

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Thursday, 24 March 2016

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **SPEAKER, ABSENCE**

**The CLERK:** I have to advise the house of the absence of the Speaker. The Deputy Speaker will take the chair.

**The Deputy Speaker (Ms F.E. Bedford)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

#### *Bills*

#### **BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY SECURITY OF PAYMENT (AUTHORISED NOMINATING AUTHORITIES) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (10:31):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (10:31):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to bring forward my first amendment to an act of this place. The change I am seeking to put in, I think, is quite a straightforward, common-sense solution to what has been a longstanding problem that has existed within the construction industry. The Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act provides for a process to deal with payment disputes in the construction industry—an industry that has particular issues due to its nature and its structure.

It is an industry that has a series of interrelated parties that can sometimes have stressed relationships. When you have head contractors taking on building jobs to build sometimes simple and sometimes quite complex buildings, and then subcontracting that work out to various other entities, or, indeed, subcontractors who also then further subcontract work out, you have a very complex, interrelated set of entities on a singular task. That, by its very nature, creates issues that need to be dealt with in a regulatory sense.

The intent of the act is to provide a mechanism to deal fairly and efficiently with disputes around payment. Unfortunately, this mechanism is not always used fairly and efficiently and has drawn a lot of criticism. There are documented issues with the current system that need to be fixed. There is often a claim within the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act of bias towards subcontractors who, through the current system, essentially shop around for an authorised nominating authority that is going to provide them with the outcome they seek.

That bias, in turn, creates an enmity with the two parties, between head contractors and subcontractors, where there is not faith and trust put in the process. What ends up happening is that there is often a breakdown of the relationship between head contractors and subcontractors through having used this process or, indeed, been antagonised through the current system.

Regardless of that fact, if the security of payments process is used successfully, it can help to fix the issues that exist within the industry. But what needs to happen is there needs to be trust in this process. I would like to quote from the Society of Construction Law, which did a really large review into this in 2014 and came up with some fairly strong information that does feed into some of the issues that I am seeking to deal with as part of this amendment. They say in their executive summary that the model we have here:

contains some problematic features...

- If there is a payment schedule, the claimant can choose an 'ANA', usually a for-profit company which has advertised its service to potential claimants, and the ANA then appoints an adjudicator, who is an individual who may have no professional qualifications, but who has agreed to pay up to 40% of his adjudication fee back to the ANA which appoints him.

They go on to say:

The system is susceptible of unfairness, in that it is in the commercial interests of the ANAs and hence their appointees to aim their marketing at their prospective applicant clients. [Society of Construction Law's] research has revealed the following:

- Cases of bias and breaches of natural justice (always favouring the claimant) are frequent. In cases in which the victims are willing and able to put up significant legal cost of challenging the determination, the courts are increasingly finding that the determinations are fundamentally flawed. Last year (2013), 80% of the determinations that were challenged in the court were quashed.

So, 80 per cent of the determinations made, when challenged by a higher court, were quashed, and that shows some fundamental flaws in the current system. They go on to say:

- Determinations are not trusted as reliable by the industry. Major contractors typically escape the application of the legislation simply by making it clear that they will not place contracts with subcontractors who use the legislation. The victims of this system are thus typically smaller, less well-resourced businesses.

I think that is a fairly strong and damning indictment. What they further go on to say, and this is the part of it that I think really needs to be fixed and is what I am attempting to fix through my amendment, is:

- Another aspect of the unfairness of the process is that its use typically spells the end of the commercial relationship between the parties. Instead of mending fences, the toxicity of the process is typically fatal to any prospect of the claimant ever working with the respondent again.

Basically, the longer this legislation as it currently stands is allowed to stay in place, the more we are going to see frustration, breakdown and dysfunctionality within our construction industry. I think it is incumbent upon us in here to fix these issues.

The government did make an attempt, and when I say 'did make an attempt', it was mandated when the original 2009 act was put in place for there to be a review into the act. The government duly put together that review. They commissioned Retired District Court Judge Alan Moss to undertake the review. Alan Moss came back and presented his findings to cabinet on 11 March last year, and I note that we have just hit the 12-month anniversary of cabinet first seeing these documents.

Alan Moss's review goes through to deal with a whole number of issues, but the first and probably most important recommendation that the retired judge makes is in relation to the appointment of authorised nominating authorities. Indeed, his first recommendation is the following:

- (a) That the Minister withdraw all authority of the current ANAs...
- (b) That the Minister appoint the [Small Business Commissioner], upon the [Small Business Commissioner's] application, to be the sole ANA...
- (c) That the [Small Business Commissioner] should give such information, or advice, or offer mediation to would be claimants under the Act as he considers consistent with his legislative charter.
- (d) That all applications for adjudication be made to the [Small Business Commissioner] as the sole ANA.

I think that is an entirely sensible suggestion. I think that cabinet would have thought that this was an entirely legitimate suggestion. But, indeed, here we are 12 months on from that review being submitted to cabinet and we still do not have an answer.

We did get a conversation of sorts; I will not call it an answer. On 30 June last year, the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy and also the Minister for Small Business came into this place and tabled the review. He then made a ministerial statement where he goes on to say the following:

There remains considerable concern within sections of the industry about the imbalance of power between subcontractors and head contractors, and Mr Moss was presented with evidence of behaviours of some parties which show the industry is a long way from best practice when it comes to a smooth payment process.

He goes on to say:

I will provide the house with further updates on the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009 as they become available.

We sit here nine months on from a ministerial statement that says, 'I will come back with further updates,' and we are still waiting. The longer this goes on, the further and further the industry is going to descend into dysfunction because of the inaction of this government, which is why I felt compelled to bring an amendment bill to this place. In the same ministerial statement, the minister also goes on to place on the record that:

...the failure of Tagara is of...concern to the state government. The Small Business Commissioner spoke to Tagara liquidators, Clifton Hall, on Monday, 29 June, who advised that a meeting of creditors was scheduled to be held on 14 July 2015. Contact will continue with liquidators to establish the cause of Tagara's collapse...

The minister has tied those two things together. He has tied together two issues—the collapse and liquidation of a builder and a review into changes proposed for the security of payments act. I think he did that deliberately. Indeed, the collapse of Tagara and the collapse of other builders that we have seen subsequently is an issue for that industry but, once again, even after having conducted a review highlighting the issue in this place, the government has now sat down and done absolutely nothing about it.

What I would like to do now is discuss the changes that I seek to bring forward. The main crux of what we need to fix here is the claims of bias. Even if those claims are not always substantiated, if there is a lack of trust within the industry in the security of payments process, then the process is failing. Fundamentally, the process needs to be viewed and trusted by all sides as a legitimate way and an unbiased way of dealing with the issues that exist.

The change I am proposing as part of this amendment bill is to do what Alan Moss wanted to do in his review and that is to make the Small Business Commissioner the only authorised nominating authority. It gives the Small Business Commissioner the ability to appoint a pool of adjudicators from which security of payments disputes can be mediated.

As part of this, we are calling for adjudicators to be appointed to cases on a random basis, it cannot be that adjudicators are plucked to fit a specific case because, as is currently the case, they are probably the ones who are going to get the right outcomes for the claimant. Appointing adjudicators on a random basis can help to deal with that claim of bias and that institutionalised bias that exists under the current system.

I do agree that there are considerations that the Small Business Commissioner will have to make in relation to the qualifications and experience of these individual adjudicators as to when they are going to be able to apply to different cases, but in my view, there has to be a principle that these adjudicators are appointed randomly, to get rid of those claims of bias. To further get rid of the claims of bias, I am proposing to create a panel of five members, with at least one of those members representing the interests of head contractors and one representing the interests of subcontractors.

The idea behind this is to give this panel the power to review the appointment of adjudicators. By consulting industry, by having people representing the two sides of the debate on this issue being part of a process to review adjudicators and by giving them a seat at the table, we will show them that the process can and should be fair and also give them the ability to ensure that the process is fair.

The functions of the panel will be to oversee the pool of adjudicators appointed; to inquire into the suitability of individual persons to be, or to continue to be, adjudicators for the purposes of the act; and to make recommendations and give advice to the Small Business Commissioner in relation to adjudication under this act. The adjudication review panel may also recommend to the Small Business Commissioner that a specific person be removed from the pool of adjudicators established under section 18.

Essentially, it gives that panel of five the ability to veto those whom they believe, and whom the majority believe, have a claim of bias. That panel will also be able to give advice to the Small Business Commissioner, because one of the issues that has been raised is that, because the commissioner is there to represent small business, the Small Business Commissioner may also potentially have a bias.

The idea behind putting in this panel is so it can counter that potential and, I believe, unfounded claim of bias against the Small Business Commissioner. So the panel will be there, we will be able to review and oversee and we will be able to direct the Small Business Commissioner in relation to specific individuals, thereby dealing with that claim of bias.

In the model that I am presenting as part of this amendment, I believe that we have been able to come to a compromise that will, by its very nature, be able to have a process that all parties can have faith in. This amendment can put together a process which, if claimants and defendants go through this process, at the end of it they will actually still be able to do business together because they will have gone off to an independent arbiter who they both have trust and faith in, have received an outcome and then go back.

What I would like to say in closing my remarks is that the review into security of payments highlighted a whole range of issues—a vast range of issues—and, indeed, my research on this topic shows that the issue that I am seeking to deal with here is, in my view, the most important and the most fundamental, but certainly only one part of a whole series of changes that need to be made.

In bringing this amendment to the house I would open it up for consultation, and I welcome feedback on the model that I am seeking to propose here today, but also to push the government to act on the remaining recommendations in Alan Moss's review and to act on the concerns that other industry partners have put to the government. It is high time for the government to get its act together and deal with this issue in a timely manner. We have an industry that is continuing to slide into dysfunction. The government has the power to act, it has the obligation to act, and I look forward to seeing, in a very timely manner, its response to the wide range of criticisms in relation to security of payments.

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

### **STAMP DUTIES (TRANSFERS EXEMPTION) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (10:47):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (10:47):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Last year when we were debating the Statutes Amendment Repeal (Budget 2015) Bill, there was, indeed, in that repeal bill an amendment to the Stamp Duties Act. I utilised the opportunity in that debate to bring to the house's attention a matter which had been raised with me by one of my constituents. I have been through it fairly extensively, but I am going to go back through it, because now I am presenting a bill to the house not only to redress the ill that I believe has occurred but also so that the Stamp Duties Act 1923 would, indeed, reflect what this house was told it would do back in 1990 by the Hon. Frank Blevins, who was then the minister of carriage of amendments to the bill at that time.

Briefly, section 67 of the Stamp Duties Act allows the Commissioner of Stamps to amalgamate separate instruments of transfer of property for the purpose of assessing the stamp duty payable. The reason this is done is because when you transfer property the scale of the stamp duty or the rate of the stamp duty payable increases with the gross value of the property being transferred. So if you transfer a property with a value of, say, \$1 million, the rate of stamp duty on that may well be less than what it would be if the value of that property was \$2 million.

Apparently, historically, and particularly with farming land, this would potentially happen quite regularly where a farming property consisted of a number of titles (which is not uncommon) and the vendor decided to sell it, he would sell or conveyance each of those titles separately and they would therefore attract a lower rate of stamp duty on these individual transactions than they would if they were treated as one whole transaction.

Apparently, this had become a reasonably common practice and I understand that, back in 1975, the Stamp Duties Act was amended to give the Commissioner of Stamps the powers, notwithstanding that separate instruments were being utilised, to amalgamate those instruments for the sake of assessing stamp duty payable and assessing the stamp duty on the total value of the instruments and, therefore, the state getting the return which it would have expected on the transfer of that particular property.

Later, it became evident that the same thing was happening with other properties. In 1990, the then minister (Frank Blevins) brought some amendments to the house, and I refer the house to page 686 of *Hansard* of 21 March 1990 where Frank Blevins said:

Section 66ab—

which was the number in a previous act—

was enacted in 1975 to counteract the tax avoidance practice of dividing land into smaller portions to avoid increased rates of stamp duty on higher value transactions. The same problem has again arisen but in relation to other property, such as businesses and units in a unit trust.

He brought this amendment to make the same section of the act applicable to these other businesses. Stephen Baker was the opposition spokesperson at the time. When he moved an amendment to clarify section 67 he said:

We are trying to avoid the situation where a person in good faith happens to buy adjoining properties which are under separate ownerships. That is they are buying properties which are adjoining but from different vendors.

He went on to say:

I would be astounded if the minister said to me that, in the situation of a person buying a property which is vaguely related from two separate individuals, there should be an aggregation of the property values for duty purposes.

For *Hansard's* benefit, I am quoting from the *Hansard* at page 2386 of Wednesday 9 September. Frank Blevins, on behalf of the government at the time, told the house that the government would not accept the amendment and, in doing so, told the house:

Where a person enters into two quite separate contracts to buy land—it may be adjoining but under separate ownership—they are not covered by proposed new section 67. There are clearly two separate contracts bought from two separate people, and this section would not apply. It does not apply now and it would not apply in the future. It has never been and will not be a problem assuming that Parliament passes this Bill substantially as it was introduced. So the answer is 'No,' the Deputy Leader need have no fears that genuine separate contracts will be touched by this Bill, because that is not the intention of the legislation.

Well, hello, Deputy Speaker: roll forward a few years and, indeed, what was told to the parliament at that time is not the way that the Commissioner of Stamps has been interpreting section 67, I believe, ever since the year 2000.

I raised this matter with the Treasurer, as I said, in the debate on the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget 2015) Bill, and the Treasurer informed the house that, indeed, in the year 2000, RevenueSA received comprehensive advice in relation to the application of section 67. That advice is applied to this day and is the basis upon which RevenueSA has issued its document guide to section 67 of the act. That guide tells conveyancers that, for the purposes of section 67, notwithstanding that there might be two separate vendors involved in a transaction, they would be amalgamated for the sake of assessing stamp duty.

I think this is a travesty. The house was clearly told that this would not be a problem. The house, when it was voting on the amendment, was clearly of the opinion that this would not be utilised in this manner. In fact, I somewhat question this, because apparently the advice came from crown law, and I would have thought that if crown law was asked a question about the interpretation of a piece of legislation, somebody fully trained as a lawyer and working for crown law might have been at least as adept as I was in going back and finding the source, the *Hansard* description, and having

a look at that and saying, 'What did the house intend?' And that is exactly what I did. It was not that difficult. If I could do it, I would have thought that a trained lawyer in crown law should have been able to do it before morning smoko.

Notwithstanding that, we have had this crown law opinion given to Revenue SA and it seems that ever since then this is the way that section 67 has been interpreted. The Treasurer defended the officers, certainly in his department, and I expect that he was referring to crown law as well, where he said, '...rather than pour scorn on people who cannot defend themselves', well, might I say, I think that the actions of crown law in this matter are indefensible, so I do not know why they would even try to defend themselves.

In my opinion it is quite clear that if we come in here and we pass a piece of legislation and we question it to the point where the opposition—and it does not matter who is in government—raises a pertinent point, to the point where it proposes an amendment simply to clarify and the minister representing the government says, 'No, no, no, you don't need to do that. I assure the house that the intent is not to capture this particular circumstance', and the house goes on and passes the bill, I would have thought that crown law should interpret that as being what the parliament intended. I would have thought so. So, I am disappointed with the Treasurer, who went on to say:

I think the solution for the member for MacKillop is to write to me. I will have a look at it.

He also said:

You have done yourself a lot of favours by calling us dishonest.

Well, I did not call anybody dishonest. I did question how honest was a Labor government and a minister giving a position to the parliament at one point in time and whether the government would back up that position into the future. The minister said:

I will look at it over the next few months, but public servants are only implementing this in the way they are advised. They are not trying to rewrite the laws.

Well, they have rewritten the laws. That is the reality. Crown law in this matter has rewritten the law. That is the reason I bring this matter to the parliament. It is a simple bill that I propose, and all it would do would be to reinstate the interpretation that the parliament was led to believe with respect to section 67 of the Stamp Duties Act, and that interpretation is that, if two separate vendors sell two separate properties (notwithstanding the same purchaser advised them), the stamp duty would be assessed separately on those transactions.

I need to tell the house that my constituent bought, indeed, four properties, four farms, which are adjoining. Now, there might be roads between them, etc., but they are neighbouring farms. He bought them as four separate transactions from four independent vendors. It just so happened that they all came on the market at around about the same time.

Indeed, when he bought the first three, the fourth vendor through his agent contacted the purchaser and said, 'Is this purchaser interested in buying another property, because I'm interested in selling mine as well?' So, the purchaser bought these four properties and Revenue SA has amalgamated the value of all four of them for the purpose of assessing stamp duty, and this has cost my constituent considerably more money than what he would otherwise have been due to pay.

The reality is, if those four properties were one property and the transaction occurred as one transaction, as one deal to buy a much larger property, I can assure the house that the value would have been less. It is pretty common knowledge in the farming community that, if you buy a block of farming land that is a thousand acres, you will get it at a price per acre less than what you would if you bought a block of land in the same area of only a hundred acres. The simple reason is supply and demand. There are a lot more intending or potential purchasers to a small block than there are to a large block.

The reality is that, if those four farms were one farm, the total price would have been less and the total stamp duty payable would have been less. I believe the state has already got a bit of a windfall gain through that series of transactions, because they were sold as four separate farms. But, no, in spite of what the parliament believed it was doing, the Commissioner for Stamps has amalgamated all four. He says, 'The reason I have done this is because of the unity of purpose. The

purchaser had a unity of purpose for each of the transactions.' For goodness sake, they are all broadacre farming land, and that is the same purpose that those four farms are being used for today.

I wrote back to the Treasurer after he wrote declining to help my constituent and pointed out to him that I can see there being an argument—but it has not been brought to the parliament—where somebody bought two adjoining properties, particularly with the intent of amalgamating them and utilising them for something which they could do on the two amalgamated properties that they could not do on them individually, say because of their physical size. I can understand there being an argument that the commissioner may want to have the power to look at the way stamp duty would be assessed in that instance, but that is not an argument that has been thrashed out in this parliament.

The reality here is that this situation has occurred in spite of the best efforts of this parliament. I bring this matter to the house simply to clarify section 67(2) and add another caveat to that section, which would particularly preclude, where there are two separate vendors and two separate conveyancers, the value of those properties being amalgamated for the purpose of assessing stamp duty. All I am trying to do is fix up something which should have been fixed up back in 1990. I commend the bill to the house.

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

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (RATE INCREASES) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:03):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:03):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am grateful for the opportunity to present this bill to the parliament today. For those who are not aware, I worked in local government for 27 years prior to coming to this place 10 years and six days ago, so I certainly do understand it. I know lots of people who work within it and lots of people who are elected members within it. It is fair to say that, since the release of the policy position that the Liberal Party took one month before the 2014 election, it has not been a nice discussion to have with all members within local government.

I present this bill on the basis that I, the Leader of the Opposition, the Liberal Party and, we believe, the community see it as a key opportunity for cost-of-living pressures in this state to be addressed, and that is the key for us. The policy direction that the Liberal Party has taken and the policy direction that will come from and is already part of policies that exist within the 2036 manifesto released by the Liberal leader quite recently are focused on cost of living pressures, improving the economy of our state and ensuring that we have a vibrant future. We present this bill to the parliament on the basis that we want to ensure that discussion takes place in a rational way, that consideration is given to it, and that we look at what occurs within a key sector of South Australia.

Remember, nearly \$1 billion per year in council rates is received. There are over 9,000 full-time employees, and there are 700 elected members who represent 68 local government areas plus the unincorporated areas through the association. They provide services to nearly 1.6 million people. It is important that in doing so we ensure that the level of dialogue that occurs results in issues that are beneficial for the community.

It is fair to say that a lot of the contact that I receive is about local government, by virtue of the shadow portfolio that I hold. Depending on the time of the year, a lot of that is about the level of rate increases. Can I put on the record that I do respect those councils that I know are very good at the budgeting process and have a reasonably moderate level of increase, which is based very closely around what the local government cost indices increase is per year.

For example, I know the City of Unley is 2.5 per cent for the 2015-16 financial year. Having a conversation with them only a month or so ago about the provisions as I intended the bill to reflect,

I allowed them to have a greater understanding of the intention of the Liberal Party. They recognised that, by virtue of their own constraints that they put on their budgetary process and the increases that they have had in recent years, for them it is not an issue.

I do recognise that the intent of this legislation will not impact upon those councils that have shown restraint and ensured that they budget within the limitations of the community to pay, and try to put in place an absolute best quality, efficient delivery of services and infrastructure. There are other councils that have not shown that same restraint. As one would expect, since public notice was given of the intention to introduce this bill in this place, I have received one message, for example, from a councillor who says that they do not want it because of bad decisions made by previous councils and the inability to rein in their costs.

I do not accept that as an answer, and I do not accept it from a local government perspective, or from a state government perspective, because in submitting this bill to the parliament I do so on the basis that I and my Liberal colleagues believe that all levels of government in Australia—local, state and federal—should exhibit controls in place to ensure that they are efficient. That is why in the 10 years that I have been here I have become so frustrated by the announcements of efficiency dividends, for which a figure magically appears as to what has to be created. I do not believe there is any follow-on investigation to ensure that it occurs.

We get a continuing escalation in taxation and expenditure costs within departments and an increased number in staff appointed to the Public Service, and indeed without ministerial authority for that to occur within the budgetary controls. I see this bill as an extension within an area that the parliament controls, because the Local Government Act 1999 ensures that local government exists by virtue of being a statute and it operates under that process, and that is why we have done it.

While the February 2014 announcement allowed very little feedback to occur, none of the councils said anything in a positive way to me, but we had lots of feedback to the Liberal Party about support from the community. Since that time, in the 2014 estimates period I asked the member for Frome, the Minister for Local Government, questions about assistance being provided within his portfolio to help communities that are dealing with increased costs. Minister, if I am wrong in this I will apologise, but my reflection upon the answer provided to me was that it was a variety of issues that were undertaken five years ago. My response to that is that there is an immediate need for it to occur.

I have absolute faith in the fact that there is still an immediate need for issues to happen and for improvements to occur. That is the reason why we have done it. It has been a rather drawn-out process. I would have preferred it to have occurred in different ways, but it has been done via a private member's bill. I hope that the Minister for Local Government ensures that on the date that we select to have a full debate about this he contributes towards it and that we do actually talk about the seriousness of the individual clauses and what we are going to do. It is not a political argument; this is about real facts, and that is why we have done it.

Rate capping has been used in New South Wales for over 35 years. For a short time, I was the general manager of a shire in New South Wales, so I have practical experience in how it works there. It is being established within Victoria. It has been shown that there need to be controls in place, and that is why they have done it. So, we have a mixture of political thought processes involved there: the Liberal Party and National Party in New South Wales and the Labor Party in Victoria. Indeed, it was part of the Victorian Labor Party election policy that assisted them in getting elected most recently.

For us, we have done it two years out, though, because we want to ensure that the opportunity is here now to do things. That is why the minister will note, when he reviews the act, that the commencement date I have for it is 1 July this year, because by putting that in place, it allows the processes that collect the necessary information to make the determination in time so that local government, in setting the 2017-18 financial year rates, will actually have the basis of it.

I did not want to do it later, into the ether; I wanted the commencement of it to be as soon as possible, to allow ESCOSA (which is the Essential Services Commission that the Liberal Party has chosen to do the review and come up with the rate cap figure, if I can use that term) the opportunity to review not just the CPI, because I recognise there is a separate local government cost index that



has to be used. That is able to be ascertained for the four quarters of the previous full financial year and for the quarter immediately prior to the determination by ESCOSA, which has to be 31 December of this year to allow it to be in place, for consultation to occur and for local government to set its budgets accordingly.

If local government wishes to seek an opportunity to go above the rate cap, that opportunity exists. For me, though, and I have worked very hard with parliamentary counsel, to whom I express my great thanks for the assistance they provided me on this, it is to ensure that there is an opportunity for those councils that may be part of a growth area—and I do recognise those that are having larger than state-average population increases or are in an area where projected growth to occur via developments is going to impact upon the capacity to provide services and infrastructure. There will be a process in place for that, but they can apply on the basis that they also have community support—and that is an important thing, where real consultation has to occur about their budgeting process.

I know councils have tried and I know the legislation currently has conditions in place for that, but the minister and I have both been part of forums where it has been a handful of people who have turned up. I actually take some heart from the fact, as much as I try to believe it will be the case, that the Minister for Planning, as part of his planning reviews which are nearly through the Legislative Council, talks about a charter for community engagement. I think that is where I want real consultation to occur with the community. The Minister for Planning has done it as part of that portfolio responsibility. My desire will be that it exists for local government rate setting, too.

There were different opportunities. I could have thought about an efficiency dividend, but as I said before, I do not have a lot of faith in the ability to actually achieve it, report it in an accurate way, and ensure that it impacts in a positive way for people. In this case, we recognise that local government is vital to the state. There is near \$20 billion worth of infrastructure, I believe, that they have control over, and they provide very important services and infrastructure. But we want to make sure that there is engagement that occurs which ensures that decisions made for the future reflect what the community is.

I do not criticise the elected members; I think they do the best job they can. I do not criticise the staff; I believe they do the best job they can, too. But my demand of all 700 elected members and all the staff of the 68 councils is to do even better, and to do the absolute best that they can to ensure that they are efficient in what they do and provide the best possible rates, and that is why we have done it.

Using ESCOSA's services has been done so on the basis that it exists already, it has a role to play in the determination of price increases, and it therefore removes any accusation of political influence. I do not want it to be a determination that a minister makes at an opportune time to make it a better resell opportunity for a future election. I want it to be, and the Liberal Party supported this very strongly, based around the assessment undertaken by experts in their field who look at the issues that impact upon councils and determine an appropriate figure, while still, remember, providing this opportunity for local government, if they wish and if they have strong community support, to do something different to that. That is why we have done it now, and we have ensured that the time frames that are in the legislation allow the 2017-18 declaration of rates to reflect it.

My follow-up from this will be a lot of conversations, minister; there is no doubt about that. As one would expect, I have had text messages and emails from people on an individual and a collective basis. I have not quite got the daggers in my back, but they are wondering what is going on. Some might consider it to be a brave action to take, but in my heart I believe that it is an appropriate one. I hope that is why the parliament sits and considers this very seriously.

There will be a variety of opinions. I already have examples of those in local government who support it, but it has been put to me that most people in local government will be against it. I am sure there is a wide variety of community groups out there that, in their own way, have tried to create some structural change and have been unsuccessful. The intention here is to put in legislation that it demands that occur. I just want to take the opportunity to put on the *Hansard* a few words from a mayor—I will not name this mayor, but I think I will put it through:

There's been a lot of concern raised in Local Government about this proposal, but I personally haven't seen anything that changes my stand.

This person is supportive. They continue:

I still support this idea raised by Steven Marshall MP. Sure, there is a 'populist' side to this policy, but also a logical one.

The fundamental thing here is that Council rates are a tax. Increasing them beyond the reasonable measure of people's ability to pay i.e. inflation, has to be the fundamental target or ideal. Where this has been introduced interstate there are a range of exemptions still allowing Councils to raise extra monies if appropriate—

as I have included in this legislation—

but still compelling Councils to do the right thing.

This is an interesting point, and I do take this very strongly:

The other factor is that having this rule puts responsibility back onto the State [government] not to cost shift to local government.

That has been a concern raised to the minister, and I personally have been aware of this for a long time. That is where I think there has to be a recognition. As part of the Liberal Party policy in February 2014, we also announced support that we were putting in place to assist councils. There was a fund of \$5 million per year for 10 years to assist as an interest offset for infrastructure works. I think the minister was also aware of this one, as part of his review and follow-up negotiations.

That was an example of where were recognised there are pressures upon councils, and we wanted, from a state government perspective, to assist. I asked a question of the minister yesterday about natural resources management levy increases, and the real concern that exists about up to 150 per cent increased collection in 2017. Minister, your response was that you have heard nothing from us about solutions to it; it is your job, minister. NRM levies are your job; let's be clear on this.

On this one, there has been no positive position on what the state government intends to do. The Liberal Party has chosen to be rather proactive on this. The Liberal Party has chosen to ensure that it puts itself out there as part of the public debate, and that we discuss it with local government and with community groups—and we want to make sure that happens—and that we get back in this place to talk about the implications and have a fulsome debate.

I truly hope that the minister and I have an opportunity to sit down in this chamber and potentially have private discussions to talk about it. I put this forward on the basis that we want it to ensure. Two months' consultation, minister—from my point of view, I am going to be writing to the mayors and providing them with a copy of the speech and the legislation, trying to address issues of concern. I am going to be meeting with them as much as humanly possible, remembering I have a grandchild being born in 23 days' time—

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Hear, hear!

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Thank you—but I want to make sure that, as part of the debate that occurs in this place, we respond to what South Australians want. That is what I believe is the key. I commend the bill to the house.

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

**INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (MISCONDUCT AND MALADMINISTRATION) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 November 2015.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:19):** I think if I speak now I close the debate?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If you speak, you close the debate; correct.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 24  
Noes ..... 19  
Majority ..... 5

#### AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.	Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Hildyard, K.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.

#### NOES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Duluk, S.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.
Knoll, S.K.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.
Wingard, C.		

#### PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.	Marshall, S.S.
--------------	----------------

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD MARRIAGE) BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 March 2016.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:26):** I rise to support the member for Adelaide's bill, which is essentially to enable a court to make orders to protect a child on reasonable grounds if it suspects that a child or children are to be removed from the state to be coerced into a child marriage. Essentially, this would prevent a party or parties from taking the child from the state, the child's passport could be held and, where appropriate, the examination or interview of the child could take place.

The Children's Protection Act in South Australia currently already makes provision in a similar way to protect young women against being removed from the jurisdiction, particularly Australia, if they were to undertake genital mutilation, which not only offend the conscience, I am sure, of all Australians, but would also break the federal law. We are very keen to ensure that we protect young women from being taken away and sold as brides.

It is not news to the people in this parliament that we have a situation where young women are traded, sold, exploited and—usually in sale arrangements or matchmaking arrangements—sent off at a young age to marry older men. It is a commercial arrangement sometimes. It can be a family

arrangement, but it offends every sense of what we feel is important when we have child protection laws to protect our children.

Nothing more offensive could have been seen in the recent media when we watched with sheer distress those who have been adversely affected or, sadly, killed at the Brussels event in the last few days where we see a situation of the city of Brussels in Belgium under siege and its people being slaughtered.

I was particularly concerned to see, notwithstanding all of the protections that we have under Australian law, that a young woman had been taken to Syria with her five children and married to a party who is being sought for terrorist activity. Now we have this painful situation of the plea of the grandmother of the children, an Australian citizen, who has gone over, probably putting her own life at risk and, contrary to all advice, gone into a war-torn country to try to rescue those children and the equally difficult dilemma for the federal government to consider in due course, if they are located and if they are alive, whether they are able to come back to Australia, to return to the country of which they are citizens.

This is the sort of situation that occurs when we allow young people, particularly young women, to be exploited and married into a situation where they leave the country and are kept out of the country in, clearly, an imbalance of the power relationship between husband and wife. It is absolute tragedy for those children to be caught up in that dilemma. The member for Adelaide has been particularly active and, I think, leading the charge in making sure that we protect our young girls, in particular, from that exploitation. I commend the bill to the house.

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

#### *Motions*

### **PORT PIRIE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:31):** I move:

That this house calls on the member for Frome to take advantage of his position as a cabinet minister and compels the Labor government to immediately address the jobs crisis and economic decline impacting the Port Pirie community; and—

- (a) provide residents with job certainty;
- (b) stem the flow of young people out of the region and South Australia;
- (c) ensure vital industries are sustainable and have the opportunity to grow;
- (d) give our regions the attention they deserve and desperately need;
- (e) recognise that Port Pirie can play an important role in South Australia's economic recovery; and
- (f) avoid the social harm caused by unemployment.

There are two key numbers, to me, in presenting this motion to the house, and they are sad ones, I must say. If I can start with our young people first, and the minister will know that this affects both of us because it is for the Yorke-Mid North area. The youth unemployment rate is 19.4 per cent. I, and the minister, I believe, are disgusted by that. I do not know how to say it.

Young people are looking for an opportunity to start their life and have a level of financial independence, to allow them to ensure that they start to make plans for their future, and for one in five to not have an opportunity for a job is a sad indictment upon our society because I think one of the important issues for all society is to ensure that we give all generations access to opportunities, no matter what.

In this case, I am disgusted that youth unemployment is 19.4 per cent, and I think that is where the focus has to be—no matter where the youth are from, from across all South Australia. While this motion is targeted at Port Pirie, and they want the future as much as anyone does—there is no doubt about that—that we have an opportunity to ensure that that is removed completely.

Minister, I recognise that we do not live in the society that you grew up in. I was slightly after you because I am a little bit younger, but not by much. You were provided with opportunities as a

young person, even with the challenges that you had in your life, to get a job. I know that opportunity was provided to me, too, and that is because our society worked hard to do it.

The responsibility of parliament and the policies it puts in place and the responsibility of expenditure and revenue policies has to be focused on employment opportunities, because I consider it to be the basis of society. That is why the last comment in the motion is about the social harm that comes from unemployment. While positivity needs to be exhibited by those who, for whatever reason, are unemployed or have become unemployed and seek opportunities, when they present they have to do so on the basis that they are the best person for the job and they can do it.

However, where you get multiple kickbacks occur the impact upon one's belief in yourself becomes so profound that that is where the social challenges come because you become introverted to some degree. You do not have the same level of confidence, and it impacts upon so many different ways in which our state operates.

This 19.4 per cent figure is a damning one, I believe. It is pushed even further by the fact that, sadly, it is the highest in the state, but we have the far west in New South Wales, for example, at 16 per cent and the outback of South Australia is at 15.5 per cent. The figures do vary, I understand that, but the importance to me is that a figure is a person, and that is the emphasis that I take from it.

I know that in previous shadow portfolio roles that I have held, in talking about unemployment rates across all sectors I have related it back to what has impacted upon a person and, by association, the impact upon their friends, their families and, indeed, their futures. So, we put this motion forward on the basis that we compel the minister, who has a rather unique opportunity within the cabinet and the ministry, to ensure that he puts in place—demands—issues to be done that actually do not allow this to continue, because we want the policies to be right and we want the policies to reflect an opportunity for all people.

Across the broader unemployment range, the Port Pirie area is the sad case. The statistics provided to me on 16 March reveal Port Pirie's unemployment rate for those being 15 and above at 12.9 per cent. In the part of the community that I have the opportunity to serve it is 8.5 per cent. Now, minister, for you in your home area it is one in every eight, in my home area it is one in every 12, and, again, it is a person.

We put forward this motion on the basis that, while having two portfolio roles, at the time of being appointed as the minister—and I am pretty sure this was reported to me accurately from those who heard it—you talked about being there for all regions, and I believe that, I understand that. That is where I have had great frustration, minister, to be honest with you, because when issues have been put to you that impact upon regional communities the response provided has been that it is not your direct ministerial responsibility.

I understand that, but you are the person who has been provided the opportunity to sit amongst that table of 14 or 15 people who actually make the decisions. Sadly, democracy has not given me or my colleagues that opportunity yet but it will one day, but you are the person who is actually in this chamber making those decisions, and you have to consider all these peripheral issues when you make those decisions and you put your voice forward. I know you do that but the voice has to be a strong one.

That is why the call has been for this motion to be specific about the minister and, indeed, specific about the community that the minister has the opportunity to serve. There is no doubt that the members who sit to the left-hand side of the Speaker are different to those in the government because many of us come from regional areas, or we have direct associations with them. We feel for our community, and that is what it comes down to for me.

Like the minister I have to exist and work and operate in the city, but it is not my comfort zone it is fair to say. For me my comfort zone is being around communities that I know, talk to, get feedback from and love being in. I love the whole state but the emotional attachment is one that will always be with us. But while we are here we work diligently as best we can and it is here that provides us with the opportunity to make the substantial change.

Minister, it is here and within the cabinet room within which you sit that provides you with that unique opportunity to make that substantial change that will make a profound difference in getting these figures down as much as humanly possible because, again, each figure relates to a person. I know there are other members who want to speak about this. It is one that the Liberal Party takes very seriously because the arguments being put here translate across all regions in South Australia.

Minister, can I just say that, while political differences do occur, I can say to you that I know that there are those of us here who want to help, too; that is just it. So, use, please, the skills of the shadow minister for regional development in the discussions that you have, as I know you have done with me when I held that portfolio in the past, and I appreciate that, because there are a variety of experiences that exist in this chamber.

We are not all perfect, but we come from different backgrounds that allow us to put perspectives into discussions that you have and decisions that you make because those eventual decisions become your voice within that chamber that makes it a really important one that controls \$16 billion worth of expenditure per year in the state.

I hope that the house has a fulsome discussion about this motion and that we translate what is being discussed here today into actions, and actions that make sure that unemployment is reduced as much as is humanly possible in South Australia. By doing that, we give all a strong opportunity for a prosperous future.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:40):** I move an amendment to the motion as follows:

Delete everything after 'house' and replace it with:

congratulates the member for Frome for the hard work he does for his electorate and regional South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! We can't hear—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am on my feet.

**Mr Tarzia:** Disgrace.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I heard the member for Hartley's voice after I am on my feet, and you know what that means. If we could all observe the standing orders we will all get a lot further. You have not even heard what he is about to say.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! While you may conjecture, I ask you to listen to him in silence. The member for Newland.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** The amendment will make the motion read:

That this house congratulates the member for Frome for the hard work he does for his electorate and regional South Australia.

Even if you take all of the points listed—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Do you have a copy of that?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Yes, I do—in the member for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** —Goyder's motion, on all of those the member for Frome has performed outstandingly. If you are making an effort to address—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hammond is called to order.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** And, of course, the single greatest issue in Port Pirie affecting employment in that town or that regional city is the future—or was the future, because it is past tense now—was the future of the smelter. The smelter was in dire straits. The future of the smelter was uncertain. It was unclear as to whether the single greatest employer in that city would even exist. If it was not for the work of the then member for Frome and current member for Frome around the time of the formation of government in this state in 2014, that would not have happened and the future would have remained uncertain. It would not have been underwritten. What the Liberal Party would have done—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** —is open to conjecture, but it certainly was an issue for—

**Mr Pederick:** He is misleading the house now.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** You can move a substantive motion should you wish to do that. It certainly was unclear and would not have been front of mind without the member for Frome bringing it to the attention of both parties, making it an issue and making it a defining issue for the formation of government. It would not have happened. The single greatest employer in the City of Port Pirie was brought front and centre to the economic and political debate in 2014 because of the work of the member for Frome.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** It was already a national issue.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is called to order.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** No-one else was as focused as he was on that particular issue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members need to remain silent. The member for Newland.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** You can set them all up for question time if you like.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, they need to ask themselves: is it worth flouting standing orders at this point of the day? That is what they need to ask—

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** I don't think it is for them. I don't think they should do that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, you just need to speak. You just need to speak.

**Mr Pederick:** You need to just stick to your script.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is warned for the first time.

**Mr Pederick:** I'm going to get a holiday.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Do you want that on the record? No, I don't think so. The member for Newland.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** The single greatest prospect for job certainty in Port Pirie is to secure the future of the smelter, which of course the member for Frome did. In terms of addressing job security, the single greatest piece of work that could have been done, close to a half a billion dollar project, was undertaken and achieved by the member for Frome. The best—

**Mr Whetstone:** How much Australian steel?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is called to order.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** —future for young people in the City of Port Pirie was to secure the future of the smelter, and the member for Frome did that. The member for Frome secured the future of the smelter, and that has had a number of flow-on benefits, each of which benefits the future of young people in that city in the north of our state.

The original motion states: 'ensure vital industries are sustainable and have the opportunity to grow'. Well, they have, because the vital industry in Port Pirie is the smelter, secured by the

member for Frome. It was the member for Frome who gave the best chance for sustainable jobs, because not only did he secure the smelter but it is also a state-of-the-art smelter. It has some of the lowest lead emissions for a lead smelter in the world, it uses cutting-edge technology, and it will be a multi-metal facility able to process not just lead but a whole lot of other metals as well as part of that process. It is hard to think of any industry in Port Pirie more sustainable and with a more assured continuation than that involving the reconstruction of the smelter. Once again, it was done and achieved by the member for Frome—no-one else but the member for Frome.

We recognise that Port Pirie can play an important role in South Australia's economic recovery; everyone agrees with that, but the single most important piece of economic infrastructure in Port Pirie is the smelter, secured by the member for Frome. So, on any reading of it, the member for Frome deserves not the questioning of his ability, not the questioning of his effort, but recognition of his efforts in securing the single most important piece of economic infrastructure that Port Pirie has—the smelter—and all of the economic spin-offs that are a part of that.

Again, we saw with Holden that it is not just the 2,000 jobs that are the problem; it is all the jobs that hang off Holden that are important as well, and it is exactly the same with the smelter in Port Pirie. If you get rid of the smelter, then all of the contractors, maintenance people, cleaners, everything else that hangs off that, disappears as well. Time and time again we are coming back to the fact that the smelter is the single most important piece of the economy in Port Pirie, and it is the smelter that was saved by the member for Frome, who made sure that it was brought to the very forefront of everything that needed to be done to ensure the best possible economic future for Port Pirie.

Everyone agrees that the smelter itself will not have an effect just on Port Pirie, but it will have the ability to do multimetal processing and to open itself up to receive ore from all over the state and, indeed, even other parts of the country if need be, and that means that it opens up the economic opportunities and contributes to the economic future not just of Port Pirie but the whole state.

Making sure that the economy does not collapse in Port Pirie is the best possible way of ensuring that the social harm caused by unemployment is absolutely minimised. No-one here disputes that, no-one here disputes unemployment is a social harm; of course it is. Everybody in this building is working to ensure that the improvement of the unemployment situation in the state. That is a given, but the single most important part of that was the smelter, and the future of the smelter was secured by the member for Frome in his negotiations after the election in 2014.

I do not think that the member for Frome deserves anything other than the congratulations of this house for the work that he has done in Port Pirie. I do not think anyone else could have done it as well as he did at that particular time. He used his position excellently, and he continues to use it excellently for the future of the state, for the regions, and for Port Pirie. On this side of the house we have nothing but support for his position, and we congratulate him on the work that he does every day in such a dedicated way for the people of Port Pirie and the regions of South Australia.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:48):** I would like to point out some of the home truths that the member for Newland just pointed out for the benefit of the house. He said it repeatedly and I think he said it with no mistake that the member for Newland has belled the cat on the fact that this government was asleep at the wheel when it came to dealing with issues at Nyrstar. His comment that the member for Frome is the one who brought this issue to the table underlines the fact that this government had no plan to help deal with Nyrstar, they had no plan for Port Pirie, and indeed it was only, in his words, the white saviour, or the great saviour, the member for Frome—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The white knight.

**Mr KNOLL:** —the white night, the member for Frome, who came into this place and fixed their issues. It is an absolute disgrace that the truth has come out today, that the member for Newland tells us that this government had no plan for Port Pirie before the member for Frome. I think that is a point that we all need to be very clear about, because it is a fundamental truth, and I think the people of Port Pirie need to completely understand how disjoined they are from this Labor government.

The second point I would like to make is in response to the member for Newland, who argued against his own amendment, because he went through point by point and said how the member for Frome had accurately dealt with all of the points made in the original motion. So why change the



motion in the first place? If the member for Frome is doing such a good job on (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f), then why do we need to change the motion?

Again, it is politics; it is the government trying to hide from the real issues that exist in the member for Frome's electorate and specifically Port Pirie, and it is an issue that we, as members who look after and represent the regions, hold very near and dear to our heart. It is something that we grapple with every day. Again, we have a government that seeks to move an amendment to sweep these issues under the carpet because it does not have a plan to deal with it.

When it comes to keeping existing jobs, I think that is extremely important. It is extremely important to underwrite and underscore the fundamental industries that exist in many of our regional centres, whether it be Arrium at Whyalla, Nyrstar in Port Pirie or, for instance, the wine industry in my electorate. These industries are fundamental, they are essential to the future of these towns and they need to be supported.

The member for Newland talks about the fact that it is the saving of Nyrstar that stopped Port Pirie from collapsing—well, a 2 per cent increase in unemployment in the last 12 months I would consider is an economy that is on the verge of collapse. The idea that by saving Nyrstar the job is done shows that the government is ignoring the fact that when the member for Frome first came to office unemployment in Port Pirie was 5 per cent. Now, here we are, and it is 12.9 per cent, having increased by 2 per cent in the last month, after the member for Newland claims that Port Pirie has been saved.

Fair enough, Nyrstar was one component, but it is the other components that the government fails to address—and one is creating new jobs. Fair enough, we need to hold onto the old jobs but we also need to create new jobs, and this is the fundamental failure of this Labor government. It is a fundamental failure because the government failed to understand the drivers of jobs. The drivers of jobs are indeed our small businesses, the ones who incrementally employ more and more people, the ones who put their hard-earned capital back on the line to try to do their best to grow their business. Indeed, if each of the over 100,000 small businesses that exist in South Australia put on only 0.1 extra of an employee that would go a long way to solving the unemployment crisis that we have here in South Australia.

The other thing that the government failed to understand and address is the fundamental cost of doing business in this state. We on this side of the house understand that in order to create jobs for families and individuals in South Australia businesses need to grow. In order for those businesses to be able to grow, they need to have an economic structure that underlines job creation and business growth, and on those scores, this government has failed.

If I go to payroll tax, the government has failed to continue with the reduction in payroll tax for businesses just on the threshold. We look at the emergency services levy; a levy that is levied upon businesses in South Australia as well as social clubs, community organisations and many of the things that keep our social fabric together. They removed the rebate on the emergency service levy which would have a great impact especially upon the agricultural parts of Frome—a huge impact.

We move on into the current debate we are having around natural resource management levies and their increase. Again, another cost of doing business on the productive part of our state, the part of our state that the Minister for Tourism and Agriculture keeps bleating on about but, instead of actually doing something to help those industries fundamentally, all we hear is the froth and bubble, instead of dealing with the fundamentals that sit underneath that.

We are also having a debate in this place at the moment about increases to minimum rates when it comes to trucking for small and family businesses across this state. We have seen no leadership, we have seen gutlessness from this government on that issue by failing to speak out against it. What is going to happen as a result of those changes potentially coming in on 4 April is an increase in the cost of trucking across the state. That cost will be passed on to businesses and would then be passed on to consumers. It is another cost of doing business in South Australia that has increased and it is going to fundamentally undermine employment growth in the member for Frome's electorate.

We then move on to this government's position and obsession when it comes to electricity. On this side of the house, we understand the need for a sensible policy on renewable energy. We understand that completely, but when that policy ends up undermining the security of our electricity supply in South Australia, when we see the government's policy has directly led to the increasing cost of electricity in South Australia to the point where we have the third-highest cost of electricity in the known world (and I consider that most of the world is known at this stage), it is pretty hard for businesses to get on and create jobs.

When it comes to tax, when it comes to fundamental utilities—and we should not even get started on the cost of water in South Australia that I know the member for Stuart highlighted the other day in this chamber—when it comes to ESL payroll taxes, natural resource management levies, charges on trucking, electricity, and we have not even started on the level of regulation that exists in South Australia.

It was interesting to read in *The Australian* the other day, there is a worldwide company that sets up endurance courses; they call themselves Tough Mudder. He said that Australia is the hardest place for him to be able to set up his business—the hardest place in the world to set up his business. He said even the Germans, who you would consider to be a very risk-averse, very bureaucratic people, take a very common-sense approach, but we here in Australia cannot get that done.

When I hear comments from Costco that this is the hardest place in the world to get a development application through to be able to build a Costco, then you know that something is wrong. When it comes to issue after issue, every time South Australian businesses have to deal with regulation and government bureaucracy, they are stifled. If the Labor government want to understand how to fix job creation in this state, instead of sweeping it under the carpet like they are seeking to do with this amendment, they should actually look at the fundamentals of the cost of doing business.

Whilst we on this side of the house may be charged with being the party of business, it is because we understand that it is business that creates jobs, and those businesses do not have to be huge conglomerates. Most of the time it is the job creation from those small, family-owned entities that gets the job done. They are the ones risking their hard-earned capital, putting that on the line in order to be able to grow and see a better future for themselves and their children and, more importantly, to provide opportunities for other people's families and children so that we can actually have a prosperous and growing economy.

This amendment that the member for Newland is putting forward is an absolute disgrace. It fails to deal with the fundamental issues. Until the Labor government starts to tackle those issues, we are going to see a continuation of things like 19.4 per cent youth unemployment and 12.9 per cent overall unemployment in Port Pirie, and we will be here debating these issues, lamenting the situation we find ourselves in, for generations to come.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:57):** I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Goyder:

That this house calls on the member for Frome to take advantage of his position as a cabinet minister and compels the Labor government to immediately address the jobs crisis and economic decline impacting the Port Pirie community; and—

- (a) provide residents with job certainty;
- (b) stem the flow of young people out of the region and South Australia;
- (c) ensure vital industries are sustainable and have the opportunity to grow;
- (d) give our regions the attention they deserve and desperately need;
- (e) recognise that Port Pirie can play an important role in South Australia's economic recovery; and
- (f) avoid the social harm caused by unemployment.

As we have heard from the previous speakers today, apart from the member for Newland who tried to move a ridiculous amendment in regard to this motion, all of the issues in Port Pirie are happening not just in Port Pirie but right throughout South Australia.

I want to go back to the election, where I think some people in Frome thought so much of the current member for Frome that I believe they thought, 'If we elect the member for Frome,

Mr Brock, we will get him and we will get the Liberal Party as well in government.' Well, we only have to look at how history unfolded, where the Leader of the Opposition, from what I understand, was told a decision would not be made until the Wednesday, yet we see the supersized ham and pineapple pizza that was purchased in Port Pirie did the job over the weekend. A few slices of pizza have cost this state a great price.

If people believed that they were going to get the Liberal Party because polling was supposedly looking so good, and also elect Mr Brock as their member, I hope they have a good, hard look at what happened. It is exactly what happened in Hammond way back in the 2002 election, when the former member ran as a so-called Independent liberal and then put the Labor government in power. People need to be absolutely certain of who they are voting for and why they are voting for them, because it can come unstuck very, very quickly.

Look at what has happened with regard to Port Pirie, where we have 19.4 per cent youth unemployment and 12.9 per cent general unemployment, with a recent 2 per cent increase. This is disgraceful. There needs to be job certainty in that region, and not just there, but in all the regions.

There are all these comments about Nyrstar and what was going to happen, and whether they would have been underwritten. The member for Frome basically embarrassed the state government into underwriting the Nyrstar redevelopment proposal because he said so on the radio. This immediately forced the Labor government to do the underwriting—

**Mr Griffiths:** ABC radio!

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, ABC radio—to several hundred million dollars. Our federal government was let off the hook. It was fantastic for them; it was just a gift. The Premier had to come up with the price of probably several hundreds of thousands of ham and pineapple pizzas to underwrite the Nyrstar redevelopment. It would have absolutely happened from our side of the chamber.

We on this side of parliament have had an interest in Nyrstar and what has gone on there in previous years. In fact, when my wife was an environmental scientist, she worked up there when Pasmenco operated the facility. We all know how critical it is. Some friends of mine who work in jobs related to the Nyrstar facility are in the trucking industry, and they freight material from around Broken Hill down to Nyrstar. Certainly, when the Strathalbyn Terramin mine was operating, the ore was carted to Nyrstar. Not only does the result impact on Port Pirie, but it is felt right throughout South Australia, and certainly affects people based in and near my electorate.

As has been mentioned earlier, there needs to be more done in the regions so that we can achieve growth in other industries such as agriculture. What really scares me about this Labor government, which the member for Frome is happy to support, is that they say one thing but they say it with forked tongue.

We have the Premier going out there and saying, 'The clean, green image of South Australia is fantastic,' and now it is supposedly backing the farmers of this state. This is only because mining has collapsed, and everything else has collapsed. The Olympic Dam proposal did not go ahead, as far as the big open-cut mine, and there are a lot of other factors that come into play.

The Premier was a bit under the pump when we delivered our manifesto the other day and he had a crack at our side of the house. He said that the Liberal Party was full of 'retired farmers, failed businessmen and Pyne apparatchiks'. That is a disgraceful comment from a Premier who is supposedly putting the future of this state in the hands of the farmers. All he can do is talk about who he thinks represents the Liberal Party in this state.

People need to be quite aware of the government that the member for Frome has supported. What we also need to be aware of are the things that have happened within this government since the member for Frome supported them, and the things that have not. For example, the \$25 million diversification fund. Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria took their \$25 million each, but where was South Australia in that mix? Gone and forgotten, because it did not affect Labor electorates. That is the simple cut and dried of it, and that is as simple as the Labor Party in this state runs its politics, right down the line. If there is not a vote in it, they absolutely do not want to know about it.

They put out this story that it was going to cost so much GST and that we would only have got \$4 million. At the worst case scenario, the state would have been \$4 million better off if we had taken the \$25 million diversification fund. That money was vitally needed throughout the Riverland and, certainly in the Murraylands, which missed out on previous bequests of the \$20 million that went into the seat of Chaffey.

That is fine. Now was the time for the Murraylands and the Lower Murray to shine, but, no—the government decided it would just cut that off, even after the terms of the millennium drought and what happened to the people in my area and the destruction that went on with the river. The Premier bleats on about 3,200 gigalitres of water being put back into the river, but when we get past all those fine words that he can put out, action is severely lacking when it gets down to the ground floor of what really needs to happen in the Lower Murray region.

When we look at blackspot funding for phone towers, where was the Labor government? Where was the member for Frome advocating for this? What was he saying around the cabinet table? I would love to know why every other state put in submissions for mobile phone tower funding, yet South Australia did not. This is how this Labor government treats regional South Australia: they just do not care. I urge the member for Newland to drive around South Australia and see how often his phone does not work. He will realise how bad it is.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** You know I do.

**Mr PEDERICK:** That's good. I just hope he fully understands the threat to safety when mobile towers go out. Recently, the tower at Yumali was not functioning appropriately and we had a fatal accident just out of Coomandook, between Coomandook and Cooke Plains. Sadly, the person was already deceased, but if we had needed instant calls to get people there to save people, it could have been another matter. Also, we have seen these huge rises to the emergency services levy, and the natural resources management levies are going through the roof.

We have seen basically the shutdown not only of Leigh Creek but also the Port Augusta power station as well. I believe some of those residents would have come from Port Pirie and would have had jobs in that area. These are errant proposals that the government has been running, that the government has forced on this state and I would just like to know what the member for Frome has been doing advocating for regional South Australia, because my end of the river and my electorate and Port Pirie and the rest of the state deserve a lot more.

**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) (12:08):** I rise to congratulate the member for Frome for the wonderful work he does in his own area and also the great work he does on behalf of every region in South Australia. It is really interesting to hear the Liberals get up and bleat and bleat and bleat. You do not learn from history, do you? You went out and attacked Karlene Maywald, you attacked Rory McEwen and you attacked Bob Such.

You always have this philosophy that if they are not with us, they are against us, instead of working with people, as the public expects us to do. The public expects us, the 47 members of this place, to actually work together. All you want to do is come in and have a gripe with the member for Frome because after the election he looked at both options. He looked at the Liberal proposition and he looked at the Labor proposition and he went with the Labor Party. He did that because he saw that it was the best thing to do for his region and the best thing to do for all regions in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I remind all members of standing orders 131 and 142.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** He was given the choice and he looked at the prospect of a Labor government for a further four years or a newly-elected Liberal government with his support, and he chose to come with the Labor Party. Right from day one, the venom from your leader and from your federal Liberal representatives in South Australia was disgraceful with the sort of language that was used against the member for Frome.

When the member for Frome talked about the guaranteeing of the loan for Nyrstar, which is \$291 million, yes, he did go out there and say that a Labor government would back that in. What did

we have? We had the spurned Christopher Pyne and the spurned member for Mayo, Jamie Briggs, out there saying, 'Well, we're not going to pay for it now, it's up to the state to do it.' Were you guys ringing them up and saying, 'No, look, if this happened in any other state or territory it would be the federal government's responsibility to step in and guarantee that loan. Why are you insisting it comes back onto the state government coffers?' You should have been saying that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have reminded you all nicely about standing orders 131 and 142. This is the last time I will remind you and I will have to start warning people. It is before question time which means you will not be here, and I know you will want to be here for the last question time this week, won't you?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** What that loan guarantee did was lock in the future for Port Pirie. Was anyone in the Liberal Party in South Australia, whether they be state members or federal members, interested in that? No, you were not. You were interested in playing base politics—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** You were interested in playing base politics. You could not get over the fact that, given the choice—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Chaffey is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —of going with a Labor government or a Liberal government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley is called to order.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —this great man went with a Labor government because he thought that was the best thing for South Australia's future.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Hartley is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** What you want to do is actually look at why you have been on the opposition benches for so much of the past quarter of a century and ask yourselves why. It is because you only want to go in your own little cohort and fight against anyone else. You do not actually stand up for your state. You are in your own little Liberal Party bubble and you do not stand up for your state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Now, what we do over here—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am on my feet. We can stop right now. We do not have to continue this debate. If you want it to continue you must remain silent. These are the standing orders of the house. You either want to respect the standing orders of the house or you do not, and I think we will have to take a very dim view if I hear another outburst. The member for Mawson.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The member for Hammond talked about South Australia missing out on Murray-Darling funds. This state got \$240 million in SARMS funding because our Premier went out there and fought for the Rolls-Royce.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order for the second time!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** What did we hear from the Liberal Party? They were happy with the Datsun 180B model.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hammond has a point of order. We will deal with that first.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Relevance, madam Deputy Speaker—the minister is not responsible for anyone in the Liberal Party and what they decide or not decide or what they do.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He certainly isn't, and do you have a point of order about something else?

**Mr PEDERICK:** No.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Alright, continue, member for Mawson.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Well, if it was relevant for you to bring it up it is relevant for me to respond to it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Just continue with the debate.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I will tell you something about the member for Frome, and perhaps if you spent more time in his electorate you would actually understand how he is thought of up there. You want to come out—

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —and attack this man. Why don't you go and spend some time with him up there? I was at the Smelter's Picnic with him last year. That is a day off for everyone in Port Pirie. It is a magnificent day. It is like the Royal Adelaide Show. There are helicopter rides and all sorts of activities going on there and I walked around with Geoff for the day. Do you know how many high fives and g'day Geoff's he got? Everyone loves this man in his electorate.

**Mr Whetstone:** No-one's attacking him.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I want to put on the record that the member for Chaffey says that no-one is attacking the member for Frome. You have done nothing but attack this gentleman since he sided with the Labor Party to back in a Labor government. You have done nothing but attack him. You have done nothing—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned for the second time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** When I walked around there not only did everyone know who the member for Frome was, but the member for Frome knew all of those people as well and he asked how their families were going by name. He is very well thought of. While you might think that you are going to win this big political point and, come 2018, you will regain the seat of Frome, I think you might want to rethink your strategy. You thought that about the seat of Fisher and the seat of Mount Gambier when Rory McEwen was in that seat and—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is on two warnings.

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Hartley, I can hear your voice and I shouldn't be able to.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I urge you to get on with the member for Frome and the Minister for Regional Development. This man is the chairman of the cabinet committee on regional

development and he is in there fighting every day for regional South Australia—seats that so many of you represent. Instead of squabbling and fighting, get on with this guy.

There is money there that he has fought hard for out of the budget to be disbursed throughout the regions. He is out there spending that money, and the best thing you can do is get on and work with him to make sure that your local area gets its fair share of the money. People in South Australia are sick of seeing politicians squabble. At the midway mark of this term, instead of bringing in motions like this attacking the member for Frome—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey, you will be leaving us if you move your lips again.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —you should be working with him as a very important minister in this Labor government. We are out in the regions all the time. I forget how many days of last year—

**The Hon. G.G. Brock:** Forty-three.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Forty-three days the member for Frome spent out in regional South Australia.

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** An interjection from the member for Mount Gambier asked—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I hope not, because that would be unparliamentary and your response to it would be, also.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I will not respond, but I will say that we talked a lot to the member for Frome before the election. In fact, in the two weeks before the election I was in Clare and we went to some bowls clubs at Port Broughton and Snowtown. We went around and met with sporting clubs up there and talked tourism, and this was because the member for Frome had invited me up there. It was not my first trip to see the member for Frome.

We also worked very closely on the grain handling committee, and that was a great bipartisan committee that was chaired by the member for Frome. The members for Chaffey and Hammond were on that committee, and I think they saw then the calibre of this man and that he was not interested in playing partisan politics. He was interested in doing the best thing for people in regional South Australia and doing the best things for the prosperity of this state. We all know that the engine room of this state is out in our regions. We know that. We want a champion, and we have that champion in the member for Frome in his role as the Minister for Regional Development.

As I said before, it is the midway point. Stop the squabbling and get over the fact that the member for Frome sided with the Labor Party for a four-year term and let us see you guys doing the very best you can in winning more money for your regions and increasing prosperity and jobs in the regions, because the Minister for Regional Development (the member for Frome) is passionate about that—I would say more passionate than anyone else in this chamber, when it comes to fighting for the rights and economic future of our regions.

I congratulate the member for Frome for the work he does as a local MP. I have seen firsthand the adulation that he receives from the local people up there and, if you think you are going to win the seat from him at the next election, you have another think coming, because I have never seen a more popular member who is so well thought of. When I get out in the regions—I spend almost as much time out there as the member for Frome—I hear great things about the wonderful work that he is doing as the Minister for Regional Development in the South Australian government. I thank him for the hard and tireless work he does on behalf of all the regions.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:19):** I rise to support the member for Goyder in this motion. I think it is very important, and I disagree with a lot of the things that the member for Mawson has just said. First of all, this motion is actually not having a crack at the member for Frome at all. It just says:

That this house calls on the member for Frome to take advantage of his position as a cabinet minister and compels the Labor government to immediately address the jobs crisis...

Now, that is a very, very positive statement. That is not about having a crack at him: that is about saying, 'Please use your position to the best of your advantage to address the jobs crisis.' I also take issue with the member for Mawson saying that we do not work constructively with the member for Frome. I can tell you, Deputy Speaker, that I work very, very constructively with the member for Frome.

We are neighbouring members of parliament, we are a minister and a shadow minister for regional development and we have a personal friendship as well. We work very, very constructively together, but that does not mean that we agree on every single issue. It does not mean that we agree on everything, but we have a very constructive working relationship.

I would say that there are any number of members in this house who could be described the way in which the member for Mawson described the member for Frome as having their whole heart in everything to do with regional development. I think there are number of us who could be described that way. This is about unemployment. This is about the fact that very recently we were made aware that Port Pirie, the Mid North and surrounding areas have a 19.4 per cent unemployment rate—

**Mr Griffiths:** For youth.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —for youth, and that is too high. It would not matter what part of the state it was in, that is too high. So, we are calling on the member for Frome as a member of cabinet to use his position to address that issue. It is as simple as that. We deal very constructively together, the member for Frome and I, with the member for Giles, in a collaborative group that we have in the Upper Spencer Gulf dealing with unemployment. We look at these numbers all the time.

The latest numbers broken down to Upper Spencer Gulf cities, which is the September quarter (so, nearly six months ago, but the very latest that we have), has the Upper Spencer Gulf at an unemployment rate of 9.3 per cent compared to the Australian average of 6.2 per cent. In Port Augusta it is 7.4 per cent, in Whyalla it is 6.7 per cent and in Port Pirie it is 14.3 per cent.

We have sat down together as a group, and the member for Frome and I have sat down as individuals to try to nut it out. Now, why is it that Port Pirie has numbers like the ones I have just read out consistently quarter after quarter after quarter higher than the other Upper Spencer Gulf cities? And we will continue to try to get to the bottom of that. We work very collaboratively in that, but I do not have the opportunity to influence cabinet to do that: the member for Frome has the opportunity to influence cabinet to do that.

It is very much a shared issue. We know in the Upper Spencer Gulf that all of our three cities are interdependent on each other. Every single one of us worries about Nyrstar, every one of us worries about Alinta and every single one of us worries about Arrium. So, the member for Mawson could not be more incorrect when he says that we do not work collaboratively together to try to address these issues. It is just completely inaccurate, but the member for Frome knows how hard—including the member for Giles—we work on our patch to address unemployment.

I heard the member for Newland say before that the member for Frome brought the Nyrstar issue to prominence, that it was an issue that nobody in government or nobody was aware of before. Again, that could not be further from the truth. He may not have known about it, some of his colleagues may not have known about it, but we certainly knew about it. Everybody in the Upper Spencer Gulf knew about it. It was actually a national issue that the federal government was addressing at the time, so it is crazy to say that nobody knew about the issue and nobody was addressing it. It was certainly something that was being addressed.

And in that time that the member for Mawson described where both Liberal and Labor parties were talking to the member for Frome and the member for Fisher, who sadly is not with us anymore, both parties were doing their best to get those two members of parliament to join with them to form government. In that time I guarantee you—and the member for Frome knows and I expect that other Labor government members know it as well—the Nyrstar redevelopment was the top of the list for matters of discussion between the Liberal Party and the member for Frome.

Now, it was also between the Labor Party and the member for Frome, but for anybody to suggest that we were not discussing that as our No. 1 priority with the member for Frome is completely incorrect and deceptive. That was very much a front-of-mind issue for us. We talked about



Nyrstar, we talked about regional development funding, we talked about regional infrastructure, and we talked about regional health, regional education and a whole range of other issues which were very, very important.

It is another statement of fact that the financial elements of the agreement that the member for Frome struck with the Labor Party to form government gave regional South Australia less money and less resources than the Liberal Party actually took to the election as their up-front election commitment. The member for Frome made his decision on a wide range of issues. He has made his decision, and we accept that decision. However, it is completely inaccurate for anybody to suggest that the Liberal Party did not have a very good deal for regional South Australia on the table, even in advance of those discussions happening, because in advance of the election none of us knew how the cards were going to fall.

In fact, from a financial perspective, the deal that was struck with the Labor government was \$116 million over four years, which is an average of \$29 million per year. What we took to the election—our flat-out election commitment before even starting to negotiate with the member for Frome—was \$139 million over three years, so an average of \$46 million per year. I say again that the member for Frome had a range of issues he needed to consider when he made his decision, but for any member of the government to suggest for a minute that the Liberal Party is not working as hard as it possibly can for regional development is inaccurate and deceptive.

One of the areas that I am very frustrated about with the member for Frome—and I have said this to him personally and I have said it openly. As I said, we have a very good working relationship, but we do not agree on everything. I consider that regional development is an umbrella portfolio for all of the other portfolios when it comes to their involvement in regional areas. The Minister for Regional Development is not the Minister for Health, but the Minister for Regional Development needs to be incredibly involved in health issues in regional areas. The Minister for Regional Development needs to be involved in health, education, transport, police and economic development—in absolutely everything that goes on.

I would like to see the member for Frome as the Minister for Regional Development taking a more active role: saying, 'Yes, if it is in a regional area, I am going to be involved in that.' I say again that we have talked about this and obviously the minister is welcome to have a different opinion. I would never ever say anything in here about any member of parliament that I would not say to them to their face, and we have had that discussion. I will leave it at that, but I make that very clear.

I do not think it is good enough to say, 'Look, that's health, leave it to the Minister for Health; that's education, leave it to the Minister for Education.' We need a champion for regional areas in the Minister for Regional Development who will take all those issues on, and that is what this motion is about. We are asking the Minister for Regional Development to use his authority and to use his membership of cabinet more actively and more aggressively with regard to addressing the unemployment issues that we see before us at the moment. Regional development is a portfolio that really has responsibility for the entire state except for the Adelaide metropolitan area.

This is intended to be a positive motion. I am incredibly disappointed with the member for Newland for essentially bastardising it, turning it upside down and turning it into something that it was not at all. A call asking the member for Frome, as the Minister for Regional Development, to use his authority and to use his position in cabinet to address the unacceptably high unemployment rate across our state is not unreasonable at all. It is a perfectly fair thing to do.

I know that the Minister for Regional Development (the member for Frome) would be extremely saddened and extremely disappointed by the unemployment figures that exist at the moment. He would want to do that and we want him to do that. We very much have shared boundaries in our particular part of the world, and we all live and breathe together. We will all be successful in the Upper Spencer Gulf or we will all be unsuccessful in the Upper Spencer Gulf together, so we need to all be working on this issue together, and I will work with the member for Frome on this any time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (12:29):** What a cowardly attack. The shadow minister for mineral resources and energy attempting—

**Mr Bell:** He's started off well.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Oh, I notice—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is that the member for Schubert?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Just a second. Was that the member for Schubert?

**An honourable member:** No.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, who was it, then?

**Mr BELL:** It was the member for Mount Gambier—me.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are on your second warning. Second warning for the member for Mount Gambier.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It was a completely cowardly attack—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —on a good man who fights for his community. Quite frankly, in terms of the softly spoken approach of the member for Stuart in saying, 'Oh, I don't do this out of anger; I do this out of regret', I have never heard once a criticism of the commonwealth government for allowing an unemployment rate that he speaks of in the Upper Spencer Gulf. It is as if the commonwealth government has no responsibility within the South Australian borders—not one.

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Oh, there it is. No, no; you cannot blame Rowan Ramsey for anything. Where is the motion condemning Rowan Ramsey, asking him to do more with the commonwealth government?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Where is that motion? Of course, the member for Stuart will not do that, because it is not a positive motion; it is an attack on one person. He is targeting one person. Why? Why is he attacking this one person? Because of his failure to win the seat in the most recent state election. Who can be held to account for that? Who is the closest shadow minister to the seat of Frome? The member for Stuart. How did he go during the election campaign? How much money was spent in Frome? How much money was allocated out of the Liberal Party's finances to win that seat? And he failed.

**Mr Knoll:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert has a point of order.

**Mr KNOLL:** The minister is getting nowhere near the substance of this debate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, we've allowed everyone to sail precariously close to the other side of the question. I shall listen to the Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** So, here we are: the member for Stuart, basking in his failure after being unable to get the liberal candidate elected in Frome, and what does he do?

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier unfortunately will need to leave us for 30 minutes.

*The honourable member for Mount Gambier having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** What does he do? When he cannot attack his policies, when he cannot win through the advocacy of his own ideas, what does he do? He attacks the man.

And that speaks volumes about the member for Stuart and who he is. It speaks volumes about who the Liberal Party are considering making their leader.

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley—second warning.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It speaks volumes about him, because I have not heard in his speech a criticism about programs that he thinks are not working and that should be changed. I have not heard him offer alternative policies for the Upper Spencer Gulf. I have not heard him advocate Liberal Party policy; simply attacking the man, simply attacking the man. Quite frankly, if that is all we have to expect from the member for Stuart—

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** What are you doing?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am defending the member for Frome.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am defending the member for Frome—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —because I am exposing the hypocrisy of the member for Stuart.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey unfortunately has to leave us for 30 minutes.

*The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Members interjecting:*

**An honourable member:** Oh, no.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I know, it's sad.

**Mr Whetstone:** Read the motion before your mouth off.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The *Port Pirie Recorder*, which is an independent voice in the community in the Upper Spencer Gulf, headlines on page 3 of the most recent addition Pirie's \$800 million 'Brock boost' and spinoffs linked to the Nyrstar revamp, which the opposition have attempted to take credit for. The commonwealth government and Rowan Ramsey were deeply involved in negotiations with the state government about using EFIC and offering guarantees in standing with us to help Nyrstar.

Andrew Robb was in my office apologising for the change in that offer—apologising to me. He felt very strongly about this, and he thought that the commonwealth government should have been more involved than they were. There has not been a single motion from this side of the house condemning Rowan Ramsey—not one. Not one motion from this side of the house saying Rowan should have used his position holding the largest seat in regional South Australia to fight for regional South Australia in the commonwealth parliament—not one single motion.

**The Hon. G.G. Brock:** Leigh Creek.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Leigh Creek—not a single motion from this side of the house condemning the commonwealth government for their lack of action. In the South-East, how many times has the member for Mount Gambier or the former deputy leader of the opposition moved

motions condemning Mr Pasin for his lack of action in the seat of Barker? Very little, yet they target the member for Frome. Why? Because it highlights their own failure—it highlights their own failure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —their failure to articulate an argument in regional South Australia and they lose.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will be interested to see in the upcoming federal election how the Liberal Party goes in its regions and how it does. I understand that there could be some very interesting candidates in the upcoming federal election. This motion and their frustration all boils down to one aspect: they are no good at politics. They are no good at it. They are run by amateurs and their leader is an amateur, so when they fail they cannot blame their own failures; they cannot look internally and ask, 'Why is it we cannot win the seat of Frome?'

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We need to get back to the substance.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Why is it that they cannot do that? Because everything in this motion that they have moved speaks to their failures. 'Provide residents with job certainty': the reinvestment in Nyrstar speaks volumes for the member for Frome's commitment to giving job security to the people of Port Pirie. It speaks volumes for it and yet members opposite cannot look internally at it and understand why it is that they keep on re-electing the member for Frome. 'Stem the flow of young people out of the region and South Australia': why is that the sole responsibility of the member for Frome and not for Rowan Ramsey and Tony Pasin?

**Mr Knoll:** Because they're not in your cabinet.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Oh, they are not in our cabinet! So, where are the motions condemning them? Where are the motions? Nowhere to be seen—silence. They do not think these things through because they cannot play the game of chess. They are good at draughts but they are no good at chess. The reason they are no good at chess is because they are amateurs. The reason they do not win seats like Frome is because they are amateurs.

The people who run the campaigns in the seat of Frome are the member for Stuart, who people can see through. I personally hope he takes the leadership of the Liberal Party because in terms of target-rich areas, the bigger they are the harder they fall. I look forward to the softly-spoken, 'I'm everyone's friend' member for Stuart being exposed for the hypocrite that he is. By this motion and the way he spoke—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I take offence at that remark and I ask the Treasurer to unconditionally apologise.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is unparliamentary definitely, and he should withdraw that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I apologise for using the word 'hypocrite' about the member. However, I think he will be exposed by attempting to say the same remarks—I think it is this 'change but consistent' line that the Prime Minister is using. He has a great deal of respect for the member for Frome, he just thinks he is bad at his job. He really likes him, but he is no good at it. He is a really nice fellow, 'I work really well with him, but it is not my fault we are not achieving anything; it's all his.' That is the argument the member for Stuart makes.

He does not have the ability to reflect internally on his own failures; his own failure in the Upper Spencer Gulf. He cannot seem to replicate what he has done in his own community anywhere else. When he goes to the seat of Port Pirie and argues and advocates for a vote for the Liberal Party he falls flat on his face and fails.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** I have no idea what you're talking about.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The member for Stuart seems—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —to have a bit of a glass jaw.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Treasurer, order! Back to the substance.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** A bit of a glass jaw, because the member for Stuart was talking about how well he works with the member for Frome but then he campaigns against him. He comes into this place and moves these motions but when he goes out into his region he says what a close working relationship they have with each other.

This motion is all about politics and has nothing to do with unemployment in Port Pirie at all. The Liberal Party, rather than attacking the man, should consider what their real failings are. Their real failings are not the member for Frome. They should ask themselves: why is it that an Independent gets elected in Frome? Why is it that the people of Frome will not elect a Liberal? They are the questions they should be asking themselves, not about why Geoff Brock is successful and they are not.

That is what all this boils down to. It is not about unemployment. His local community and his local paper celebrate his achievements. We have seen it in Port Pirie in *The Recorder*; we have seen it in his re-election time and time again; we have seen him win a by-election; and we have seen him win at a local government level. His community likes him; his community elects him; he works for his community and he knows his community and he understands his community. That is why they keep on sending him to this place to fight for them.

The Liberal Party cannot seem to accept that. Long may they sit in their ignorance about what their failures are. These motions are self-serving and, in my opinion, are a waste of the parliament's time, and speak volumes about those who move them rather than those they are intended to criticise.

If they were serious about Port Pire, if they were serious about unemployment in Port Pirie, rather than moving these motions they would be putting up policy alternatives about what they would do differently, and we would be debating that today rather than attacking the man, but there is none of that.

There is no alternative tax policy, no alternative industry policy, no alternative regional development policy, nothing, just personal attacks on the man because they are not good enough to beat him. If you cannot beat him, attack him. Quite frankly, it speaks volumes about the member for Stuart and the people who moved this motion, and it speaks volumes about the integrity of the man they are trying to attack.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:39):** I also rise to respond to the member for Goyder's original motion and also the amendment brought forward by the member for Newland. The honourable member calls on me to take advantage of my position as the Minister for Regional Development to address economic decline in my home town of Port Pirie. I can understand why the member has asked me to do this. Having spent so many years in opposition, he does not understand what it means to be a cabinet minister.

I serve the electorate of Frome as the local member, but as a minister and a member of this parliament I serve all South Australians. I am not here to take advantage of my position in the cabinet. My regional development portfolio allows me to work with industry and communities to drive regional economic development and accelerate jobs and investment in regional infrastructure that will continue to have an impact on our regional economies and communities for many years to come.

I also have the privilege of travelling through all of our regions—I repeat, all of our regions—on a regular basis. I meet with people, hearing their concerns and their aspirations. I am always struck by the optimism that is out there. I repeat: I am always struck by the optimism out there. People say there is nothing happening in the regions, but I am out there. I know, I see, and I have seen how

much is going on. It is a transition; it is a journey we are on. People out there in the regions are making things happen.

The honourable member has also called on me as the member for Frome to address economic decline in Port Pirie. That was part of the original motion. When was the last time the honourable member was in Port Pirie? I would be more than happy to take him on a tour to show him that this is the busiest and best it has been in many, many years. The city is believing in itself again. The city has been promised so much; never, ever has so much been achieved. But with the Nyrstar transformation, people know they have secure jobs. They know they have a future; they know that the future of the city is secure.

As the Independent member, I did drive the negotiations that resulted in this government underwriting the \$563 million transformation project. It is so rewarding to see the transformation in progress, with the skyline full of cranes—more than has ever been seen in the history of our city. There are cranes lined up: five cranes and one massive crane that will lift 2,000-odd tonnes. In the words of local reporter Greg Mayfield:

We're witnessing an enormous expansion of the lifeblood of our city... The cranes on our horizon serve as a reminder of a positive future ahead.

I will repeat that: 'The cranes on our horizon serve as a reminder of a positive future ahead.' As I said a minute ago, this is a transition period. Building approvals are up from the city council, and businesses are investing in upgrades and expansions. There is so much going on, with projects either underway, recently completed, or in the pipeline, amounting to nearly \$800 million worth of both private and public-private investment in our city. I should repeat that: almost \$800 million private and public-private investment in our city. That is unheard of in a regional city in South Australia.

The Flinders Motel on Main has undertaken a \$2 million refurbishment. There is a Foodland doing a \$1 million upgrade around the corner from my own home. The Sportsman Tavern and the Risdon Hotel are also undertaking major renovations. The Ellen Hotel in the main street is an old social security building and is being converted and upgraded to a 4½ to 5-star hotel. That is \$10½ million between them.

Because of the growth in the number of primary and secondary students, St Mark's College is investing nearly \$5 million. In residential care, Helping Hand is investing \$6 million. Again, this will improve and increase employment opportunities. Air Liquide is investing \$88 million in a new state-of-the-art air separation unit for the smelter transformation. This is a French company that has been there for many years—\$88 million.

Then there is the Wandearah Road redevelopment. I also want to congratulate and thank the opposition for allowing this to happen. This was an excellent project which will generate \$60 million to \$80 million of investment, and will create up to 350 jobs when it is finished. We had to change the Port Pirie Racecourse Site Act to allow this development to go ahead. I have been honoured to champion the passing of this legislation to open the door for this investment. These are just a few of the projects and a few examples of the confidence that businesses are showing in the strength and future of our community; \$800 million in investment is a lot of confidence.

I was recently speaking to a local real estate agent and his comments to me were, 'The last 12 months have been our busiest in the last 12 years,' and others are saying the same. Houses are being built and houses are selling, and that again shows the confidence that our community has. To quote an article in *The Recorder*:

We are weathering the economic downturn in the Upper Spencer Gulf...Port Pirie is building its way to a better economy.

Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, there are plenty of challenges, not only in Port Pirie but across the region, and I keep saying that. But, there are plenty of opportunities, and enthusiasm and optimism are out there. We have been through tough times, but there is a vision for the city's future direction, and we need to continue to work together to actually achieve this.

This government is working with the city to help make sure that it has a successful future and fulfils its vision. I do not stand silent on what this Labor government has done for Port Pirie. I

stand firmly behind everything this government has done and continues to do, and I will continue to stand up for my electorate as the member for Frome.

Again, I will not stand silent. I am doing the best I can as the Independent member for Frome and as Minister for Regional Development. We are advocating, but we need to have both sides of politics working together, and not say, 'You are the minister; this is your job.' It is my honour and privilege to be part of the bright future of Port Pirie and to represent my hometown and its people in this place.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:47):** It has been an interesting debate. We have had people like the Treasurer, who has come in here and argued that the debate is about something that it is not. We have had the member who the motion is about tell us what he has been doing in his electorate. None of us deny that. This is not about that.

This is about the fact that we have a government in South Australia that the people have rejected, not just at the most recent election but at the one before as well. This is a government that has been ignoring rural and regional South Australia for 14 years, and by the end of this term, it will be 16 years. I invite the member for Frome to reflect—

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** —on what has happened to rural and regional South Australia. I agree with what he just said about the wonderful things happening in our regions. Madam Deputy Speaker, they are happening in spite of this government, not because of it.

*The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister scoffs, but when—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No personal reflections.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** —he recently handed over millions of dollars to Treasury Wine Estates in the Barossa Valley, supposedly for 22 jobs or something, I brought to the house's attention that there were 20-something jobs lost by that same company in McLaren Vale and 11 in my electorate in the Coonawarra. There was a net loss of four jobs. The minister knows this, because we have had a private discussion on this matter.

This is the sort of nonsense that rural and regional South Australia have been getting from this government. I ask the minister to reflect on what happened in my electorate to the good people of Keith and their hospital, and they may well be facing a similar scenario very shortly. Does a community of that size in rural and regional South Australia deserve to have its medical services closed down?

We have a government that the people of South Australia have been trying to get rid of, but they cannot through the democratic process because democracy does not work in South Australia. But, minister, you have a very unique opportunity and we are making a plea. Unlike what the Treasurer said, we are not condemning you. He suggested we are condemning you, but we are not. We are urging you to use your unique position to deliver a little more.

**The Hon. J.M. Rankine:** You're a joke.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes, I might be a joke, and you're a waste of space.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is unparliamentary to interject and to respond to them.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I will only respond if I am provoked. Surely, Madam Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, stop. No responding. I will call her to order if she does it again.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** You could throw her out, too, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** She has not gone as far as some of your colleagues and she will not. I know her. She will not interrupt you, and we are all listening to you now.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I make an impassioned plea to the member. I have seen nothing but cuts, cuts, cuts to expenditure in rural and regional South Australia under this government and increases in taxes and levies on rural and regional South Australia by this government. It has been a disaster for rural and regional South Australia. I make a plea to the minister that he ask his colleague, the minister for water, the environment and those things to fulfil his obligation under the National Water Initiative before he imposes millions of dollars of additional burden on my electors. Ask him to meet his obligations, which are simply to publish what he has to publish under the National Water Initiative.

This government signed off on that initiative, which means it is obliged to do certain things and one of them is to publish the real costs and the justification for imposing those costs. This minister refuses to do it and do you know why he refuses to do it? Because he cannot justify his actions. That is impacting on those good people down in my part of the world who are trying to do those good things that you are talking about. As I said, they are doing them and they will continue to do them in spite of this government.

Please use your unique position. You will get full support from this side of the house every time you stand up to this government and stand up for rural and regional South Australia. That is all we are asking you to do and I know you are doing good work in your electorate, but you must be a very worried man after hearing the words of the member for Newland who basically said that, but for the outcome of the election and the unique situation you found yourself in, if this lot had been returned to government without the need of your support, nothing would have been done at Nyrstar.

I think you know in your own mind that if we happened to have got into government at the last election, we would have bent over backwards to save that operation, but if that lot had got into government without your support, God knows what would be happening in Port Pirie now. You should be very worried. You have been able to save Nyrstar and I congratulate you for that. I am asking you to save other things in rural and regional South Australia, and the Keith hospital might be one of them. I might be knocking on your door shortly about that. I know my colleague wishes to close out this debate, so I will leave my comments there.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:54):** I confirm that the opposition will not accept the amendment. I personally believe it is a direct contradiction, anyway. In closing, I emphasise three key points. First, as I said and as other members have said, it is about using your position created by being virtually a member of cabinet to ensure that things occur. That is what the focus was upon. It was not a personal attack. The two key numbers that I emphasise, and others have also, are 19.4 per cent youth unemployment and 12.9 per cent overall unemployment, and that is what we have the responsibility for. The opposition will not support the amendment.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes ..... 23  
Noes ..... 17  
Majority ..... 6

#### AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.	Digance, A.F.C. (teller)	Gee, J.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Hildyard, K.	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Vlahos, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.	

#### NOES

Bell, T.S.	Duluk, S.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Redmond, I.M.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.



## NOES

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

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

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

## PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.  
Pisoni, D.G.

Pengilly, M.R.

Snelling, J.J.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

*Petitions***MOONTA POLICE STATION**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder):** Presented a petition signed by 943 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to increase police presence by the assigning of dedicated police officers to the Moonta township and the re-opening of the Moonta Police Station.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Natural Resources Management Board—

Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Annual Report 2014-15

Alinytjara Wilurara Annual Report 2014-15

Eyre Peninsula Annual Report 2014-15

Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2014-15

Northern and Yorke Annual Report 2014-15

South Australian Arid Lands Annual Report 2014-15

South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Annual Report 2014-15

South East Annual Report 2014-15

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Education and Care Services National Amendment Regulations 2015—Education and Care Services National Law

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. L.A. Vlahos)—

Submission from the South Australian Government for the Social Development

Committee's Recommendations into the Inquiry into Comorbidity—8 February 2016

*Question Time***PATIENT RECORDS**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02):** My question is to the Minister for Health. When will the location of the off-site patient records storage facility for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital be identified, and has the government done any modelling to identify the time it would take to get a patient's historical records from an external storage site and into the hands of clinicians?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:02):** We will know when we are ready, and we are consulting with clinicians. Let me make something quite clear. Paper records at the moment, even on site, can take a long time for clinicians to get their hands on. They can take some hours, even when they are kept on site because, often, they get lost and, often, we don't know where they are. Lots and lots of things can happen to paper records.

That is why we are moving towards an electronic health patient record, so that these things don't happen and so that clinicians have the information they need when they need it. I was having a look at the health policy in the 2036 document, and I have to say, it is more than just physical resemblance that the Leader of the Opposition shares with Dennis Denuto—more than just a physical resemblance—because you read the few paragraphs on health policy and, in essence, it's Wik! It's Mabo! It's everything!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** May I intervene? I call the minister to order for flagrantly debating the matter rather than providing information. Is the minister finished? The member for Newland.

### GOLD PRODUCTION

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:04):** Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Minister, can you update the house on the state of South Australia's gold sector amid the current challenging business climate for the mineral resources industry?

**The SPEAKER:** Before the minister starts, I call to order the members for Hartley—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Oh, dear! The member for Hammond was already on two warnings.

**Mr Pederick:** Only one, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, I have two here, so the member for Hammond will withdraw for the next half hour.

*The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** I also call to order the members for Chaffey (who has already departed the chamber once today), the member for Mitchell and the member for Morphett, and I call to order the leader and I warn him for the first time and I warn him for the second time owing to his egregious conduct before the minister had begun to debate the matter. Minister.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:05):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I would like to thank the member for Newland for his question and note his spectacular support for all things mining.

South Australia ranks second behind Western Australia in terms of the percentage of the country's economically demonstrated resource—gold. South Australia is home to the world's fourth largest gold resource at Olympic Dam, where it is mined along with copper. In fact, it is not unusual to find gold within copper deposits. South Australia produces the precious metal from its Prominent Hill and Kanmantoo copper mines, and OZ Minerals is continuing to make progress towards developing the world-class Carrapateena copper-gold project south of Olympic Dam.

Aside from copper-gold deposits, South Australia also has a stand-alone gold mine in Challenger, which has operated since 2002. Challenger is not alone. Slowly but surely, we have been adding new gold mines to our tally of mineral assets. The White Dam Gold Production Joint Venture and the Drew Hill Exploration Joint Venture, with partners Exco Resources and Polymetals Mining Limited, first poured gold in April 2010.

White Dam was originally expected to have a 30-month mine life. Six years on, White Dam has already produced more than 150,000 ounces of gold. Only last month, mining resumed at White Dam to further extend the mine's life. I am also pleased to inform the house and members that a

major milestone has been achieved at Havilah Resources' Portia project, with the mining of its first gold ore 3½ months earlier than initial expectations. Portia's next major milestone will be passed when the processing of the stockpiled ore begins when construction and commissioning of the processing plant is completed next month.

Earlier this month WPG Resources was granted a mineral lease over its Tarcoola goldfield, south of the existing Challenger gold mine, and finalised the purchase of the Challenger gold mine itself. The acquisition of the Challenger mine and the new lease for Tarcoola are a key step forward towards WPG's multi-pronged approach to develop a regional gold play in the Gawler Craton. WPG's position has the potential to extend the life of the Challenger mine and to utilise the project's existing infrastructure as a central processing facility.

Additionally, WPG is also developing another gold project near Tunkillia, also in the Gawler Craton region, which could again potentially use the processing facilities at Challenger. In 2014-15, South Australian gold miners produced 10 tonnes of gold valued at \$484 million, contributing \$17.98 million in royalties for South Australians.

The majority of South Australian gold is used domestically rather than exported and, in contrast to recent lower commodity prices, the average price achieved by South Australian gold miners has remained buoyant and steady between \$1,400 and \$1,700 per ounce during the past five years. In these difficult times for the resources industry it is too easy to sit back and focus on projects that have been cut back—

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley is on two warnings, and he will depart for the remainder of question time.

*The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber.*

**The SPEAKER:** Apparently, there was much contretemps during private members' time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yet, sir, South Australia continues to press forward on many fronts. Gold is one of those areas where investment is continually made on mine development. Some of these mines may not be huge projects by any stretch of the imagination, but they are employing South Australians, generating economic activity in the regions and helping maintain confidence in the industry until commodity prices swing back in their favour. Collectively, they are an important element in the overall South Australian economy, and I for one welcome the progress that they are making. And, no, I have not been speaking dirty to the member for Newland.

#### ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** My question is to the Minister for Health. When will the EPAS system be fully implemented and operational at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and does this latest delay in the rollout of the EPAS affect the overall budget for this EPAS project?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before the minister answers, there was no need for the members for Stuart and Kavel to interject during the asking of the question. Accordingly, the member for Stuart is warned for the second and final time, and the member for Kavel is called to order. The minister.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10):** The answer to the first question is: within about six months of us moving into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Let me be quite clear though to the house—

**Mr Goldsworthy:** Don't hold your breath.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel is warned.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** He has been doing it all day, sir. About six months after the opening of the new RAH, we expect EPAS to be fully operational at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Let's be quite clear: the reasons are not because EPAS is not ready or won't be ready for implementation. The reason we are staggering it is so that the clinicians who are orientating

themselves to a new hospital with a very different working environment do not have an additional complexity of a new IT system like EPAS to have to get used to at the same time.

Based upon expert clinical advice, a decision has been taken to stagger the rollout, so we will move in to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and then approximately six months later we will have EPAS full operationality. EPAS will be partly operating at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, so we will be using parts of it that are safe for us to use, that are not overly complex and provide good patient care. So there will be aspects of EPAS that will be there from day one, with full operationality about six months after us moving into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

**The SPEAKER:** Can the minister address the question of the cost?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** With regard to cost, no, I do not expect that there would be any additional cost.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is on two warnings. I call to order the members for Morialta, Davenport and Schubert. I warn the member for Morialta for the first time and I warn for the second and final time the member for Kavel. The member for Little Para.

### SOCCEROOS' MATCH

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:12):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can you inform the house on how ticket sales are faring for tonight's FIFA World Cup qualifying match between the Socceroos and Tajikistan at Adelaide Oval?

**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) (14:12):** I thank the member for Little Para for the question. I can say that I know that the member for Little Para is a keen soccer supporter. When you head over the beautiful Adelaide Oval footbridge to the Oval tonight, you won't be walking alone. We have so far sold about 30,000 tickets for tonight's game, and we are hoping to get about 35,000 people in there. I will be there.

It is going to be a terrific game. It is the first time since 2004 that we will be hosting the Socceroos in a competitive game, and it is actually a 2018 World Cup qualifier. The last time the Socceroos played in a competitive game in 2004, it was in front of just 2,000 people at the Marden sports park, so we have come a long way.

It is going to be a terrific night in terms of the tourism boost for the state. We know that the Adelaide Oval pumps about \$320 million into the economy of South Australia each year and that 7 per cent of the people who go to the Adelaide Oval have come from interstate. Half of those people have come specifically because of an event on at the Adelaide Oval. We have hosted the Rolling Stones, AC/DC and Liverpool. We had the very first day/night test in the world with Australia versus New Zealand last year. So, from the tourism point of view, it is a terrific result for South Australia.

I look at that oval as not just one of the finest sports grounds in the world but as a monument to jobs. It's a monument to the jobs that went into the construction of the oval, and it's a monument to those wonderful people who work at the Adelaide Oval. And then it's the people who are employed in hotels, some who had jobs before, some who have been taken on since then. It's the people who have been working—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I can't hear, sorry. It's the people who work in the four new hotels that have been built by the private sector since the Adelaide Oval opened two years ago, and it's the people who will work on the six hotels that are on the drawing board to open in Adelaide in the next two years. So, it's been a terrific boost for the economy of South Australia. This weekend the Adelaide Oval will welcome its 4 millionth visitor. We've got Port Adelaide versus the Saints down there on Sunday, and that will be a great game, and the week after, of course, it's the Showdown, so we'll have the Adelaide Crows hosting Port Adelaide, and it's—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —one of those great events that really gets a big local crowd. But the other thing I like about having the Socceroos in town—and it was a bit the same last month when we had the women's Australian golf open here and we had 31,000 people going down to see the best women golfers in the world—is that when we have the Socceroos here, they're the heroes of the younger generation.

I know that the member for Little Para's son, Jimmy, who is playing for the under 16s with Adelaide City, is going to be down there seeing our national team at one of the best sports stadiums anywhere in the world—not that he needs much more inspiration. Since he could walk he's been kicking soccer balls around the place. He's a great young player, but there's thousands of young people in South Australia who haven't seen their national team play here for over 12 years, and we're giving them the opportunity to get out there and see the wonderful Socceroos.

Ryan McGowan is a young fellow born in Adelaide, raised at Para Hills. I met up with him earlier in the week. He's so pumped to be back in Adelaide and to see what we've done with the place because, when he left, Adelaide Oval hadn't been revitalised, and the small bar scene hadn't happened. He congratulated us on what a great job we've done running the state in the 10 years since he left town to take on the world. So, to all the Socceroos tonight: go well and get the points!

### CATS, THE MUSICAL

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (14:16):** Supplementary, please, Mr Speaker.

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

**Ms REDMOND:** Could the Minister for Tourism inform the house how many tickets have been sold to tomorrow night's performance of *Cats* at the Festival Theatre and its impact on tourism in South Australia?

**The SPEAKER:** The cultural attaché.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17):** Indeed; thank you very much; minister for the 'yarts'. I haven't got the exact number, but I can say I was there on Sunday night, and I do know and I can confirm, I presume—

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** No, nothing happened with Mr Mistoffelees, I can assure the Deputy Premier. The Adelaide Festival Centre does have I think more visitors or more attendances through the year than the Adelaide Oval, but of course it's operating far more nights than the Adelaide Oval. Of course, it's an enormous success, and *Cats* has been a fabulous production. I don't know if the member for Heysen—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is called to order.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I don't know if the member for Heysen was there, and I'm presuming she was, but it was a packed house and it's gone very, very well. Of course, the arts are an incredibly important part of our state economy. The government has made it a particular priority. I know that the Treasurer shares my enthusiasm and the government's enthusiasm for the arts, because they do of course create jobs, and we certainly welcome the wonderful work that Douglas Gautier has done at the Adelaide Festival Centre. I know that this will be the first of many fantastic productions that will be on at that centre.

### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Who will be making the final sign-off on whether the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is safe to open, and who will be taking ultimate responsibility for this? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, it's conventional, having phrased it in the correct form, to continue with the explanation.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Earlier this week the minister stated that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital would not open unless it was safe for patients, while this morning SASMOA and senior clinicians reiterated claims first made in April of this year that keeping patient records off site would pose a patient safety issue.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:19):** It's not unusual for SASMOA to make rather inflammatory and inaccurate comments. I have to say that I think the doctors in this state have been let down by the leadership of SASMOA. It pains me to say it, but I do not think that SASMOA is really at all representative of the opinions of the doctors who work in our health system. I think those doctors have been badly let down by the leadership of SASMOA.

However, that point aside, the question was: who will take responsibility? I guess, ultimately, in a ministerial sense, it will be my responsibility and I will take full responsibility but, of course, I will do so upon the advice of experts in the system: clinicians who will provide me—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —with advice about the—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Clinicians will provide me with advice about the safety of the hospital. Obviously, I'm not a doctor and I'm not an expert and it would be rather silly for me to be making technical judgements, but if those doctors provide me with the advice that it's safe then, of course, we will move in and I will take ultimate political responsibility for the safety of that hospital.

#### HEALTH REVIEW

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:20):** My question is to the Minister for Health. How will access to elective surgery change under Transforming Health for those many residents in country South Australia who need to travel to metropolitan Adelaide for elective surgery?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21):** I thank the member for Light for this very important question, because on any given day nearly 20 per cent of patients receiving elective surgery at our metropolitan hospitals are from, in fact, regional South Australia. That's why, under Transforming Health, improvements we're making to the provision of elective surgery will benefit all South Australians, including those who live in the country.

We know that having to travel to metropolitan Adelaide for elective surgery can cause disruption to the lives of country patients, and this is clearly made worse when elective surgery is postponed or delayed or where hospital stays are longer than they need be. At the moment, around one in every four planned elective surgery operations undertaken in our metropolitan hospitals are postponed. This is often because theatres are not available due to unplanned and urgent surgery.

Having complex emergency surgery undertaken in the same theatres as elective surgery means that surgeons and clinical teams are often pulled away from planned elective surgery when an emergency occurs. Under Transforming Health we have created dedicated elective surgery centres at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Noarlunga Hospital and the Modbury Hospital. Having separate, dedicated centres for elective surgery will mean fewer postponements due to emergency surgery and better planned and managed surgery lists.

In addition, clinical evidence shows that our specialists need to see a critical mass of patients to maintain their highly specialised skills and to deliver safer and better quality outcomes for patients. Through dedicated elective surgery centres we will allow this to happen. This model is tried and tested interstate, resulting in shorter waiting times, shorter stays in hospital and better outcomes for patients. Interstate experience shows that clinical teams are rarely called away from elective surgery for emergencies if provided separately in dedicated streams.

This is good news for our country patients needing to have elective surgery in Adelaide. This means less disruption to their lives, less inconvenience from cancellations and unnecessary travel. With an increase in elective day surgery across all our metropolitan hospitals as well as the establishment of dedicated surgery centres, Transforming Health will help country patients to return home to their local communities much sooner.

When they return home, our country patients will have more access to Adelaide-based specialists via Telehealth, with over 180 videoconferencing units in more than 90 locations across 76 towns as well as in metropolitan Adelaide. Transforming Health will ensure that our country patients receive better access to faster elective surgery with shorter hospital stays. This means less interruption to their lives and safer, high-quality services.

#### STATE ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. When does the minister expect the settlement on the sale of the State Administration Centre will occur, and are there any pending legal proceedings in respect of the sale?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:24):** I thank the deputy leader for her question and her interest in this matter. I will ask the minister responsible for some information about that, and I will come back to the house with it.

#### HOMELESS FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:24):** My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. What action has the minister taken to achieve funding continuity for the specialist homelessness services sector?

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:24):** I thank the member for this important question and note his ongoing interest in community welfare. Almost nine years ago, a new prime minister asked members of parliament to visit homeless shelters to get a firsthand view of the significant nationwide challenge that is homelessness.

The executive director of the Brotherhood of St Laurence was asked to lead a national committee in the development of a long-term plan to improve the issue, and what followed was the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness. This agreement initially provided funds for a minimum of three years, with equal contributions from the commonwealth and the states. This time frame ensured that homelessness services could recruit and retain critical workers, who do some of the hardest work in Australia.

In South Australia, our homelessness and domestic violence system now consists of dozens of services across the state, with annual funding of more than \$50 million. Approximately one-third of this vital funding comes from the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness, and yet we are now in the position where our future progress has been once again put at risk. In recent years, the agreement has twice been extended for one year only—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** —and in 2015 was not renewed until weeks before it was due to expire.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time. Minister.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** By this late stage, critical staff had already begun to leave the sector and, when the agreement was finally extended, those who remained were not provided with the reassurance of the Equal Remuneration Order from Fair Work Australia to ensure they were compensated properly. In contrast, the South Australian government's contribution to the agreement has provided additional funds for the Equal Remuneration Order.

On 1 January 2016, I wrote to the commonwealth Minister For Social Services, the Hon. Christian Porter, to ask that the continuity of homelessness funding be made a priority. I highlighted that, if agreement on future funding is not reached by early 2017, there is significant risk of services being terminated. This would threaten assistance provided by the sector to more than 20,000 South Australians each year. Further, if this funding cannot be secured, approximately 230 jobs from the South Australian specialist homelessness services sector will be put at risk. To date, I have not received a response.

In order to ensure that this matter is centrestage, where it belongs, South Australia has written a submission to a meeting of ministers with responsibility for housing and homelessness that will take place in Brisbane on 31 March 2016. With the talk of an early election, there has never been a better time for the commonwealth to declare support for those most vulnerable in our community.

#### STATE ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** My question is to the Treasurer. When does the government expect to settle on the sale of the State Administration Centre, and will he inform the house if there are any pending legal proceedings in respect of the sale?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:28):** The sale of the State Administration Centre precinct was subject to a structured competitive sales process with full legal and probity oversight. An EOI was released to the market on 31 March 2015, with the EOI closing on 7 May 2015. After a short-listing process, exclusive negotiations had been taking place with a preferred bidder. Since July 2015, these exclusive negotiations have now ceased. The state, in going to a preferred bidder process, reserved its right to enter into negotiations with any other party, including other short-listed bidders, or to re-release the State Administration Centre to the market.

On 26 November 2015, exclusive negotiations with a revised preferred bidder were entered into. The sale process is yet to conclude. Settlement is expected to occur prior to 30 June 2016. Our sales adviser, JLL, has advised that these processes are not unusual in large property transactions and, due to the commercial-in-confidence nature of the process, I am unable to say anything further about the status of the State Administration Centre sale negotiations.

**Mr Marshall:** Are there any legal proceedings?

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Treasurer?

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** You don't wish to comment on the legal proceedings. The member for Wright.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:29):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Minister, how is the government working to ensure just and timely dispute resolution outcomes for workers compensation matters?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:29):** Can I thank the honourable member for her question. This is a very important area, and something that the government has been very keen to make progress on.

On 1 July last year, the South Australian Employment Tribunal opened its doors. This was opened with the objective of providing resolution of disputes through high quality processes, the avoidance of formality and technicality as far as possible and the use of mediation and alternative dispute resolution procedures wherever appropriate.

Consistent with its objectives, the South Australian Employment Tribunal is processing applications and resolving disputes as quickly as it possibly can whilst achieving just outcomes for



the parties involved. Since it opened on 1 July last year, the employment tribunal has already resolved 70 per cent of the 3,385 applications it has received. Matters are now referred to conciliation within two business days of an application being lodged, which is very swift indeed compared to other jurisdictions.

A face-to-face initial directions hearing is held within three weeks of lodgement. The mean time for lodgement to resolution at conciliation is just nine weeks, compared to the old workers compensation tribunal's 28 weeks. For matters referred to a full hearing, the mean time from lodgement to decision is 25 weeks, compared to 48 weeks under the old system.

These significant reductions in time are being achieved while maintaining the quality of the processes and the justness of the outcome. I can also report that there has been a positive response from practitioners who were frustrated with the delays in the old tribunal and who are now seeing the benefits—

**Ms Chapman:** They are all the same people.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I will tell you a little bit more about that. The practitioners who were appearing before the old system are now being very positive about the benefits of the new system. It is true—

**Ms Chapman:** Same judges!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —that there are some people who were members of the old tribunal and who are members of the new tribunal. The important thing is the rules of the way the tribunal operates and the whole structure of the employment tribunal are completely different to the old structure, which is why we are seeing—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It's true. And, in addition to that, we appointed two new deputy presidents—deputy presidents Calligeros and Dolphin—both of whom have done a sensational job in really chewing through the work. These improvements in the system not only provide a positive benefit to workers, they also provide certainty and reduced costs to business. I am very pleased to congratulate all those people at the employment tribunal for their success and their commitment, and I wish them all the best in continuing that in the future.

#### FESTIVAL PLAZA CAR PARK

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:33):** My question is to the Minister for Planning. Will the construction of the Festival Plaza car park have started by 1 July this year, as required under the contract between the state government and Walker Corporation?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:33):** I think, just as a matter of clarification, at this point in time what we have is heads of agreement between the government and Walker Corporation. Those heads of agreement are, at the present time, the subject of a lot of work by people in the Crown and people who work for Walker Corporation to distil those heads of agreement into—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —a contract document. My expectation is that that will be resolved fairly shortly and, at the point of that being resolved, we should be in a position to be able to answer that question one way or the other.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Colton.

#### SOUTH ROAD UPGRADES

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:34):** Thank you, sir; I am working extremely hard today. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I work hard every day. Can the minister provide the house with an update on recent and current works on the Torrens to Torrens project?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:34):** I would like to thank the member for Colton for his question, which I know is of particular interest to him, as well as perhaps to you, Mr Speaker, as a local member. Members would be well aware that the state government's progress on the \$896 million Torrens to Torrens project, which has been jointly funded with the commonwealth, is delivering a significant upgrade to the South Road corridor, particularly at the intersections of Grange Road and Port Road and now, through a robust competitive tendering process and cost allocation, underneath Torrens Road as well.

The project is being delivered by the T2T Alliance, which is the alliance between South Australian civil construction firm York Civil as well as Leighton Contractors and Aurecon. They have been engaged in broad community engagement, ensuring local residents and commuters are aware of the works that are being undertaken on the ground. At the northernmost end of the project, community feedback is currently being sought on the options for the Pym Street intersection. Mr Speaker, as you would be aware, Pym Street is the intersection immediately north of the Torrens Road intersection.

This intersection was brought into consideration after the announced extension to the project late last year, taking the project underneath Torrens Road as well as Grange and Port roads. Options for the configuration of this intersection were uploaded onto the T2T Alliance website this week, and I strongly encourage residents and local commuters to examine the options and provide their comments. These options can be found at [www.t2talliance.com.au](http://www.t2talliance.com.au) and, based on community feedback, a final configuration for this intersection will be decided and communicated to residents and commuters alike.

I would like to thank the local residents who have already offered their feedback and contributions thus far on this particular part of the project. The benefits of this project, though, go further than on-road traffic. They include improvements to pedestrian and cycling access which, of course, has been a key focus for the state government. At the southernmost end of the project, we recently announced the commencement of the construction of a \$2 million pedestrian and cycling bridge in West Hindmarsh. This bridge, located on McDonnell Avenue, spans 30 metres across the River Torrens, providing improved access for residents in West Hindmarsh to the Brickworks shopping precinct.

I now report to the house that this bridge has been completed and shortly will be opened for public access in the coming weeks. Local residents, pedestrians and cyclists will now benefit from improved access to local facilities, such as the Outer Harbor Greenway; the Thebarton Community Centre; St Joseph's School; local shopping precincts, including that Brickworks precinct; Thebarton Senior College; Queen Street; and the Croydon Railway Station. Following the completion, landscaping works will begin to beautify the surrounding area and provide improved amenity for local residents.

I would like to thank the South Australian company SMB Civil for their work on this bridge project, employing 25 South Australian workers over the period of construction. SMB Civil, a Mount Gambier based company, was delighted to be given an opportunity to be involved in delivering an infrastructure project of this nature, and I understand that reported to the parliament that it provided the opportunity to give useful work experience to a young South Australian trainee engineer throughout the life of the project.

If members, residents, commuters or, indeed, anyone else would like further updates about the Torrens to Torrens project and the different elements of the project as it progresses, they can subscribe for email updates or call the community information line on 1300 794 899.

#### **FESTIVAL PLAZA CAR PARK**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:38):** My question is again to the Minister for Planning. Has the Walker Corporation sought an extension of time to commence

construction of the Festival Plaza car park or, indeed, any other agreement variations to the heads of agreement entered into in respect of the plaza with the government last year?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:39):** I thank the deputy leader for the question. The situation, as I was trying to explain in the previous answer, is that we had a set of heads of agreement which were settled upon a while ago. For the sake of just being clear about this, the normal commercial practice, I have discovered, is for somebody to enter into what is called 'heads of agreement'. Heads of agreement are not binding legal terms. What they are are heads of agreement and they are, if you like, an agreement to enter into an agreement broadly under the following terms. That is heads of agreement. They have been sitting there for a while. Obviously—

**Mr Marshall:** Since when?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I cannot tell you the exact date, but they have been there for a while. There is no question about that.

**Mr Marshall:** Was it 2012 or a bit more recently?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It was more recently than 2012.

**Mr Marshall:** Is that when they got their exclusivity agreement?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Can I answer one question at a time? What has happened is that the Crown on behalf of the state government and legal representatives on behalf of Walker are now translating that heads of agreement document into a contract. That contract will be legally binding and it will ultimately be a matter for the government to be satisfied with the terms.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** There is no time under the contract presently—

**Ms Chapman:** Under the agreement.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I don't think there is any relevant question—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Is that what it says? Is that what the heads of agreement say? Well, so far, there is no change. So far we are still talking.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Not as far as I am aware, no, but can I say that there undoubtedly have been, and will continue to be, many matters raised by both the Crown and by Walker in relation to the detailed translation of the heads of agreement into a deed of agreement. Those conversations have been going on for some time, and I am hopeful we might see some end to that conversation in the next couple of weeks. It will be very nice.

#### WINE VINTAGE 2016

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:41):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you update the house on the progress of the 2016 wine vintage?

**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) (14:41):** I thank the member for Light for the question and acknowledge the great work he does on behalf of the grapegrowers and winemakers in his electorate. We have 18 wine regions throughout South Australia and they are a vitally important part of our economy. We just need to look at the carpet in here to see the bunches of grapes that obviously point to the fact that, right since the very early days of the colony, the wine industry has been very important to our economy.

This year's report card on food and wine saw an increase from \$17.1 billion to \$18.2 billion, so that is a fair jump—\$1.1 billion in a 12-month period. That is a terrific result and just shows how

important the agriculture sector is. It employs one in five working South Australians. We all need to be out there supporting these industries as much as we possibly can.

One thing we cannot do though is pull the right levers to make the weather do the right thing at all times. We have had some challenging vintages over the past decade and this 2016 one, while some people still have some grapes out there to bring in, is looking like a very good vintage right across all of our 18 wine regions. Not only are yields up in most places, but the quality is exceptional.

We had a very dry December, and I know there were a lot of people worried about water around my area of McLaren Vale. It slowed the growing season a bit, and then in January and February we had rains which really freshened things up, so all the reports that I am getting back from people like James March up in the Barossa is that the shiraz, in particular, up there is looking great and they are looking to have not just a really good vintage in terms of quantity, but the quality is exceptional. Adelaide Hills is reporting the same. The Riverland, of course, which produces more wine than any other region in South Australia, has also had a very good year as well.

What we have seen though is that a lot of grape varieties ripened at the same time, which put everyone under a little bit of pressure. I want to pay tribute to the 3,500 grapegrowers that we have in South Australia and to all of those people involved along the process. We have grapegrowers, winemakers, retail shops, distributors and those people who are involved in the export industry. It really is part of the engine room of the South Australian economy and employs so many people. Of course, we produce 80 per cent of Australia's premium wine, and 50 per cent of the total wine market is made here in South Australia.

The Premier was in the US a few weeks ago, and he made the announcement that Adelaide had been accepted into the Great Wine Capitals of the world global network. We are in there with eight other international cities, including Porto, Bordeaux, San Francisco and other places around the world that are seen as—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned for the second and the final time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —international leaders in wine, so it is only fitting that Adelaide would be chosen as the great wine capital of Australia, and to be part of that international network. I know the people in the Napa Valley have been trying to get Adelaide in for a few years, and we have done the work now. It will help us not just to be on a list of international wine regions but, also, in the collaboration and discussions between the wine and tourism industries here and all around the world. It will help our growers, winemakers and tourism operators to benchmark their operations and activities against those of other places.

When I was in the Napa Valley about six years ago, one of the big advantages they had was in biosecurity so, when the European grapevine moth turned up in their vineyards, they could ring their friends in Italy and France and work out how to get rid of it, and it was gone in one season rather than their messing around and letting that pest grow throughout the beautiful Napa Valley.

#### **PUBLIC SERVICE ACCOMMODATION**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46):** My question, again, is to the Minister for Planning. Is the government now considering putting government tenants into the Walker Corporation building to be constructed next to Parliament House?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:46):** We have been asked this many times, and the answer remains the same. I have to say that the government chooses its tenancies on the basis of what is the best value for money for the taxpayer and how best can we get outcomes for our employees and, quite frankly, I think the whole line of questioning is probably not really achieving anything, because the government has been—

**Ms Chapman:** A simple question: are you considering it or not?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The government does not have plans, other than the current tenancies we have in place now. If they change, we will inform the house in the budget process.

### MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:47):** My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Can the minister tell the house about her trip to Mount Gambier last week?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:47):** I had the privilege last week of visiting the member for Mount Gambier's electorate and getting a firsthand look at the mental health and disability services in the region. We know that issues around mental health are particularly acute in regional and rural areas across the state, and I was particularly struck in the South-East by the work of the Aboriginal Suicide Prevention Network (the first of its type in South Australia), Menswatch and the Mount Gambier Suicide Prevention Network, who gave generously of their time to me and my team as they spoke about the work that they do to make a positive change in the area they work in towards mental health, resilience and wellbeing.

I have also had the opportunity of visiting the Mental Health Unit at the Mount Gambier Hospital and the Disability SA Mount Gambier office and talking to the staff of both of these facilities. Disability SA alone looks after 511 clients across the Limestone Coast region and it was heartwarming to hear their passion, amazing story and the work they do to help their clients in the area.

The NGO sector also plays a vital role in delivering services to the South-East, and I thank Mr Mark Kulinski from Community Living Australia's (also known as CLASS) disability accommodation service, who took the time to introduce me to some of the disability service clients that he has at CLASS homes in the area and their support workers. I was really pleased to meet Craig, who is a CLASS customer and has been helped in a transition from a long extended stay at a local hospital into his own home where he and others live a more independent life, with the support of the support workers.

Finally, it was my privilege to visit and talk to some of the occupants whose lives have been dramatically changed for the better by access to community rehabilitation housing in Mount Gambier. These houses not only provide a bed for those needing mental health care but a wraparound service which provides individual clients with new basic living skills such as how to prepare a shopping list, and how to get on with housemates and regular appointments with a psychologist that they would not have received.

Without these rehab services the consumers I met told me they more than likely would have remained homeless, on the street or perhaps even dead. Unfortunately, important services in our regions such as the one that I have just spoken of and the associated jobs that they create are under threat from the federal Liberal government because they have not agreed to commit to funding \$20 million in mental health with the National Partnership Agreements beyond 30 June this year, and this is despite repeated requests from the state government and several ministers.

It is reassuring to hear the comments of the federal member for Mount Gambier, Mr Tony Pasin, who said that he is calling on the federal Minister for Health to, and I quote '...ensure the important services that funding these facilities will be maintained in the future'. I call on the state Liberals to follow the lead of their federal colleagues and stand up to the federal government's funding cuts in South Australia.

### ABORIGINAL ARTEFACTS

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for the Arts. What steps will the government take to ensure that our museum's priceless collection of 60,000 Aboriginal cultural artefacts will be protected in adequate storage conditions?

Concerns have been publicly raised this week by David Rathman, board member and chair of the museum's Aboriginal Advisory Committee, that priceless artefacts have been damaged both by vermin and by eight separate flooding events in recent times, most recently after the sprinkler system was set off as a result of a fire alarm.

**An honourable member:** Put them in with the hospital records!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:51):** It is a very serious issue and not a joking matter. Of course, we do have, I think, probably one of the world's greatest collections of Aboriginal artefacts, and its preservation is probably, I think, the number one priority for me as Minister for the Arts.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** We are doing everything we can within the current facility to protect those artefacts. Of course, in the current facility we cannot protect against issues regarding insect infestation, but we are certainly looking at what might be other options, and we certainly recognise that, in the medium term, the continued keeping of that collection at the present site is unacceptable.

#### EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:52):** My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Minister, can you advise the house on how the Department for Education and Child Development is supporting ongoing professional development of staff?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:52):** Thank you, sir, and I thank the member for her question. Members may be aware that the Department for Education and Child Development has an accredited registered training organisation that supports DECD employees to further their professional knowledge and experience by completing vocational education and training.

Next week, we will celebrate the achievements of approximately 550 DECD staff members who have completed a vocational qualification with the DECD RTO. This is a remarkable achievement and one worth celebrating. Vocational education is hugely important to ensuring our workforce is skilled and aims for continual improvement.

Often we hear about it in the context of helping young people to enter the workforce with job-ready skills, but it is also a critical part of making sure that our existing workforce has ongoing opportunities to better understand and develop crucial skills within their roles. Vocational education helps workers keep up to date with advances, innovation and current research relevant to their profession, to learn skills to enable them to work smarter rather than harder and, most crucially, to work together to build a focused and responsive South Australian education and child protection system.

Staff involved represent a huge range of roles within the department: SSOs, principals and preschool directors, residential care workers and Aboriginal education workers. The demographics represented by the graduates are similarly wideranging, including students who are in their 20s right through to those over 50, as well as students who have not studied since high school and those for whom English is a second language.

The graduates have completed an extensive variety of qualifications, including certificates in child and youth and family intervention, accounting and education support and diplomas in early childhood education and care. Also, among those being recognised at next week's ceremony will be the first graduates of the Graduate Diploma of Strategic Leadership, which is a qualification aligned with the Australian Professional Standard for Principals.

Leaders have a critical and broad role in schools and preschools, from working with staff, students and parents to managing finances and infrastructure. Their role is critical to students' success. Research tells us that leadership is second only to teacher quality as the most important factor affecting student outcomes. Our leaders require a broad set of skills, and supporting them to hone or develop these skills is a priority for DECD.

The advanced leadership qualification, the first of its kind in Australia, supports DECD leaders and aspiring leaders to strengthen their skills and their ability to manage the significant day-to-day demands of leading their school communities. The course content was developed in collaboration with the University of South Australia, DECD site leaders, education directors and corporate representatives. Areas covered include management of site resources; leading improvement, innovation and change; and engaging the school community, just to name a few.

This first group of 27 graduates are new leaders, and they were supported to undertake the course free of charge. Recognising they were balancing study with the demands of being a new leader, they were also allocated release time from their schools. Not only are they better equipped for the demands of leadership, they are also the first DECD leaders to hold the qualification of choice for site leader appointments.

To help build the capacity of our future principals and directors, aspiring leader programs will commence with a trial cohort in 2016. I applaud each of the RTO graduates for making the effort to boost their skills and qualifications. They are bringing back to their workplaces new skills and ideas that will benefit our schools, preschools, Families SA services and, most importantly, our children and young people.

#### HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:56):** My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Regarding the 1,000 homes in 1,000 days announcement, will there be builders' warranties and, if so, for how long? I am informed by contractors who work repairing Housing Trust houses that a lot of their time and a lot of government money is spent fixing issues with newly built homes that do not have adequate builders' warranties.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:56):** I thank the member for Adelaide for her question. Of course, we will make sure that we have got stringent and robust requirements on builders who are successful in winning tender processes in order to construct houses under that program.

#### PORT RIVER MUD COCKLES

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:57):** I am being a hard worker today—and no comments from the simple son of a sausage maker. My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. What is the state government doing to revive the mud cockle fishery at the Port River?

**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) (14:57):** I thank the member for Colton and place on the record the fishing industry's gratitude for the great work that he did as minister for fisheries in South Australia. I also acknowledge the fact that I think he is the only dual gold medal winning fisher in this chamber from the World Police and Fire Games.

The mud cockle fishery down at the Port River has been closed since 2011 to commercial and recreational fishers. I know that came as a great disappointment to the Premier, who as a child would be taken down there by his father to go looking for mud cockles, tube worms and tiger worms so they could use them for bait when they went fishing off the Henley jetty. But the fishery has been closed.

What SARDI, our South Australian Research and Development Institute, has been doing is working with the local cockle industry to try to revive a fishery that was overfished and that also had problems with some of the environmental conditions down there. They have recently put some trays of baby cockles of varying sizes into the mud down in the Port River area for a trial to repopulate the depleted stocks of this popular catch.

The stock enhancement and restoration project covers the fishery from Port Gawler Road to the tip of Lefevre Peninsula at Outer Harbor. The key objective is to reveal the factors contributing to the decline in the stock and attempt to re-establish aggregation of mud cockles in the Port River. They are slow-growing animals and also produce a small number of eggs per individual each season, so the stocks will take some time to recover. A total of 144 plastic trays measuring about 60 centimetres by 30 centimetres containing 16,000 baby cockles of different sizes and densities were buried and will need to remain undisturbed during the next three months. So just tell George about it, but tell him to stay away, alright? We don't want him taking any of these mud cockles.

Each tray was tagged to allow them to be identified and removed to measure the growth and survival of the cockles and the impact of natural predators such as crabs and rays. We ask the public and fishers to help the project by not anchoring or disturbing the bottom at Section Bank or of course

moving any of the plastic trays that may be visible during low tide. The experimental trays will be monitored regularly.

I would like to thank commercial fishers who have assisted by suggesting the best locations for the restocking trial to occur. Their help has been invaluable. I would like to take this opportunity, too, to thank those members of parliament who came along to a briefing today with our people from SARDI and PIRSA. We have the recreational fishing review. There are three reviews underway. We announced it last month. It goes right through until the end of April.

There has been some tremendous feedback from all parts of the state. I want to commend everyone. I think it's been done in a very professional and respectful way. We will hear a different view in one part of the state than we might in another part, but all the letters that I am getting are coming in with really great contributions. In what can sometimes be a really emotive issue I think people are taking a sensible approach to it and really trying to offer positive things for the future of our recreational fisheries in South Australia.

The really important thing that we want to do is make sure the grandparents of the next generation can take their grandchildren fishing and be able to catch a fish, and we can't do that if we overfish the stocks that are there. So, a big thanks to the PIRSA and SARDI staff who have done a great job going around the state for all of these briefings and for conducting a briefing today, which was well attended by both sides of the house.

#### **KAROONDA AREA SCHOOL SWIMMING POOL**

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Minister, given the Minister for Sport's comments in the house yesterday about the importance of the VACSWIM program in South Australia, when will the Karoonda Area School swimming pool be repaired so that the children of the community can take part in that program, given they have not had a pool for two summers?

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wright is warned. The minister.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:02):** I thank the member for Chaffey for his question. I know that he's got a keen interest in making sure that the Karoonda pool is available for his community, and I think it also services a greater area beyond the Karoonda township and community that lives around there.

My understanding is that there's been an assessment of what would be required to get the pool back into an appropriate condition so that it can be used again, and there might be some alternatives to how that might be delivered in a more cost-effective way. I undertake to go back to my department, which has been involved in those assessments, seeking if that is indeed something that can be achieved so that we can expedite getting this pool back functioning for the Karoonda community.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:03):** Our regions contribute more than \$20 billion to our state's economy and produce more than 50 per cent of overseas exports with just 30 per cent of the state's population. This week marks the two-year anniversary of the agreement between the member for Frome and the Labor state government, commonly referred to as the 'Brockument'. Yet the reality for many South Australians is that things have not improved. There is higher employment, especially youth, longer waiting times for medical services, particularly dental, and a general decline in services. It is clear that prior to the balance of power scenario the Labor government had no interest in regional South Australia whatsoever.



Does anyone remember when the Premier was in Frome just four weeks out from the state election and had no idea who the Labor candidate was? By the way, his name was Marcus Connelly. I wonder what he is doing now. A flaw in our electoral system is that the marginal seats are the only focus for this current government. This diverts energy, resources and opportunities from where they could have the greatest impact for the state's better good. That is why I am in favour of a top-up system where every vote counts, no matter which electorate it comes from.

If you went to the Labor document which they keep talking about called Let's Keep Building South Australia, promoted by all and sundry before the election and carried under their arm, and looked at the section 'Let's keep building strong regions', you would be mightily disappointed. For an area that generates \$20 billion, it contained four pages in total. One page is entirely taken up with a photograph of a cow. The rest of it could be compiled on one of the pages, there are so many photos in there; in fact, there are more photos in there than I have seen in some wedding albums. I feel sorry for the poor Labor staffer who had to put that section together.

A couple of points here from that section that have not been done include relocating city health jobs into the country and upgrading the Strzelecki Track. Apart from that, the rest was very light in detail. The Liberal commitment prior to the election has largely been copied in the 'Brockument'; however, a few have not and it is here I think more work needs to be done, and I draw the attention of the member for Frome to this over the next two years.

First, the establishment of Infrastructure SA. South Australia does not have a comprehensive, long-range infrastructure plan. Can anyone honestly say, with rising unemployment in South Australia, particularly youth unemployment, that the O-Bahn extension is seriously the highest priority project for this state? Sure, the argument will be given that it creates jobs during the construction phase, but almost any \$160 million project will do that. What I am talking about is the ongoing impact major projects can have on job creation in the post-construction phase. Investments like Arrium should be seriously considered going forward.

Another policy that the government can copy from our 2014 election commitment is the community infrastructure fund: a \$50 million community infrastructure fund which has the potential to unlock \$500 million in local infrastructure across the state. A similar \$100 million scheme in New South Wales has claimed to have leveraged \$1 billion in infrastructure investment in local areas. It is vital that we invest in our regional communities, develop the infrastructure and grow their capabilities as a foundation for future jobs and economic growth.

The Weatherill Labor government has neglected regional South Australia for 12 years and paid lip service to it in the last two. In fact, sitting on this side of the chamber are the members for Chaffey, Finnis, Flinders, Goyder, Hammond, Heysen, Kavel, Mackillop, Mount Gambler, Schubert, Stuart and Davenport who all have a regional focus and who all contribute to policy discussions which look at regional South Australia as an integral part of this state and not just an add-on.

The state Liberals understand the importance of supporting our regions to grow our state's economy. Only a Marshall Liberal government will have better regional priorities to put our state back on track, and I encourage the member for Frome and the Minister for Regional Development to get on board and assist us in that.

### **WINDSOR GARDENS SECONDARY COLLEGE**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:08):** Last week the sweet sound of music could be heard at Windsor Gardens Secondary College in my electorate of Torrens. While this is not unusual for the school, it was a special occasion: the official opening of the new first-class music suite that includes a performance space and a high-tech recording studio.

The \$4.2 million state government-funded redevelopment of Windsor Gardens Secondary College includes three classrooms; renovations to provide an electronics area; a new physical education area; and specialist spaces for music instruction, practice, performance and sound recording.

The students' educational experience and opportunities are enhanced by the new music suite providing for participation in indoor and outdoor programs. Now there is no need to set up a temporary stage for the school's annual arts event, Windsor Under the Stars, as the new design

structure allows the stage to be in the building with the audience sitting out under the stars. It provides the perfect stage for showcasing the students' voices, instrumental skills and harmonies.

Students also have space to play their musical instruments or practise with the bands, choir or small ensemble, and all students are now using the new music suite for music theory lessons, music practice or music performances. Classes are run for students from years 8 to 12, including SACE music courses. In addition, the sound production certificate III is offered across the north-east schools for year 11 students from schools in the area and run by a teacher from Windsor Gardens Secondary College.

I have spoken to students who are now accessing the new music suite, and they told me it makes such a difference. They love the performance area and the practice rooms, and the teachers in the arts area love the new facilities and how they benefit students. One of the voice coaches said:

The best part is that the students can practise in a space and have their voices or playing recorded and then be able to listen to their sound and get instant feedback.

This in itself makes the learning experience more valuable and supports the students to evaluate and improve on their performance. College principal Paulette Sargent said to me that they are keen to continue building the school's music program and down the track would love to share the space with surrounding schools in their partnership. It is terrific to see the commitment by the state government delivering for students at Windsor Gardens Secondary College. The new music suite adds significantly to the school's music focus, providing greater opportunity for its students.

This week in Australia, we celebrated Harmony Day. It is a day on which we celebrate Australia's diversity, a day of cultural respect for everyone who calls Australia home. The central message for Harmony Day is that everyone belongs, reinforcing the importance of inclusiveness of all Australians. This year's theme is 'Our diversity is our strength' and is focused on how diversity makes Australia a more inclusive, cohesive and stronger nation.

Over the past 70 years, 7 million migrants have made Australia their home. Almost half of Australians were born overseas or have a parent who was. People from more than 200 countries make up our Australian community, and 300 languages are spoken in our homes. Harmony Day coincides with the United Nations International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. This year marks 50 years since the declaration of the day.

I was very pleased to be able to attend one of my local primary schools on Harmony Day to join in their acknowledgement and celebrations. From the moment you step into the Hillcrest Primary School, you know you have entered a wonderful learning environment where everyone is respected for their uniqueness, individuality and culture. The principal, Lissa Hutter, and the teachers lead by example, engaging with the students, embracing and celebrating the cultural diversity of the school community, working to ensure students achieve to the best of their ability.

To celebrate Harmony Day, students at Hillcrest Primary School ate oranges, orange being the chosen colour for Harmony Day. They later placed orange images of their hands that they had made in class on the school's harmony tree, which was central to their gathering in the schoolyard. Those students that were in traditional dress formed a circle around the tree, and then all students and teachers joined hands to form a friendship circle. To add to the special occasion, ABC's *Behind The News* (BTN) was on hand filming so that Hillcrest Primary School's Harmony Day celebrations could be shared with other schools across the state.

### NEGATIVE GEARING

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:13):** Our forefathers have fought so hard for the land that we live in, of opportunity, of equal opportunity, where we have the right to own property, to invest and to build wealth, and to progress so that we do not have to depend on government if we do not need. Federal Labor has recently announced a policy that will hurt everyday South Australians who are having a go. So many families in my electorate, and across the state in fact, have come to Australia with nothing, have made sacrifices, invested and built wealth through investment in property. Federal Labor recently announced a policy that would see an increase in rental prices and a decrease in housing investment.

This is an attack on the aspiring; it is an attack on the middle class. Federal Labor's proposal to limit negative gearing to new housing would hurt Australian families, investors and those renting properties. Removing future access to negative gearing by investors in established dwellings would lead to lower dwelling construction, restrict housing supply and ultimately produce higher rental yields. South Australians looking to rent could expect a sharp increase in rental prices, while there would be a decrease in housing development, hurting potential investors. Adelaide tenants would feel the biggest impact, with an expected increase in rent of over \$1,500 per year, and this 10 per cent increase will hurt the pockets of the approximately 25 per cent of South Australians who currently live in rented homes.

It is careless of federal Labor to announce this policy at a time when South Australian households are suffering from housing stress. This federal Labor policy will discourage development, as investors would be less inclined to invest in the rental housing market as a result of lower expected returns. If this policy were to be implemented, more than 72,000 fewer dwellings will be built in Australia every year. This amounts to 175,000 fewer jobs being created nationally over the space of a decade.

At a time in which South Australia unfortunately boasts the highest unemployment rate in the nation, this policy would only worsen the jobs crisis we have in this state. So, what can South Australians expect from federal Labor's proposed change in negative gearing rules? Well, it is simple: a higher cost of renting for the average tenant, discouragement of investment, and a hit to developers—developers that would otherwise contribute over \$1.5 billion in revenue from taxes.

As it stands, negative gearing gives ordinary Australians (including ordinary South Australians) the opportunity to get ahead. This is an attack by federal Labor on the middle class and on the aspiring middle class. This proposed Labor policy will be toxic for the South Australian economy, and it is about time that the South Australian government stood up to their weak federal Labor colleagues—

**Mr Duluk:** Shame! Shame on the Labor Party!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Davenport, I can hear your voice over everything, and I would hate to have to give you a warning.

**Mr TARZIA:** The calculation is simple: to stimulate and grow our economy, we must tax less. If you want to hinder our economy, then tax more, and that is what federal Labor are proposing. One of the keys to South Australia's success moving forward is to encourage investment, entrepreneurship, innovation, and, by virtue, create more jobs. That is what we are here to do: create more jobs. That is what this government has not done. We are nowhere near the 100,000 jobs promise that they delivered so many moons ago.

I am sure that if the federal Labor Party takes this toxic policy to the polls later this year, the Australian people and the South Australian people will reject this toxic reform and choose policy that encourages investment and creates more jobs, not punishes those that are having a go.

#### **EDWARDSTOWN REGIONAL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:17):** Today I rise to speak about a very dynamic and proactive group of businesspeople known as the Edwardstown Regional Business Association (ERBA). Ten years ago, six forward-thinking businesspeople came together with a vision to support and grow businesses in the local area. Today, ERBA is the fastest-growing business association in southern Adelaide, with over 150 members and a newsletter database reach of over 750 businesses.

Undeniably, it fulfils a vital role in the inner southern Adelaide business community. The importance of this group is the collaboration, peer support and exchange of ideas and experiences, and it is valued by all who attend the meetings. An example of a recent event saw 65 businesspeople join Heatlie Barbecues for a tour at their new facility in North Plympton to hear how the business has expanded over the past 10 years and how it intends to strategically face the future.

To further demonstrate the initiatives of ERBA, at the beginning of April there will be a breakfast meeting entitled 'Creating a digital office using the NBN', and at the beginning of May, in recognition of mental health issues and pressures business owners can experience, ERBA has

organised a morning workshop with keynote speaker Jeff Kennett AC, chair of *beyondblue*. This conference will be opened by the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (minister Vlahos).

In an around the electorate of Elder, there are around 1,600 small to medium business enterprises of all persuasions, from coffee shops that serve the local area right through to businesses with overseas networks and markets such as MIMP and Sturm Mechanical Engineering. Over time, I have strengthened relationships with business in my area, and ensure annually that the Treasurer is a guest speaker at ERBA post budget. I know his candid discussion is always appreciated.

Discussions with past convener Paul Williams and, in recent times, his predecessors, co-chairs Greg Garrihy, Kosette Lambert and Phil Ransome, motivated me to initiate and convene lunchtime meetings at my office to provide business owners a further forum to voice their opinions and share their experiences. I posed a goal to add one more employee per business—a vision the group shared; recognition that if employers can grow their business, they grow employment opportunities and, in turn, boost our economy.

My inaugural business roundtable attendees were those who had demonstrated recent growth attributed to renewed strategic visions underpinned by various federal and state government funds. I was honoured to host Greg Garrihy, MD, NEM; Phil Ransome, CE, The Executive Roundtable; and Kosette Lambert, GM, Advanced Focus. Also present were Allan Aitchison, CE, MIMP Connecting Solutions; Andrew Richards, MD, Sturm's Mechanical Engineering; Cathy Barton, MD, Silver Fleece; and Paul Williams, MD, Comace. Unfortunately, on this occasion Ben Grace from ec-group, South Australia's only carpet manufacturer, and Neville Cornish from Australian Welding Solutions were unable to attend.

All business owners present shared a common theme, being commitment to South Australia, vision for the future, redefined strategic directions recognising opportunity and working continually for success in growth and expansion of their businesses. One such example is Silver Fleece, a company of over 60 years of age, still powering strong under the direction of Managing Director, Cathy Barton. It is, and has always been, proudly an Australian manufacturer.

Silver Fleece began by supplying the school market with garments, and today, while it continues to supply many schools and colleges throughout Australia with a wide range of customised product, finished and ready for sale, it also supplies many corporations and companies looking to identify themselves with a quality garment befitting the quality of their own goods or services. Excitingly, this South Australian company will soon begin production of the jumpers for our very own Australian cricket team.

I thank the group for its robust discussion and some very frank and fearless feedback. Some key messages from the meeting were that business owners benefit from the value of networking; they must value taking time to 'look up', accepting help and being brave enough to redesign their business and utilise peer-to-peer learning opportunities. ERBA published in its latest newsletter the outcomes of this meeting and the support at the local level.

All attendees at my inaugural business roundtable meeting were complimentary of the South Australian government's endeavours in support of business and agreed unanimously that the solutions to our state's challenges are a responsibility for all of us and it was not simply for the government to deal with alone.

### SCHOOL BUS SERVICES

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:22):** I rise with great reluctance and a bit of trepidation today to discuss an issue that needs urgent redress by this government. My previous interactions with the Minister for Transport have been very good. Indeed, there was an incident with a flooded roundabout which he dealt with within two weeks of my having raised it and, after constant badgering, he finally announced the Angaston railway land transfer to the Barossa Council for which, again, I am very grateful.

However, there is an issue that I need to bring to the attention of the house today which I know the minister is aware of and has been dealing with for over a month, but it seems we are actually further away from a resolution rather than closer. I speak of the fact that bus services that

were previously provided by Faith Lutheran College in Tanunda have been taken over by the monopoly provider, LinkSA.

Since that takeover occurred, over the last couple of years, the number of complaints have ramped up and a number of those complaints are now, in my view, of an extremely serious nature. In highlighting these incidents, I would like the minister to urgently deal with this issue because the volume of complaints and the seriousness of a couple of the complaints warrant it. I will go through some of them.

There was an incident where a bus broke down and students were left on the side of a very busy road in the rural part of my electorate, waiting for over an hour to be picked up in a very unsafe and unacceptable environment and another where a fill-in driver was not provided with the proper updated list of the route and, hence, students were not picked up at all and were actually left on the side of the road.

There is a bus service that travels by the most indirect route possible, travelling 62 kilometres to pick up the students and bring them to Faith College when, at the same time, parents are being asked to pay \$800 a month for the privilege. This indirect route has led to a lot of anxiety and new students starting at Faith are having real issues coping with and dealing with that. I have even had a letter in my local media from students of Faith on a certain Tanunda loop, who wrote an open letter, saying:

I am writing in concern for the students of the Nuriootpa (Tanunda Loop) bus route who have recently requested to be provided with a bus with improved features. This request and complaint is simply due to health risk issues.

The buses that were previously provided by Faith were of excellent and new condition and all with adequate air conditioning, but the new buses are not. We had a number of students who have had some reasonably serious health effects as a result of having to sit on these buses for extended periods of time without appropriate air conditioning.

I also want to talk about an incident where an air duct actually fell down and some students at the back of the bus decided to take it upon themselves to duct tape the duct back on. After constantly complaining to the driver, nothing happened. Link SA then went on to fix it; however, the next day it was unfixed again and this issue has gone on to occur.

There have been issues on the Lobethal run where the buses do not show up and when they do they are unmarked buses where previously they were Faith marked buses, and there is a reluctance by parents to put students on buses in those situations.

I have an incident here where a student came home extremely concerned and upset about the fact that the driver was cutting corners and was driving too fast on a single-lane road and the journey home was marred with a near miss at Gumeracha when the bus veered onto the wrong side of the road and almost collided with a car.

But the first of two important incidents that I want to raise is the fact that on the Saddleworth bus trip on the day of the Pinery fire the buses were not stopped from sending home and on the Saddleworth bus students travelled extremely close to the fire with a bus driver who was completely unaware of what was going on. I heard about an incident where a student was dropped off and the parting words from the bus driver were, 'Don't die in the fire,' which really escalated what was an extremely stressful day.

The final one I want to talk about is an incident where a bus driver agreed to take a student, who was dropped off at the college and had dropped her bag at the college, on to a third venue. I am not going to release more details about what happened afterwards, but, suffice to say, when a parent believes a bus service drops that child off at school and that child then ends up somewhere else meeting with other people in circumstances that I am not going to explain, it is unacceptable and the minister needs to deal with this issue urgently.

#### **NORTHERN ECONOMIC PLAN**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:27):** I have spoken in this place many times about the decline of the automotive sector and its devastating effect on the economy in the northern suburbs.

The closure of Holden, as we all know, is the most obvious example of the challenges facing the north at the moment, but it is reflective of a broader decline in traditional manufacturing in the north. It is difficult to hear every day about the very real psychological impact on people in the north and the decline in morale. There is an anxiety there which we cannot ignore about the loss of the old way of doing things and about what is going to replace it.

So, my priority, while I am in this place, more than ever, is to get local people into meaningful jobs and training which will set them up for the future. That is why I support the government's Northern Economic Plan, a plan which not only identifies areas of potential growth, but also commits resources to helping small business in particular and looks at all options for future growth and employment. Importantly, it also recognises that an ongoing government commitment to infrastructure in civil construction is a key component of job creation into the future. As I said, getting local people into these jobs is my top priority.

On Tuesday, I was really pleased to stand alongside the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure when he announced that more than \$3 million was being spent on upgrading the intersection of Bolivar Road and Kings Road in Paralowie in the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse's electorate. She would know the intersection well. It is a well-known blackspot. It has been described by some people on my Facebook page as an absolute nightmare. I have family members who live out there, and it is certainly a long overdue upgrade to a very difficult part of our road network.

It is also the first component of the \$985 million Northern Connector project which will improve travel times and freight efficiency and support hundreds of local jobs. The work around this intersection has been awarded to BMD Group and involves the installation of a roundabout at the intersection of the two roads, as well as a significant realignment. About 28,000 vehicles, I am advised, use Kings and Bolivar roads every day, and that is expected to increase when the Northern Connector comes online at the end of 2019.

When this work is done, this intersection will not only be safer but will also ultimately feed into the Northern Connector at the proposed Bolivar Road interchange. One of the great things about this upgrade is that it will also play a vital role in developing on-site live training programs for disadvantaged job seekers. We hope, and we fully intend, that such on-site live training facilities will be a permanent fixture along the Northern Connector work site and on major infrastructure work sites into the future.

At this site, a training site has been set up with a meeting room turned into a classroom for students studying construction and infrastructure courses and, over time, will provide a valuable opportunity for, among others, workers looking to transition from the automotive industry, as well as providing jobs for the disadvantaged and the long-term unemployed. These trainees will also receive assistance to win job opportunities in later work packages on the Northern Connector project and on other local infrastructure works.

At any one time, there are about 15 trainees on the site and they are all locals—indeed, several of them on Tuesday told me that they walk to work—and they are all learning skills in a live work site which will translate into getting tickets to work in civil construction for the life of the Northern Connector project, and beyond. My main role in relation to the entire Northern Connector project is to ensure that more than half of the 480 jobs per year that will be supported by the Northern Connector project go to local northern suburbs workers.

But, as part of this process, weight is also being given to Aboriginal employment and, already, dozens of Aboriginal workers are being employed on projects associated with the Northern Connector project through companies such as ART Services. ART Services will conduct traffic management for the Kings Road-Bolivar Road roadworks, and they played a similar role in early works on the project to upgrade the Sturt-Marion roads intersection ahead of the Darlington upgrade project. About 25 Aboriginal employees worked on the Darlington early works package, and this new project in Paralowie will employ a further 10.

My absolute priority is to ensure that there are real jobs and real relevant training opportunities for people in the northern suburbs, and the Northern Connector and the Paralowie roundabout upgrade as part of the northern economic plan is providing just that.

*Bills***PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE BILL***Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

- No. 1. Clause 3, page 16, line 30—Delete subparagraph (i)
- No. 2. Clause 4, page 21, line 36—After 'such longer period' insert '(not exceeding 5 years)'
- No. 3. Clause 5, page 22, after line 9—Insert:
- (1a) The first proclamation that constitutes Greater Adelaide for the purposes of this Act must be consistent with *Greater Adelaide* as defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G16/2015 (being the plan as it existed on 1 December 2015).
- No. 4. Clause 5, page 22, after line 35—Insert:
- (4a) The Minister must seek advice from the Commission under subsection (4)(a) before proceeding to give notice to a council under subsection (4)(b) and, in giving that notice, must furnish to the council a copy of the Commission's advice.
- No. 5. Clause 6, page 23, lines 19 and 20—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:
- (3) The Minister must, before a notice is published under this section—
    - (a) seek the advice of the Commission; and
    - (b) give any council that will be directly affected notice of the Minister's proposed course of action and give consideration to any submission made by a council within a period (being at least 28 days) specified in the notice,and the Minister may consult in relation to a proposed notice with any other person or body as the Minister thinks fit.
  - (3a) The Minister must seek the advice of the Commission under subsection (3)(a) before proceeding to give notice to a council under subsection (3)(b) and, in giving that notice, must furnish to the council a copy of the Commission's advice.
- No. 6. Clause 7, page 23, line 24 to page 25, line 30—Delete the clause and substitute:
- 7—Environment and food production areas—Greater Adelaide
- (1) On the commencement of this section, the *environment and food production areas* as defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G17/2015 (being the plan as it existed on 1 December 2015) are established within Greater Adelaide.
  - (2) The Minister must ensure that a copy of the plan referred to in subsection (1) is published on the SA planning portal.
  - (3) In making any decision under this section (following the establishment of the initial environment and food production areas under subsection (1)), the Commission must ensure that areas of rural, landscape, environmental or food production significance within Greater Adelaide are protected from urban encroachment and the Commission may only vary an environment and food production area if the Commission is satisfied—
    - (a) that—
      - (i) an area or areas within Greater Adelaide outside environment and food production areas are unable to support the principle of urban renewal and consolidation of existing urban areas; and
      - (ii) adequate provision cannot be made within Greater Adelaide outside environment and food production areas to accommodate housing and employment growth over the longer term (being at least a 15 year period); or
    - (b) that the variation is trivial in nature and will address a recognised anomaly.

- (4) If an area of land that is, or is included in, a character preservation area under a character preservation law ceases to be, or to be included in, a character preservation area, the area of land will, at the time of the cessation, by force of this subsection, be taken to be an environment and food production area established under this section.
- (5) The following provisions will apply in relation to a proposed development in an environment and food production area that involves a division of land that would create 1 or more additional allotments:
  - (a) a relevant authority, other than the Commission or the Minister, must not grant development authorisation to the development unless the Commission concurs in the granting of the authorisation;
  - (b) if the Commission is the relevant authority, the Commission must not grant development authorisation to the development unless the council for the area where the proposed development is situated concurs in the granting of the authorisation;
  - (c) no appeal lies against a refusal by a relevant authority to grant development authorisation to the development or a refusal by the Commission or a council to concur in the granting of such an authorisation;
  - (d) if the proposed development will create additional allotments to be used for residential development, the relevant authority must refuse to grant development authorisation in relation to the proposed development;
  - (e) a development authorisation granted in relation to the proposed development will be taken to be subject to the condition that the additional allotments created will not be used for residential development.
- (6) In acting under subsection (5)(a), the Commission must take into account the objective that areas of rural, landscape, environmental or food production significance within Greater Adelaide should be protected from urban encroachment.
- (7) For the avoidance of doubt, the establishment of 1 or more environment and food production areas does not affect the operation of this Act, a Mining Act or any other Act, except as provided in subsection (5).
- (8) Subject to this section, the Commission may, from time to time, by notice published in the Gazette and on the SA planning portal, vary an environment and food production area (including an environment and food production area established (or taken to be established) under this section).
- (9) The Commission may only act under subsection (8) if—
  - (a) the Commission has conducted an inquiry into the matter and furnished a report on the outcome of the inquiry to the Minister; or
  - (b) the Commission has conducted a review in accordance with subsection (10) and furnished a report on the outcome of the review to the Minister.
- (10) The Commission must conduct a review under subsection (9)(b) on a 5 yearly basis.
- (11) The purpose of a review under subsection (9)(b) is to assess the matters set out in subsection (3)(a).
- (12) If the Commission publishes a notice under subsection (8), the Minister must, within 6 sitting days after publication of the notice, cause a copy of—
  - (a) the notice; and
  - (b) (at the same time as the notice is laid before Parliament) the report of the Commission under subsection (9)(a) or (b) (as the case requires),to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.
- (13) If either House of Parliament, acting in pursuance of a notice of motion, passes a resolution disallowing a notice laid before it under subsection (12) the notice cannot take effect.
- (14) A resolution is not effective for the purposes of subsection (13) unless the resolution is passed within 14 sitting days (which need not fall within the same session of Parliament) after the day on which the notice was laid before the House.
- (15) If a resolution is passed under subsection (13), notice of that resolution must immediately be published in the Gazette.



- (16) If or when a notice laid before both Houses of Parliament under subsection (12) can take effect after taking into account the operation of subsection (13) and (14), the Commission may, by notice published on the SA planning portal, fix a day on which the notice will come into operation.
- (17) A notice under this section may define an area by a plan deposited in the General Registry Office (as it exists at a specified date), or in some other way as the Commission thinks fit.
- (18) In this section—
- residential development* means development primarily for residential purposes but does not include—
- (a) the use of land for the purposes of a hotel or motel or to provide any other form of temporary residential accommodation for valuable consideration; or
- (b) a dwelling for residential purposes on land used primarily for primary production purposes.

No. 7. Clause 12, page 26, line 27—Delete 'prosperity' and substitute:

liveability and prosperity in ways that are ecologically sustainable and meet the needs and expectations, and reflect the diversity, of the State's communities

No. 8. Clause 12, page 27, line 12—After 'practices' insert:

, including by providing for policies and principles that support or promote universal design for the benefit of people with differing needs and capabilities

No. 9. Clause 14, page 27, lines 32 and 33—Delete 'responsive to emerging challenges, changing trends' and substitute 'able to respond to emerging challenges'

No. 10. Clause 14, page 28, after line 13—Insert:

(iiia) built form and the public realm should be designed to be inclusive and accessible to people with differing needs and capabilities (including through the serious consideration of universal design practices);

No. 11. Clause 18, page 30, line 30—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Governor on the nomination of the Minister'

No. 12. Clause 18, page 30, line 31—Delete 'the Chief Executive' and substitute:

a public sector employee (other than the Chief Executive) who is responsible, under a Minister, for assisting in the administration of this Act, designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette

No. 13. Clause 18, page 30, line 32 to page 31, line 9—Delete subclauses (2) and (3) and substitute:

- (2) The Minister must, when nominating persons for appointment as members of the Commission, seek to ensure that, as far as is practicable, the members of the Commission collectively have qualifications, knowledge, expertise and experience in the following areas:
- (a) economics, commerce or finance;
- (b) planning, urban design or architecture;
- (c) development or building construction;
- (d) the provision of or management of infrastructure or transport systems;
- (e) social or environmental policy or science;
- (f) local government, public administration or law.

No. 14. Clause 18, page 31, after line 9—Insert:

(3a) In making an appointment that is relevant to the operation of subsection (3)(f) insofar as it relates to local government, the Minister must take reasonable steps to consult with the LGA before the appointment is made.

No. 15. Clause 18, page 31, line 12—Delete 'Minister may' and substitute 'Governor may, on the recommendation of the Minister,'

No. 16. Clause 20, page 31, line 36—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Governor on the recommendation of the Minister'

No. 17. Clause 20, page 31, line 39—Delete 'Minister may' and substitute 'Governor may, on the recommendation of the Minister,'

No. 18. Clause 21, page 32, line 15—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Governor on the recommendation of the Minister'

No. 19. Clause 24, page 34, lines 30 to 33—Delete paragraph (b)

No. 20. Clause 30, page 37, lines 6 and 7—Delete paragraph (b)

No. 21. Clause 35, page 39, after line 12—Insert:

- (1a) If a proposed planning agreement will include any part of the area of a council, the Minister must (unless the proposal has been initiated by the council) ensure that the council is specifically invited to be a party to the agreement (on reasonable terms and conditions) under subsection (1)(a).

No. 22. Clause 41, page 42, lines 36 and 37—Delete 'consult with the other parties to the relevant planning agreement' and substitute:

—

- (a) consult with the other parties to the relevant planning agreement; and
- (b) seek the advice of the Commission.

No. 23. Clause 44, page 44, line 23—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 24. Clause 44, page 44, line 26—After 'reasonable,' insert 'timely,'

No. 25. Clause 44, page 44, line 27—After 'opportunities' insert 'to gain access to information about proposals to introduce or change planning policies and'

No. 26. Clause 44, page 45, line 11—After 'Minister' insert ', acting on the advice of the Commission'

No. 27. Clause 44, page 45, after line 23—Insert:

- (5a) The charter must, in relation to any proposal to prepare or amend a designated instrument under Part 5 Division 2 Subdivision 5 that is relevant to 1 or more councils, provide for consultation with—
  - (a) if the proposal is specifically relevant to a particular council or councils—that council or those councils (unless the proposal has been initiated by the council, or those councils); or
  - (b) if the proposal is generally relevant to councils—the LGA.

No. 28. Clause 44, page 45, line 39—After 'this Act' insert:

unless the failure is under a provision that requires compliance with the charter for the purposes of consultation in relation to a particular matter

No. 29. Clause 45, page 46, line 9—Delete paragraph (a)

No. 30. Clause 45, page 46, lines 10 and 11—Delete 'on behalf of the Minister (at the direction or with the approval of the Minister)' and substitute 'on its own initiative or at the request of the Minister'

No. 31. Clause 45, page 46, after line 15—Insert:

- (ia) the LGA; and

No. 32. Clause 45, page 46, after line 16—Insert:

- (iii) any other entity the Commission thinks fit; and

No. 33. Clause 45, page 46, line 35—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 34. Clause 45, page 46, line 39—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 35. Clause 46, page 47, lines 20 to 24—Delete paragraphs (a) and (b) and substitute:

- (a) resolve that it does not object to the charter or amendment; or
- (b) resolve to suggest amendments; or
- (c) resolve to object to the charter or amendment.

No. 36. New clause, page 48, after line 28—Insert:

## 46A—Commencement and publication

The Minister must ensure that an up-to-date copy of the charter is published on the SA planning portal and available for inspection and downloading without charge.

No. 37. Clause 47, page 48, line 34—After 'information' insert 'and community participation in the planning system'

No. 38. Clause 47, page 49, after line 10—Insert:

- (5) The SA planning portal must also include a facility that allows members of the public to be notified directly about specified classes of matters or issues that are of interest to them (subject to any rules, requirements, restrictions or exclusions determined by the Chief Executive for the purposes of this subsection and subject to any determination of the Chief Executive as to the cost, practicality and viability of providing such a service).

No. 39. Clause 52, page 50, line 36—After 'planning' insert 'and assessment'

No. 40. Clause 53, page 51, line 3—After 'Gazette' insert 'and on the SA planning portal'

No. 41. Clause 53, page 51, after line 6—Insert:

- (ab) commercial value or sensitivity; or

No. 42. Clause 55, page 51, after line 32—Insert:

- (3a) The Chief Executive must take reasonable steps to consult with the LGA before setting or varying a contribution to be paid by a council under subsection (2).

No. 43. Clause 56, page 52, after line 14—Insert:

- (ca) rules should aim to achieve consistency while providing for local variations that reflect special or unique character at the local level;
- (cb) rules and standards must seek to protect the environment and the pursuit or ecologically sustainable development;

No. 44. Clause 57, page 52, line 32—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 45. Clause 57, page 53, line 6—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 46. Clause 57, page 53, line 9—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 47. Clause 58, page 53, line 15—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 48. Clause 58, page 53, after line 17—Insert:

- (2) The design quality policy must include specific policies and principles with respect to the universal design of buildings and places to promote best practice in access and inclusion planning.

No. 49. Clause 59, page 53, line 19—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 50. New clause, page 53, after line 21—Insert:

## 59A—Adaptive re-use

The Minister must ensure that there is a specific state planning policy (to be called the *adaptive re-use policy*) that specifies policies and principles that are to be applied to encourage and support the adaptive re-use of buildings and places.

No. 51. New clause, page 53, after line 21—Insert:

## 59B—Climate change policy

The Minister must ensure that there is a specific state planning policy (to be called the *climate change policy*) that specifies policies and principles that are to be applied with respect to minimising adverse effects of decisions made under the Act on the climate and promoting development that is resilient to climate change.

No. 52. Clause 60, page 53, line 23—Delete 'Minister must, after consultation with the Commission' and substitute 'Commission must, after seeking the advice of the Minister'

No. 53. Clause 60, page 53, line 30—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 54. Clause 60, page 53, line 33—Delete 'Minister may, after consultation with the Commission' and substitute 'Commission may, after seeking the advice of the Minister'

No. 55. Clause 60, page 53, line 35—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 56. Clause 60, page 53, after line 38—Insert:

- (aa) does not have effect unless it is approved by the Minister by notice published in the Gazette; and

No. 57. Clause 61, page 54, line 5—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 58. Clause 61, page 54, line 9—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 59. Clause 61, page 54, line 21—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 60. Clause 61, page 54, line 30—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 61. Clause 62, page 55, line 4—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 62. Clause 63, page 55, after line 21—Insert:

- (iv) support the adaptive re-use of buildings and places in cases determined to be appropriate under the Planning and Design Code; and

No. 63. Clause 63, page 55, line 25—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 64. Clause 63, page 55, line 28—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 65. Clause 63, page 56, line 4—Delete 'or modification'

No. 66. Clause 63, page 56, line 5—Delete ', including by permitting' and substitute 'to provide for necessary and appropriate local variations in specified circumstances, including by permitting in the Code'

No. 67. Clause 63, page 56, lines 6 and 7—Delete 'specified parameters' and substitute 'parameters specified in the Code'

No. 68. Clause 63, page 56, lines 8 and 9—Delete 'specified parameters' and substitute 'parameters specified in the Code'

No. 69. Clause 63, page 56, line 10—After 'development' insert ', specified in the Code,'

No. 70. Clause 64, page 56, line 33—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 71. Clause 64, page 57, after line 3—Insert:

- (4) In addition, an area cannot be designated under an amendment to the Planning and Design Code as constituting a heritage charter or preservation zone or subzone unless the amendment has been approved by persons who, at the time that consultation in relation to the proposed amendment is initiated under the Community Engagement Charter, constitute at least the prescribed percentage of owners of allotments within the relevant area (on the basis of 1 owner per allotment being counted under a scheme prescribed by the regulations).

- (5) In this section—

*prescribed percentage* means 51% of relevant owners of allotments within a relevant area.

No. 72. Clause 66, page 57, line 34—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'

No. 73. Clause 70, page 59, line 3—Delete paragraph (a)

No. 74. Clause 70, page 59, lines 4 and 5—Delete 'on behalf of the Minister (at the direction of or with the approval of the Minister)' and substitute 'on its own initiative or at the request of the Minister'

No. 75. Clause 70, page 59, line 8—Delete paragraph (a)

No. 76. Clause 70, page 59, lines 9 and 10—Delete 'on behalf of the Minister (at the direction of the Minister or with the approval of the Minister)' and substitute 'on its own initiative or at the request of the Minister'

No. 77. Clause 70, page 59, line 11—After 'Minister' insert ', acting on the advice of the Commission'

No. 78. Clause 70, page 59, line 12—Delete subparagraph (i)

No. 79. Clause 70, page 59, line 32—After 'entity' insert 'and charge the person or entity reasonable costs associated with doing so'

No. 80. Clause 70, page 60, after line 2—Insert:

- (ba) to the extent that paragraph (b) does not apply, in the case of a proposed amendment to a regional plan that has been prepared by a joint planning board where the amendment is not being proposed by the joint planning board—must consult with the joint planning board; and

No. 81. Clause 70, page 60, after line 2—Insert:

- (bb) to the extent that paragraph (b) does not apply, in the case of a proposed amendment to the Planning and Design Code that will have a specific impact on 1 or more particular pieces of land in a particular zone or subzone (rather than more generally)—must take reasonable steps to give—
- (i) an owner or occupier of the land; and
  - (ii) an owner or occupier of each piece of adjacent land, a notice in accordance with the regulations; and
- No. 82. Clause 70, page 60, line 3—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'
- No. 83. Clause 70, page 60, line 6—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'Commission'
- No. 84. Clause 70, page 60, lines 11 and 12—Delete '(except where the designated entity is the Minister)'
- No. 85. Clause 70, page 60, after line 12—Insert:
- (7a) The designated entity must, after furnishing a report to the Minister under subsection (7), ensure that a copy of the report is published on the SA planning portal in accordance with a practice direction that applies for the purposes of this section.
- No. 86. Clause 70, page 60, line 15—After 'this section' insert:
- (subject to the requirement to charge costs under subsection (4)(b) (if relevant))
- No. 87. Clause 70, page 60, after line 30—Insert:
- (9a) The Minister must, within 5 business days after taking action under subsection (9), cause to be published on the SA planning portal a copy of any final advice furnished to the Minister by the Commission for the purposes of this section.
- No. 88. Clause 71, page 61, after line 35—Insert:
- (7a) If—
- (a) the ERD Committee is proposing to suggest an amendment under subsection (4); and
  - (b) the amendment is specifically relevant to a particular council or councils, then—
  - (c) the ERD Committee must, before resolving to suggest the amendment, refer the amendment to the council or councils for comment and a response within the period of 2 weeks; and
  - (d) any period applying under subsection (5), (6) or (7) will be extended, by force of this subsection, by an additional 21 days.
- No. 89. Clause 72, page 62, line 30—After 'may' insert ', after seeking the advice of the Commission,'
- No. 90. Clause 72, page 62, after line 40—Insert:
- (1a) An amendment under subsection (1) must be the subject of consultation under the Community Engagement Charter.
- No. 91. Clause 72, page 62, lines 41 and 42—Delete subclause (2)
- No. 92. Clause 73, page 63, lines 36 to 38—Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:
- (c) in order to provide consistency between the designated instrument and section 7(5) after a notice under section 7(8) has taken effect in accordance with that section; or
- No. 93. Clause 73, page 64, after line 23—Insert:
- (3a) The Minister must consult with the Commission before making an amendment under this section.
- No. 94. New clause, page 64, after line 29—Insert:
- 73A—Publication
- The Minister must ensure that an up-to-date copy of each designated instrument is published on the SA planning portal and available for inspection and downloading without charge.
- No. 95. Clause 74, page 64, lines 32 to 39—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

- (1) If the Minister is of the opinion that it is necessary in the interests of the orderly and proper development of an area of the State that—
- (a) an amendment to a regional plan should come into operation without delay; or
  - (b) the Planning and Design Code or a design standard should come into operation without delay in order to counter applications for undesirable development ahead of the outcome of the consideration of the amendment under this Part,
- the Minister may, at the same time as, or at any time after, the amendment is released for public consultation under the Community Engagement Charter under this Part, and without the need for any other consultation or process, by notice published in the Gazette, declare that the amendment will come into operation on an interim basis on a day specified in the notice.

No. 96. Clause 74, page 64, after line 39—Insert:

- (1a) For the purposes of subsection (1)(b), undesirable development, in relation to a proposed amendment to the Planning and Design Code or a design standard, is development that would detract from, or negate, an object of the amendment.
- (1b) The Minister must consult with the Commission before the Minister acts under subsection (1).

No. 97. Clause 74, page 65, after line 18—Insert:

- (7) Despite any other provision of this Act, while an amendment to the Planning and Design Code or a design standard is in interim operation under this section—
  - (a) any application for planning consent in respect of which the amendment is relevant must be assessed against the provisions of the Planning and Design Code or design standard immediately before the amendment was made and the provisions of the Planning and Design Code or design standard after the amendment was made and if the decision on the application would be different depending on which version of the Planning and Design Code or design standard applies (including with respect to any condition that would apply in relation to the development)—
    - (i) planning consent must not be granted until the amendment is no longer in interim operation; and
    - (ii) the application must then be assessed at the end of the period of interim operation against the provisions of the Planning and Design Code or design standard as in force immediately after the end of that period (and section 126(2) will not apply); and
    - (iii) any period that applies under section 119 will be suspended while the application is subject to the operation of this paragraph; and
  - (b) if the amendment reduces the level of notification or consultation required under this Act, any application for planning consent in respect of which this aspect of the amendment is relevant must be considered as if the amendment to the Planning and Design Code or design standard had not been made (unless or until the amendment is no longer in interim operation).

No. 98. Clause 76, page 65, line 34—After 'may,' insert 'after consultation with the Commission,'

No. 99. Clause 76, page 65, line 40—After 'sustainability' insert ', adaptive re-use'

No. 100. Clause 76, page 66, after line 1—Insert:

- (1a) In particular, the Minister must publish a Ministerial building standard under subsection (1) that relates to adaptive re-use of buildings constructed before 1 January 1980.

No. 101. Clause 76, page 66, line 5—After 'may,' insert 'after consultation with the Commission,'

No. 102. New clause, page 66, after line 6—Insert:

76A—Publication

The Minister must ensure—

- (a) that an up-to-date copy of the Building Code as it applies under this Act; and
- (b) that any Ministerial building standard,

is published, or is capable of being accessed, on or via the SA planning portal and is available for inspection and downloading without charge.

No. 103. Clause 78, page 67, line 3—After 'members' insert ', only 1 of which may be a member of a council,'

No. 104. Clause 78, page 67, lines 19 and 20—Delete paragraph (d) and substitute:

- (d) a person who is a member of the Parliament of the State is not eligible to be appointed as a member of an assessment panel;

No. 105. Clause 78, page 67, after line 33—Insert:

- (i) in the case of an assessment panel appointed by a council—the council must substitute the existing members of the panel with new members if directed to do so by the Minister acting on recommendation of the Commission under section 80A.

No. 106. Clause 78, page 67, after line 33—Insert:

- (1a) Subsection (1)(c) does not apply if—
  - (a) the person is a member, or former member, of a council; and
  - (b) the designated authority is satisfied that the person is appropriately qualified to act as a member of the assessment panel on account of the person's experience in local government.

No. 107. Clause 79, page 68, lines 26 to 32—Delete paragraph (d) and substitute:

- (d) in relation to a local assessment panel—the Minister may only constitute a local assessment panel if the Minister is acting on the recommendation of the Commission under section 80A;

No. 108. Clause 79, page 68, line 36—After 'members' insert ', provided that only 1 member of the assessment panel may be a member of a council'

No. 109. Clause 79, page 69, lines 5 and 6—Delete paragraph (f)

No. 110. New clause, page 69, after line 37—Insert:

80A—Substitution of local panels

- (1) If the Minister has reason to believe that an assessment panel appointed by a council has consistently failed to comply with a requirement under this Act, the Minister may request the Commission to conduct an inquiry under this section.
- (2) The Commission, in conducting an inquiry—
  - (a) must consult with the relevant council; and
  - (b) may undertake such other investigations as the Commission thinks fit.
- (3) The Commission may, at the conclusion of the inquiry—
  - (a) recommend to the Minister—
    - (i) that the Minister issue a direction under section 78(1)(i); or
    - (ii) that the Minister appoint a local assessment panel under section 79(1)(d); or
  - (b) advise the Minister that no action is warranted in the circumstances of the case.
- (4) In connection with subsection (3)—
  - (a) the Commission may only make a recommendation under subsection (3)(a) if satisfied that the assessment panel appointed by the council has consistently failed to comply with a requirement under this Act; and
  - (b) if the Minister acts on a recommendation under subsection (3)(a)(ii), the assessment panel appointed by the council will be removed by force of this provision (and a local assessment panel appointed by the Minister will be substituted).

No. 111. Clause 93, page 76, line 20—Delete 'assessed' and substitute 'approved'

No. 112. Clause 93, page 76, after line 21—Insert:

- (4) The notice of a decision of a council granting a development approval must include the name and contact details of every other entity that has acted as a relevant authority in relation to that approval.

No. 113. Clause 94, page 76, line 24—After 'A relevant authority' insert ', other than an accredited professional.'

No. 114. Clause 96, page 77, lines 11 and 12—Delete 'the requirement that the development is assessed as being appropriate after taking into account'

No. 115. Clause 101, page 80, after line 39—Insert:

and

- (c) to the extent that paragraph (b) applies—the development must not be granted planning consent if it is, in the opinion of the relevant authority, seriously at variance with the Planning and Design Code (disregarding minor variations).

No. 116. Clause 102, page 82, after line 15—Insert:

- (2a) If the Minister proposes to make a declaration under subsection (1)(c) in respect of a development that will, if the development proceeds, be situated wholly or partly within the area of a council, the Minister must notify the council before making the declaration.

No. 117. Clause 102, page 82, after line 18—Insert:

- (3a) A regulation under subsection (1)(b) or a declaration under subsection (1)(c) cannot apply with respect to a development or project within the Adelaide Park Lands (within the meaning of the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005*).

No. 118. Clause 102, page 82, after line 29—Insert:

- (7) The Minister must, in acting under subsection (1)(c), take into account principles prescribed by the regulations.

No. 119. Clause 104, page 84, after line 12—Insert:

- (2a) If a person is to appear personally or by representative before the Commission to be heard in support of a representation made, the Commission must, at least 5 business days before the appearance, ensure that—

(a) a copy of the application and any accompanying documents; and

(b) a copy of any report prepared by or on behalf of the Commission in relation to the application,

are published on the SA planning portal and available for inspection and downloading without charge.

No. 120. Clause 104, page 84, lines 13 to 15—Delete subclause (3)

No. 121. Clause 107, page 87, after line 18—Insert:

- (ab) the expected effects of the development on the climate and any proposed measures designed to mitigate or address those effects;

No. 122. Clause 107, page 89, after line 11—Insert:

and

- (c) ensure that a copy of the Assessment Report is published on the SA planning portal.

No. 123. Clause 109, page 92, line 9—Delete '\$250,000' and substitute '\$120,000'

No. 124. Clause 112, page 93, line 21—After 'Building Code' insert 'or a Ministerial building standard'

No. 125. Clause 112, page 93, line 23—After 'Building Code' insert 'or a Ministerial building standard'

No. 126. Clause 112, page 93, line 33—After 'Building Code' insert 'or a Ministerial building standard (as the case maybe)'

No. 127. Clause 112, page 94, line 4—After 'Building Code' insert 'or a Ministerial building standard'

No. 128. Clause 112, page 94, line 7—After 'Building Code' insert 'or a Ministerial building standard'

No. 129. Clause 112, page 94, line 22—After 'Building Code' insert 'or a Ministerial building standard'

No. 130. Clause 114, page 97, after line 24—Insert:

- (3a) However, if—



- (a) there has been a material change to 1 or more elements of the development; or
  - (b) a new or additional matter requires assessment (subject to any variations allowed by a practice direction),
- then—
- (c) further notification and consultation may be required in accordance with any provision made by a practice direction; and
  - (d) subsection (3) will not apply to the extent that a new assessment must be made in the circumstances.

No. 131. Clause 116, page 99, after line 36—Insert:

- (12) A relevant authority must ensure that a response from a prescribed body under this section is published on the SA planning portal and available for inspection and downloading without charge as soon as is reasonably practicable after the response is received by the relevant authority.

No. 132. Clause 123, page 106, after line 10—Insert:

- (4) This section does not apply to any development within the Adelaide Park Lands, within the meaning of the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005* (and any such development must be assessed under Part 7).

No. 133. Clause 124, page 109, after line 4—Insert:

- (28) This section does not apply to any development within the Adelaide Park Lands, within the meaning of the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005* (and any such development must be assessed under Part 7).

No. 134. Clause 125, page 112, after line 17—Insert:

- (27) Subject to subsection (28), this section does not apply to any development within the Adelaide Park Lands, within the meaning of the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005* (and any such development must be assessed under Part 7).
- (28) Subsection (27) does not apply—
  - (a) so as to exclude the Governor making a regulation under subsection (4) with respect to minor works of a prescribed kind; or
  - (b) so as to exclude from the operation of this section development within any part of the *Institutional District* of the City of Adelaide that has been identified by regulations made for the purposes of this paragraph by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister.
- (29) Before making a recommendation to the Governor to make a regulation identifying a part of the *Institutional District* of the City of Adelaide for the purposes of subsection (28)(b), the Minister must take reasonable steps to consult with the Adelaide Park Lands Authority.
- (30) A regulation under subsection (28)(b) cannot apply with respect to any part of the *Institutional District* of the City of Adelaide that is under the care, control or management of The Corporation of the City of Adelaide.
- (31) For the purposes of this section, the *Institutional District* of the City of Adelaide is constituted by those parts of the area of The Corporation of the City of Adelaide that are identified and defined as—
  - (a) the Riverbank Zone; and
  - (b) the Institutional (Government House) Zone; and
  - (c) the Institutional (University/Hospital) Zone,by the Development Plan that relates to the area of that Council, as that Development Plan existed on 24 September 2015.

No. 135. Clause 128, page 113, line 34—Delete ', before granting the building consent,'

No. 136. Clause 128, page 113, after line 40—Insert:

- (2a) A requirement under subsection (1)—

- (a) subject to paragraph (b)—may be imposed on the basis that the relevant matters must be addressed as part of the application before the relevant authority will grant building consent; and
- (b) in cases prescribed by the regulations—may only be imposed as a condition of the building consent that must be complied with within a prescribed period after the building work to which the application for consent relates is completed.

No. 137. Clause 128, page 114, line 5—After 'Building Code' insert 'or a Ministerial building standard'

No. 138. Clause 128, page 114, line 8—Delete ', before granting the building consent,'

No. 139. Clause 128, page 114, line 11—After 'Building Code' insert 'or the Ministerial building standard (as the case may be)'

No. 140. Clause 128, page 114, after line 11—Insert:

(3a) A requirement under subsection (3)—

- (a) subject to paragraph (b)—may be imposed on the basis that the building work or other measures to achieve compliance with the relevant performance requirements must be addressed before the relevant authority will grant building consent; and
- (b) in cases prescribed by the regulations—may only be imposed as a condition of the building consent that must be complied with within a prescribed period after the building work to which the application for consent relates is completed.

No. 141. Clause 133, page 116, line 12—Delete 'relevant authority' and substitute 'person undertaking the development'

No. 142. Clause 133, page 116, line 14—Delete 'a person' and substitute 'the person'

No. 143. Clause 133, page 116, line 17—Delete 'a person' and substitute 'the person'

No. 144. Clause 133, page 116, line 22—Delete 'a person' and substitute 'the person'

No. 145. Clause 134, page 117, lines 28 and 29—Delete 'the council for the area in which the adjoining allotment is situated' and substitute 'the Court'

No. 146. Clause 134, page 117, line 30—Delete 'a council' and substitute 'the Court'

No. 147. Clause 134, page 117, lines 33 to 36—Delete subclauses (6) and (7)

No. 148. Clause 134, page 118, line 2—Delete 'a council' and substitute 'the Court'

No. 149. Clause 134, page 118, line 5—Delete 'a council' and substitute 'the Court'

No. 150. New clauses, page 133, after line 31—Insert:

Subdivision A1—Interpretation

155A—Interpretation

(1) In this Division—

*basic infrastructure* means—

- (a) infrastructure within the ambit of paragraph (a), (b) or (h) of the definition of 'essential infrastructure' under section 3(1); or
- (b) roads or causeways, bridges or culverts associated with roads; or
- (c) stormwater management infrastructure; or
- (d) embankments, wells, channels, drains, drainage holes or other forms of works or earthworks connected with the provision of infrastructure under a preceding paragraph.

(2) For the purposes of this Division, a designated growth area is an area which is to be developed in 1 or more of the following ways:

- (a) by the division of land and the sale (or proposed future sale) of all or some of the resulting allotments;
- (b) by rezoning to increase development potential;
- (c) by undertaking urban in-fill, consolidation or renewal.

Subdivision A2—Establishment of schemes—basic infrastructure

## 155B—Initiation of scheme

- (1) The Minister may initiate a scheme under this Subdivision in relation to the provision of basic infrastructure in, or in connection with, a designated growth area.
- (2) A scheme under this Subdivision should be limited to—
  - (a) the provision of basic infrastructure; and
  - (b) funding arrangements for the provision of that basic infrastructure,in 1 or more of the following situations:
  - (c) the basic infrastructure is reasonably necessary for the purposes of development that is proposed or to be undertaken within the designated growth area (including on account of rezoning that has occurred, or is expected to occur, in relation to the whole or a significant part of the development that is to occur within the designated growth area);
  - (d) the basic infrastructure will support, service or promote significant development that is proposed or to be undertaken within the designated growth area;
  - (e) it is reasonably necessary or efficient to co-ordinate the design, construction and funding of basic infrastructure under a scheme because of the scale of—
    - (i) development that is proposed or to be undertaken within the designated growth area; or
    - (ii) the basic infrastructure that is to be provided,(or both).
- (3) Subject to subsection (4), a proposal to proceed under this section may be initiated—
  - (a) on the Minister's own initiative; or
  - (b) at the request of another person or body interested in the provision or delivery of infrastructure.
- (4) The Minister may only act under this section on the advice of the Commission.
- (5) The Commission must, in providing advice under this section, take into account any relevant state planning policy and regional plan, and the relevant provisions of the Planning and Design Code (subject to any relevant amendments that might be made in connection with potential or proposed development that is to be undertaken within the designated growth area).
- (6) The Minister will initiate a scheme by preparing a draft outline of the scheme that—
  - (a) provides detailed information about—
    - (i) the nature and intended scope of the basic infrastructure; and
    - (ii) any related development that is proposed to be undertaken as part of the scheme; and
  - (b) identifies the proposed designated growth area; and
  - (c) provides information about the proposed timing or staging of the various elements of the scheme; and
  - (d) assesses the costs and benefits of the scheme; and
  - (e) outlines a funding arrangement for the scheme, including whether it is proposed to impose a charge under Subdivision 2A; and
  - (f) provides information about the person or body that will be carrying out the work envisaged by the scheme (to the extent that is known); and
  - (g) identifies any basic infrastructure or other assets that might be expected to be transferred to another entity when the scheme has been completed; and
  - (h) provides such other information as the Minister thinks fit after consultation with the Commission.
- (7) In giving consideration to the nature and intended scope of basic infrastructure under a scheme, the Minister must seek to facilitate the provision of infrastructure that is—

- (a) fit for purpose; and
  - (b) capable of adaptation as standards or technology change over time (insofar as is reasonably practicable or appropriate in the circumstances); and
  - (c) capable of augmentation or extension to accommodate growth or changing circumstances over time (insofar as is reasonably practicable or appropriate in the circumstances); and
  - (d) where appropriate, designed to build capacity for the future, including by allowing for connections, extensions or augmentation by others who are able to leverage off the initial investment in the basic infrastructure; and
  - (e) designed and built to a standard that is appropriate taking into account the nature and extent of development that is proposed to be undertaken within the relevant designated growth area; and
  - (f) capable of being procured and delivered in a timely manner to facilitate and promote orderly and economic development.
- (8) In giving consideration to the constitution of a designated growth area under subsection (6)(b), consideration must be given to—
- (a) the area or areas which will benefit from any basic infrastructure to be provided under the proposed scheme; and
  - (b) the extent to which it is possible to establish an area that will provide fair and sufficient funds over time with respect to the provision of the basic infrastructure under the proposed scheme; and
  - (c) the extent to which the designated growth area may overlap with a contribution area under Subdivision 1.
- (9) In giving consideration to whether or not to include a proposal for the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A, the Minister must take into account—
- (a) the extent that it is reasonable that other sources of funding be used instead; and
  - (b) any schemes or arrangements (including with respect to the imposition of separate or other rates or charges) that are already in place, or already planned (and known to the Minister) with respect to the provision of basic infrastructure or the undertaking of works in the designated growth area (or in an adjacent or related area).
- (10) The Minister, in preparing the draft outline, must—
- (a) take reasonable steps to consult with—
    - (i) the owners of land within the proposed designated growth area; and
    - (ii) the person or persons who are intending to undertake any relevant development within the proposed designated growth area; and
  - (b) take reasonable steps to consult with the council within whose area the proposed designated growth area is situated,
- and may consult with any other person or body as the Minister thinks fit.
- (11) The Minister will then publish the draft outline—
- (a) in the Gazette; and
  - (b) on the SA planning portal.
- (12) In addition, the Minister must, as soon as is reasonably practicable after acting under this section on the advice of the Commission, publish the advice on the SA planning portal subject to any qualifications or redactions that are necessary to prevent the disclosure of confidential or commercially sensitive information provided by or relating to—
- (a) an owner or occupier of land; or
  - (b) a proponent of development relating to the provision of infrastructure; or
  - (c) a provider of infrastructure.
- (13) The Minister will then (at a time determined by the Minister) refer the proposed scheme to the Chief Executive for the appointment of a scheme coordinator.

No. 151. Heading, page 133, line 32—Delete the heading and substitute:

Subdivision 1—Establishment of general schemes

No. 152. Clause 156, page 134, lines 8 to 11—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

- (3) Subject to subsection (3a), a proposal to proceed under this section may be initiated—
  - (a) on the Minister's own initiative; or
  - (b) at the request of another person or body interested in the provision or delivery of infrastructure.
- (3a) The Minister may only act under this section on the advice of the Commission.
- (3b) The Commission must, in providing advice under this section, take into account any relevant state planning policy and regional plan, and the relevant provisions of the Planning and Design Code (subject to any relevant amendments that might be made in connection with potential or proposed development that is to be undertaken as part of, or in connection with, the scheme).

No. 153. Clause 156, page 134, after line 31—Insert:

- (4a) In giving consideration to the nature and intended scope of infrastructure under a scheme, the Minister must seek to facilitate the provision of infrastructure that is—
  - (a) fit for purpose; and
  - (b) capable of adaptation as standards or technology change over time (insofar as is reasonably practicable or appropriate in the circumstances); and
  - (c) capable of augmentation or extension to accommodate growth or changing circumstances over time (insofar as is reasonably practicable or appropriate in the circumstances); and
  - (d) where appropriate, designed to build capacity for the future, including by allowing for connections, extensions or augmentation by others who are able to leverage off the initial investments in the infrastructure; and
  - (e) designed and built to a standard that is appropriate taking into account the nature and extent of development that is proposed to be undertaken as part of, or in connection with, the scheme; and
  - (f) capable of being procured and delivered in a timely manner to facilitate and promote orderly and economic development.

No. 154. Clause 156, page 134, after line 35—Insert:

- (ab) the extent to which the implementation of the scheme will have an impact on any council (including on account of any infrastructure or other assets that might be transferred to the council when the scheme has been completed) after taking into account any submissions made by the council under subsection (7); and

No. 155. Clause 156, page 134, line 38—Delete 'and amenity' and substitute 'or amenity'

No. 156. Clause 156, page 135, line 2—After 'contributions' insert 'through the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 3 by the relevant council'

No. 157. Clause 156, page 135, after line 15—Insert:

- (6a) The Minister must, in considering a scheme under this Subdivision, apply the principle that a scheme that relates to, or includes, basic infrastructure and is more suited to a scheme under Subdivision A2 should not be initiated under this Subdivision.
- (6b) However, nothing in subsection (6a) (or Subdivision A2) prevents a contribution being sought with respect to basic infrastructure under Subdivision 3 insofar as it is considered by the Minister to be reasonable that owners of land within a contribution area (and outside a designated growth area) should make a contribution towards the cost of that basic infrastructure.

No. 158. Clause 156, page 135, line 17—Delete paragraph (a)

No. 159. Clause 156, page 135, after line 27—Insert:

- (8a) In addition, the Minister must, as soon as is reasonably practicable after acting under this section on the advice of the Commission, publish the advice on the SA planning portal

subject to any qualifications or redactions that are necessary to prevent the disclosure of confidential or commercially sensitive information provided by or relating to—

- (a) an owner or occupier of land; or
- (b) a proponent of development relating to the provision of infrastructure; or
- (c) a provider of infrastructure.

No. 160. New heading, page 135, after line 29—Insert:

Subdivision 1A—Scheme coordinator

No. 161. Clause 157, page 135, line 31—Delete 'section 156' and insert 'section 155B or 156'

No. 162. Clause 157, page 135, line 32—Delete 'a person' and substitute 'a suitably qualified person'

No. 163. Clause 157, page 136, after line 4—Insert:

- (5) The Chief Executive must, in exercising a power under this section, act with the concurrence of the Commission.

No. 164. Clause 158, page 136, after line 15—Delete inserted subclause (1a) and substitute:

- (1a) In addition to the other provisions of this Division, in developing a funding arrangement that includes a proposal for the imposition of a charge made under Subdivision 2A, the scheme coordinator should seek to act consistently with the following principles:
  - (a) the charge should be limited to recovering the reasonable capital costs of the basic infrastructure based only on infrastructure that is not excessive and that is not produced or delivered at a cost or price that is unreasonable in the circumstances;
  - (b) the charge should not have an excessively adverse impact on—
    - (i) the development of a designated growth area; or
    - (ii) housing or living affordability within a designated growth area; or
    - (iii) employment, investment or economic viability associated with a designated growth area; and
  - (c) the charge must be based on a scheme under which a payment or payments under the charge become payable (or commence to become payable) on a specified event or events; and
  - (d) funding under the scheme should recognise the need to provide value for money in connection with funding arrangements including, as appropriate, through contestable provision of basic infrastructure; and
  - (e) rebates for charges should be available in appropriate circumstances; and
  - (f) exemptions from the imposition of a charge should be considered depending on the circumstances of the case.
- (1b) In connection with subsection (1a)(c), an event or events that trigger the requirement to make, or to begin to make, a payment under a charge must be related to when development is undertaken being—
  - (a) the depositing of a plan for the division of land under Part 19AB of the *Real Property Act 1886*; or
  - (b) undertaking of approved development.
- (1c) In addition to subsection (1a)(f), exemptions from the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A will apply in any circumstances prescribed by the regulations.

No. 165. Amendment No 65 [Emp-4]—Delete 'consideration must be given to' and substitute 'the scheme coordinator should seek to act consistently with'

No. 166. Clause 158, page 136, line 23—Delete 'excessive' and substitute 'excessively adverse'

No. 167. Clause 158, page 136, line 25—Delete subparagraph (ii) and substitute:

- (ii) employment, investment or economic viability associated with a contribution area;

No. 168. Clause 158, page 136, after line 25—Insert:

- (ba) the timing of the collection of contributions under the scheme should be connected to the production or delivery of infrastructure to which the contributions relate, such that the scheme should not involve the collection of an excessive amount of contributions before the relevant infrastructure is produced or delivered; and

No. 169. Clause 158, page 136, line 37—Delete 'contributions' and substitute 'charges imposed under Subdivision 3'

No. 170. Clause 158, page 136, after line 37—Insert:

- (f) exemptions from the imposition of charges imposed under Subdivision 3 should be considered depending on the circumstances of the case.

No. 171. Clause 158, page 137, line 5—After 'contribution area' insert 'under Subdivision 3'

No. 172. Clause 158, page 137, after line 10—Insert:

- (3a) In addition to subsection (2)(f), exemptions from the imposition of a charge imposed under Subdivision 3 will apply in any circumstances prescribed by the regulations.

No. 173. Clause 158, page 137, after line 12—Insert:

- (5) The Minister must publish a copy of a report furnished under subsection (4) on the SA planning portal as soon as is reasonably practicable after determining whether or not to proceed with the scheme to which the report relates, subject to any qualifications or redactions that are necessary to prevent the disclosure of confidential or commercially sensitive information provided by or relating to—

- (a) an owner or occupier of land; or
- (b) a proponent of development relating to the provision of infrastructure; or
- (c) a provider of infrastructure.

No. 174. New heading, page 137, before line 13—Insert:

Subdivision 1B—Adoption of proposed scheme and related operational matters

No. 175. Clause 159, page 137, after line 18—Insert:

- (1a) However, the Minister must, before making a variation, exclusion or inclusion under subsection (1)(a) that will involve a significant change to the scheme, refer the scheme (including the proposed variation, exclusion or inclusion) to the scheme coordinator for the scheme coordinator to consider and report to the Minister on the scheme in accordance with section 158 as if it were a proposed scheme under that section.

No. 176. Clause 159, page 137, after line 28—Insert:

- (5a) The Minister must, before making a variation that will involve a significant change to the scheme—
- (a) if the scheme provides for the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A, give consideration to whether or not such a charge should be included in the scheme, taking into account the variation and the matters referred to in section 155B(9); and
  - (b) seek the advice of the Commission; and
  - (c) take reasonable steps to consult with the council within whose area the scheme is proposed to be undertaken and, if relevant, any council whose area may include the whole or any part of a proposed contribution area; and
  - (d) take reasonable steps to consult with the owners of any land that would be directly affected by any infrastructure or works to be provided or undertaken under the proposal scheme; and
  - (e) consult with any other person or body as the Minister thinks fit,
- and the Minister must then refer the scheme (as proposed to be varied) to the scheme coordinator.
- (5b) The scheme coordinator must, on a referral under subsection (5a), consider and report to the Minister on the scheme in accordance with section 158 as if it were a proposed scheme under that section.

No. 177. Clause 159, page 137, after line 33—Insert:

- (8) To avoid doubt, the liabilities of a scheme will accrue under the terms of the scheme (and, if relevant, against a fund established under Subdivision 4 and not against a council that is required to make contributions under Subdivision 3).
- (9) Once a scheme has been adopted by the Minister, the Chief Executive must ensure that the Commission is kept informed about the operation of the scheme (and any significant changes to the scheme) under an arrangement established by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Commission.

No. 178. Clause 160, page 138, line 2—After 'to the Minister about' insert 'the enforcement of any charge under Subdivision 2A or'

No. 179. Clause 160, page 138, after line 10—Insert:

- (2) Without limiting subsection (1), the scheme coordinator should seek to ensure that essential infrastructure is procured and delivered in a timely manner and at reasonable cost and, in so doing, apply and act in accordance with the following principles:
  - (a) the cost of essential infrastructure should be open and transparent;
  - (b) the design of, and procurement processes for, essential infrastructure should be dynamic, flexible and adaptable to the changes in circumstances, especially changes within a designated growth area or contribution area;
  - (c) essential infrastructure should be delivered in a way that facilitates and promotes orderly and economic development, economic growth and employment.
- (3) In addition, the scheme coordinator should, insofar as is reasonable, seek out and bring to the attention of the Chief Executive any additional or alternative funding sources that could ensure that charges and contributions under any funding arrangement for infrastructure under the relevant scheme as kept as low as possible.

No. 180. Clause 161, page 138, after line 18—Insert:

- (iia) the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A, including by establishing a designated growth area;

No. 181. Clause 161, page 138, line 22—After 'under' insert 'Subdivision 2A or'

No. 182. Clause 161, page 138, after line 30—Insert:

- (aa) a scheme that provides for the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A—
  - (i) may provide for the indexing of the charge under an index, or at a rate, determined or approved by the ESCOSA, or by some other prescribed person or body; and
  - (ii) must specify arrangements for the periodic review of the charge under the relevant scheme and, as part of such a review, may provide for any matter to be considered or determined by ESCOSA, or by some other prescribed person or body; and

No. 183. Clause 161, page 138, line 35—Delete 'specified' and substitute 'prescribed'

No. 184. Clause 161, page 138, line 40—After 'paragraph' insert '(aa) or'

No. 185. Clause 161, page 139, after line 6—Insert:

- (2a) Despite paragraph (aa) of subsection (2), ESCOSA, or another prescribed person or body acting in accordance with that paragraph, may not make a determination in relation to a scheme that provides for the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A that results in the charge being payable over a longer period of time than the period applying under the funding arrangement established by the scheme.
- (2b) Despite the preceding subsections, a funding arrangement under a scheme that provides for the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A must provide that the liability to make a payment or payments under the charge after the occurrence of an event or events that trigger the requirement to make, or to begin to make, such payments cannot be transferred to a purchaser of any land or dwelling to which the scheme relates who intends to occupy the land or dwelling for residential purposes.

No. 186. Clause 161, page 139, line 14—After 'Subdivision 3' insert 'or charge that is to be imposed under Subdivision 2A'

No. 187. Clause 161, page 139, lines 22 to 28—Delete paragraphs (a) and (b) and substitute:

- (a) the Minister has made a recommendation for the purposes of this subsection to the Governor that the funding arrangement be approved; and



- (b) the funding arrangement has been approved by all of the persons who, at the time that the Minister is submitting the funding arrangement for approval of the Governor under subsection (3), own land within the relevant contribution area or areas, other than—
- (i) community land under the *Local Government Act 1999*; or
  - (ii) a public road under the *Local Government Act 1999*; or
  - (iii) dedicated land under the *Crown Land Management Act 2009*; or
  - (iv) land held by, or under the care, control or management of, the Urban Renewal Authority under the *Urban Renewal Act 1995*; or
  - (v) other land held for a public purpose excluded from the ambit of this definition by the regulations.

No. 188. Clause 161, page 139, lines 30 to 43—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

- (a) the Minister must not make a recommendation under subsection (6)(a) unless or until—
- (i) the Commission has taken reasonable steps to consult with—
    - (A) an entity or entities that, in the opinion of the Minister represent the interests of persons who are directly involved in providing infrastructure or developing land that may be subject to a scheme of the relevant kind under this Division; and
    - (B) if the funding arrangement is specifically relevant to a particular council or councils—that council or those councils; and
    - (C) the LGA; and
    - (D) any other person or body specified by the Minister; and
  - (ii) the Commission has furnished a report to the Minister—
    - (A) setting out the outcome of the consultation required under subparagraph (i); and
    - (B) recommending that the Minister make the recommendation under subsection (6)(a).

No. 189. Clause 161, page 140, after line 3—Insert:

- (7a) The Commission may only make a recommendation to the Minister under subsection (7)(a)(ii)(B) if the Commission is satisfied, having regard to any consultation on the scheme undertaken by the scheme coordinator, that the scheme provides for contributions under Subdivision 3, and rebates and other adjustments in relation to the contributions, in a manner that—
- (a) is fair and equitable; and
  - (b) would not unreasonably disadvantage persons who own small areas of land within the relevant contribution area or areas; and
  - (c) is reasonable taking into account the matters referred to in section 156(5) and the principles referred to in section 158(2).

No. 190. Clause 161, page 140, lines 4 to 10—Delete subclause (8) and substitute:

- (8) If a report furnished to the ERD Committee under subsection (5) relates to the approval of a scheme for the collection of contributions under Subdivision 3 (a *contributions scheme*) or the approval or variation of a funding arrangement under a scheme that provides for the imposition of a charge under Subdivision 2A (a *charge scheme*), the ERD Committee must, after receiving the report—
- (a) resolve that it does not object to the contributions scheme or charge scheme (as the case requires); or
  - (b) resolve to suggest amendments to the contributions scheme or charge scheme (as the case requires); or
  - (c) resolve to object to the contributions scheme or charge scheme (as the case requires).

No. 191. Clause 161, page 140, line 14—After 'contributions scheme' insert 'or charge scheme (as the case requires)'

No. 192. Clause 161, page 140, line 34—After 'contributions scheme' insert 'or charge scheme (as the case requires)'

No. 193. Clause 161, page 140, line 35—After 'contributions scheme' insert 'or charge scheme (as the case requires)'

No. 194. Clause 161, page 140, line 36—After 'contributions scheme' insert 'or charge scheme (as the case requires)'

No. 195. Clause 161, page 140, line 39—After 'contributions scheme' insert 'or charge scheme (as the case requires)'

No. 196. Clause 161, page 140, lines 40 and 41—After 'contributions scheme' insert 'or charge scheme (as the case requires)'

No. 197. Clause 161, page 141, lines 8 and 9—After 'contributions scheme' insert 'or charge scheme (as the case requires)'

No. 198. Clause 161, page 141, lines 22 and 23—Delete the definition of *prescribed percentage*

No. 199. New clauses, page 141, after line 30—Insert:

Subdivision 2A—Charges on land

163A—Application of Subdivision

This Subdivision applies with respect to charges for the purposes of a scheme initiated under Subdivision A2.

163B—Creation of charge

- (1) The Minister may impose a charge under this Subdivision over land within a designated growth area.
- (2) The Minister may impose a charge over land with or without the agreement of the owner of the land.
- (3) For the purpose of the imposition of a charge, the Minister may deliver to the Registrar-General a notice, in a form determined by the Registrar-General—
  - (a) setting out or incorporating the terms of the charge; and
  - (b) setting out the real property over which it exists; and
  - (c) requesting the Registrar-General to note the charge against the relevant instrument of title or, in the case of land not under the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886*, against the land.
- (4) The Registrar-General must, on receipt of a notice under subsection (3), in relation to the real property referred to in the notice, enter an appropriate notation in accordance with the notice.
- (5) When an entry is made under subsection (4), a charge over the real property is created.
- (6) The terms and conditions of the charge may be varied—
  - (a) by the Minister after consultation with the owner of the land to which the charge relates (and with or without the agreement of the owner of the land); or
  - (b) on account of a periodic review under section 161(2)(aa); or
  - (c) in circumstances prescribed by the regulations.
- (7) A variation under subsection (6) will be effected in a manner determined by the Minister after consultation with the Registrar-General.
- (8) The Minister must, when payments under a charge have been made and paid in full, by further notice to the Registrar-General under this section, cancel the charge.

163C—Ranking of charge

- (1) While a charge exists over real property, the Registrar-General must not register an instrument affecting the property unless—
  - (a) the instrument was executed before the charge was created or relates to an instrument registered before the charge was created; or
  - (b) the instrument is an instrument of a prescribed class; or

- (c) the Minister consents to the registration in writing; or
  - (d) the instrument—
    - (i) is expressed to be subject to the charge; and
    - (ii) is not a conveyance that relates to the transfer or sale of the real property to a purchaser who intends to occupy the real property for residential purposes; or
  - (e) the instrument is a duly stamped conveyance that relates to the transfer or sale of the real property under section 163D.
- (2) An instrument registered under subsection (1)(a), (b), or (c) has effect, in relation to the charge, as if it had been registered before the charge was created.
- (3) If an instrument is registered under subsection (1)(e), the charge will be taken to be cancelled and the Registrar-General must make the appropriate entries to give effect to the cancellation.

#### 163D—Enforcement of charge

- (1) If a person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of a charge, the charge may be enforced as follows:
- (a) the Minister must, by notice in the Gazette, inform the person of the breach and give the person at least 1 month to remedy the breach; and
  - (b) if the person does not remedy the breach within the time allowed in a notice under paragraph (a), the Minister may proceed to have the land to which the charge relates sold.
- (2) The sale will be by public auction (and the Minister may set a reserve price for the purposes of the sale).
- (3) If, before the date of such an auction, the outstanding amount of the charge and the costs incurred by the Minister in proceeding under this section are paid to the Minister, the Minister must call off the auction.
- (4) The requirement to sell at auction does not apply in any circumstances prescribed by the regulations.
- (5) If—
- (a) an auction fails; or
  - (b) an auction is not required under subsection (4),
- the Minister may sell the land by private contract for the best price that the Minister may reasonably obtain.
- (6) Any money required by the Minister in respect of the sale of land under this section will be applied as follows:
- (a) firstly—in paying the costs of the sale and any other costs of a prescribed kind;
  - (b) secondly—in discharging any liabilities secured by instrument registered before the charge was created, or that is taken to have such effect by virtue of section 163C;
  - (c) thirdly—in discharging the amount or amounts secured by the charge;
  - (d) fourthly—in discharging any other liabilities secured by registered instruments;
  - (e) fifthly—in discharging any other liabilities that exist in relation to the land of which the Minister has notice;
  - (f) sixthly—in payment to the owner of the land.
- (7) The title obtained under the sale of the land will be free of—
- (a) any charge under this Subdivision; and
  - (b) all other liabilities discharged under subsection (6); and
  - (c) any other liability that may exist on account of any mortgage, charge or encumbrance.

- (8) If land is sold, an instrument of transfer or conveyance in pursuance of the sale executed by the Minister will, on registration or enrolment, operate to vest title to the land in the person named in the transfer or conveyance.
- (9) If it is not reasonably practicable to obtain the duplicate certificate of title to land that is sold in pursuance of this section (or other relevant instrument), the Registrar-General may register a transfer or conveyance despite the non-production of the duplicate (or instrument), but in that event will cancel the existing certificate of title for the land and issue a new certificate in the name of the transferee.

No. 200. Clause 168, page 144, after line 36—Insert:

- (6a) If a council incurs costs in recovering a charge as a debt, the council is entitled to claim the reimbursement of those costs (insofar as they are reasonable) from the relevant fund established under Subdivision 4.

No. 201. Clause 170, page 145, line 18—Delete 'Subdivision 3' and substitute 'Subdivision A2 or 1 (including in conjunction with the operation of Subdivision 2A or 3)'

No. 202. Clause 170, page 145, line 20—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

- (a) any money—
  - (i) payable to the Minister under a charge imposed under Subdivision A2 (including under Subdivision 2A); or
  - (ii) payable by a council and recovered under Subdivision 3; and

No. 203. Clause 211, page 180, after line 16—Insert:

- (2a) The court must, in determining whether to make an adverse publicity order, take into account any material before the court relating to the effect that the taking of action or actions that the court proposes to specify in the order is likely to have on a person other than the offender.

No. 204. Clause 231, page 192, after line 5—Insert:

- (1a) The Minister may only act under subsection (1) if the Minister is acting on the advice of the Commission.

No. 205. New clauses, page 192, after line 11—Insert:

231A—Advisory committees on implementation of Act

- (1) The Minister must establish the following committees to provide advice on the implementation of this Act:
  - (a) after consultation with the LGA, a committee that relates to the local government sector;
  - (b) a committee that relates to entities involved in undertaking development within the State.
  - (c) a committee that relates to—
    - (i) community participation; and
    - (ii) ecological sustainability and liveability,with respect to planning, design and development.
- (2) The Minister may, in establishing a committee under subsection (1), make provision with respect to—
  - (a) the membership of the committee; and
  - (b) the procedures of the committee; and
  - (c) the functions or scope of operation of the committee; and
  - (d) other matters as the Minister thinks fit.
- (3) Nothing in this section limits any other committee or other entity that may be established, or any other step or other process that may be undertaken, in relation to the implementation of this Act.

231B—Inquiries by Commission

- (1) The Commission must conduct the following inquiries under section 22(1)(e):

- (a) an inquiry into schemes in relation to the provision of essential infrastructure under Part 13;
  - (b) an inquiry into the scheme for off-setting contributions and the open space contribution scheme under Part 15 Division 2.
- (2) The inquiry under subsection (1)(a) must—
- (a) investigate alternative schemes for the provision of essential infrastructure and make recommendations as to whether any such scheme should be adopted in this State; and
  - (b) investigate alternative schemes for the provision of prescribed infrastructure (within the meaning of section 161(18)) and make recommendations as to whether any such scheme should be adopted in this State; and
  - (c) consider such other matters as the Commission thinks fit.
- (3) The inquiry under subsection (1)(b) must—
- (a) investigate alternative schemes for off-setting contributions and contributing to open space and make recommendations as to whether any such scheme should be adopted in this State; and
  - (b) consider such other matters as the Commission thinks fit.
- (4) The Commission must furnish the following reports on inquiries under this section to the Minister:
- (a) a report on the outcome of the inquiry under subsection (1)(a) no earlier than 2 years after the commencement of this Act;
  - (b) a report on the outcome of the inquiry under subsection (1)(b) within 2 years after the commencement of this Act.
- (5) The Minister must cause a copy of each report submitted to the Minister under this section to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.
- (6) A proclamation for the purposes of this Act fixing a day on which Part 13 Division 1 Subdivision 1 will come into operation cannot be made until after a report on the outcome of the inquiry under subsection (1)(a) has been laid before both Houses of Parliament.

No. 206. Schedule 6, clause 21, page 213, after line 16—Insert:

- (2) Section 221—after subsection (6) insert:
- (7) Subsection (3)(b) operates subject to the following qualifications:
- (a) an accredited professional under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2015 may only grant an approval under subsection (3)(b) with the concurrence of the council; and
  - (b) any other relevant authority under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2015 may only grant an approval under subsection (3)(b) after consultation with the council.
- (8) The requirement to consult under subsection (7)(b) does not extend to an assessment panel appointed by the council.

No. 207. Schedule 6, clause 22, page 213, after line 21—Insert:

- (6b) Subsection (6a) operates subject to the following qualifications:
- (a) an accredited professional under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2015* may only grant an approval under subsection (6a) with the concurrence of the council; and
  - (b) any other relevant authority under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2015* may only grant an approval under subsection (6a) after consultation with the council; and
  - (c) an approval to use the public road as envisaged by subsection (6a) will be for a period prescribed by the regulations (and, at the expiration of that period, this section will then apply in relation to the use of the road).
- (6c) The requirement to consult under subsection (6b)(b) does not extend to an assessment panel appointed by the relevant council.

No. 208. New Schedule, page 217, after line 2—Insert:

Schedule 7—Rural living areas

1—Rural living areas

- (1) The following provisions will apply in relation to a rural living area in place within an environment and food production area defined by the plan referred to in section 7(1):
- (a) section 7(5)(d) and (e) will not apply in relation to the rural living area;
- (b) if—
- (i) after the commencement of this clause, an application for development authorisation is made that involves a division of land within the rural living area that would create 1 or more additional allotments to be used for residential development; and
- (ii) the relevant policies or conditions relating to the minimum size of allotments or the division of land generally that were in force on 1 December 2015 (the *prescribed land division provisions*) provide for a larger minimum allotment size or involve more restrictive conditions on the division of land than the provisions that would otherwise apply in relation to the proposed development,
- the prescribed land division provisions will apply in relation to the proposed development (despite any other relevant instrument and despite the other provisions of this Act).
- (2) In this clause—
- rural living area* means—
- (a) an area that is defined as a rural living zone by a Development Plan under the *Development Act 1993* on 1 December 2015; or
- (b) an area that is defined as an *animal husbandry zone* by the Development Plan for The District Council of Mallala under the *Development Act 1993* on 1 December 2015;
- (c) any of the following areas or zones defined by the Development Plan for Alexandrina Council under the *Development Act 1993* on 1 December 2015:
- (i) *Residential Airpark Policy Area 2 in an airport zone;*
- (ii) *Precinct 11 Hindmarsh Island North in a primary production zone;*
- (iii) *a coastal settlement zone.*
- (3) This Schedule expires 2 years after the day on which it comes into operation.

**LOCAL NUISANCE AND LITTER CONTROL BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**MENTAL HEALTH (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 March 2015.)

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:34):** I am pleased to offer my contribution in this place to the Mental Health (Review) Amendment Bill 2015. As many people here know, I started nursing way back in 1986 at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital after completing my year 12 the year before.

People with mental health conditions are some of the most vulnerable members of our community and certainly some of the most vulnerable people that I have had the pleasure to look

after. Providing comprehensive, inclusive health care of a high standard poses a huge challenge as each patient is unique and responds differently in circumstances that they find themselves in. Providing mental health services is a skill and also an art delivered by caring and committed practitioners across the healthcare system.

Section 111 of the Mental Health Act 2009 required a review of its operation by 30 June 2014. This was carried out with the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist placing a focus on the enhancement of service delivery to people with mental illnesses, their carers and families. While a full redraft was not required, there have been many amendments made, with 37 of them enhancing rights and reinforcing clinical best practice, a number of which we will see the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist work closely with the sector and consumers to ensure understanding of the intent and impact of the changes. I will mention just a few.

Firstly, Level 1—Community Treatment Order provisions have been amended in order to ensure clinicians can enhance service delivery while optimising patient rights (very important). Secondly, changes to provisions regarding electro-convulsive therapy (ECT) (a treatment sometimes used in order to provide relief from some psychiatric illnesses) and other prescribed psychiatric treatment will improve patient rights and enhance service delivery. These changes will:

- clarify consent (such as the addition of consent capacity for a substitute decision maker);
- clarify that the ECT consent does not include the use of reasonable force and that consent can be withdrawn at any time;
- change notification requirements (all ECT consent must be notified to the Chief Psychiatrist);
- improve review and decision-making capacity (such as the introduction of the new Prescribed Psychiatric Treatment Panel); and
- change process requirements (such as applications for neurosurgery for mental illness to go before the Prescribed Psychiatric Treatment Panel).

Thirdly, the addition of Patient Assistance Requests will change the way community mental health services, the SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) and South Australia Police (SAPOL) are able to collaborate to keep a person with mental illness safe and well.

Currently, if a person on a Community Treatment Order refuses their medication when a community mental health team visits them in their home, the team must use a Patient Transport Request to ask SAAS or SAPOL to transport the person to a hospital where they will be assessed and their medication involuntarily provided before the person is transported by SAAS or SAPOL back to their home again.

This is very disruptive. It is traumatic for the person and for their family, it is traumatic for SAPOL and for SA Ambulance, and it is traumatic for hospital emergency department workers also. It would be preferable to avoid unnecessary use of mental health services.

The amendments will allow a community mental health team to ask for the assistance of SAAS or SAPOL to deliver a person's medication to them involuntarily in their own home, a much less restrictive, less traumatic option for the person and their family and a more efficient form of use of public resource and service perspective. A Patient Assistance Request will only be made when it is safe and appropriate to do so.

Fourthly, our Community Visitor Scheme, which provides an incredible point of contact and advocacy for users of our mental health services, will see an increase in the facilities and services within the scope of the scheme to now include community mental health centres, community rehabilitation centres and intermediate care centres. This provides increased advocacy and voice to our vulnerable community members.

I am very pleased to support this important work which provides an opportunity for our government the means to improve the rights of people with mental illnesses, enhance the capacity of mental health services to provide treatment and care, enhance the capacity of government

agencies to collaborate, provide clarity for matters that are currently ambiguous and to remove provisions that are stigmatising and potentially discriminatory.

I also want to thank all the health and community sector workers, many of whom I consider friends, for all the invaluable work they do in advocating for this group of patients within our community. I commend the amendments to the house.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:40):** I would like to speak in support of the Mental Health (Review) Amendment Bill 2015. In particular, I will speak on cross-border arrangements and, of course, rights associated with this particular issue.

Part 10 of the Mental Health Act 2009 provides for the transfer of care of patients under community treatment orders and inpatient treatment orders between South Australia and other Australian states and territories. Cross-border provisions are essential to protecting the health, safety and rights of around 20 to 30 individuals per year who are moving between states and territories. It is important to keep cross-border provisions as succinct and usable as possible to enhance the rights and service options available for this group in the context of a part of the act that is used less often and is less familiar to consumers, carers, clinicians and advocates alike, but nevertheless can bring distress to those who are caught in this particular issue.

The bill proposes amendments to the act which will provide more cross-border treatment options for people in South Australia and who are subject to an interstate community treatment order or inpatient treatment order so that an individual can be provided treatment in South Australia under the interstate order, subject to the principles and protections in our act, while the person, their family and the South Australian and interstate treatment teams decide in which state the person wants to reside.

It also provides more cross-border treatment options for people in other states who are subject to a South Australian community treatment order or inpatient treatment order so that an individual can be provided treatment interstate under the South Australian order while the person, their family and the South Australian and interstate treatment teams decide in which state the person wants to reside.

It will also enhance consent options so that a person and their family can consent to an interstate transfer and waive the existing mandatory minimum 14-day waiting period. It will improve rights for people and their families so that they will be given copies of the appropriate orders and statements of rights when receiving involuntary treatment and care in South Australia.

It will reduce administrative impediments by streamlining the recognition of corresponding law, requiring Chief Psychiatrist approval for cross-border arrangements and improving how ministerial agreements may guide interstate collaboration. It will clarify the powers for authorised officers and police officers by specifying that South Australian and interstate authorised officers and police officers will draw their powers from the act, from corresponding law and from any ministerial agreement.

In regard to rights, we all agree rights are essential, and they certainly are a central part of any act that suspends the liberty of individuals. The review found that the rights contained in the act required enhancement only to match developments in legislative and clinical practice in more recent times. The bill proposes amendments to the act which will:

- Introduce the guiding principle that mental health services should meet the highest standards of quality and safety.
- Introduce individual rights so that people subject to section 56 powers (usually called care and control) and forensic mental health patients subject to a supervision order of section 269 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 are included in the act's definition of a patient. This means they will receive the general rights of a patient under the act, including receiving copies of orders and statements of rights, access to the Community Visitor Scheme, access to interpreters, reasonable freedom of communication, and falling within the oversight of the Chief Psychiatrist and the minister.



- Clarify existing rights, especially for children, since the introduction of the Advance Care Directives Act 2013 and the amendment of the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995.
- Formalise contemporary treatment order practice by introducing a decision-making capacity criterion, based on the Advance Care Directive Act 2013 definitions, for community treatment orders and inpatient treatment orders.
- Formalise contemporary clinical practice by requiring services to take into account the specific needs of individuals, which may include developmental stage and age, gender and sexuality, cultural and linguistic background, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander beliefs and culture, disability and the experience of torture or trauma.

In practical terms, this set of clauses will overcome a situation where a person may be under mental health legislation in another state and they visit South Australia. If a person becomes unwell and needs to be an inpatient needing care and then progresses to being well (often times this can take a few days), they would currently need to apply to return home, and this may be just across the border, say, in Victoria. Even then they would have to wait 14 days before they can return home even though clinically they are well enough and all involved in their care agree that it is best for them.

These clauses will take away that problem and assist their return home in a timely fashion. This type of situation happens about once or twice a month, when someone from another state is affected by this situation. It is in no-one's interest for someone to have to remain unnecessarily in Glenside, as occurred recently, for an extra two weeks after the person is well enough and waiting to return home but, because of our current legislation, unable to leave.

As you can imagine, this type of situation as it stands needs to have these amendments put in place as it can cause a lot of aggravation and uncertainty and extra distress to people. In closing, I support the progress that this mental health review and amendment suggest.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:46):** I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [MenHSubAb-1]—

Page 5, after line 5—Insert:

- (1a) Section 3, definition of *approved treatment centre*—delete 'Minister' and substitute:  
Chief Psychiatrist

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 15 passed.

Clause 16.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [MenHSubAb-1]—

Page 11, line 16 [clause 16(2), inserted paragraph (c)]—Before 'illness' insert:

Mental

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I move:

Amendment No 3 [MenHSubAb-1]—

Page 11, line 26 [clause 17(3), inserted paragraph (ba)]—Before 'illness' insert:

Mental

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 18 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I move:

Amendment No 4 [MenHSubAb-1]—

Page 12, line 22 [clause 21(2), inserted paragraph (ba)]—Before 'illness' insert:

Mental

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 22 to 24 passed.

Clause 25.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I move:

Amendment No 5 [MenHSubAb-1]—

Page 13, line 24 [clause 25(2), inserted paragraph (ba)]—Before 'illness' insert:

Mental

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 26 to 69 passed.

New clause 69A.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I move:

Amendment No 6 [MenHSubAb-1]—

Page 35, after line 9—After clause 69 Insert:

69A—Amendment of section 92—Annual report of Chief Psychiatrist

(1) Section 92(1)—before paragraph (a) insert:

(aa) in respect of the administrative functions conferred on the Chief Psychiatrist under this Act—information about how the Chief Psychiatrist has performed those functions; and

New clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (70 to 81), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:50):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:51):** I would just like to put on the record my congratulations to the new minister on her first bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (TRIALS OF AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGIES) AMENDMENT BILL***Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) REPEAL BILL***Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

*Adjournment Debate***NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:51):** I rise today to speak about the Neighbourhood Watch program in my community, and some people who do some wonderful work who I would like to commend here. I have a number who are in my direct electorate and a few who spill over into outer regions of my community as well, which takes in the people who live in my area. The people who run these Neighbourhood Watch programs do a marvellous job.

I kick off with the Neighbourhood Watch program in Reynella, where Dianne Harvey is the area coordinator, Joy Rolls is the secretary and Melissa Worden is the police coordinator. I thank them for their work very much. They are very active in their community. They do a lot of work in that region, and the locals engage very well with that Neighbourhood Watch group.

I would also like to talk about the Seacombe Gardens group. The committee contacts there are Di Pearson and Pat Broughton, and Nick Wilks is the police coordinator. David Modra filled the role previously and did a great job. They are, again, working well in their community. They are having an Alzheimer's Australia forum very shortly with Rob Crouch speaking on dementia. They really are very active. If you need a lift to their sessions, they meet at the Sturt Police Station on Sturt Road and Di or Pat can organise a lift for you if you contact them. That's how community minded they area.

In the Sturt Neighbourhood Watch program, David D'Lima organises that and does a brilliant job. We help to print their newsletters from time to time and give them a hand, but David does a marvellous job with his group and keeps people very engaged with what is going on. He does a brilliant job in the Sturt area and we thank him for all the wonderful work he does. They also have a good association there with the Second Chances op shop, so helping out the community in more ways than one.

The other two that I will talk about cross over into my electorate. In Warradale, Bruce Hull is the area coordinator, and Senior Sergeant Kevin Carroll is the police coordinator. They currently have the secretary's position available and up for grabs so if anyone wants to come along and volunteer and be part of that group they would love to have you on board. They do over 2,100 newsletters delivered in their area to local households as well, so a big thank you to all the people at the Reynella Neighbourhood Watch program.

The other one that I share with the member for Bright is South Brighton, where John Wallace is the area coordinator and Sandra Lawson is a police coordinator, along with Marika Parrish. Marika does a marvellous job in this area. I bumped into her when I was out with my family the other night having an ice-cream at the local shop. She said she did it for a long time, volunteering and not realising that she did get a little bit of help for going out and helping. She loves it and is always recruiting her friends and trying to get them along as well. I have mentioned Marika in this house before and the wonderful work that she does in SAPOL and keeping our community safe.

Some of the things they do in Neighbourhood Watch I really enjoy—and I talked about the group at Seacombe Gardens and the fact they meet at Sturt police station—are they are also having an Alzheimer's forum, which I think is just outstanding. The other groups as well do many good things. In South Brighton, John Wallace and his crew that I talked about are often talking about security and safety around the local area. They outline the incidents that have happened in recent times. You can

see what is going on in your area and know where things are going on, where things have been stolen from and where to keep an eye out.

The Reynella group are very active and they do a lot of work helping in the community. They look at reporting graffiti damage and the like in their area, so that is something they really take to heart. They are very big on stamping out graffiti in and around the Reynella area, which I do 100 per cent applaud. I mentioned vehicle security, and Reynella, again, are looking at that. Especially for tradies, we know they need to be very vigilant with their vehicle security. They often have a lot of money invested in tools in the back of their van, so they are very conscious of that as well.

I mentioned the Warradale crew are looking for volunteers. They do a great job with that, and Bruce there does try to attract volunteers wherever he can, because they have a big coverage. They are also very conscious about scams in the Warradale group. Their most recent newsletter talked about how to protect yourself against scams. I put in my newsletter, in fact, quite a bit of information about that as well.

There were quite a few people doing telephone scams in particular going around. We are very conscious of that, especially with older people in the community being scammed, with people ringing up wanting to get inside their house and/or trying to get hold of bank details. If you have anything like that come your way, of course, like the Neighbourhood Watch, I would very much recommend that you do contact the local SAPOL service.

Again, the Sturt Neighbourhood Watch do a marvellous job, and they too are very conscious of vehicle incidents that go on in their area. I know David talks about a lot of very friendly stories, and they also meet at the Sturt police station. Their next meeting is Tuesday 10 May between 7.30pm and 8.30pm. I thank all the people involved in Neighbourhood Watch in my community. They do a marvellous job. I encourage them to keep up that great work and to also try to draw more people into their Neighbourhood Watch programs wherever possible.

#### **SMALL BUSINESS FORUM**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:57):** In my maiden speech, I said the following:

The typical Davenport business operator works 7 days a week, has his or her home as collateral for their business finance, ensures that their employees are well looked after and remunerated, and finally, at the end of the week, takes home for themselves a wage to look after their family, pay the mortgage and put a bit away for a rainy day.

On Tuesday 15 March, I had the pleasure of hosting nearly 40 members of the small business community of Blackwood and surrounds at a small business forum at the Belair Hotel. The small business forum was an opportunity to engage with political representatives and discuss matters that are important to those small businesses and traders in my area. I would like to particularly thank the Belair Hotel; Ian Horne of the Australian Hotels Association; Rick Cairney, formerly of Business SA and a guru on small business matters; and the Hon. Rob Lucas from the other place for facilitating this forum with me.

There was an excellent response from the local business community and the event was well attended. We saw representatives from the Artisan Café, NewsXpress Blackwood, Kruse Legal, Blackwood Hire, Shakespeare's Books, Blackwood Natural and Remedial Solutions, Blackwood Community Buzz, Harcourts Blackwood, Chemmart Blackwood, Harris Real Estate Blackwood, LJ Hooker Blackwood, Terrain Group, Butterfly Press, Joan's Pantry, Elegant Images, Fotoswift, Blackwood Lingerie, Kuoni Creative, Bendigo Bank, Jacob's Tyres and More, and of course the Blackwood Business Network. There were also many more local business people who apologised for the event as indeed they were working in their businesses that evening.

This was an excellent representation of local businesses from Blackwood and the surrounding suburbs. Blackwood local traders demonstrated their strong interest and willingness to engage in discussing how small local businesses can be assisted by government and, more importantly, what we can learn as representatives from small business. Most interestingly, though, was their commitment to how they (small and local businesses) can help the SA economy and job creation.

Rick Cairney in his presentation asked the group, 'What is the one thing Government could do that would enable them to employ 1 more person?' There was quite a wide range of responses to this question. Amongst them, some of the responses were, of course, a review of penalty rates on public holidays. Many traders believed there was a deterrent to opening businesses in the Mitcham Hills on public holidays.

These business owners are happy to pay extra to their workers on public holidays, and many of their workers are willing to work, but these local business owners who do the right thing and pay correctly feel that penalty rates are crippling their ability to open businesses on long weekends. This has a significant impact on the small business community in Blackwood.

Other answers to the important question of what can be done to employ an extra person included: reduce workers compensation premiums; improve access to loans and financial assistance; improve incentives around traineeships; and increase commercial development in the Blackwood CBD. Other topics that were discussed during the forum included the importance of teaching entrepreneurial skills in schools, and I know that everyone on this side of the house supports that a lot.

Small business in South Australia is the largest economic sector and the largest source of employment. While small businesses may not generate as much money as large corporations, they are a critical component of our society and a major contributor to the strength of local economies. Small businesses create jobs for their workers, for themselves and their families, and many young people find their first jobs in the small business sector. They are job creators.

Small businesses create more jobs than almost any other sector in the South Australian economy. Small businesses meet local needs—the hairdressers, the financial consultant, the emergency plumber. It is small business that drives the incentives that encourage people to innovate and create using their technical skills and common sense to create the new inventions, technology, improved systems and operating methods.

With South Australia having the highest unemployment rate in the nation, now at a seasonally adjusted rate of 7.7 per cent, and the highest youth unemployment rate in the nation, I ask the question I quite often ask when I am on my feet: what is this government doing to help existing small businesses stay in business?

The mum and dad businesses, from the fish and chip shop to the newspaper operator, the local hairdresser, the barber, the franchise owner, the self-employed tradie, the fruit and veg wholesaler and the apple and pear grower, are all looking for answers from this government, because they are the backbone of our community.

This was the consistent message that I was receiving in the forum. Too often, small business feels ignored by this government, but the small businesses in my community can be sure that they will always have my support and that of members on this side of the house, as we know they are the lifeblood of our community.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CRICKET ASSOCIATION**

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:02):** I am going to talk about cricket today. Firstly, I would wish the South Australian team, the Redbacks, all the very best for the Sheffield Shield final which is being played at Glenelg Oval and commencing this Easter weekend. What I actually want to speak about today is a much darker and sinister scenario that is being proposed and advanced by the South Australia Cricket Association (SACA).

Some time ago, the SACA made no bones about the fact that they want the competition to be a 12-team competition. They have commissioned an internal report (the Schedlich report) that looked at the demographics of Adelaide and determined that the demographics of the western suburbs were such that it could not accommodate the amount of teams we currently have. I think that is an absolute nonsense, and I will talk about that a little bit later.

The history of it was that they made no bones about wanting that. Yesterday (23 March) the SACA Board issued a press release. This confirmed further discussions regarding the West End Premier Cricket 1<sup>st</sup> Grade men's competition, and that SACA had communicated with the West

Torrens District Cricket Club and the Port Adelaide Cricket Club that its preferred position is for the two clubs to merge.

It also alerted people to the fact that the Woodville District Cricket Club will remain as its own entity in the West End Premier Cricket 1<sup>st</sup> Grade competition for next season. It goes on to talk about additional funding and a few other things that I will not necessarily raise here, but the real sting in the tail is the last paragraph of this press release. It says:

The SACA Board also confirmed that should either club be unwilling to commit to merger discussions, it will immediately make a termination to return to a 12-team competition, reducing it from the current 13-team structure.

I assume this might also be the case, although it is silent on that if they cannot reach an agreement for a merger, but I question the merger being proposed between Port Adelaide and West Torrens because it is not a very good fit.

I also alert the house to the fact that the West Torrens cricket club has a fantastic history. It began in 1857 as the Hindmarsh cricket club, playing at Lindsay Circus in Hindmarsh, now the Hindmarsh Stadium. It is the oldest continuously operating cricket club in South Australia and it is the only original SACA club remaining. The SACA competition commenced in 1873. The name was changed in 1897 when SACA decided that residential boundaries would be introduced and these took the form of the seven House of Assembly electorates. The club was required to take the name West Torrens and has held it ever since.

Interestingly, also, with respect to famous players, the first South Australian to represent Australia on the 1880 tour of England was Arthur 'Affie' Harwood Jarvis (a West Torrens player), a wicketkeeper who played 11 tests, but we know many other famous and outstanding cricketers have represented West Torrens over many years at both the state and national or international level.

It has also been a leader in advancing women's cricket in this area. We currently have three women playing who have played test cricket for Australia who are also representing the West Torrens cricket club. West Torrens, along with Glenelg, has produced through its junior ranks more test players since World War II than any other club.

The SACA decision, I say, is unreasonable. It is illogical and it has lacked transparency. SACA, indeed, has refused to release to the clubs the Schedlich report that it relies on with respect to why it is the western suburbs that should bear the brunt of this form of reform. There are indeed three other clubs, at least, with poorer off-field and on-field performances than the three clubs that are being targeted. One is University. I have no bones with University. It is a parasite club in the true biological meaning of the term, as it does not take part in junior development and exists by feeding off the clubs' junior development programs.

Interestingly, the mission statement of 12 of the 13 clubs overseen by the SACA—bearing in mind that University does not have a junior program—is to provide the best environment for junior players to join a club at an early age, to participate, enjoy, learn and advance to higher grades so that those of sufficient talent can progress through to fulfil the need for some of them to become state cricketers—a need that has been obvious for some time.

In its history over the last 15 years, West Torrens had the highest level of premierships at the junior level, from 2000-01 through to 2014-15, having won 19 during that period of time, with the next closest being Kensington, another outstanding club, having 12, down to clubs such as Woodville that have won one junior premiership during that particular time. It is clearly a leader in junior development both with boys and girls.

West Torrens is a leader, as I said earlier, in the progress of women's cricket. It has won 40 premierships over all grades in the last 15 years. It is also a leading developer of country juniors which includes scholarships for country boys and girls to travel to the city, has top-class facilities, has produced, as I said earlier, homegrown test players and six first-class players through its junior development program over these last 15 years. It has also won four of the last 12 championships in the four men's senior grades combined.

With respect to this particular proposal, it seems to me also that they are focusing on viability, when I mentioned earlier that there are at least three other clubs who are in a far worse position than those three that are being asked to merge. If it is the SACA's position that clubs ought to go, I know

there are those that are going to wither on the vine unless they are provided with some particular support, so why do we not let the marketplace determine, on financial viability, which clubs will survive?

It is also the case that other clubs are going to benefit from a merger between Port Adelaide and West Torrens, if it occurs. For example, there are five clubs who do not have women's cricket, including Woodville and Glenelg, so they would already be looking at poaching those West Torrens players should West Torrens merge with Port Adelaide, because Port Adelaide already has two women's teams. There are going to be those who will benefit.

University, which does not have a junior program, is developing with \$1.2 million or more the sports fields down on Airport land at West Beach. The intention is in mixed messages coming from University about its role in junior cricket in the future. It will obviously be poaching or fill a void. Also, if there are too many clubs in the western suburbs, why would University be relocating down there to fill what would appear to be a void? It does not make sense.

I would also note that there have been four resignations from the board in most recent times which means that there are four vacancies on a 12-person board that have not been replaced during that period of time, and other clubs that are making decisions in this regard are clubs that are due to benefit from this particular proposal.

I want to suggest—and I have spoken to a couple of my colleagues already—that such is the illogical nature of this, the fact that the reports that are being used and spoken about for making this decision have not been available, that I am certainly going to speak to my colleagues about the establishment of a select committee to inquire into the actions of the SACA in this regard during this particular process.

We will see where that goes, and I will be speaking to my colleagues when we return to see whether or not they would support such a move. I would reinforce the point that the SACA's decision has been unreasonable. We have been big supporters of SACA. We gave it \$85 million, and I was sitting around cabinet at that time, to address its lease arrangements at Adelaide Oval, but also to retire its not insubstantial debt at that stage.

I know there are moves afoot to develop Park 27 in the Parklands at a fee of around \$8 million. I certainly will not be supporting the government providing any money for that, if it is ever asked for by the SACA to develop that, on the basis of the way it has handled this particular exercise which is not discharging its responsibility for the betterment of cricket in this state. It is safe to say that the people in my area are very cranky. The most logical fit, if there was to be a merger, would be for the Eagles to merge with Woodville, similar to what occurred in the football.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** A Woodville West Torrens powerhouse.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, it occurred with the football. It has been extremely successful and, in fact, the history of those clubs has not been lost, it has been enhanced. We are forging a new history with the footy club, but what I am told is that originally the SACA said, 'We would back a merger of Woodville and West Torrens to the hilt.' This is what I am told.

The club said, 'It might cost \$750,000 to extend the facilities to accommodate the merger. It doesn't matter. We will back it to the hilt.' This is what I am told. Then when they come around they say, 'We're only going to give you \$500,000.' Woodville, I am told, believed that that was not enough to be able to facilitate what it is they required with respect to those discussions.

I would like SACA to show far more leadership than it has in this regard as opposed to just allowing this to meander along without any true leadership. I want it to adopt an approach towards transparency which it has not to date. I want it to act in a far more professional manner than it has, and to this end I cannot see that happening and to that extent I will reinforce a point that I think an inquiry needs to be undertaken into this proposal that is being advanced by SACA which is not in the best interests of cricket in this state.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Let common sense prevail. Before I put the question, on behalf of the Speaker, I extend to the people of South Australia and all here, every good wish for a happy and safe Easter.

At 16:13 the house adjourned until Tuesday 12 April 2016 at 11:00.



*Estimates Replies***MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

The Department for Treasury and Finance set the 2015-16 budget for the Office of the Minister for Education and Child Development at \$1.706 million with an allocation of 11 FTE employees. There has been no change to the number of FTE employees between the 2014-15 budget and the 2015-16 budget.

The Department for Education and Child Development funds a further 8.4 FTE for ministerial liaison officers and administrative support staff. A further 2.0 FTEs are funded by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Ministerial Liaison Officer (1.0 FTE) and Media Adviser (1.0 FTE). 1.0 FTE (Driver) from Parliament House.

**WORKCOVER**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

I have been advised that no report exists. During the period of their engagement GK Forge worked with Families SA to develop a strategically focused project methodology by working and engaging with:

- the Families SA Executive team
- selected Families SA program or project team/s
- business manager and accountant position responsible for management reporting, budget preparations and Treasury reporting
- the executive level change manager.

During the period of engagement GK Forge conducted various workshops and meetings and coaching sessions to transfer project methodology and knowledge.

**GRANT EXPENDITURE**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (24 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):**

The below table lists grants and subsidy expenses for the Department for Education and Child Development for the 2014-15 financial year.

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
BURTON ROAD CC & ELC	\$10,000.00
CARERS ASSOCIATION OF SA	\$10,000.00
COMMUNITY KIDS MT GAMBIER ELC	\$10,000.00
DENNIS O'BRIEN	\$10,000.00
DEPT OF STATE DEVELOPMENT	\$10,000.00
KAURNA WARRA KARRPANTHI	\$10,000.00
KIM THOMAS	\$10,000.00
LITTLE HEARTS CHILD CARE CTR	\$10,000.00
ROYAL AGRICULTURAL & HORTICUL	\$10,000.00
SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM	\$10,000.00
STEPPING STONE-MORPHETT VALE	\$10,000.00
DAVIES L	\$10,037.13
XINGGUANG CHINESE SCHOOL INC	\$10,093.00
CHRISTIES BEACH PS OSHC	\$10,115.28

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
GAWLER EAST PS CNCIL/OSHC	\$10,521.14
GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE AUS	\$10,557.00
BUBBLE N SQUEAK GOLDEN GROVE	\$10,560.00
FLINDERS UNIVERSITY	\$10,576.93
ASC TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT	\$10,620.00
COMMUNITY KIDS GREENACRES ELC	\$10,862.50
HOGAN SUE	\$11,037.60
ST DIMITRIOS GREEK ORTHODOX	\$11,220.00
TAFE SA	\$11,577.50
CHRISTIAN BROTHERS COLLEGE CCC	\$11,618.75
CEYLON TAMIL ASSOC OF SA INC	\$11,760.00
CHINESE ASSOC OF SA INC -	\$11,956.00
PRECIOUS CARGO EDU LOCKLEYS	\$12,302.50
PRECIOUS CARGO MONTESSORI	\$12,375.00
LADY GOWRIE CC—UNDERDALE	\$12,430.00
TURKISTAN ETHNIC SCHOOL	\$12,530.00
EGYPTIAN COPTIC SCHOOL	\$12,531.00
AUSTN UNITARIAN DRUZE COMMINC	\$12,542.00
WEST LAKES SHORE PS OSHC	\$12,581.66
CHINESE WELFARE SVCES SA INC	\$12,920.00
THE ARABIC LANGUAGE SCHOOL	\$12,940.00
HALLETT COVE EAST PS OSHC	\$13,424.60
NEW ERA PERS LANG & CUL SCHL	\$13,460.00
BRAEVIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL OSHC	\$13,549.48
PRECIOUS CARGO WESTBOURNE PARK	\$13,722.50
DAVEY,BD	\$13,750.00
FEJO,NM	\$13,750.00
UNITINGCARE WESLEY PT ADEL INC	\$13,750.00
GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH	\$14,221.00
BRIGHTON CTR FOR HEARING IMP	\$14,270.00
OASIS COMMUNITY CHILDRENS CNTR	\$14,643.75
AUSTN POETRY LTD	\$15,000.00
FOUNDATION 21 INC	\$15,000.00
LAP ASSOCIATION INC	\$15,000.00
MIWI-INYERI PELEPI-AMBI	\$15,000.00
SA SCIENCE TEACHERS ASSOC INC	\$15,000.00
SPENCER,NI	\$15,000.00
STAR OF THE SEA SCHOOL	\$15,000.00
GREEK ORTH COMM & PARISH OF	\$15,116.00
CHINESE SCHOOL OF SA INC	\$15,160.00
WARRADALE COMM CC—WARRADALE	\$15,468.75
ST MARY'S VIETNAMESE SCHOOL	\$15,850.00

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
JUDY'S CHILDCARE & ELC	\$15,853.75
MAITLAND LUTHERAN SCHOOL	\$15,866.00
OUR LADY OF THE VISITATION SCH	\$15,866.00
OWEN,L	\$16,000.00
MURRAYLANDS CC ELC-STRATHALBYN	\$16,087.50
ADELAIDE TAMIL ASSOC INC	\$16,402.00
SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH&SCHOOL	\$16,575.00
DINKA BOR ETHNIC SCHL OF SA	\$16,990.00
BHUTANESE ETHNIC SCHOOL	\$17,255.00
ASBESTOS DISEASES SOCIETY SA	\$17,500.00
STEPPING STONE-PARA HILLS	\$17,600.00
BURUNDI INTAMBA GASIMBO ASSOC	\$17,640.00
RUSSIAN MOLOKAN SCHOOL INC	\$17,715.00
CEDARS MONTESSORI PRESCHOOL	\$17,820.00
SPECIAL SCHLS PRINCIPALS ASSN	\$18,658.00
PRECIOUS CARGO EDU-MYRTLE BANK	\$19,185.00
ADEL MONTESSORI ELC NORWOOD	\$19,195.00
ADELAIDE YOUTH ORCHESTRA INC	\$20,000.00
ANDREWS,JL	\$20,000.00
BAUGH,SJ	\$20,000.00
BRIDGE,CG	\$20,000.00
DANIELLA PISANI	\$20,000.00
FINCH,Z	\$20,000.00
LOW,DC	\$20,000.00
RANIERI,TP	\$20,000.00
REYNOLDS,S	\$20,000.00
WANKLYN,CJ	\$20,000.00
THE BANTU ETHNIC COMM OF SA	\$20,273.00
STEPPING STONE-KIDMAN PARK	\$20,432.50
BABTHORPE MONTESSORI PRE-SCHL	\$20,460.00
ST PATRICK'S TECH COLLEGE N/AD	\$20,581.83
WILDERNESS SCHOOL ELC	\$21,120.00
MUSICA VIVA AUSTRALIA	\$21,818.19
GLEESON COLLEGE	\$22,472.39
ADEL JAPANESE COMM SCHOOL	\$22,620.00
ALLIANCE FRANCAISE D ADELAIDE	\$22,706.00
ADEL MONTESSORI ELC THEBARTON	\$23,237.50
COURTNEY THESEIRA	\$23,500.00
BLACKWOOD COMMUNITY CCC	\$23,787.50
AL SALAM ARABIC SCHOOL INC	\$23,840.00
AUSTN CHILDREN'S TV FOUNDATION	\$23,900.00
SA AREA SCHOOL LEADER'S ASSOC	\$24,139.00

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
SUDANESE ETHNIC SCHL OF SA INC	\$24,330.00
THE KOREAN PURE PRESBYTERIAN	\$24,460.00
AUSTN SCHOOLS SPORTS COUNCIL	\$24,582.81
LET'S TALK TOGETHER ASSOC INC	\$24,620.00
ST GEORGE COLLEGE ELC	\$24,750.00
HILLBANK COMM CHILDREN'S CTR	\$24,832.50
SCHOOL SPORT AUSTRALIA	\$24,902.40
SA ICE SPORTS FEDERATION INC	\$25,000.00
SA NETBALL ASSOC INC	\$25,000.00
WALLIS,JA	\$25,000.00
MT BARKER WALDORF SCHL PRESCHL	\$25,437.50
ST PETERS LUTHERAN BLACKWD ELC	\$25,822.50
TENISON WOODS COLLEGE	\$26,054.00
BROMPTON CHILDREN'S CENTRE INC	\$26,537.50
KIDDYWINKS CHILD CARE CENTRE	\$26,826.25
SOUTHERN MONTESSORI SCHOOL ELC	\$26,881.25
ADEL SRI LANKA BUDD VIHARA INC	\$27,650.00
THE HILLS MONTESSORI SCHL CCC	\$27,885.00
GLANDORE KTG & LONG DAY CC	\$27,953.75
AL-FAROOQ ARABIC SCHOOL	\$28,460.00
SCHOOL FOR THE GERMAN LANGUAGE	\$28,480.00
WALFORD EARLY LEARNING CTR	\$28,572.50
GOC NATIVITY OF CHRIST	\$28,770.00
GREEK ORTH COM OF NOR E/SUB	\$28,985.00
VICTOR HARBOR CHILD CARE CTR	\$29,287.50
THE GUMS CHILDCARE CENTRE P/L	\$29,768.75
CEASA INC	\$31,136.37
GREENWITH CHILD CARE CENTRE	\$31,460.00
PEMBROKE SCHOOL ELC	\$31,900.00
WEST COAST YOUTH SERVICES	\$32,500.00
CONNECTED SELF PTY LTD	\$33,250.00
SUNRISE CHRISTIAN SCH M VL ELC	\$33,797.50
MISSION AUST	\$34,000.00
RIVERLAND CREATIVE COMM. INC	\$34,000.00
SEYMOUR COLLEGE PRESCHOOL CTR	\$34,980.00
SA WRITERS CENTRE INC	\$35,000.00
NORTH LAKES CC & FAMILY CTR	\$35,200.00
SEAFORD DISTRICT CCC INC	\$36,643.75
SPECIAL EDUCATION RES UNIT	\$37,026.43
WILLUNGA WALDORF SCHL KG TEN	\$37,592.50
ST PETER'S GIRLS SCHOOL ELC	\$37,714.00
ADELAIDE RUSSIAN ETHNIC SCHL	\$38,271.00

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
ST PETERS COLLEGE ELC	\$38,582.50
COMMUNITY LIFESTYLES INC	\$39,298.60
ANNESLEY EARLY LEARNING CENTRE	\$39,545.00
MINDA INC VACATION CARE	\$39,992.81
TODD,NJ	\$40,000.00
ST JOHN'S LUTHERAN SCHOOL	\$41,085.00
SMALL SCHOOLS ASSOC OF SA	\$41,498.00
MODBURY SPECIAL SCHL OSHC	\$41,585.04
VICTOR HARBOR R-7 SCHOOL	\$42,381.15
THE HILLS CHRIST COMMUNITY	\$43,670.00
WILTJA PROGRAM	\$44,000.00
FEDERATION OF P&F ASSOC OF SA	\$45,200.00
ENCOUNTER LUTHERAN SCHOOL ELC	\$46,612.50
FINDING WORKABLE SOLUTIONS INC	\$47,000.00
RENMARK KINDER RESORT	\$48,950.00
A GESTURE FOOD FOR THE	\$49,400.00
SUNRISE CHRIST SCHL WHYALLA	\$49,837.33
GREEK ORTHODOX COMM OF SA INC	\$49,980.00
PORT ADELAIDE F/BALL CLUB LTD	\$50,000.00
ROXBY DOWNS CHILD CARE CENTRE	\$50,000.00
THE CARLY RYAN FOUNDATION	\$50,000.00
TENISON WOODS EARLY LEARNING	\$51,562.50
PORT LINCOLN ABORIGINAL	\$51,838.25
AFGHAN UNITED ASSOC OF SA INC	\$51,916.00
VIETNAMESE COMM IN AUST	\$54,401.00
PRESCHOOL DIRECTORS ASSOC SA	\$56,696.00
ISLAMIC INFORMATION CTR OF SA	\$56,730.00
MURRAYLANDS CC M/BRIDGE ELC	\$56,787.50
TANUNDA LUTHERAN ELC	\$57,337.50
CHANCERY LANE MONTESSORI PRESC	\$57,612.50
PRESTIGE TROPHY BADGE & ENGRAV	\$58,322.00
ST PETERS WOODLANDS GRAMM ELC	\$58,410.00
RE-ENGAGE YOUTH SERVICES INC	\$60,000.00
ROBERTSTOWN PRE-SCHOOL	\$60,479.75
PRINCE ALFRED COLLEGE ELC	\$61,270.00
IGNATIUS EARLY YEARS	\$61,325.00
PULTENEY GRAMMAR SCHOOL ELC	\$62,287.50
IMMANUEL PRIMARY SCHOOL ELC	\$62,770.00
BURRANDIES ABORIGINAL CORPRN	\$65,000.00
CONNECTING FOSTER CARERS—SA	\$66,179.55
ST ANDREW'S ELC	\$66,770.00
PORT AUGUSTA CITY COUNCIL	\$70,000.00

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
SCOTCH COLLEGE PRESCHOOL	\$70,317.50
SA ASSOC OF SCHL PARENT'S CLUB	\$71,324.10
NAZARETH EARLY CHILDHOOD CNTR	\$81,262.50
OVERSEAS CHINESE ASSOC SA INC	\$81,390.00
WESTMINSTER EARLY LEARNING CTR	\$83,050.00
DOWN SYNDROME SOCY OF SA	\$83,147.50
PORTSIDE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE ELC	\$83,720.00
CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH	\$88,335.05
SASPA-SA SECONDARY	\$95,673.45
JULIA FARR ASSOCIATION	\$96,250.00
NTHRN ADVANCED MANUFACTURING	\$100,000.00
TOGETHER SA	\$100,000.00
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA	\$108,160.00
NORTHGATE CHILDREN'S SERVICES	\$110,770.00
PLAYGROUP SA INC	\$116,217.03
SPELD (SA) INC	\$117,181.00
GUIDE DOGS ASSOC OF SA & NT	\$117,607.00
PENNESHAW PRE-SCHOOL	\$120,603.49
RENDELSHAM PRE-SCHOOL	\$120,647.60
SNOWTOWN PRE-SCHL KGTN	\$120,846.95
ELLISTON RSL MEMORIAL CC	\$121,076.71
HAWKER CHILDHOOD SERVICES CTR	\$121,099.81
LOCK EARLY LEARNING CENTRE	\$121,214.12
GERANIUM KINDERGARTEN	\$122,021.56
LOXTON NORTH KINDERGARTEN	\$122,132.10
ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST	\$122,274.55
MORGAN KINDERGARTEN	\$122,582.47
SADDLEWORTH EARLY LEARNING CTR	\$122,625.86
DECD (INTERNAL FUNDING TRANSFER FROM DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS)	\$124,506.00
PINNAROO KINDERGARTEN	\$126,661.63
KALANGADOO PRE-SCHOOL	\$127,761.05
COONALPYN KINDERGARTEN INC	\$128,209.75
ORROROO KINDERGARTEN	\$129,283.61
COOMANDOOK & DISTRICTS KGTN	\$129,333.08
WOMENS AND CHILDRENS HEALTH	\$130,875.00
LEIGH CREEK KINDERGARTEN	\$130,977.89
ROBE SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL KGTN	\$131,603.54
PORT WAKEFIELD KGTN	\$131,849.42
SWAN REACH & AREA KGTN	\$132,416.50
WILMINGTON KINDERGARTEN	\$133,528.21
RENMARK WEST PRE-SCHOOL	\$134,511.52
HALIFAX ST CHILDREN'S CTR	\$135,358.35

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
GOWRIE TRAINING CENTRE	\$135,741.00
PORT BROUGHTON KINDERGARTEN	\$138,722.33
HAMLEY BRIDGE KINDERGARTEN	\$139,513.57
POONINDIE KINDERGARTEN	\$140,599.61
LADY GOWRIE CCC INC-THEBARTON	\$142,135.00
LAKE WANGARY PRE-SCHOOL	\$143,291.10
QUORN KINDERGARTEN	\$144,752.66
THE SMITH FAMILY	\$145,000.00
LAMEROO & DISTRICT KGTN	\$145,690.92
GLENCOE DISTRICT KGTN	\$145,946.73
THE VIETNAMESE CATHOLIC	\$148,056.00
GOODWOOD CHILD PARENT CTR	\$148,550.00
SA PRIMARY PRINCIPALS ASSOC	\$149,925.00
BRINKWORTH PRE-SCHOOL CTR	\$151,587.05
BRIDGEWATER KGTN INC	\$155,991.31
GLADSTONE KINDERGARTEN	\$156,088.76
KIRINARI KINDERGARTEN	\$156,530.56
ETHNIC SCHOOLS ASSOC OF SA INC	\$156,570.00
OAKBANK KINDERGARTEN	\$157,154.55
CLARENDON KINDERGARTEN	\$157,443.07
CARCLEW YOUTH ARTS CENTRE INC	\$160,811.99
KIMBA COMMUNITY KGTN	\$161,299.80
ASHTON KINDERGARTEN	\$164,029.90
MOUNT PLEASANT & DIST KGTN	\$165,015.68
ELIZABETH DOWNS CPC	\$166,200.00
EUDUNDA COMMUNITY PRE-SCHL	\$167,112.41
ARDROSSAN & DIST COMM KGTN INC	\$168,236.98
TELETHON INST FOR CHILD HLTH	\$168,750.00
WATTLE PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$170,258.76
MENINGIE PRE-SCHOOL	\$172,012.58
TOWNSEND HOUSE INC	\$173,258.00
COROMANDEL VALLEY KGTN	\$174,214.32
MONASH KINDERGARTEN	\$174,394.29
REYNELLA KINDERGARTEN	\$178,064.89
MOUNT COMPASS PRE-SCHL CTR	\$178,502.95
MOUNT TORRENS PS	\$182,160.65
TIME FOR KIDS INC	\$182,660.00
WUDINNA RSL MEMORIAL KGTN	\$186,055.88
RICE REMOTE & ISOLATED	\$190,400.00
LIBERMAN KINDERGARTEN INC	\$190,733.73
MARTHUR PARK KGTN	\$194,874.49
BANKSIA PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$194,938.85

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
ANZAC REMEMBRANCE APPEAL	\$195,000.00
GREY WARD CHILDRENS CENTRE	\$196,206.62
MEADOWS & DISTRICTS KGTN	\$198,363.51
O'HALLORAN HILL KGTN	\$198,820.91
CALLINGTON KINDERGARTEN	\$200,144.54
FLAGSTAFF HILL KGTN	\$202,766.81
MODBURY KINDERGARTEN	\$203,312.36
ACER LTD	\$204,029.16
LYNDOCH VALLEY FAMILY CENTRE	\$204,043.11
CAMBRAI CHILD/PARENT CENTRE	\$207,050.00
KICE-PARNDANA CAMPUS PRESCHOOL	\$207,050.00
KATHLEEN MELLOR PRE-SCHL KGTN	\$207,218.95
ASCOT PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$207,589.86
DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS (INTERNAL FUNDING TRANSFER FROM DECD)	\$209,000.00
WOODSIDE PRE-SCHL PLAYCENTRE	\$210,288.36
HAMPSTEAD PRESCHOOL	\$210,304.13
SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST	\$211,000.00
HOLDEN HILL KINDERGARTEN	\$212,456.51
STREAKY BAY CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$214,095.79
PADTHAWAY CHILD/PARENT CENTRE	\$217,050.00
AUTISM INTERVENTION-BLACKWOOD	\$217,767.19
HOUGHTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$218,336.43
YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES ASSOC SA	\$220,000.00
WILLSDEN CHILDHOOD SVCS CTR	\$221,149.69
MINLATON & DISTRICT KGTN	\$229,961.21
CRYSTAL BROOK KINDERGARTEN	\$236,590.16
SURREY DOWNS KINDERGARTEN	\$237,409.61
COORARA PRE-SCHOOL CENTRE	\$238,055.78
THE SCIENCE EXCHANGE	\$239,000.00
BRAHMA LODGE KGTN INC	\$239,376.92
RENOWN PARK PRESCHOOL	\$242,448.12
SAHMRI	\$250,000.00
RIVERTON KINDERGARTEN	\$254,831.34
NETLEY KINDERGARTEN	\$255,208.60
LAURA PRE-SCHOOL CENTRE	\$255,693.91
UNITINGCARE WESLEY ADELAIDE	\$260,000.00
STIRLING NORTH C/HD SVCS CTR	\$264,707.70
BALHARRY MEMORIAL KGTN	\$265,949.83
PORT PIRIE COMMUNITY KGTN	\$266,597.94
BUTE & DISTRICT KINDERGARTEN	\$270,552.19
TAUONDI INC	\$272,727.27
MARGARET IVES COMM CC INC	\$273,050.84



DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
ANNESLEY COLLEGE	\$277,530.90
KEITH WAR MEM COMM CTR KGTN	\$277,823.22
JAMESTOWN PRE-SCHL KGTN	\$281,593.81
BARKER KINDERGARTEN	\$283,276.85
COWELL EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTRE	\$283,821.01
MINYA BUNHII CHILD CARE & KGTN	\$285,951.52
FAIRVIEW PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$290,839.32
GOODSTART EARLY LEARNING	\$290,880.16
UNLEY KINDERGARTEN	\$290,998.26
BURRA PRE-SCHOOL KGTN	\$291,208.86
MARGARET LOHMEYER KGTN	\$292,303.08
BRENTWOOD DRIVE KGTN	\$293,133.52
ANGASTON KINDERGARTEN	\$293,427.38
MCKAY CHILDRENS CENTRE	\$293,565.97
CLARENCE GARDENS KGTN	\$294,442.95
BLACKWOOD KINDERGARTEN	\$296,632.14
MITCHAM VILLAGE KGTN	\$296,889.83
MADISON PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$297,862.77
TORRENSVILLE PRE-SCHL CTR	\$299,434.00
KINGSTON PRE-SCHOOL&KGTN	\$300,553.29
NORRIE STUART CHILD SVCS CTR	\$302,251.97
SEAVIEW DOWNS KINDERGARTEN	\$302,864.44
STIRLING EAST KINDERGARTEN	\$303,768.85
WALLAROO PRE-SCHL CTR INC	\$304,556.02
YALATA CHILD PARENT CTR	\$304,800.00
CLARENCE PARK COMMUNITY KGTN	\$307,358.12
MORPHETT VALE EAST KGTN	\$307,540.01
TAILEM BEND KINDERGARTEN	\$308,513.52
NORTH HAVEN KINDERGARTEN	\$308,763.38
GROVE KINDERGARTEN	\$309,749.16
ST MARGARET'S KGTN—WOODVILLE	\$309,953.36
ST JAMES' PARK KGTN	\$310,232.36
COUNTRY HEALTH SA LHN—METRO	\$310,556.82
MANOR FARM KINDERGARTEN	\$312,029.61
TORRENS VALLEY CHILDREN'S CTR	\$313,817.55
YORKETOWN COMMUNITY CC	\$318,991.82
EDEN HILLS KINDERGARTEN	\$319,092.21
HACKHAM WEST CHILDRENS CTR	\$320,824.95
TANUNDA KINDERGARTEN ASSOC	\$321,161.41
CREATE FOUNDATION SOUTH AUST	\$322,352.00
YANKALILLA COMMUNITY CHILD CTR	\$322,529.50
KANGAROO ISLAND CHILD SVCS CTR	\$323,193.90

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
JEAN BONYTHON KINDERGARTEN	\$323,309.71
HAWTHORNDENE KGTN INC	\$323,591.60
DEPT FOR COMMUNITIES & SOCIAL	\$323,816.00
ALDGATE KINDERGARTEN INC	\$323,932.12
POORAKA COMMUNITY KGTN	\$326,190.45
KAPUNDA KINDERGARTEN	\$326,665.84
PARA HILLS WEST PRE-SCHL	\$327,291.52
DERNANCOURT KINDEGARTEN	\$329,436.76
PT AUGUSTA WEST CHILD SVC CTR	\$329,800.38
FULHAM PARK PRE-SCHL KGTN	\$330,517.73
ROSE PARK PRE-SCHOOL	\$330,674.57
THE LADY GEORGE KGTN	\$330,928.12
SEACLIFF COMMUNITY KGTN	\$332,017.09
PARADISE KINDERGARTEN	\$332,193.73
CHANDLERS HILL KINDERGARTEN	\$332,553.44
MITCHELL PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$332,871.65
OAKLANDS ESTATE KGTN	\$332,875.00
CUMBERLAND PRE-SCHL KGTN INC	\$332,980.45
NETHERBY KINDERGARTEN	\$333,147.47
BISHOP KINDERGARTEN	\$333,458.49
MORPHETT VALE PRE-SCHL KGTN	\$334,044.14
BLAKEVIEW PRE-SCHOOL	\$334,792.57
WOODVILLE WEST KINDERGARTEN	\$335,288.48
CRANSTON STREET KINDERGARTEN	\$335,688.88
PETERBOROUGH COMM PRESCHL/KGTN	\$336,879.97
PASADENA KINDERGARTEN	\$337,387.01
YUNTA RURAL SCHOOL	\$337,473.76
CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	\$341,773.55
WYNN VALE COMM HOUSE KGTN	\$341,824.26
ROSTREVOR KINDERGARTEN	\$342,842.37
WIN NEWBY KINDERGARTEN	\$343,800.81
HALLETT COVE KARRARA KGTN	\$348,513.71
LOBETHAL COMMUNITY KGTN INC	\$348,659.26
SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD KGTN	\$349,319.65
MAGILL KINDERGARTEN	\$349,821.47
MOONTA KINDERGARTEN INC	\$350,423.65
SMITHFIELD PLAINS KGTN	\$352,826.57
ELIZABETH GROVE CHILDRENS CTR	\$353,520.29
MICHELLE DE GARIS MEMORIAL KGN	\$354,816.39
SCSEEC	\$356,265.38
MOUNT BARKER KGTN	\$357,580.76
ELIZABETH EAST KINDERGARTEN	\$357,901.74

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
CHRISTIES NORTH KINDERGARTEN	\$359,068.67
DOVER KINDERGARTEN	\$359,232.47
NARACOORTE NORTH KGTN	\$359,971.53
GLADIGAU PARK KGTN	\$360,086.40
MURRAY BRIDGE PRE-SCHL KGTN	\$360,299.15
KURRALTA PARK COMMUNITY KGTN	\$360,806.61
SOMERTON PARK KGTN	\$361,808.21
FRIEDA CORPE COMMUNITY KGTN	\$362,327.43
LUTHERAN SCHOOLS ASSOC	\$363,581.44
BADEN PATTINSON KGTN	\$363,801.90
NEWLAND PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$363,972.58
PENNINGTON KINDERGARTEN	\$364,039.50
PORT KENNY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$364,051.41
WEST BEACH KINDERGARTEN	\$365,089.65
NETA KRANZ CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$365,448.45
HAPPY VALLEY KINDERGARTEN	\$368,041.11
THORNDON PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$368,283.76
KENSINGTON GARDENS PRE-SCHL	\$368,394.62
MCKELLAR STEWART KGTN	\$368,619.06
AGNES GOODE KGTN INC	\$368,974.36
ATHELSTONE PRESCHOOL	\$369,045.19
ENFIELD FOLLAND PARK KGTN	\$369,090.06
JEAN HORAN KINDERGARTEN	\$369,316.21
RIVERVIEW PRE-SCHL CTR	\$369,748.13
DUNBAR TERRACE KGTN	\$370,585.35
MANNUM KINDERGARTEN	\$370,646.19
MELALEUCA PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$371,237.39
WARRADALE KINDERGARTEN	\$373,252.57
SALISBURY KINDERGARTEN	\$373,302.38
MAITLAND KINDERGARTEN	\$374,156.80
STIRLING DISTRICT KGTN	\$375,158.66
TROTT PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$375,313.89
BALLARA PARK KINDERGARTEN	\$375,836.91
MARY BYWATERS MEMORIAL KGTN	\$376,695.26
GARDEN COLLEGE INC	\$377,286.80
MOANA KINDERGARTEN	\$377,291.95
MODBURY NORTH KGTN	\$379,051.40
INCLUSIVE DIRECTIONS INC	\$380,050.50
GLANDORE COMMUNITY KGTN	\$380,547.56
MCRITCHIE CRES CHILD SVCS CTR	\$380,585.10
DOROTHY HUGHES KGTN	\$380,634.87
ANDREWS FARM COMM PRE-SCHL	\$380,765.17

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
RISDON PARK SOUTH KGTN	\$382,120.93
PLYMPTON SOUTH KGTN	\$382,604.69
LE FEVRE KINDERGARTEN INC	\$382,811.56
ST PHILLIP'S PRE-SCHL KGTN	\$382,958.38
VICTOR HARBOR COMMUNITY KGTN	\$384,429.16
MUNNO PARA KINDERGARTEN	\$385,559.34
ADELAIDE MIETHKE PRESCHOOL	\$385,693.01
TUMBY BAY KINDERGARTEN	\$393,036.68
WEST LAKES KGTN & EARLY CC	\$393,634.42
HALLETT COVE PRE-SCHOOL	\$394,154.82
CAROL MURRAY CHILDREN'S CTR	\$394,429.76
PORT ELLIOT KINDERGARTEN	\$394,577.73
WILLUNGA PRESCHOOL	\$396,158.77
GAWLER EAST PRE-SCHL CTR	\$397,216.85
MILLICENT NORTH KGTN	\$399,479.89
WAIKERIE PRE-SCHOOL KGTN	\$401,662.52
LUCY MORICE KINDERGARTEN	\$402,491.47
FLAGSTAFF OVAL KGTN	\$406,226.83
BERRI COMMUNITY PRE-SCHL	\$407,062.22
TWO WELLS COMM CHILDREN'S CTR	\$407,368.96
BARMERA KINDERGARTEN INC	\$411,633.85
CLEVE DISTRICT CHILDRENS CTR	\$412,264.74
HENLEY COMMUNITY KGTN	\$412,670.14
BERTRAM HAWKER KGTN	\$414,383.10
CURRAMULKA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$417,656.46
ST HELEN'S PARK KGTN	\$418,553.56
ANGLE VALE PRE-SCHL	\$419,464.42
VALE PARK PRE-SCHL	\$420,284.16
PORT NEILL PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$421,687.20
WEST LAKES SHORE KGTN	\$422,238.99
KADINA PRE-SCHOOL CENTRE INC	\$424,034.30
LOXTON PRE-SCHOOL CTR INC	\$425,273.59
UNIVERSITY OF SA FINANCE UNIT	\$425,932.00
BOOLEROO CENTRE & DIST KGTN	\$428,254.62
ELIZABETH O'GRADY KGTN	\$428,719.51
HIGHBURY PRESCHOOL	\$429,591.50
WOODEND CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$431,770.70
SOLOMONTOWN KINDERGARTEN	\$434,190.45
EDITHBURGH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$435,221.25
TARLEE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$436,072.60
TANTANOOLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$437,071.14
SALISBURY HEIGHTS PRE-SCHL	\$437,489.57

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
AUGUSTA PARK C/HOOD SVCS CTR	\$437,494.67
CAMPBELLTOWN PRESCHOOL	\$437,826.04
PROSPECT KINDERGARTEN	\$441,268.10
SEAFORD K-7 CAMPUS KINDY	\$443,859.70
GOOLWA CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$444,005.12
CHRISTIE DOWNS KINDERGARTEN	\$445,124.16
BALAKLAVA COMMUNITY CHILDN CTR	\$446,825.37
ABERFOYLE PARK CAMPUS PRE-SCHL	\$447,466.23
MITCHAM PRE-SCHL CTR	\$448,243.05
KLEMZIG KINDERGARTEN	\$452,633.10
BARBARA KIKER MEMORIAL KGTN	\$453,251.21
CAFE ENFIELD CHILDRENS CTR	\$455,034.16
MADGE SEXTON KGTN	\$456,454.42
WIRRABARA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$456,464.80
KIRINARI COMMUNITY SCHOOL INC	\$456,585.05
JB CLELAND KINDERGARTEN INC	\$457,334.75
MAWSON LAKES PRESCHOOL	\$460,294.07
CAMPBELLTOWN PRE-SCHL CTR	\$460,423.44
AKUNA KINDERGARTEN	\$460,854.21
VALLEY VIEW KINDERGARTEN	\$461,925.95
GOLDEN GROVE KINDERGARTEN	\$462,155.67
HACKHAM EAST KINDERGARTEN	\$462,744.01
KOOLUNGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$463,632.11
ABERFOYLE HUB PRESCH-TAYLORS R	\$464,113.36
CRAIGMORE CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$466,147.04
PORT LINCOLN CHILDRENS CTR	\$469,157.91
BLANCHETOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$472,181.93
LARGS NORTH KINDERGARTEN	\$474,693.86
SEAFORD RISE CHILDRENS CTR	\$476,234.81
OCEAN VIEW COLLEGE CHILDN CTR	\$483,156.96
ROXBY DOWNS KINDERGARTEN	\$485,308.63
KINGSTON-ON-MURRAY PS	\$485,725.85
O'SULLIVAN BEACH KGTN	\$486,066.63
PARKS CHILDREN CENTRE	\$493,770.57
THE JOHN F CLARK MEMORIAL KGTN	\$497,000.77
BOOBOROWIE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$498,916.75
FORBES CHILDRENS CENTRE	\$499,498.46
PARALOWIE KINDERGARTEN	\$500,820.95
RENMARK CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$501,510.42
CLARE VALLEY CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$502,634.23
WASLEYS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$506,486.54
PORT VINCENT PS	\$507,685.04

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
SALISBURY PARK KG TN	\$511,609.03
NURIOOTPA COMMUNITY CHILD CTR	\$515,375.85
ADAMS ROAD CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$516,994.17
MELROSE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$517,504.53
DARLINGTON KG TN/PRESCHOOL	\$522,178.89
MANOORA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$522,489.62
ELLENDALE KINDERGARTEN	\$525,205.03
SALISBURY DOWNS PRE-SCHL CTR	\$528,964.35
LOCKLEYS CHILDRENS CENTRE	\$531,393.26
RELATIONSHIPS AUST (SA) INC	\$534,221.36
SPALDING PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$540,575.66
RENDEL SHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$542,040.84
ACACIA KINDERGARTEN	\$542,584.59
RAPID BAY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$545,892.63
ST SPYRIDON COLLEGE	\$546,066.75
UPPER STURT PS	\$550,855.94
UNGARRA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$552,097.45
GERANIUM PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$553,402.10
PALMER PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$557,176.19
ROBERTSTOWN PS	\$558,796.59
BRINKWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$564,177.79
STANSBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$566,024.71
KEYNETON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$566,723.99
KAURNA PLAINS CC/PRE-SCHOOL	\$573,731.95
KEITHCOT FARM CHILDREN'S CTR	\$574,963.17
GEORGETOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$577,964.11
GREENWITH KINDERGARTEN	\$578,936.22
WILLOW CLOSE PRE SCHOOL CENTRE	\$582,385.33
FARRELL FLAT PS	\$587,268.64
FLINDERS CHILDREN'S CENTRE	\$587,506.40
KALANGADOO PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$589,819.82
MOOROOK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$592,694.38
ALDINGA BEACH CC	\$594,542.84
STRATHALBYN KINDERGARTEN	\$603,707.86
BASKET RANGE PS	\$607,547.27
RAISING LITERACY AUSTRALIA	\$612,000.00
SPRINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$613,962.46
PENONG PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$615,420.39
CADELL PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$615,664.19
COONALPYN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$618,188.72
FRANCES PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$621,570.32
WINKIE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$625,994.11

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
LANTANA KINDERGARTEN	\$626,895.65
TRURO PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$635,104.61
MYLOR PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$635,230.93
TAIKURRENDI CHILDN & FAMILY CNT	\$635,724.93
NGURA YADURIRN CHILD & FAMILY	\$639,665.24
KANGARILLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$639,811.83
BURTON PARK PRE-SCHOOL	\$643,830.19
MORGAN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$645,100.91
WHYALLA STUART ECC KGTN	\$654,619.40
BLAKES CROSSING CHRISTIAN	\$663,125.40
HACKNEY KINDERGARTEN	\$663,300.46
KALAYA CHILDRENS CENTRE	\$670,751.71
MINTABIE AREA SCHOOL	\$690,708.99
RIVERGUM COLLEGE	\$690,775.46
POINT PEARCE ABORIGINAL SCHOOL	\$692,839.84
SCOTT CREEK PS	\$696,341.34
WOODCROFT HEIGHTS CHILDRENS CT	\$700,710.03
HEATHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$705,460.79
AUBURN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$708,739.24
BLYTH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$709,638.70
CORA BARCLAY CENTRE	\$711,931.50
PARAFIELD GDNS CHILDRENS CTR	\$713,324.30
NAPPERBY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$717,420.56
ALDINGA COMMUNITY KGTN	\$721,518.66
NORTON SUMMIT PS	\$721,997.84
BUTE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$723,965.37
KIRTON POINT CHILDRENS CENTRE	\$732,799.57
RAUKKAN ABORIGINAL SCHOOL	\$742,914.71
MOUNT PLEASANT PS	\$743,856.30
LIGHT PASS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$745,214.56
INGLE FARM COMMUNITY KGTN	\$749,848.88
SETTLERS FARM CAMPUS-PRE-SCHL	\$758,018.11
KERSBROOK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$760,915.67
KONGORONG PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$767,585.00
WATERVALE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$768,866.80
BEACHPORT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$776,646.23
HINCKS AVENUE CHILDREN'S CTR	\$784,084.11
LOXTON NORTH PS	\$784,557.81
WOOMERA AREA SCHOOL	\$786,274.85
CALLINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$786,283.76
MUNDULLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$793,753.69
PARACOMBE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$799,508.22

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
GLENCOE CENTRAL PS	\$809,679.80
GLADSTONE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$818,708.54
LAURA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$833,807.36
HAMLEY BRIDGE PS	\$840,365.48
BARKUMA INC	\$846,275.00
CLARENDON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$849,818.21
MACCLESFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$852,211.12
FELIXSTOW COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$862,220.36
GUMERACHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$864,991.87
BAINS ROAD PRESCHOOL	\$866,438.20
GLENBURNIE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$873,636.04
PORT WAKEFIELD PS	\$876,527.61
PADTHAWAY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$879,139.99
SANDY CREEK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$880,587.00
OWEN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$888,333.25
ECHUNGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$901,073.77
KENMORE PARK ANANGU SCHOOL	\$905,460.55
MARREE ABORIGINAL SCHOOL	\$909,856.80
ACARA	\$913,830.00
ROBE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$914,418.21
URAILLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$917,417.13
LENSWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$920,228.28
YAHL PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$923,292.26
SADDLEWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$925,193.73
RAMCO PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$927,525.06
MIL LEL PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$939,844.42
NANGWARRY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$942,006.92
TYNDALE CHRIS SCHL-STRATHALBYN	\$947,560.00
WILMINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$947,827.52
ASSOC OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS	\$948,889.12
POONINDIE COMM LEARNING CTR	\$960,706.87
DFEEST SHARED SERVICES	\$969,000.00
LAKE WANGARY PS	\$972,867.60
MURRAY BRIDGE SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$977,475.76
COMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$991,580.66
JERVOIS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$993,183.97
GLOSSOP PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$993,223.62
ELSIE EY KINDERGARTEN	\$993,386.06
THE HILLS MONTESSORI SCHOOL	\$1,002,732.46
KOONIBBA ABORIGINAL SCHOOL	\$1,009,329.32
MOUNT BURR PS	\$1,012,837.02
ANDAMOOKA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,016,999.60



DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
SUTTONTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,024,802.60
OAK VALLEY ANANGU SCHOOL	\$1,026,940.49
MURRAY BRIDGE SOUTH KG TN	\$1,030,666.17
MOORAK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,049,729.39
GREENOCK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,054,898.11
COBDOGLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,070,423.82
SNOWTOWN AREA SCHOOL	\$1,096,958.91
WAROOKA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,111,552.44
THE AUSTN CENTRE FOR SOCIAL	\$1,114,800.00
PENNINGTON JUNIOR PS	\$1,136,825.83
MURPUTJA ANANGU SCHOOL	\$1,158,565.50
OLD NOARLUNGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,200,263.06
EAST MURRAY AREA SCHOOL	\$1,237,765.52
MEADOWS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,239,065.27
MERIDIAN SCHOOL INC	\$1,253,858.00
FULHAM GARDENS PS	\$1,259,256.21
ARBURY PARK OUTDOOR SCHOOL	\$1,267,142.99
ELLISTON AREA SCHOOL	\$1,275,809.57
MYPOLONGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,291,611.80
MARION PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,301,912.06
HAWKER AREA SCHOOL	\$1,311,886.22
WALLAROO MINES PS	\$1,321,486.16
PINNAROO PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,323,283.97
RIVERTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,338,054.70
LYNDOCH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,350,517.31
MILTABURRA AREA SCHOOL	\$1,352,129.95
MUIRDEN SENIOR SECONDARY	\$1,355,177.90
LOCK AREA SCHOOL	\$1,365,639.63
TEA TREE GULLY PS	\$1,380,204.16
PORT LINCOLN SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$1,394,951.71
THE BRIARS SPECIAL ELC	\$1,396,210.80
MYPONGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,396,454.91
PILGRIM SCHOOL	\$1,407,207.60
LOBETHAL PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,410,745.00
EYNESBURY COLLEGE YRS 11 & 12	\$1,421,375.37
LOCKLEYS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,426,693.42
EVANSTON GARDENS PS	\$1,431,294.22
THE MID NORTH EDUCATION CENTRE	\$1,452,928.91
ODNADATTA ABORIGINAL SCHOOL	\$1,464,551.71
LONSDALE HEIGHTS PS	\$1,473,849.70
LINCOLN GARDENS PS	\$1,524,882.28
LUTHERAN COMMUNITY CARE	\$1,528,780.00

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
PETERBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,548,562.16
ST PAULS COLLEGE	\$1,556,830.00
WHYALLA STUART CAMPUS R-7	\$1,576,873.47
NORTH INGLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,594,185.75
ASCOT PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,600,142.40
AUTISM ASSOC OF SA INC	\$1,601,465.50
WARRIAPPENDI SCHOOL	\$1,605,564.12
WHYALLA SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$1,615,096.77
CAMBRAI AREA SCHOOL	\$1,620,123.71
NEWBERY PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,630,119.54
MALLALA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,645,268.15
HACKHAM WEST R-7 SCHOOL	\$1,646,155.65
GILLES PLAINS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,656,456.07
PORT AUGUSTA SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$1,657,854.21
FRASER PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,663,095.31
SEATON PARK PS	\$1,663,735.71
BRIDGEWATER PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,664,441.93
MIMILI ANANGU SCHOOL	\$1,731,329.66
KARCULTABY AREA SCHOOL	\$1,734,752.43
KARRENDI PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,748,986.86
SOUTHERN MONTESSORI SCHOOL	\$1,750,781.00
FISK STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,752,573.26
RENMARK WEST PS	\$1,763,112.48
SOUTH DOWNS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,794,174.69
CARLTON SCHOOL	\$1,797,969.11
AIRDALE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,815,647.30
CRYSTAL BROOK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,822,317.75
BANKSIA PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,823,048.37
TAILEM BEND PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,834,336.12
GAWLER PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,835,808.30
SWAN REACH AREA SCHOOL	\$1,842,186.44
REYNELLA SOUTH SCHOOL	\$1,846,021.67
KELLER ROAD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,855,029.98
PENOLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,858,698.42
RENMARK NORTH PS	\$1,869,369.76
YALATA ANANGU SCHOOL	\$1,870,958.15
STURT STREET COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$1,875,252.28
FREGON ANANGU SCHOOL	\$1,881,048.63
HALLETT COVE SOUTH PS	\$1,889,367.53
MCLAREN FLAT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,890,383.18
HUNTFIELD HEIGHTS PS	\$1,891,995.90
BROMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,892,728.32

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
MOUNT BARKER SOUTH PS	\$1,898,573.28
ST ANDREW'S SCHOOL	\$1,925,769.75
PARADISE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,938,230.73
PIPALYATJARA ANANGU SCHOOL	\$1,956,455.16
SUNRISE CHRISTIAN SCHL WHYALLA	\$1,957,024.16
WOODSIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,969,627.36
ROSEWORTHY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$1,977,081.47
SHEIDOW PARK PS/CANTEEN	\$1,981,121.89
WALLAROO PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,044,832.04
INGLE FARM EAST PS	\$2,046,731.69
TINTINARA AREA SCHOOL	\$2,053,186.80
MONASH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,063,523.88
ST AGNES PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,068,987.49
ADELAIDE EAST EDUCATION CENTRE	\$2,069,375.83
SEAVIEW DOWNS PS	\$2,095,180.05
MODBURY SOUTH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,107,260.01
INDULKANA ANANGU SCHOOL	\$2,108,390.77
KANGAROO INN AREA SCHOOL	\$2,128,780.51
CLARE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,133,819.06
ALDGATE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,134,794.59
NOVITA CHILDREN'S SERVICES INC	\$2,141,591.50
WILLIAMSTOWN PS	\$2,167,283.53
ORROROO AREA SCHOOL	\$2,178,556.10
SERVICE TO YOUTH COUNCIL INC	\$2,180,770.00
NARACOORTE SOUTH PS	\$2,182,127.55
WEST BEACH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,199,498.18
ONE TREE HILL PS	\$2,199,824.36
PETERBOROUGH HIGH SCHOOL	\$2,205,133.61
MODBURY SCHOOL CPC-7	\$2,219,099.74
KAURNA PLAINS SCHOOL	\$2,237,747.73
EDEN HILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,241,727.57
THORNDON PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,251,162.10
HINCKS AVENUE PS	\$2,254,554.06
CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF PT PIRIE	\$2,254,760.00
ANGASTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,285,821.53
MEMORIAL OVAL PS	\$2,298,875.58
NOARLUNGA DOWNS PS	\$2,302,565.97
PENOLA HIGH SCHOOL	\$2,302,628.20
MELALEUCA PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,326,635.38
EUDUNDA AREA SCHOOL	\$2,343,502.78
BIRDWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,375,109.93
WAIKERIE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,376,018.86

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
FREELING PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,380,130.03
CRAFERS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,393,983.73
HAHNDORF PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,407,121.05
BALAKLAVA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,407,278.26
MILLICENT NORTH PS	\$2,415,371.34
FAIRVIEW PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,417,490.05
MOUNT BARKER WALDORF SCHOOL	\$2,424,693.51
COORARA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,426,212.46
NORTH ADELAIDE PS	\$2,429,055.14
PORT BROUGHTON AREA SCHOOL	\$2,430,447.30
SURREY DOWNS R-7 SCHOOL	\$2,435,421.35
ENFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,440,392.42
BRAHMA LODGE PS	\$2,440,680.59
THE GROVE EDUCATION CENTRE	\$2,460,833.34
BAPTIST CARE (SA) INC	\$2,471,992.00
CARA INCORPORATED	\$2,487,587.70
KIMBA AREA SCHOOL	\$2,487,631.04
LEIGH CREEK AREA SCHOOL	\$2,489,695.72
KAROONDA AREA SCHOOL	\$2,493,594.69
HAPPY VALLEY SCHOOL	\$2,527,815.22
SEAFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,533,909.16
PARKSIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,541,141.59
GLEN OSMOND PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,545,050.77
RIVERLAND SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$2,551,896.29
COOMANDOOK AREA SCHOOL	\$2,561,832.98
HAWTHORNDENE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,566,203.48
COWELL AREA SCHOOL	\$2,575,673.77
O'SULLIVAN BEACH PS	\$2,584,554.27
TORRENSVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,592,872.67
SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST SCHOOLS	\$2,603,710.35
WYNN VALE R-7 SCHOOL	\$2,610,704.99
WILLSDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,637,666.10
HALLETT COVE EAST PS	\$2,651,693.60
LUCINDALE AREA SCHOOL	\$2,660,264.49
ALLENDALE EAST AREA SCHOOL	\$2,665,394.63
GULFVIEW HEIGHTS PS	\$2,669,457.31
CLAPHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,676,467.41
NORTH HAVEN SCHOOL	\$2,688,825.21
HILLCREST PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,695,706.74
ST LEONARDS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,700,276.09
RIDGEHAVEN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,708,332.25
PARA HILLS WEST PS	\$2,710,157.72

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
PLYMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,711,880.65
NURIOOTPA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,714,347.57
POORAKA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,740,840.53
AMATA ANANGU SCHOOL	\$2,745,866.96
GORDON EDUCATION CENTRE	\$2,747,399.31
RIVERTON & DISTRICT HS	\$2,752,052.15
LAMEROO REGIONAL COMM SCHL	\$2,770,469.21
WUDINNA AREA SCHOOL	\$2,784,939.62
PROSPECT NORTH PRIMARY SCHL	\$2,786,053.02
HAMPSTEAD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,787,292.75
BARMERA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,791,850.05
FLINDERS PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,796,487.31
WHYALLA TOWN PS	\$2,805,705.58
KAPUNDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,820,401.26
SALISBURY PARK PS	\$2,833,868.92
WARRADALE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,836,381.26
BLACKWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,849,894.42
MADISON PARK SCHOOL	\$2,853,585.99
ATHELSTONE SCHOOL	\$2,857,022.12
WANDANA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,857,767.86
WOMENS & CHILDRENS HEALTH	\$2,878,118.00
NORWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,883,130.14
WESTPORT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,887,552.94
ARDROSSAN AREA SCHOOL	\$2,890,888.63
QUORN AREA SCHOOL	\$2,893,529.58
BOOLEROO CENTRE DIST SCHL	\$2,895,180.25
SUNEDEN SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$2,921,831.57
TWO WELLS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,927,808.34
VALE PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,945,916.81
BELLEVUE HEIGHTS PS	\$2,960,789.39
BURRA COMMUNITY AREA SCHOOL	\$2,968,605.10
VIRGINIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$2,970,023.53
CRAIGMORE SOUTH PS	\$2,975,760.29
STIRLING NORTH PS	\$2,984,587.87
PORT AUGUSTA WEST PS	\$3,018,768.21
SALISBURY HEIGHTS PS	\$3,024,325.30
SEACLIFF PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,025,847.59
ELIZABETH GROVE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,042,016.09
DERNANCOURT SCHOOL R-7	\$3,051,904.58
PORT PIRIE WEST PS	\$3,057,775.71
BORDERTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,058,880.32
THIELE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,060,938.88

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
KILPARRIN TCH & ASMT SCH & SVS	\$3,066,560.02
KIRTON POINT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,068,059.79
PORT ELLIOT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,068,390.35
FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,075,457.73
SA INDEPENDENT SCHLS BLOCK	\$3,078,456.89
MODBURY WEST SCHOOL	\$3,100,972.88
UNIVERSITY SENIOR COLLEGE	\$3,104,060.70
FLINDERS VIEW PS	\$3,109,840.05
MENINGIE AREA SCHOOL	\$3,129,936.71
MORPHETT VALE EAST PS	\$3,149,151.69
TUMBY BAY AREA SCHOOL	\$3,152,683.43
WILLUNGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,154,857.56
ABERFOYLE HUB R-7 SCHOOL	\$3,161,269.62
ERNABELLA ANANGU SCHOOL	\$3,162,857.38
WILLUNGA WALDORF SCHOOL	\$3,191,741.26
PARA HILLS SCHOOL P-7	\$3,192,715.60
EDWARDSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,204,156.39
FULHAM NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,219,828.91
ELIZABETH EAST PS	\$3,226,427.39
GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL	\$3,235,417.15
LOXTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,257,167.64
PASADENA HIGH SCHOOL	\$3,266,340.22
WOODVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,271,611.32
THE HILLS CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY	\$3,272,342.51
MAITLAND AREA SCHOOL	\$3,275,600.18
JAMESTOWN COM SCHOOL/CANTEEN	\$3,283,652.53
COROMANDEL VALLEY PS	\$3,284,879.55
SOLOMONTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,286,913.90
RICHMOND PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,299,015.04
ELIZABETH SOUTH PS	\$3,307,011.82
GOOLWA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,337,378.32
ADELAIDE WEST SPECIAL EDUC CTR	\$3,342,831.52
FLAGSTAFF HILL R-7 SCHOOL	\$3,349,826.16
REYNELLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,355,992.62
MORPHETT VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,365,047.98
MID NORTH CHRISTIAN COLLEGE	\$3,385,947.96
SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES	\$3,388,881.84
SALISBURY DOWNS PS	\$3,407,112.86
OAKBANK AREA SCHOOL	\$3,407,492.30
STREAKY BAY AREA SCHOOL	\$3,408,628.21
PARINGA PARK PS	\$3,411,909.80
HERITAGE COLLEGE INC	\$3,416,299.51

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
KLEMZIG PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,418,389.35
LARGS BAY SCHOOL	\$3,473,993.89
PARA VISTA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,475,371.63
LOCKLEYS NORTH PS	\$3,495,264.03
NARACOORTE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,499,971.62
PORT NOARLUNGA PS	\$3,507,650.46
HACKHAM EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,507,835.20
PROSPECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,511,297.25
LITTLEHAMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,514,253.56
WALFORD ANGLICAN SCHOOL FOR	\$3,515,634.30
FLAXMILL SCHOOL P-7	\$3,541,529.54
PORT LINCOLN JUNIOR PS	\$3,574,205.41
GAWLER EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,575,280.44
MCLAREN VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,579,213.71
MARRYATVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,595,025.66
ARDTORNISH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,600,258.94
STIRLING EAST PS	\$3,616,689.34
CLEVE AREA SCHOOL	\$3,625,484.84
MUNNO PARA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,627,663.12
MOUNT BARKER PS	\$3,636,469.71
BERRI PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,641,742.38
REDWOOD PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,646,387.80
YOUTH EDUCATION CENTRE	\$3,664,334.68
GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,669,635.77
CRAIGBURN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,671,693.43
NORTHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,695,363.35
LE FEVRE PENINSULA PS	\$3,695,396.56
RIVERDALE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,699,377.65
STUART HIGH SCHOOL	\$3,713,806.82
HENLEY BEACH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,714,183.50
ALBERTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,721,623.81
MOANA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,742,473.83
YORKETOWN AREA SCHOOL	\$3,744,122.58
THE SALVATION ARMY	\$3,747,206.00
BLACK FOREST PS	\$3,761,476.65
ST GEORGE COLLEGE INC	\$3,771,008.85
ANGLE VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,781,671.19
EAST PARA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,789,397.22
SA SCHOOL FOR VISN IMP CHILDN	\$3,825,566.39
REMARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,836,252.03
CHALLA GARDENS PS	\$3,840,574.87
DARLINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,842,106.24

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
BRAEVIEW SCHOOL R-7	\$3,845,872.58
KEITH AREA SCHOOL	\$3,857,787.25
SEAFORD RISE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,858,352.56
KEITHCOT FARM PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,869,792.16
MARY MACKILLOP COLLEGE	\$3,907,273.91
LONG STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,909,117.17
UNLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,910,415.91
GILLES STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,925,064.38
PIMPALA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,925,687.88
SALISBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,936,996.58
ERRINGTON SPECIAL EDU CENTRE	\$3,952,017.67
KINGSTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$3,955,403.47
ST PETER'S COLLEGIATE GIRLS'	\$3,957,032.01
ROSE PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,957,612.30
ALLENBY GARDENS PS	\$3,977,700.19
CHRISTIES BEACH PS	\$3,988,240.82
BOWDEN BROMPTON COMMUNITY SCHL	\$3,991,822.21
RISDON PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$3,992,260.15
PENNINGTON SCHOOL R-7	\$3,996,891.60
NAILSWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,015,799.59
MURRAY BRIDGE SOUTH PS	\$4,029,128.50
BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL	\$4,050,106.55
BELAIR PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,050,613.99
WESTBOURNE PARK PS	\$4,059,312.77
NAIRNE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,071,306.18
JUNCTION AUSTRALIA	\$4,105,336.00
BURTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,107,465.71
VALLEY VIEW SECONDARY SCHOOL	\$4,121,657.54
EAST TORRENS PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,148,972.34
SEYMOUR COLLEGE	\$4,184,964.10
KILKENNY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,193,544.53
TANUNDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,193,895.36
MULGA STREET PS	\$4,195,839.52
HIGHBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,204,795.92
YANKALILLA AREA SCHOOL	\$4,240,567.05
HIGHGATE SCHOOL	\$4,256,894.98
REIDY PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,322,535.88
WAIKERIE HIGH SCHOOL	\$4,326,167.61
ST PETER'S WOODLANDS GRAMMAR	\$4,354,114.55
PORT LINCOLN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,391,917.93
MOUNT COMPASS AREA SCHOOL	\$4,413,440.12
BALAKLAVA HIGH SCHOOL	\$4,421,566.96



DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
ELIZABETH VALE PS	\$4,492,264.19
ELIZABETH DOWNS PS	\$4,518,829.12
KIDMAN PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,519,476.72
WALKERVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,532,344.84
MINLATON DISTRICT SCHOOL	\$4,621,121.63
HENDON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,636,286.60
NICOLSON AVENUE PS	\$4,656,864.92
EAST MARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,670,950.01
WILDERNESS SCHOOL	\$4,680,314.96
MCDONALD PARK SCHOOL	\$4,724,869.66
CLOVELLY PARK PS	\$4,727,020.23
HARVEST CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	\$4,737,924.96
CUMMINS AREA SCHOOL	\$4,751,139.65
HEWETT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,764,517.39
SA INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS	\$4,783,749.53
ANGLICAN COMMUNITY CARE INC	\$4,816,232.00
COLONEL LIGHT GARDENS PS	\$4,881,906.87
MOUNT GAMBIER NORTH PS	\$4,909,860.24
FINDON HIGH SCHOOL	\$4,916,135.15
MITCHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,946,139.34
KEY ASSETS SA LTD	\$4,972,348.00
NARACOORTE HIGH SCHOOL	\$4,974,000.83
COWANDILLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$4,981,333.72
WEST LAKES SHORE SCHOOL R-7	\$5,025,472.06
INGLE FARM PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,034,145.08
UNITING CARE WESLEY COUNTRY	\$5,044,860.00
ELIZABETH PARK PS	\$5,047,859.09
EDMUND RICE EDUCATION AUST	\$5,051,592.15
EAST ADELAIDE SCHOOL	\$5,120,231.81
MURRAY BRIDGE CHRISTIAN	\$5,132,895.71
HORIZON CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	\$5,135,764.20
AUGUSTA PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,142,233.01
MODBURY SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$5,145,750.40
EDWARD JOHN EYRE HS	\$5,152,299.74
WOODEND PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,163,702.47
GREENWITH PS/COUNCIL	\$5,180,956.34
MANNUM COMM COLLEGE—HIGH	\$5,217,880.24
GRANGE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,218,083.29
BURC COLLEGE	\$5,225,193.76
BLAKEVIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,261,484.37
GOLDEN GROVE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,296,071.10
KAPUNDA HIGH SCHOOL	\$5,311,011.03

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
EECSRS BOARD OF SA	\$5,320,154.00
WILLIAM LIGHT R-12 SCHOOL	\$5,350,429.53
WHYALLA HIGH SCHOOL	\$5,362,325.66
COOBER PEDY AREA SCHOOL	\$5,384,274.43
CHRISTIE DOWNS SCHOOLS	\$5,384,998.04
SWALLOWCLIFFE R-7 SCHOOL	\$5,425,066.27
SCOTCH COLLEGE	\$5,477,455.35
AUSTN SCIENCE & MATHS SCHL	\$5,500,435.13
HOPE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE INC	\$5,530,107.56
GLENELG PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,591,378.80
BURNSIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,600,421.87
THE PINES SCHOOL	\$5,634,314.88
BIRDWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	\$5,652,759.84
BRIGHTON PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$5,658,808.09
MAWSON LAKES SCHOOL	\$5,672,831.59
SALISBURY NORTH R-7 SCHOOL	\$5,704,314.98
VICTOR HARBOR PS	\$5,734,836.16
PULTENEY GRAMMAR SCHOOL	\$5,738,493.46
MITCHAM GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL	\$5,746,980.12
CLARE HIGH SCHOOL	\$5,751,090.18
PARAFIELD GARDENS R-7 SCHOOL	\$5,760,310.17
TORRENS VALLEY CHRISTIAN SCHL	\$5,775,448.20
ELIZABETH NORTH PS	\$5,839,687.95
ADELAIDE NORTH SPECIAL SCHOOL	\$5,905,042.58
MAGILL R-7 SCHOOL	\$5,926,216.25
SEAVIEW HIGH SCHOOL	\$5,969,020.36
MURRAY BRIDGE NORTH SCHOOL R-7	\$5,974,433.26
STRADBROKE SCHOOL	\$6,033,932.31
LAKE WINDEMERE B-7 SCHOOL	\$6,063,030.45
ALDINGA BEACH R-7 SCHOOL	\$6,090,806.63
MILLICENT HIGH SCHOOL	\$6,126,807.58
BLAIR ATHOL NORTH B-7 SCHOOL	\$6,167,868.47
ST JOHN'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL	\$6,252,083.24
BETHANY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	\$6,255,587.55
RENMARK HIGH SCHOOL	\$6,262,814.92
LOXTON HIGH SCHOOL	\$6,361,908.84
PLAYFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$6,383,782.83
ST DOMINIC'S PRIORY COLLEGE	\$6,386,642.16
EMMAUS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE INC	\$6,442,784.75
JOHN HARTLEY SCHOOL B-7	\$6,475,844.65
PRINCE ALFRED COLLEGE	\$6,539,359.11
MOUNT BARKER HIGH SCHOOL	\$6,550,075.76

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
WOODCROFT PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$6,563,557.71
TRINITY GARDENS PS	\$6,619,213.05
PORTSIDE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	\$6,724,341.15
MOONTA AREA SCHOOL	\$6,778,914.60
ISLAMIC COLLEGE OF SA	\$6,804,378.90
MARDEN SENIOR COLLEGE	\$6,870,159.54
SETTLERS FARM CAMPUS R-7	\$6,920,491.38
LIFE WITHOUT BARRIERS	\$6,935,309.00
UNDERDALE HIGH SCHOOL	\$6,980,885.73
LINDEN PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	\$6,990,056.80
CATHOLIC CHURCH ENDOWMENT SOC	\$7,088,190.00
ROXBY DOWNS AREA SCHOOL	\$7,111,067.58
ST PETER'S COLLEGE	\$7,117,919.86
WOODVILLE GARDENS B-7 SCHOOL	\$7,203,567.71
CEDAR COLLEGE	\$7,248,107.95
SOUTHERN VALES CHRISTIAN COMM	\$7,274,847.40
WINDSOR GARDENS VOC COLLEGE	\$7,392,756.45
NORTHERN ADELAIDE SENIOR COLL	\$7,401,206.34
SALISBURY EAST HIGH SCHOOL	\$7,450,587.82
PARA HILLS HIGH SCHOOL	\$7,608,865.79
ST MARY'S COLLEGE	\$7,681,431.96
PEDARE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE	\$7,738,577.08
LE FEVRE HIGH SCHOOL	\$7,816,531.45
GRANT HIGH SCHOOL	\$7,932,066.19
ABORIGINAL FAMILY SUPPORT SVCE	\$7,941,904.00
WESTMINSTER SCHOOL	\$8,039,816.30
ANGLICARE SA INC	\$8,145,654.00
CEDUNA AREA SCHOOL	\$8,217,560.26
PORT AUGUSTA SECONDARY SCHL	\$8,277,053.19
KING'S BAPTIST GRAMMAR SCHL	\$8,352,833.80
BANKSIA PARK INTERNATIONAL HS	\$8,354,203.86
JOHN PIRIE SECONDARY SCHOOL	\$8,403,176.27
ADELAIDE SEC SCHL OF ENGLISH	\$8,410,732.07
GLOSSOP HIGH SCHOOL	\$8,451,231.57
PEMBROKE SCHOOL	\$8,543,535.45
SA CONF OF THE SDA CHURCH	\$8,547,723.81
HEATHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL	\$8,625,848.12
VICTOR HARBOR HIGH SCHOOL	\$8,680,584.34
BLACKWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	\$8,828,304.49
PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL	\$8,929,186.80
SUNRISE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	\$8,951,452.41
OCEAN VIEW P-12 COLL—TAPEROO	\$9,268,224.66

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
SEATON HIGH SCHOOL	\$9,417,604.52
MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL	\$9,478,094.38
KANGAROO ISLAND COMMUNITY EDUC	\$9,536,448.11
MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL	\$9,799,201.08
FREMONT-ELIZABETH CITY HS	\$9,869,149.29
TEMPLE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE	\$10,005,384.15
PARAFIELD GARDENS HS	\$10,142,907.42
ABERFOYLE PARK HIGH SCHOOL	\$10,504,112.74
SEAFORD 6-12 SCHOOL	\$10,507,154.36
WIRREANDA HIGH SCHOOL	\$10,647,887.34
NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL	\$10,939,270.57
CHARLES CAMPBELL COLLEGE	\$10,975,115.72
WILLUNGA HIGH SCHOOL	\$11,093,429.73
SALISBURY HIGH SCHOOL	\$11,156,621.77
URRBRAE AGRICULTURAL HS	\$11,164,172.07
CRAIGMORE HIGH SCHOOL	\$11,310,686.27
ST ALOYSIUS COLLEGE	\$11,349,623.25
MARRYATVILLE HIGH SCHOOL	\$11,564,608.94
UNLEY HIGH SCHOOL	\$11,623,982.56
HALLETT COVE SCHOOL	\$11,835,198.72
KADINA MEMORIAL SCHOOL	\$12,111,402.66
THE HEIGHTS SCHOOL	\$12,395,771.40
WOODVILLE HIGH SCHOOL	\$12,551,050.81
WOODCROFT COLLEGE INC	\$12,699,604.65
HAMILTON SECONDARY COLLEGE	\$12,745,257.70
ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL	\$12,834,716.88
OPEN ACCESS COLLEGE	\$13,060,691.38
EASTERN FLEURIEU R-12 SCHL	\$13,254,361.68
HENLEY HIGH SCHOOL	\$13,283,774.07
MURRAY BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL	\$13,468,177.16
BRIGHTON SECONDARY SCHOOL	\$13,536,809.33
THEBARTON SENIOR COLLEGE	\$13,717,138.88
CHRISTIES BEACH HS & STH VOC	\$13,896,027.51
GAWLER & DISTRICT COLLEGE B-12	\$14,038,295.97
GLENUNGA INTERNATIONAL HS	\$14,610,571.30
NORWOOD MORIALTA HIGH SCHOOL	\$14,815,645.30
GOLDEN GROVE HIGH SCHOOL	\$14,897,535.77
PARALOWIE SCHOOL	\$14,958,347.00
ROMA MITCHELL SEC COLLEGE	\$15,797,266.08
DPTI-PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES	\$16,233,476.31
TYNDALE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	\$16,398,140.91
REYNELLA EAST COLLEGE	\$16,499,101.72

DECD & DECD ADMINISTERED ITEMS GROSS GRANT & SUBSIDY EXPENSES > \$10,000 FOR 2014-15	
VENDOR NAME/CATEGORY	TOTAL
MARK OLIPHANT COLLEGE B-12	\$16,619,523.61
SACE BOARD OF SA	\$18,931,541.08
FAMILY DAY CARE / HACC—SUPPORT SUBSIDIES AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE	\$24,749,863.13
SA ANGLICAN SCHOOLS SYSTEM INC	\$47,514,862.01
CHILDREN'S ALTERNATIVE SUPPORT COSTS AND SUBSIDIES	\$94,408,111.66
LUTHERAN SCHLS ASSOC OF SA INC	\$122,464,778.92
CATHOLIC EDUCATION SA	\$489,148,071.41
TOTAL	\$3,217,110,641.48