is the owner of leviable premises is liable to pay the levy in respect of each leviable parking space situated at or constituting those premises. The clause provides that operators of a car park that includes leviable premises are jointly and severally liable with the owner or owners for the payment of the levy.

#### 9—Amount of levy

This clause sets the amount of the levy for the 2014/2015 financial year at \$750, and provides that the amount of the levy for subsequent financial years is to be the CPI adjusted levy for that financial year.

### Part 3—Registration and returns

#### Division 1—Registration

##### 10—Requirement for registration

This clause sets out the requirements for the registration of the owner of a leviable parking space and the operator of a car park that includes leviable premises.

##### 11—Registration

This clause provides that the Commissioner must register a person who applies for registration under proposed Part 3 Division 1, and may, at any time remove a person from the register or make amendments to the register that the Commissioner considers appropriate.

##### 12—Requirement to notify changes

This clause requires notice (in the approved form) of a change of owner or operator or of a person ceasing to be an owner or operator to be given to the Commissioner in accordance with the regulations.

#### Division 2—Returns

##### 13—Returns

This clause provides that a person liable to pay a transport development levy in a financial year must lodge a return (in the approved form) with the Commissioner on or before 31 March in that financial year. A return may be lodged by the owner on behalf of the owner and the operator, or by the operator on behalf of the operator and the owner.

##### 14—Levy to accompany return

This clause sets out the time frame in which transport development levy must be paid to the Commissioner, and that the Commissioner must pay the levy into the State Transport Fund established by proposed Part 4 of the measure.

##### 15—Obligations may continue

This clause provides that a person's obligation to furnish a return and pay the levy continues despite a failure to furnish a return or pay the levy in time.

### Part 4—State Transport Fund

#### 16—State Transport Fund

This clause establishes the State Transport Fund. Subclauses (1) to (3) contain the formal requirements of the Fund. Subclause (4) provides for the matters that the Fund may be applied towards, including research, programs, grants, loans, repayments, refunds and costs outlined in the subclause. Subclause (5) permits the Minister to invest

money that is not immediately required for the purposes of the Fund. Subclauses (6) and (7) provide that the Treasurer may advance money to the Fund in the form of a loan, or charge a fee in respect of such a loan. Subclause (8) provides that payments out of the Fund will be made in accordance with the directions of the Minister (after taking into account any terms or conditions that apply in relation to money paid or advanced for the purpose of the Fund).

#### Part 5—Miscellaneous

##### 17—Guidelines

This clause provides that the Commissioner may establish guidelines, with the approval of the Minister, as to what does or does not constitute a parking space in particular circumstances and whether or not a parking space is or is not an exempt parking space.

##### 18—Notice of CPI adjustment

This clause provides that the Commissioner must publish the CPI adjusted levy for a particular financial year on an appropriate website by 1 July of that financial year.

##### 19—Levy first charge on land

This clause provides that an unpaid transport development levy is a first charge on the land on which the leviable parking space in respect of which the levy is payable is or was situated.

##### 20—Power to sell land liable to levy

This clause outlines the process by which the Commissioner may give notice regarding transport development levy that is in arrears for 6 months or more, and the subsequent circumstances in which the Commissioner may apply to the Supreme Court for an order of sale of the land in respect of which the levy is payable to recover the amount of the levy.

##### 21—Passing on levy

This clause outlines the circumstances in which an owner of leviable premises is entitled to recover transport development levy from an operator of a car park, an occupier of the land (including a lessee or a licensee) or a person who parks a motor vehicle on the leviable premises. It also outlines the circumstances in which an operator of a car park that includes leviable premises is entitled to recover transport development levy from a person who parks a motor vehicle on the leviable premises.

##### 22—Anti-avoidance provision

This clause provides that the Commissioner may determine that an area or space is a leviable parking space as at 1 January in a particular financial year if the Commissioner considers that the area or space constitutes a leviable parking space on a regular basis, but that steps have been taken to change the circumstances applying in relation to the area or space in order to avoid the imposition of levy in relation to the area or space. The Commissioner's determination will have effect in accordance with its terms, and despite other provisions in this measure and the operation of the *Taxation Administration Act 1996*.

##### 23—Regulations

This clause provides for the making of regulations by the Governor.

#### Schedule 1—Exempt parking spaces

##### 1—Residential parking

This clause outlines the circumstances in which a parking space will be considered an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure in relation to parking for residential purposes and at residential premises.

##### 2—Parking for customers or suppliers of businesses

This clause outlines the circumstances in which a parking space used by customers or suppliers of businesses is an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure.

##### 3—Loading bays

This clause provides that a parking space is an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure if it is set aside or used exclusively for the parking of a motor vehicle by a person engaged in loading or unloading passengers or goods, supplies or other items.

##### 4—Hospitals

This clause outlines the circumstances in which a parking space located at the site of a hospital (as defined in the clause) is considered an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure.

##### 5—Disabled parking

This clause outlines the circumstances in which a parking space set aside or used exclusively for the parking of a motor vehicle displaying a disabled person's parking permit (as defined in the clause) will be considered an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure.

#### 6—Motor bike parking

This clause provides that a parking space is an exempt parking space if it is set aside or used exclusively for the parking of a motor bike, and is clearly identified as being for the parking of motor bikes.

#### 7—Parking for emergency vehicles

This clause outlines the circumstances in which a parking space set aside or used exclusively for the parking of emergency vehicles is an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure.

#### 8—Parking for people attending special events

This clause outlines the circumstances in which a parking space set aside or used exclusively for the parking of a motor vehicle in conjunction with a particular special event (as defined in the clause) is considered an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure.

#### 9—Car sales displays and car service spaces

This clause provides that a parking space is an exempt parking space if it is set aside or used exclusively for the parking of a motor vehicle that is displayed or stored on the premises for the purpose of its being offered on the premises for sale or hire, or for the purpose of being serviced or repaired on the premises on which the space is situated or on adjoining premises.

#### 10—Bus layovers

This clause provides that a parking space is an exempt parking space if it is set aside or used exclusively for the parking of a passenger bus during layover periods.

#### 11—Limited numbers of parking spaces in 1 ownership

This clause outlines the circumstances in which a parking space located on a site where there are a limited number of parking spaces is an exempt parking space for the purposes of the measure.

#### 12—Prescribed exemptions

This clause provides that a parking space is an exempt parking space if it falls within a class prescribed by regulations for the purposes of the Schedule.

#### Schedule 2—Amendments—transport development levy

##### Part 1—Amendment of *Taxation Administration Act 1996*

#### 1—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the definition of *tax*.

#### 2—Amendment of section 4— Meaning of taxation laws

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the definition of *taxation laws*.

#### Schedule 3—Other budget measures

##### Part 1—Amendment of *Education Act 1972*

#### 1—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

#### 2—Amendment of section 22—Interruption of service

This clause inserts new section 22(5) into the principal Act, disapplying section 22 in respect of officers of the teaching service to whom the new section 22A applies.

#### 3—Insertion of section 22A

This clause inserts new section 22A into the principal Act.

The new section applies to certain officers of the teaching service as defined in new section 22A(11), being officers who are temporary teachers.

The new section sets out how the long service leave, and skills and experience retention leave, entitlements of these officers are to be determined.

The new section further sets out how the question of whether or not the service of the officers is continuous service is to be determined.

The new section also makes procedural provisions in respect of its operation, and confers a regulation making power enabling the regulations to make provisions of a savings or transitional nature.

#### 4—Amendment of section 23—Transfer of teachers to other Government employment

This clause inserts new section 23(3) into the principal Act, clarifying that, in relation to the operation of the section, the question of continuity of service of officers to whom new section 22A applies is to be determined in accordance with new section 22A.

5—Amendment of section 24—Rights of persons transferred to the teaching service

This clause inserts new section 24(6) into the principal Act, disapplying section 24 in respect of officers to whom new section 22A applies.

Part 2—Amendment of *First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000*

6—Amendment of section 3—Definitions

This clause inserts a definition of *seniors housing grant*, makes a consequential amendment to the definition of *new home grant scheme* and redefines *residence requirement* to include the residence requirement for seniors housing grants.

7—Amendment of section 5—Ownership of land and homes

This clause amends section 5 so that the Commissioner can impose appropriate conditions on the payment of a seniors housing grant to ensure its recovery if prescribed criteria about future conduct or events are not satisfied.

8—Amendment of section 7—Entitlement to grants

This clause amends section 7 to provide that seniors housing grants are payable if the requirements of new section 18BAC inserted by this measure are satisfied. It also ensures that only 1 seniors housing grant is payable in relation to a particular new home, and that such a grant is not payable if any other grant is payable under this Act in relation to the construction or purchase of the home.

9—Insertion of section 12B

This clause inserts a new section that sets out the criteria that apply to seniors housing grants.

12B—Criteria—seniors housing grant

This section provides that an applicant for seniors housing grant must be a person who has contracted to buy a new home, a person for whom a new home is being built, or an owner builder who is building a new home. The applicant must be a person of 60 or more years of age, or if there are 2 or more applicants, at least 1 of them must be 60 or more years of age and all of them must be natural persons. The applicant, or if there are 2 or more, at least 1 of the applicants, being a person of 60 or more years of age must occupy the home to which the application relates as his or her principal place of residence for a continuous period of at least 6 months or a shorter period approved by the Commissioner, commencing within 12 months after completion of the eligible transaction, or within a longer period approved by the Commissioner. A person is ineligible for a grant if their spouse or domestic partner has been a party to an earlier application for a seniors housing grant and the grant was paid. But an applicant is not ineligible if the grant was repaid due to a failure to comply with the residence requirement or any conditions on which the grant was made and any penalty amount payable under section 39 in relation to repayment has been paid.

10—Amendment of section 14—Application for grant

This clause amends section 14 so that it applies to an application for a seniors housing grant.

11—Amendment of section 17—Commissioner to decide applications

This clause amends section 17 so that the Commissioner is required to authorise the payment of a seniors housing grant if satisfied that it is payable on an application, and so that the Commissioner can authorise payment of such a grant before completion of an eligible transaction if satisfied there are good reasons for doing so and the State's interests can be adequately protected by conditions requiring repayment if the transaction is not completed within a reasonable time.

12—Insertion of section 18BAC

This clause inserts a new section that sets out how a seniors housing grant is to be calculated.

18BAC—Seniors housing grant

This section almost identical to section 18BAB except that it relates to seniors housing grants for eligible transactions on or after 1 July 2014 and before 30 June 2016 and requires eligible transactions for 'off-the-plan' purchases of new homes to be completed by 31 December 2017. The maximum market value of the home is the same as for a housing construction grant under section 18BAB and the amount of the seniors housing grant is calculated according to the same formula as for housing construction grants.

13—Amendment of section 18BB—Market value of homes

This clause amends section 18BB so that the market value of homes for which seniors housing grants are payable is calculated in accordance with the section.

14—Amendment of section 18C—Amount of grants must not exceed consideration



This clause amends section 18C so that a seniors housing grant can be adjusted to be equal to the amount of consideration for a home where, by virtue of such a grant, the total amount payable for the home would, but for section 18C, exceed the consideration of the eligible transaction.

15—Amendment of section 20—Payment in anticipation of compliance with residence requirement

This clause amends section 20 so that the Commissioner can authorise payment of a seniors housing grant in anticipation of compliance with the residence requirement.

16—Amendment of section 41—Protection of confidential information

This clause amends section 41 to allow protected information to be disclosed to let a person know whether a seniors housing grant has been paid in relation to a particular home.

17—Transitional provision

This clause makes provision to enable the amount of a seniors housing grant to be adjusted to take account of any *ex gratia* payment made by the State to provide for a seniors housing grant for the period between 1 July 2014 and the day on which this measure is assented to by the Governor.

Part 3—Amendment of *Mining Act 1971*

18—Amendment of section 17—Royalty

This amendment increases the royalty payable on extractive minerals to 55 cents per tonne.

19—Amendment of section 17E—Penalty for unpaid royalty

This amendment is consequential to the amendments to section 73E.

20—Amendment of section 73E—Royalty

Currently, royalty is only payable on extractive minerals recovered from a private mine. This clause amends section 73E to provide that royalty is also payable on other minerals recovered from a private mine if a relevant event occurs in relation to the private mine (and if a relevant event occurs in relation to a private mine, such royalty is payable only on those other minerals recovered from the mine on or after the day on which the relevant event occurs).

The clause provides that a relevant event occurs if, on or after 19 June 2014, there is a change in the proprietor of a private mine or the whole or any part of the right to carry out mining operations at a private mine.

The clause sets out further interpretive provisions relating to the meaning of a relevant event for the purposes of the section.

A consequential amendment is made to subsection (5).

21—Insertion of section 73EA

This clause inserts new section 73EA:

73EA—Notification of relevant event

This new section requires a person who becomes a proprietor of a private mine or acquires a right to carry out mining operations at a private mine as a result of a relevant event to give the Minister written notification, within a specified time frame of the event, of the intention to hold the event, including information about the event.

22—Amendment of section 73F—Passing of property in minerals

This amendment is consequential to the amendments to section 73E.

23—Transitional provision

This provision provides that the increase in the royalty on extractive minerals (to 55 cents per tonne) applies in relation to extractive minerals recovered on or after 1 July 2014.

Part 4—Amendment of *Passenger Transport Act 1994*

24—Insertion of Part 5A

It is proposed to insert a new Part after section 44 of the *Passenger Transport Act 1994*.

Part 5A—Special passenger services for events

44A—Interpretation

This new section inserts definitions necessary for the purposes of the proposed Part. In particular, a *special passenger service* means an alteration of an existing regular passenger service, whether—

- by adding to, supplementing, replacing, delaying or diverting an existing regular passenger service; or
- by waiving or reducing fares (or substituting some other form of consideration) for such a service; or

- by any other means.

#### 44B—Notification of event

If the manager of a venue in Metropolitan Adelaide at which an event is to be held expects at least 5,000 people to attend the venue during the period of the event or requires a special passenger service (or is of the opinion that a special passenger service may be required) for the purposes of the event, or there are reasonable grounds to expect that a special passenger service will be required for the purposes of the event, the manager must give the Minister written notice of the event within the required time frame. Notification under this section may be given instead by the organiser of the event if the manager of the venue so agrees.

#### 44C—Planning for passenger services for events

New section 44C provides that the Minister may require the venue manager and the organiser of an event of which the Minister has been given notice to consult with the Minister for the purposes of determining whether a special passenger service should be provided in relation to the event. If the Minister determines (after consideration of certain matters) that a special passenger service should be provided for an event that is a commercial event, the Minister may, after consultation with both the manager and organiser, determine a fee to be paid by the manager for the provision of the service. Any such fee may be waived or reduced by the Minister or, should it not be paid, recovered as a debt.

#### 44D—Power of Minister to charge fee in certain circumstances

New section 44D provides that if the Minister has not been notified of a commercial event as required under this new Part, or has been so notified but the manager of the venue at which the event is to be held fails to consult with the Minister as required, and a special passenger service is provided in relation to the event, the Minister may require the manager to pay a fee determined by the Minister for the provision of the service. Any such amount may be recovered as a debt from the manager.

#### 44E—Recovery of costs by venue managers not prevented

New section 44E provides that nothing in this new Part prevents the manager of a venue from recovering, in the ordinary course of commerce, from the organiser of an event held at the venue any costs for which the manager may be liable under the Part.

#### Schedule 4—Substitution of short title

This clause provides for the repeal of proposed section 1 and the substitution of the short title of the measure on the commencement of this Schedule.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

## CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND WELLBEING BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

#### **The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development)**

**(15:41):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish a legislative framework to ensure that the development and wellbeing of children and young people is considered from a whole of government perspective; to recognise the importance of children and young people to the State; to establish a Commissioner for Children and Young People; to establish the Child Development Council; to require the preparation of an Outcomes Framework for Children and Young People; to make related amendments to the Children's Protection Act 1993 and the Freedom of Information Act 1991; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

#### **The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development)**

**(15:43):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As every parent knows, children are the centre point around which families are organised. From the moment a woman knows she is pregnant, lives shift their focus towards a child. As a government, over the past 12 years, children and their families have been a focal point for our program of reform. When we came to government, we inherited an under-resourced, under-staffed and under-prioritised early education and care system.

Since 2002, we have nearly doubled the funding per student in our public schools. We have more than 1,800 more staff in schools. We have established children's centres across the state, providing a one-stop shop for preschool, occasional care, allied health programs and other community services. We have increased funding for our child protection system from around

\$90 million in 2002 to \$325 million in 2014. Significantly, we have brought young people into the centre of what we do, making 'every chance for every child' one of our state's seven strategic priorities, focusing on supporting and strengthening children, young people and families in South Australia to achieve their best.

Since our election in 2002, the government has made significant improvements to legislation for children and young people in South Australia.

Initiatives implemented by this government have seen more children and young people stay at school for longer. In 2002 under the Liberal government, just 69.5 per cent of students completed their secondary education. Under Labor, 91.9 per cent of students completed their secondary education in 2013.

We have brought together school education, early childhood education and care, child protection and health services for children and young people. The Child Development and Wellbeing Bill that I present to the house today seeks to further improve the development and wellbeing outcomes for children and young people. Significantly, the bill provides for South Australia's first commissioner for children and young people. The bill also contains provisions to establish a child development council and an outcomes framework for children and young people, initiatives that will further entrench the importance of children in the work of government across all portfolios.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in Hansard without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Child Development and Wellbeing Bill builds on South Australia's proud history as a leader in early childhood, by supporting a stronger, child-friendly State that generates lasting opportunities for every child and young person.

Children and young people, when they get the best possible support particularly in the first three years of life, are better equipped to lead fulfilling, productive and satisfying lives. In turn, this improves outcomes and overall wellbeing for each child and young person and for society as a whole.

As a government, we have long recognised the importance of seeking expert guidance to inform our work. Through our Thinkers in Residence program, and through talking to those people on the frontline, we have sought widespread input to ensure what we do is going to make a difference.

This legislation is no different. It has been strengthened as a result of seeking, and listening to, the views and ideas of the community and stakeholders on how to best legislate to support children, young people and their families.

The legislation acknowledges that, individually and collectively, we have a responsibility to help shape our future and to improve outcomes for children and young people to be the best they can be at every stage of their development.

Consultations commenced in 2012 and between August and October, 79 public forums and meetings were held and approximately 7,000 discussion papers were distributed. We received 156 written submissions from stakeholders and members of the community.

During public consultation:

- Goodstart Early Learning acknowledged the Government's commitment to children and young people and expressed support for the establishment of a commissioner as strengthening South Australia's commitment to children and young people and recognising their citizenship and other rights;
- the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner said the Bill clearly promotes a rights based approach with the recognition of children and young people as valued citizens, as has the Australian Child Rights Taskforce;
- UNICEF Australia said the Bill is a welcome development in improving the rights, development and wellbeing of children and young people in South Australia and commended the inclusion of a rights based framework within the legislation;
- the Child Health Clinical Network expressed support for the Bill and the Australian Medical Association commended the objective of the Bill to 'ensure that the development and wellbeing of children and young people is considered from a whole of government perspective'; and
- members of the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council also expressed their support for the Bill.

Key feedback from the consultation process included significant support for:

- an overarching legislative framework for children and young people;

- the appointment of an independent commissioner for children and young people;
- the establishment of a child development council;
- community involvement, with or without legislation, to inform the nature of local services.

This Government listened to the views of the community and the Bill proposes:

- the appointment of a commissioner;
- an outcomes framework (including a charter) for children and young people with performance indicators against which to measure outcomes for children and young people;
- the formation of a child development council;
- a commitment to an integrated planning and coordination approach that is multidisciplinary, cross-sector and regionally focussed; and
- to require state authorities to consider the impact and consequences of their policies on children and young people.

The consultation undertaken on exposure drafts of the legislation in 2013 helped to further develop and refine the Bill.

I would like to acknowledge the significant contribution made by stakeholders and members of the South Australian community in helping us to shape the legislation.

The Child Development and Wellbeing Bill acknowledges that children and young people have competencies and rights, as recommended by recent Thinker in Residence, Professor Carla Rinaldi.

The legislation also recognises that parents, carers and families have the primary role for the development and wellbeing of their children and young people.

Governments and others who provide services to children and young people must—to achieve the best and most sustainable outcomes—work in close partnership with parents, carers and families.

Importantly, children and young people also should be involved in decision-making processes that affect their lives, to the greatest extent possible.

This legislation will also improve information sharing, community voice in decision making and the accountability of government to children, young people and their families and advocacy to improve the outcomes of children and young people in this state.

While existing legislation regulates and directs service provision for children and young people in specific settings and circumstances, such as in relation to education, care, health and child safety, currently there is no overarching legislative framework with an holistic, overall focus on the rights, development and wellbeing of children and young people.

The Commissioner for Children and Young People will provide an authoritative voice and hold decision makers to account at a systemic level and will assist South Australia, as part of the Commonwealth, to satisfy international obligations in respect of children and young people.

The Commissioner will also provide South Australia with a clear counterpart to the Children's Commissioners and Commissions in other Australian jurisdictions, including the National Children's Commissioner.

While the Commissioner will hold decision makers and service providers to account at a systemic level, the Commissioner should not be a lone advocate or champion for children and young people in South Australia. The Bill therefore establishes a legislative mandate applicable to all stakeholders in relation to the rights, interests, development and wellbeing of children and young people in this State.

The Government's Bill, in creating an overarching framework for all children and young people in South Australia establishes a child development council to develop and keep under review, in conjunction with the Minister, a statewide outcomes framework (including a charter) for children and young people.

The Child Development Council and the development of an outcomes framework was supported in the most recent consultation on the draft legislation by the Australian Child Rights Taskforce, the Royal Australasian College of Physicians, UNICEF Australia, the Law Society and others.

The Outcomes Framework will be developed in consultation with children, young people and families and in close collaboration with state and local government bodies and the relevant industry, professional and community organisations. The Outcomes Framework will guide our work for children and young people across the state.

The Child Development Council will advise Government on the effectiveness of the Outcomes Framework in relation to outcomes for children and young people including their safety, care, health and wellbeing; their participation in education, training, sporting, creative, cultural and other recreational activities; and maintaining their cultural identity.

The Bill will amend the *Children's Protection Act 1993* to remove the provisions in that Act that establish the Council for the Care of Children. We have consulted the Council for the Care of Children and that body is supportive

of being replaced by a Commissioner with a broad mandate to advocate for the rights and interests of children and young people in South Australia.

The Bill requires the cooperation of state and local government bodies to ensure any impacts on children, young people and families are considered in decision making and policies that influence the social, economic and environmental conditions in our society and to ensure that children, young people and families are consulted.

Through the administration of the Act, the Minister has a role in helping to facilitate the coordination of services across South Australia in the best interests of children and young people.

Research from the Bernard Van Leer Foundation indicates that children and young people who are encouraged to express their views and are listened to are less vulnerable to abuse and better able to contribute towards their own protection.

This Labor Government has long understood the importance of the early years in particular, and the child as a whole. We have made this incredibly important area of government one of the foundations of our legacy.

The Child Development and Wellbeing Bill 2014 will continue this proud history of reform and formally entrench and confirm the fundamental importance of children, young people and families for South Australia's present and long-term future.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

###### 3—Interpretation

This clause defines key terms used in the measure.

###### 4—Meaning of rights, development and wellbeing

This clause sets out the meanings of the terms *rights*, *development* and *wellbeing*.

###### 5—Interaction with other Acts

This clause is formal.

##### Part 2—Fundamental aspects of Act

###### 6—Declaration

This clause makes a declaration in respect of children and young people.

###### 7—Objects

This clause sets out the objects of the measure.

###### 8—Principles

This clause sets out the principles to be applied in the administration of the measure.

###### 9—Statutory duty in respect of children and young people

This clause imposes a statutory duty on each State authority, to be met in carrying out its functions or exercising its powers.

###### 10—Outcomes Framework for Children and Young People

This clause requires the Council to prepare an Outcomes Framework for Children and Young People, and sets out procedural matters in respect of the making etc of the framework.

##### Part 3—Administration

###### 11—Functions of Minister

This clause sets out the functions of the Minister under the measure.

###### 12—Power of delegation

This clause is a delegation power in respect of the Minister's functions and powers under the measure.

##### Part 4—Commissioner for Children and Young People

###### 13—Commissioner for Children and Young People

This clause provides that there will be a Commissioner for Children and Young People.

14—Terms and conditions of appointment

The Commissioner will be appointed on conditions determined by the Governor and for a term not exceeding 5 years, and may be reappointed.

The clause also sets out when the appointment of the Commissioner may be terminated.

15—Appointment of acting Commissioner

The Minister may appoint an acting Commissioner in the circumstances set out in the clause.

16—Function of Commissioner

This clause sets out the functions of the Commissioner under the measure.

17—Delegation

This clause is a delegation power in respect of the Commissioner's functions and powers under the measure.

18—Honesty and accountability

This clause makes a procedural provision in respect of the operation of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

19—Commissioner may require information

This clause enables the Commissioner to obtain information that is in the possession of a State authority (being information needed by the Commissioner in the performance of his or her functions under the measure) and sets out the consequences for a State authority that fails to comply.

20—Commissioner's reports

This clause provides that the Commissioner may, after inquiring into and considering a matter, prepare and present a report on the matter to the Minister, and makes procedural provision in respect of such reports.

21—Use of staff etc of Public Service

This clause provides that the Commissioner may, by agreement with the Minister responsible for an administrative unit of the Public Service, make use of the services of the staff, equipment or facilities of that administrative unit.

Part 5—Child Development Council

22—Establishment of Child Development Council

This clause establishes and describes the Council and its composition.

23—Presiding member and deputy presiding member

This clause requires the Minister to appoint a presiding member, and deputy presiding member, of the Council.

24—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause sets out the terms and conditions of members of Council, including that they will hold office for 3 year terms and may be reappointed.

25—Allowances and expenses

This clause provides that members of the Council are entitled to fees, allowances and expenses approved by the Governor.

26—Validity of acts

This clause provides that acts or proceedings of the Council are not invalid by reason only of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a member.

27—Power of delegation

This clause is a delegation power in respect of the Council's functions and powers under the measure.

28—Committees

This clause allows the Council to establish committees under the measure.

29—Council's procedures

This clause sets out the procedures of the Council, including a requirement that it meet at least 6 times per calendar year.

30—Commissioner or representative may attend meetings of Council

This clause provides that the Commissioner, or his or her representative, may attend (but not vote in) meetings of the Council.

31—Conflict of interest under *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*

This clause makes provision in relation to Council members' duties under the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995* by providing that they will not be taken to have an interest in a matter if they only have an interest that is shared in common with other persons involved in the development and wellbeing of children and young people.

32—Functions of Council

This clause provides that the primary function of the Council is to prepare and maintain the *Outcomes Framework for Children and Young People*.

This clause also sets out further functions (ie, in addition to preparation of the Outcomes Framework) of the Council under the measure.

33—Council may require information

This clause enables the Council to require State authorities to provide it with information required for the performance of its functions under the measure.

34—Use of Staff etc of Public Service

This clause enables the Council to use public service staff and facilities, in accordance with an agreement with the relevant Minister.

Part 6—Miscellaneous

35—Confidentiality

This clause is a standard clause preventing confidential information obtained in course of official duties from being disclosed other than in the circumstances set out in the clause.

36—Service

This clause sets out how documents etc under the measure can be served on a person or body.

37—Review of Act

This clause requires the Minister to conduct a review of the operation of the measure within 5 years of its commencement.

38—Regulations

This clause is a standard regulation making power.

Schedule 1—Related amendment

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Children's Protection Act 1993*

2—Repeal of Part 7B

This clause repeals Part 7B of the *Children's Protection Act 1993*.

Part 3—Amendment of *Freedom of Information Act 1991*

3—Amendment of Schedule 2—Exempt agencies

This clause amends Schedule 2 of the *Freedom of Information Act 1991* to include the Commissioner as an exempt agency for the purposes of that Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

At 15:46 the house adjourned until Tuesday 1 July 2014 at 11:00.