

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 4 July 2013

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.M. Gazzola)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (11:01):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers and question time to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REFORM) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July 2013.)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (11:02):** I continue my remarks in relation to the contribution clubs make to the community and the potential impact of the legislation on clubs. There has been some criticism that the clubs industry is only being represented by the South Australian National Football League-type clubs and others, and I wanted to put on the record (and I thank Clubs SA for this) an example of a metropolitan-based club and a rural or regional-based club in terms of the contribution they make to their communities, which is significantly impacted by the revenue they generate from gaming machines.

The first one to which I refer is the Marion Sports and Community Club, which was established in 1908 to develop and maintain recreational community facilities and amenities and to promote recreational and community sporting activity. They say that, as a not-for-profit organisation, all the proceedings from their gaming machines are put back into the club for its members and the public by providing the best possible sporting facilities for: the Marion Football Club, Marion Cricket Club, Marion Tennis Club, Marion Lawn Bowling Club, Marion Croquet Club, Marion Trotting Club, Marion Swimming Club, Marion Women's Soccer Club, Sturt Marion Thunder Men's Soccer Club, Atlantis Masters Swimming Club, Marlin Masters Swimming Club, Arista Marion Korfbal Club, South City Chiefs Gridiron Club, Glenelg Rebels Softball Club, Over 60s Cricket Club, and South Adelaide Basketball Club.

They also provide the use of community and recreational facilities free of charge, including: two cricket ovals with turf centre pitches; two turf practice cricket pitches; two hard practice cricket pitches with fully enclosed soft netting practice facilities; six change rooms; a football oval; two soccer pitches; a trotting track; floodlighting for night soccer, tennis and football; five bowling greens and clubrooms; four croquet courts and clubrooms; six tennis courts and clubrooms; two meeting rooms, two large function rooms, or four medium-size function rooms, complete with integrated audiovisual; training areas for softball and gridiron; and a fortnightly market.

All of the club's open space grounds are made available to the general public for recreational use. They also provide support and services to the community for other not-for-profit organisations such as: Novita, Kanga Cricket, Auskick, Brighton Lions, Mitcham Kiwanis, Marion Probus, Ladies Keep Fit, COTA, Holdfast View, Marion View, Brighton Rotary, Brighton Kiwanis, Holdfast JPs, Marion Lions, Sunrise Christian School (for everyday oval use), and the Adelaide Rock 'n' Roll Club.

The second club I want to put on the record is the Renmark Club. They write:

The Renmark Club was established to create an environment for the community to meet together and enjoy each other's company away from the everyday grind of the workplace environment. With a membership of nearly 3000 people, the local community support us very well, as well as the tourists that come to the Riverland for Holidays.

As a not-for-profit organisation, all the proceeds from our gaming machines are put back to the club, for its members and the public, by providing:

- Sporting facilities—our sponsorship donations for each year to sporting clubs are over \$38,000

- Community and recreational facilities. We are in liaison with the Renmark Paringa Council with the Town Square upgrade and our commitment is \$90,000 which involves a boat Mooring out on the Murray River and Pavers in front of the club
- Services to the community e.g., meeting place for over 10 sporting and social clubs each month, as well as community donations.
- Support for other not-for-profit organisations e.g. the Renmark Club and the Renmark Community Hotel along with the local Council hold annual events between the 3 Venues for the benefit of the Riverland

I have a long list of others, but I am not going to put them all on the record; I just wanted to put forward those two as an example that we are not just talking here. Those of us who are concerned about this legislation and the government's policy being a club killer, we are not just talking about the big South Australian National Football League clubs; we are talking about small to medium-size clubs right across the state—right across the metropolitan areas and, in particular, in the regions—who service, as in the Marion example I gave, dozens and dozens of sporting, recreational and community clubs and organisations that make use of the facilities the clubs are able to provide.

That is why there is the concern in relation to the legislation that we have seen. A number of members of parliament have received in recent days a letter from Clubs SA—again, it is some five pages and I am not going to read all of it—signed by Cameron Taylor and Bill Cochrane on behalf of Clubs SA. They summarise their position pretty clearly:

It should be noted that the government has not done any modelling of the impacts of its proposed changes on clubs with gaming, clubs without gaming, or the club industry generally. It seems that this government simply does not care about the consequences for sporting and community clubs...

In summary, the changes proposed by the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Reform) Bill 2013 pose an enormous threat to the viability of gaming clubs, and as a consequence the many other sporting and community clubs that benefit indirectly. It will favour the expansion of the largest and wealthiest venues, the Adelaide Casino, Woolworths-Coles and the commercial hotel groups, and force out not-for-profit sporting and community clubs.

At a time when the club industry is already under pressure as a result of government policies and rising costs, the impacts of the bill on clubs, the impacts of the bill on club gaming venues must be considered more carefully. We urge you to split the bill to allow for that proper consideration.

That summarises the clubs' position. Before turning to the issue of specifically how this measure is meant to be tackling problem gambling and some issues there, I do want to raise my concerns about the way the government and its representatives have operated in terms of trying to intimidate stakeholders and others into supporting the legislation.

As I said, for two years the government ignored the clubs industry and its representatives in terms of consultation. However, in recent days I have become aware that the chief of staff to minister Rau, Mr Danny Romeo, has been making threatening and abusive calls to representatives of the clubs industry, seeking to intimidate them into changing their position on the legislation.

The clubs industry generally is big enough and ugly enough to look after itself, and it is for them to do so. However, I want to express my concern—and I think this is one of the problems we have with this government—that we have non-elected spin doctors, wholly-owned subsidiaries generally of Labor factions (such as Mr Romeo, who has attracted controversy in the past) who, rather than treating stakeholders and others who might have differing views with respect, seek to be abusive and threatening and, in this particular case, threatening retribution to the clubs industry that if it does not change its position the government is in a position, obviously, to impact and influence the clubs industry in the future.

Minister Rau, in my view, is on very dangerous ground if he is going to unleash the dogs within his office onto stakeholders in the industry to, as I said, seek to intimidate, threaten or be abusive in relation to the position on this legislation. This is not the only example in relation to this. There was a recent example also in relation to the real estate industry, where exactly the same tactic was used, same behaviour, same individual, same minister. Ultimately, minister Rau has to accept the responsibility for what he endorses his staff to do in terms of handling relations with stakeholders.

I hope that this government would at least pause and reflect on the way it goes about seeking to intimidate those who have views different from its own. As I said, this is not the first example; this is, at the very least, the second example in recent times where exactly the same sort of behaviour has occurred. That is not the way to win friends and influence people. All it does, in my judgement, is harden opposition to both the government and its policy position in relation to these sorts of issues.

I want to turn to the issue of problem gambling and the claim that this particular bill is going to impact on that matter. My questions to the government are: can the minister present hard evidence to this chamber—not just claims from commentators and others—that increasing the number of machines in the Casino by 505 will lead to a reduction in problem gambling? Can he provide hard evidence to this chamber that increasing by 50 per cent the maximum number of machines in a venue, from 40 to 60—with the resultant impacts that a number of stakeholders, including clubs, have warned about in terms of greater concentrations of influence within the gaming machine industry—will lead to a reduction in problem gambling?

Can he provide hard evidence to the committee that warning signs flashing across screens will lead to a reduction in problem gambling? Will he provide, on behalf of the government, the evidence that a voluntary precommitment scheme will lead to a reduction in problem gambling?

I think it is important, in relation to the voluntary precommitment scheme, to be aware of exactly how that is intended to operate and that is, essentially, an individual can go and set their own voluntary precommitment, which can be \$1,000, \$100,000, \$200,000 or whatever it might happen to be, and only when you reach that particular self-imposed voluntary precommitment will actions then occur. Those actions will be someone, as we understand it, approaching the particular gambler indicating, 'You have reached or you are approaching this particular voluntary limit' and the gambler can then indicate, 'Well, thank you very much for that. I am now going to set a new limit for myself' and double that particular limit or just ignore the warning advice anyway.

I accept, in relation at least to the voluntary precommitment issue, that this is something which is being imposed nationally, albeit further down the track, as part of national changes. If I had been in the federal parliament, I would have been putting the same question to the federal government and that is: where is the hard evidence that this is actually going to make a significant difference in terms of the number of problem gamblers?

There is a range of other provisions in the federal legislation and in the state legislation as well where I think the same challenges should be put to the government and to say, 'Well, at least share with us the hard evidence that you have got that this will actually achieve a reduction in problem gambling.' I think, if we are frank about it, the brutal reality is that governments of all persuasions and over a long period of time believe they need to be seen to be doing something in relation to problem gambling. That means there are some things which clearly can have an impact, and that is money being spent on the 0.4 per cent of people with a gambling problem, in terms of additional counselling, assistance and all those sorts of things that you can endeavour to do.

As I said last night, my view is that problem gamblers will crawl over cut glass to get to a machine, a venue, an outlet or an option to satisfy their addiction. Many of the things that we are talking about will not stop the problem or the addiction, but governments will be able to pat themselves on the back and say, 'We are attempting to do something about it.' That is why the hard evidence is important in terms of: what is it?

Short of banning gambling full stop and somehow being able to impose or enforce that, which, again, as I have indicated before in the many arguments I have had with the Hon. Nick Xenophon over the years, the simple fact of purporting to ban gambling in the modern day and age where you can access gambling options from anywhere around the world at the click of a computer screen or your mobile phone is farcical and has been for many years. These are clearly the issues that confront legislators such as ourselves and in the federal parliament.

Given the federal parliament is actually imposing these conditions over a certain time frame, the Responsible Gambling Working Party last year basically said, 'Well, if it is going to be imposed federally, let us stick to those sorts of time lines,' but this government now believes it knows better or wants to be seen to be doing something, so it is now saying, 'Blow the community clubs; we are not worried about them. We need to be seen to be doing something and we will bring forward the dates different from and earlier than the dates that have been imposed by the federal legislative changes.'

The member for Davenport pursued this issue of the extent of problem gambling with the government, and he was provided very recently with a copy of a letter from Robert Chappell, the Director of the Independent Gambling Authority, to Treasury and Finance on 8 May this year. The question the member for Davenport put to the government was: what is the extent of problem gambling in South Australia and how does it compare to the other states and territories? I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a purely statistical table on problem gambling.

Leave granted.

Year of publication	Jurisdiction	PGSI 3-7	PGSI 8+	PGSI 3+/ SOGS 5+
2001	South Australia			2.00
2001	Australian Capital Territory			1.90
2001	Queensland	2.70	0.83	2.53
2003	Queensland	2.00	0.55	2.55
2003	Victoria			1.22
2003	Victoria	0.91	0.88	1.79
2005	Northern Territory			1.06
2005	Northern Territory	—	0.64	—
2005	Tasmania	1.02	0.73	1.75
2006	New South Wales	1.60	0.80	2.40
2006	South Australia	1.20	0.40	1.60
2007	Queensland	1.80	0.47	2.27
2007	Tasmania	0.86	0.54	1.40
2008	Victoria	2.36	0.70	3.06
2009	New South Wales	1.30	0.40	1.70
2009	Queensland	1.58	0.37	1.96
2012	New South Wales	2.90	0.80	3.70
2012	Queensland	1.90	0.48	2.38

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** When members have an opportunity to have a look at this table provided by the Independent Gambling Authority, what it shows is a series of studies done since 2001 through to 2012—so they are not all done at the one time—and it indicates the extent of problem gambling in each of those jurisdictions. I note in one of the explanatory notes:

The Problem Gambling Severity Index of the Canadian Problem Gambling Index (PGSI) was introduced into Australia in 2001 and has now been agreed by Australian gambling ministers as the standard screen for population work. This 9 item questionnaire gives scores in the range 0-27, on which a score in the range 3-7 is described as moderate risk and 8+ is described as problem gambler (high risk). For the South Australian study published in 2006, the group in the community in whom we were interested was regarded as the PGSI 3+ group (that is, the moderate and high risk groups combined). PGSI numbers are shown in bold text.

The PGSI 8+ number, which is the Problem Gambling Severity Index agreed by all gambling ministers, shows that on the most recent measure in South Australia, which was done now six or seven years ago in 2006, the measure in South Australia was 0.4 per cent. That is the figure that I have referred to on a number of occasions in this contribution—0.4 per cent problem gamblers in South Australia. So 99.6 per cent of the population are not problem gamblers.

What it shows is that in New South Wales, for example, the problem gambling index, the same measure there, is double that, at 0.8 per cent. In Queensland it is higher; it is at 0.48 per cent in 2012. In Victoria in 2008 it is higher; the measure there was 0.7 per cent. In 2007 in Tasmania it was 0.54 per cent. So on all those measures, we in South Australia, whatever it is that we are doing here, on those numbers, provided by the Independent Gambling Authority, have the lowest problem gambling problem of all the states and territories.

As I said, the number of problem gamblers is 0.4 per cent of the population. That is contrary to the views that many in the media and many of the anti gambling campaigners would lead you to believe. They will take higher numbers, because they will take it as a percentage of gamblers, for example, or adults, or adult gamblers, or whatever it might happen to be, so that those percentages can be increased. Then they will multiply the numbers by the number of people in the family, to indicate that a number of other people are influenced, or potentially influenced, by the problems of the problem gambler. Certainly, I acknowledge, as I said in my opening contribution, that the problems of the problem gambler, sadly, often do flow on to family members and to friends as well. I acknowledge that.

What the official statistics show is that our problem gambling index is the lowest of all states and territories. When you also compare it with the prevalence of poker machines in the community, as the member for Davenport highlighted there in his contribution, in states such as Victoria, which has a lower level of poker machines per head of population than South Australia, the problem gambling rate on those figures was nearly twice as in South Australia. So in Victoria they have a lower level of poker machines per head of population, but their problem gambling rate is twice that of South Australia.

Tasmania also has a lower rate of poker machines per head of population, and the problem gambling index is 0.54; it is again higher than South Australia. What the figures also show is that the reverse occurs in some other jurisdictions, so I am certainly not arguing the case that having a lower percentage of gaming machines leads to a higher problem gambling rate.

What it shows is that this view is not conclusive. It is the accepted wisdom of the government here—because it was announced as a publicity stunt a number of years ago, 'We shall get rid of 3,000 machines because that will help problem gambling in South Australia'—but there was never any hard evidence produced for that. It was a feel-good policy announcement at the time. Everyone has said, and rightly, that they have not delivered on that since then, and the minister now says, 'We are going to try to deliver on the 3,000 eventually.'

The reality is that if you actually go back to the original policy promise, there was never any evidence presented that indicated that reducing 3,000 would actually reduce the number of problem gamblers anyway. It was just an announcement, and the government hoped it would convince people that it would reduce the number of problem gamblers. The figures I have indicated show that there is no simple causal link between the prevalence of gaming machines in some jurisdictions and the extent of problem gambling in those jurisdictions. Clearly, there are other, more significant issues at play than just the number of machines.

That is my argument, in particular. As I said, if you have a gambling problem, if you are one of the 0.4 per cent who have a problem, you will find a machine wherever it is. People will crawl over cut glass to get there or they will move to another gambling option that is provided on their mobile phone or on the internet, if they have a problem or a need they have to satisfy.

In relation to gambling issues, my view has been driven by the fact that any policy should be targeted at those who have the problem. Why unnecessarily or unreasonably restrict the 99.6 per cent of the population who do not have a gambling problem, in terms of their access to gambling options? They are quite happy and able to manage in terms of what they seek to do with their dollars and their life.

I am not sure about you, Mr President, but those with younger family members and friends will know that a much more prevalent issue these days is sports betting. Sports betting is done over people's mobile phones, through their computers or television screens, and for a number of acquaintances of my family members—who are much, much younger than I am—

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** Most people are.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** That's true. Their gambling options of choice are moving towards sports betting, and it is being done on their mobile phone or their internet gambling account, or a whole variety of other options that are being done that way. That is not to say that there is not still an issue in relation to the 0.4 per cent of the population who have problem gambling issues in relation to gaming machines, but if we are going to do something, do it on the basis of hard evidence that will actually achieve something rather than just dressing it up so that it appears as if you are going to do something.

The final issue, in relation to the extent of problem gambling—and I guess this is the challenge I put to the minister in terms of providing the hard evidence—is when one looks at the budget papers just released. Page 45 of Budget Paper 3, Volume 3, which is the revenue section, shows the take from gambling taxes predicted by Treasury and government. If you look at the tax take from gaming machines it was estimated at \$287 million for last year; the government estimates that after this very (as they would portray it) significant crackdown on problem gambling, the gaming machine tax take would increase by \$47 million to \$334 million over the forward estimates period.

Whether or not you believe the Treasury estimates is an interesting issue. I know there are some stakeholders within the industry who would say, 'Don't believe what Treasury are predicting,' but nevertheless that is the Treasury estimate on the basis of implementing this particular legislation and its impact on gaming machine revenues.

When one looks at the take from the Casino, which is separately listed as opposed to gaming machines, the tax take from the Casino will double from \$22 million to \$45 million over the forward estimate period—an extra \$23 million from the Casino in terms of the total take. The take from the South Australian TAB, obviously, will be at a much lower level, and that from South Australian Lotteries will be significantly reduced as a result of the recent privatisation by the Labor government.

The evidence would appear to be the contrary; that is, it is indicating that the extent of the tax take is going to increase significantly. That does not prove that there are going to be more problem gamblers. It does not prove anything other than the fanciful notion that in some way what the government is doing here is going to influence in a negative way the tax take coming in—because it is not: it is going to influence it in a positive way—or it will reduce the number of problem gamblers. As I have said, there has been no evidence given by the government that it will do that.

I asked earlier if the minister would provide in her reply the members of the Casino task force; I just repeat that particular question. I asked the minister, in relation to the gaming machine revenue estimates that Treasury has done, whether she is prepared to provide advice from Treasury on what basis they have estimated such significant increases in gaming machine revenue and whether or not they have had advice from stakeholders in the industry that they do not believe the accuracy of those particular estimates as well.

In one of the press releases issued by minister Rau in the last week, he indicated, for example, that 'The Liberals' amendments mean no reduction in venues, no reduction in the number of machines.' Clearly, the minister is saying that there will be a reduction in the total number of machines under this particular measure. Can the minister indicate what the government estimates what total reduction in the number of machines will be?

Clearly, if an extra 505 machines are going into the Casino, I am assuming the government is telling us that they are going to be reducing the number of machines through their other measures by a number greater than that. So, to see whether or not this particular claim from minister Rau and Premier Weatherill is correct, that their measures will lead to a reduction in the number of machines, my question to the minister is: what are the government's estimates on the number of machines for each of the forward estimate years? With that, I conclude my contribution to the second reading.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (11:33):** I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Reform) Bill 2013. The bill covers two rather contentious issues, the first being the so-called statewide cap on gaming machine entitlements and the second being the Casino expansion.

In relation to the first issue, the bill seeks to establish a statewide cap on gaming machine entitlements that covers all gaming sector venues. As such, the Adelaide Casino will be required to purchase additional gaming machine entitlements it requires through the approved trading system. However, according to the government, SkyCity may require certainty as to the regulatory framework and operating capacity to underpin its investment in an expanded Adelaide Casino.

The bill also provides that, if agreed targets for the Casino obtaining gaming machines are not achieved, the government can provide these entitlements directly to the Adelaide Casino. Gaming machine entitlements obtained this way are not transferable outside of the Adelaide Casino and can only be used in premium gambling areas.

Despite the ability to provide these entitlements directly to the Casino, the government maintains that the statutory target for the number of gaming machines operating in South Australia will not change because they will be offset by additional forfeiture through the approved trading system over time. Indeed, the government appears confident that the inclusion of the Casino in the approved trading system, combined with other proposed changes, will accelerate the overall reduction in the statewide gaming machine entitlements cap.

To suggest that the government is being overly optimistic is an understatement. To be perfectly frank, I think I have more chance of winning the New York Marathon before the target of reducing the number of poker machines to 3,000, trumpeted by the government 2004, is achieved. The deal to give the Casino extra entitlements may as well be a gift wrapped with a 'with compliments' slip from the government. Even blind Freddy can see that the casino stands to gain from this agreement at the expense of the targeted reduction of poker machines. To that end, I foreshadow that I will be moving an amendment that provides for a ballot scheme aimed at achieving the target of reducing the number of poker machines to 3,000 within two years of the act passing if the target is not achieved through the trading round. This will apply to all gambling venues, including the Adelaide Casino.

If the government is serious about reaching its 2004 target, in my lifetime at least, then there ought to be no reason why it would not support this amendment. In addition, I will be proposing that the provisions that allow for the gift of more poker machines in the Casino's premium gambling area be deleted and I will also be opposing a proposal that would allow the Casino to vary the terms of its licence via the approved licensing agreement.

I remain completely gobsmacked at these two changes in particular. On the one hand the government is saying that we need gambling reform to address the issue of problem gambling yet, on the other, it is saying that the Casino can do whatever it likes when it comes to high rollers. It is effectively giving the Casino the green light to adopt different rules for premium gambling areas over the rest of the Casino. Not only can the rules be different, they can also be entirely inconsistent with the act. In short, members are being asked to sign a blank cheque to be paid for by problem gamblers.

The other proposed changes in the bill include differentiating between major and minor poker machine venues, that is hotels and clubs, with vastly different levels of regulation applying to each. Briefly, major venues will be those with 40 to 60 poker machines, while minor venues will be limited to a maximum of 20 poker machines.

From 1 January 2014, major venues will be required to have both precommitment and automated risk-monitoring systems in place. The precommitment system will be voluntary for patrons. That is, even though venues will be required to operate machines that offer precommitment, it will not be mandatory for patrons to sign up to any such scheme. This completely defeats its purpose.

From 1 January 2016, only major venues with these systems in place will be able to retain loyalty programs and current opening-hour arrangements. From 1 January 2020, only those major venues that have complied with all these requirements will be able to retain automated coin machines. By 1 January 2017, major venues will also be required to install more sophisticated poker machines that comply with modern standards and are capable of being remotely controlled, receiving and displaying on-screen messages and being limited to a \$5 maximum bet. Major venues that comply with these requirements will also be able to offer account-based cashless gaming, and those customers who register for such an account will have access to the precommitment system and be monitored using the automated risk-monitoring systems.

Of course, there are a number of other changes that will accompany the distinction between major and minor venues, but I will not go into all of these at this stage other than to say that they are, according to the government, designed to reduce the harm caused by problem gambling, a claim which is, at best, wishful thinking. Members would have no doubt received correspondence and/or met with representatives from the concern sector, including SACOSS and Uniting Communities (formerly known as UnitingCare Wesley), about this bill.

Members will also no doubt be aware that I intend to move a number of amendments aimed at dealing with the issues raised by some representatives of the concern sector that actually have half a hope of addressing problem gambling. Those amendments include removing the distinction between major and minor venues. They also include limiting cash facility withdrawals within the Casino to \$200 per transaction per card per day; limiting the return-to-player rate of 87.5 per cent to within a calendar year rather than having it open-ended over the life of the machine; providing for \$1 maximum bets and capped jackpots in line with the Productivity Commission's recommendations; introducing a mandatory five-second break in play; and limiting cashless gaming.

If those amendments are not supported, and I am not holding my breath, I will be moving an alternative set of amendments aimed at making all poker machines and poker machine venues subject to the same level of regulation. In other words, the bans on coin machines and loyalty schemes, the requirement for pre-commitment schemes, the limits on cash facility withdrawals, and the requirements in relation to opening hours and the like would apply to all venues irrespective of whether they are major or minor venues. The amendments would also reduce the number of machines allowable in a major venue to 40, as is presently the case, and minor venues to 10.

In terms of the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund, I will be proposing that a gambling advisory committee be established in order to advise the minister on the performance of his or her functions in applying the funds towards programs for or related to minimising problem gambling and rehabilitation. That committee would also have the power to provide advice on its own initiative to the minister or the authority on any other matters relating to the gambling industry.

It is not very often that we see the Australian Hotels Association (AHA) and Clubs SA disagreeing over poker machine reforms but in this instance I think it is fair to say they are divided. Clubs SA have voiced their very strong opposition to the proposed changes and have advocated strongly for the bill to be split, allowing the amendments relating to the Casino to be dealt with

separately to those relating to poker machine reforms. The Hon. Rob Lucas has outlined their case very well.

From their perspective, dealing with the bill in its current form will only serve to encourage the expansion of the largest and wealthiest sector of the industry—that is, the Adelaide Casino, Woolworths, Coles and other commercial hotel groups—at the expense of sporting and community clubs. That view is obviously shared by most, if not all, of Clubs SA members, many of whom have written to me as well as honourable members about this bill.

It should come as no surprise that the only thing that the concern sector and Clubs SA appear to agree on in relation to this bill is that lack of adequate public consultation in the lead-up to its introduction. Interestingly, and perhaps for the first time, the AHA appears to have remained rather silent on the proposed reforms at least insofar as lobbying for or against the proposed changes.

In relation to the Casino expansion, the bill proposed to make amendments to the Casino Act to enable the Casino to offer what the government refers to as internationally competitive gaming product comparable to interstate and overseas competitors. To my knowledge, the Adelaide Casino masterplan incorporates a hotel, car park, more gaming facilities, VIP suites, restaurants, and even a rooftop spa and pool, all aimed at attracting high rollers to Adelaide.

The fact that the bill introduces a distinction between the Casino premises and gambling areas to allow children into the non-gambling parts of the Casino certainly tends to suggest that the Casino is looking to incorporate many facilities such as those that exist, for example, in Melbourne's Crown Casino. For those members who are not aware, the Crown Casino has a number of retail outlets, eateries, restaurants, nightclubs and bars. It also has a cinema and rather large children's entertainment venue or gaming arcade, the Galactic Circus, within its premises.

Galactic Circus is said to be Australia's largest indoor theme park and, from what I understand, children of all ages can enter, irrespective of whether they are accompanied by an adult. I do not know whether the Adelaide Casino intends to incorporate these very sorts of facilities, but the proposed amendments in the bill will certainly enable it to do so. Of course, I cannot be sure of any of this (and this applies to other members as well) because many of us have been kept completely in the dark about the Casino expansion. The information provided by the government certainly does not go into any detail about the redevelopment.

Indeed, there has been some suggestion that this is not the appropriate forum for a detailed discussion about the Casino development. The Hon. Rob Lucas, on behalf of the opposition, has certainly expressed that view. With respect, I strongly disagree with the position, particularly if we, as I understand it, are being asked by the opposition to consider splitting the bill so that the Casino-related provisions can be dealt with separately. Given that the opposition intends to support those provisions, we will be none the wiser, at least in the short term, as to detail of the expansion if this goes ahead.

Members may recall that in February this year I asked the Premier and Treasurer a series of questions on this very issue, which to date remain unanswered. By way of background, I explained that in December of last year the former treasurer announced that the government had struck a deal concerning the future of the Casino, which would give SkyCity Entertainment Group's casino exclusivity until 2035, but they would pay more tax. Treasurer Snelling said that the deal would see SkyCity's tax arrangements on a more equal footing as those currently paid by South Australian hotel owners.

In addition, the Casino would be allowed to operate 1,500 gaming machines, up from 995, and 200 table games, up from 80. The government claimed that in return the Casino would have the strongest possible responsible gambling measures applied to any casino in Australia. I will be seeking a response from the government to all the questions I asked in February before proceeding any further with this bill.

In particular, I think it is absolutely critical that we know: what parts of the Casino's master plan have been agreed to, if any, and what are the details of the plan; what this plan will mean in terms of the heritage areas at the rear of Parliament House and within the existing Casino building; what, if any, considerations have been given to safety issues around Parliament House; whether the master plan seeks to incorporate a multilevel car park and how this will impact on existing heritage structures; and, perhaps more importantly, whether there has been any consultation or feedback from the public regarding the Casino's redevelopment plans and, in particular, the



proposal to erect a new contemporary-style building that is to extend to the River Torrens, adjoining the existing heritage building.

I will also be seeking a more detailed explanation about the proposals to allow the Casino to vary its licence via the ALA and to receive extra entitlements for premium gambling directly from the government. It is absolutely critical that the government and, indeed, the Casino put all their cards on the table so that we can all make an informed decision on this issue, rather than speculating on what the redevelopment will and will not include and what the government has or has not agreed to with the Casino in terms of increased gambling facilities, premium gambling and the like.

On the issue of splitting the bill, I will say that I think the opposition is trying to have a two-way bet on this bill: on the one hand, they are trying to deliver to the Adelaide Casino its expansion wish list on a silver platter, and on the other they are trying to overcome the need for adequate regulatory restrictions and consumer protection measures around poker machines in clubs and hotels.

I do not agree with some of the comments of the Hon. Rob Lucas regarding the lack of consultation and the like on this bill. However, there is no doubt in my mind that if the bill is split the opposition will oppose any proposal aimed at reducing the harm caused by problem gambling. Some of the amendments on file clearly demonstrate this. Whilst I have serious concerns about the government bill, I have even greater concern about what is being proposed by the opposition. Taking the lipstick off the pig is not the solution. For the record, although I do not necessarily agree with the way this bill has been presented, I am not supportive of having it split. We have come a long way in terms of addressing problem gambling in this state, but there is a very long way to go. I urge the government and other honourable members to give consideration to my amendments.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (11:49):** I rise on behalf of the Greens to indicate our position on the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Reforms) Bill 2013. I indicate that at this point we will support a second reading vote, but we give no guarantees of support for a third reading of this bill. According to the report, this bill:

...takes a holistic and consistent approach to responsible gambling environments across the Casino, clubs and hotels. It seeks to integrate advances in technology with customer care and service that are the hallmark of the hospitality industry.

We also have the background that the commonwealth's proposal for reform of the gambling industry has settled, and that the South Australian government is working with the industry, union and community sectors to deliver practical benefits to the South Australian community. My first question of the minister is: what liaison is being undertaken with what sectors of industry, which unions and what parts of the community sector, and in what way are they delivering practical benefits to the South Australian community?

The bill contains a number of provisions. Certainly, those who read *The Advertiser* would have thought that this bill guarantees a reduction in the number of poker machines in this state. Of course, anyone who reads the bill quickly realises that that is in no way guaranteed. Again, my question to the government is: should the Casino's 505 extra entitlements not be found through the trading rounds, will that mean that these extra entitlements will simply stay in the system, and does that put lie to the government's claims that this bill reduces the number of poker machine licences overall in this state?

We are also told that it will eliminate the need for gaming machine sale and disposal approvals, introduce a consistent code of practice and conditions across all sectors of the gambling industry including wagering and lotteries, extend expiation fees to all licence conditions, extend the rights and responsibilities of licensees to landlords in possession of a gaming venue, and change the tax collection arrangements for casino taxation so that they can be administered by the Commissioner of State Taxation. Obviously, this will not be commencing, as the bill originally intended, from 1 July 2013.

We are further advised that the bill will streamline and simplify recognised training requirements with a greater focus on responsible gambling, simplify and standardise barring arrangements across all sectors of the gaming industry (including wagering and lotteries), and simplify signage requirements to provide for more effective, responsible and problem gambling messages, as well as introduce online employee notifications.

We have heard from previous speakers. I requested to speak after the Hon. John Darley, and I would simply say that the Greens would look favourably on his amendments. We thank the

Hon. Mr Darley's office and staff, and also Senator Nick Xenophon, for the work that they have put in to ensure that this bill, by the end of the third reading stage, will do what Premier Jay Weatherill has said that he believes the bill does. The Premier issued a little poster that is doing the rounds on Twitter, which reads:

Problem gambling continues to adversely impact too many South Australian families.

That's why I want the South Australian Parliament to support the following reforms...I support problem gambling reforms. Do You?

My challenge to the Weatherill Labor government is to support reforms that will actually address problem gambling, and indeed support those who support problem gamblers. Yet, we see a bill that largely addresses the needs of the Casino. Yes, the Casino redevelopment will be very important, I think, to the future of jobs and economic prosperity of the Riverbank development; that is a decision that the government has chosen to pursue and a course that they are taking, but they cannot take that course without ensuring that they are also really addressing problem gambling.

Poker machines are a vexed issue; we all know that. This place has seen three members of parliament elected on a platform of opposing poker machines. I think South Australia, having poker machines far later than my home state of New South Wales, certainly saw that political debate in a much more heated way than I did when I was growing up. However, having been in South Australia for over two decades, I am no stranger to the history of the various reforms intended to minimise harm from poker machines; to extend the profits of those machines to particular sectors to address the harm that they cause directly by supporting problem gamblers; and to ensure that we have great supports in grassroots sport and recreation and, indeed, live music, which is a particular element of the South Australian legislation which I will focus on later.

Of course, poker machines do cause great harm. Four per cent of the adult population play poker machines at least weekly and around 95,000 of those 600,000 Australians are in that group of weekly players who are defined as problem gamblers and, indeed, a further 95,000 are at risk of falling into that category. It is estimated by Uniting Communities that there could be up to 160,000 Australian adults suffering significant problems from gambling and another 350,000 who are vulnerable.

It is said that problem gamblers account for around 40 per cent of total poker machine spending and weekly players spend, on average, \$8,000 a year. That is a sizeable share of the income for a household and it is a cause of harm for some people who cannot afford that amount. Poker machine players, it is said, regularly underestimate their spending and for each problem gambler so many others are affected—their family members, their friends, their employers and their colleagues.

The social costs of problem gambling are serious and they include depression, relationship breakdowns, lower work productivity, job losses, bankruptcy, crime and, indeed, sometimes suicide—unfortunately not all that rarely do they include suicide. The social cost of problem gambling is estimated to be around \$4.7 billion a year.

Let's not look at this bill as all revenue; indeed, there are large costs associated with this industry and we should have those in mind—certainly the Greens have those in mind. We take umbrage at the Premier's claim that if you oppose this bill you do not support addressing problem gambling. We do not think this bill goes far enough; we do not think this bill is strong enough; and we do not really think that this bill does everything that it could do to address problem gambling.

Uniting Communities have welcomed this legislation because they welcome the removal of an additional 700 poker machines. Again, I reiterate: what happens to the 505 extra entitlement should they not be found through the trading rounds? Do we simply have them in the system as additional, and does that put the lie to the government's headline media grab on this bill?

This bill does not address dollar bet limits. I note that the Hon. John Darley will be moving amendments on that. The government has claimed that dropping \$10 limits down to \$5 limits is a great step forward, and it is a position that the Greens have long held. Certainly Senator Richard Di Natale has long championed dollar bets. We will continue our position to support a drop to dollar bets.

I acknowledge some of the words of the Hon. Rob Lucas, that it is something that has not been modelled and something that has not been tested or costed. It has, however, been recommended by the Productivity Commission but it has been blocked at a federal level from

having been costed and modelled. The Greens have done their utmost, in terms of moving for further research and information in that area, and we will continue to do so.

We will continue to take on board the care sector, as the government has been calling it in this debate, although I would call it the community sector, and also the words of groups like Communities Against Pokies who call for dollar bets. We are told in our consultations—and on this bill they have been quite extensive—that dollar bets may kill the industry. That may or may not be true. I guess what we really need to be evaluating is how this industry affects South Australia, how it affects our community, how it affects our sport and recreation, how it affects our culture and, of course, how it affects those people who are unfortunate enough to have a problem with their gambling, and indeed their friends, families and colleagues.

The Greens have long highlighted—and this has not yet been raised in this debate, so I will go into some detail on this point—that SACOSS which is, of course, the South Australian Council of Social Service, which we do rely on to provide researched advocacy in this area, has never received funding. In October 2011 I raised with the then minister, minister Gago, when she was the relevant minister in this area, whether or not she was concerned that the SACOSS submission to a 2011 code of practice review consisted of 1½ pages which essentially said that they were unable to provide input because they did not have the adequate resources to do so. This was quite concerning because they were the only non-gambling industry body to make a written submission to that particular review.

I would have thought at that point that would raise alarm bells with the government, but when I raised this question with the minister—why the community sector was not being adequately resourced to ensure that we had the wide range of voices that we need for a healthy democracy—she said that they could get an extension. At the time I pointed out that I thought she was missing the point and drew her attention further to the words in the letter:

The sector recognises the importance of the codes of practice under review and has concerns particularly around the regulation of gambling advertising. However, SACOSS is unable to put a submission or any information to the review at this stage. This should not be interpreted as a lack of concern from the sector about the issues, nor an endorsement of the current guidelines and practices.

SACOSS receives no funding from the IGA or from government for gambling advocacy. We have on many occasions over the last year made representations to government alerting them to the fact that we do not have the resources to keep relevant members informed of IGA and government processes and to aggregate and articulate the sector's position on gambling regulation. We believe this creates a serious imbalance in public policy. In other industries where there is a similar asymmetry of power and resources between industry and consumers (e.g. utilities), funds are made available to underpin consumer advocacy so as to ensure the interests of vulnerable consumers are recognised and represented. This is not the case in relation to gambling, despite many key reforms currently under consideration.

We are aware that some organisations in our sector will put in submissions to the review and we welcome their work...

I move away from the letter at that point and note that, in fact, SACOSS was the only organisation able to make a submission to that review that was not from the industry. It continues:

However, we remain concerned that the voices of many organisations in our sector, particularly smaller service providers and consumer groups, will not be heard in this review (and in relation to gambling regulation more generally) because of lack of resourcing.

The very disappointing response from the then minister has certainly not been rectified under the current ministerial arrangements and, indeed, the SACOSS submission to the gambling reform bill before us starts with the words:

There was no public consultation in the lead up to the introduction of the Statutes Gambling Reform Bill. SACOSS and a limited number of other stakeholders were consulted confidentially, but in its response SACOSS was clear that we were not in a position to provide a detailed response to the proposals. We did provide formal feedback with a number of proposals. None were adopted in the Bill. However, other changes have been made which weaken the reforms in favour of industry interests.

That to me rings alarm bells. I would have thought that it would do with government as well. Again, they go on to say:

Due to lack of resources, SACOSS has not been able to evaluate all clauses in the Bill or consult with the sector on the implications of the proposed changes. Accordingly, while the comments here are based on our established policies and concerns around gambling regulation, the particular comments are tentative and not necessarily the final SACOSS position on the specific proposals.

So it should come as no surprise to government that a party like the Greens, which does indeed liaise quite strongly with the South Australian Council of Social Service, and the community sector and those who stand up for problem gambling and, as I say, Communities Against Pokies, will have great concerns about this bill and will ask many questions in the committee stage. We will seek not to rush this bill through according to the timetable of the Casino, but to ensure that this bill does what the Premier said it would do on Twitter and actually support a reform of the industry to support problem gamblers and to eradicate problem gambling. SACOSS goes on to say:

SACOSS has long believed that the community would be better served by fewer gaming machines and fewer venues. To the extent that the current proposals will see a boost to trading in entitlements and therefore the compulsory surrendering of some entitlements, we support the broad direction of the proposals. Similarly, if the proposed scheme results in fewer poker machine venues because the trading scheme sees bigger venues entering the market to take advantage of the increase in the number of machines allowed at a venue, then this too would be welcomed.

However, I do ask the government how it guarantees that under this bill, and I will certainly ask it to address that in its second reading summary. SACOSS raises specific issues about the bill and says quite clearly and starkly:

SACOSS supports the Productivity Commission recommendation of a \$1 bet limit.

It also goes on further to say there should be no exemptions to the bet limit. It addresses another area which I understand is the subject of some amendments which have been moved by the Hon. John Darley. It also goes on to say:

...we maintain our broad concerns around cashless gambling, but if it is to be introduced as part of this integrated system, it should be available only to those who enter the pre-commitment system.

Certainly, we have thanked SACOSS for the work that it has been able to do in addressing this bill. Given the role of advocacy in a healthy democracy, I would have thought that the government would have ensured that the only voice that is currently in a position to be making a submission in most of the reviews would actually be ensured to have the resourcing to do so in a much stronger way than currently exists in our state.

I will go further into some of my concerns about advocacy near the end of my speech, but I will move on to clubs, which, of course, have been well addressed here. I thank the Hon. Rob Lucas for reading out some of the work of clubs, because I would have done so, had he not. I have been greatly concerned with the level of consultation with clubs about this bill and the nature of the consultations in general. 'Decide and declare', we were told, was a hallmark of the Rann government and not the Weatherill government, but when you consult but do so in confidence, and do so without adequate resourcing, that is not true consultation.

I agree that you do not have to take on board each idea that somebody puts forward as part of the consultation process, but you do have to have a transparent process, and I believe the lack of transparency here has gone a long way to eroding faith in the consultation processes that were undertaken. The clubs, of course, have written, I believe, to all members, certainly all members of the opposition and crossbenches, in this place, and they have put a case, quite strongly I believe, that they do not fare well as a result of the changes under this bill. Their concerns are for their grassroots activities, and my concerns in particular are for that community activity that they engender and the sport and recreational activities of our state.

It is no secret that our sport and recreation funding has been falling in this state for some time. Indeed, current minister Bignell was quite critical, prior to his elevation, of the parlous state of funding to sport and recreation. I hope that he would rectify that situation now that he is in the exact position he needs to be in to ensure that we have a healthy sport and recreational culture in our state.

I will highlight some of the work of some of our South Australian clubs. The Central District Football Club spends more than a quarter of a million dollars each year on sporting facilities. These include gym and training facilities to develop the game of Australian Rules football in the northern community, from Auskick through to under 15s football, and it conducts development squads for under 13s, 14s and 15s. Its services to the community, through allowing other sporting codes to use the Playford Alive Oval and the promotion of schools' football programs, are well valued by the northern community. Sponsorship of many other sporting codes is also part of the work of the Central District Football Club; indeed, its donations of funds and merchandise are in excess of \$45,000 each year to schools, churches and charities.

Not to be too partisan—although, 'Go Doggies'—the Norwood Football Club, which is doing far better on the ladder this year (but they are certainly not my team) provides great support for its local communities as well. It provides community and recreational facilities for community sporting clubs and locally zoned schools, and these include daily use by primary school children from the Norwood Primary School. Its support for affiliated clubs includes a partnership arrangement with local netball clubs and an arrangement of mutual use and support with community groups via the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council and the Norwood RSL.

The North Adelaide Football Club also provides sporting facilities for young players and coaches. The club engages in community and recreational provision of facilities, providing personal training and expertise as well as entertainment through member and partner engagement. It runs football schools and clinics, and junior development clinics in the holidays. It supports other not-for-profit organisations, it offers a function facility, and it donates the time of its players and supports opportunities at its own matches for other community groups.

The South Adelaide Football Club is very similar. Again, it supports its local community through the provision of community and recreational facilities. It also maintains the children's playground next to the club and maintains the community function centre.

*The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** It has some interesting things and, as the Hon. Robert Brokenshire says, it is a good club. It has a Panther Be Your Best education program, in primary schools, and the Southern Man Made program, which provides mentoring to young boys in the community aged 11 to 16 who do not have a father figure. Having worked for an organisation that ran Big Brothers Big Sisters, I know that is an area of great need in our community, and I certainly commend the club for that. It also supports fundraising activities on game days, and it has community events and Christmas carols functions each year.

The Sturt Football Club provides sporting facilities, including a gym and grandstands, and community and recreational facilities in their admin building. It provides services to the community through its charity partner, the Childhood Cancer Association; indeed, that association has raised more than \$175,000 in the last four years. It also supports other sporting organisations, including Sturt tennis, bowls and cricket clubs.

The West Adelaide Football Club, again, provides facilities. It also supports women's football. Its community and recreational facilities are used by its zoned clubs, including the Riverland, Mallee, Roxby Downs and Coober Pedy. Services to the community include the St Martin's Aged Care Facility and Western Futures, and it also works with other not-for-profits, including Mission Australia, Woods Panthers Netball Club, Adelaide Lightning Basketball, and the South Australian Gridiron Association.

The Woodville West Torrens Football Club is similar again, supporting junior development and providing support to the community at large. It provides its facilities and, in conjunction with the City of Charles Sturt, provides a major sporting hub as well as meeting and conference facilities. It also holds regular bingo sessions and has, for over 20 years, provided a social gathering for the local elderly community.

The Marion Sporting Club's facilities are utilised by the Marion Football Club, the Marion Cricket Club, the Marion Tennis Club, the Marion Lawn Bowling Club, the Marion Croquet Club, the trotting club, the swimming club, the women's soccer club, the Thunder men's soccer club, the Atlantis Masters Swimming Club, the Marlin Masters Swimming Club, the Arista Marion Korfbal Club, the South City Chiefs Gridiron Club, the Glenelg Rebels Softball Club, the Over 60s Cricket Club, and the South Adelaide Basketball Club.

They also provide community and recreational facilities free of charge, including the oval pitches, clubrooms, trotting track, function rooms, and a fortnightly market. While all the open-space grounds are available to the general public for recreational use, their support for non-profits include Novita—as I believe the Hon. Rob Lucas has already commended them for—Kanga Cricket, Auskick, Brighton Lions, Mitcham Kiwanis, Marion Probus, Ladies Keep Fit, COTA, Holdfast View, Marion View, Brighton Rotary, Brighton Kiwanis, Holdfast JPs, Marion Lions, the Adelaide Rock 'n' Roll Club, and Sunrise Christian School through everyday use.

There are similar supports given, as highlighted by the Hon. Rob Lucas, by the Para Hills Community Club, the Renmark Club—which must have special mention made of their \$90,000 commitment to Renmark's town square upgrade and 10 sporting and social clubs meeting

in that premises each month—the Roopena Football & Sporting Club, the Mount Gambier Community RSL, Squash SA, and Adelaide Juventus Sports & Social Club. The list goes on and on of clubs that impact on our local communities.

Clubs are greatly affected by this bill, and we have strong concerns about that. We have those concerns because we do not want to see measures taken here impact on the provision of community supports and, as I say, in particular, sport and recreational supports in our state, where we have, indeed, such a parlous state of funding under the current regime.

I also want to move on to the current situation with problem gamblers. In the course of this bill and briefing myself, I contacted Communities Against Pokies, which I have previously worked with on other issues. I want to thank, in particular, Shanika, Sharon and Julia. Julia may be known to many of you as the woman who runs Pokies Anonymous. I want to draw members' attention to the fact that Pokies Anonymous is currently operating on a shoestring budget out of Julia's pocket. It is not receiving any government funding.

Given the millions of dollars associated with the distribution of funds that are supposed to address poker machine harm, it defies belief that Pokies Anonymous is run by one woman, out of her own pocket, from the Thebarton Community Centre, and she is unable to actually pay the phone bill at times to keep that service going. This is a service that saves lives, this is a service that helps those most in need, and it is a service that in previous years has received some small amount of government funding.

I do not have the exact figures in front of me, but I think amounts of around \$20,000 have been allocated from the relevant fund, but those small amounts of money come with strings attached, so Julia is not prepared to sign the publicity clause that goes into those contracts that would effectively, in her words, 'gag her' from providing advocacy and comment on problem gambling from the mouths of problem gamblers and those who support them most directly.

I call on the government to ensure that there is no publicity clause inserted into any contract that supports those who support problem gamblers. I draw the government's attention to the fact that they do not resource SACOSS, they do not resource advocacy in this area, and they seek to gag, through their publicity clause, even the smallest of organisations, such as Pokies Anonymous, which might actually provide an independent voice in this debate.

I will have further questions in the committee stage about the state of funding and the various revenue streams that were set up under the act. I ask the government to provide this council with the originally allocated amounts for the Sport and Recreation Fund, the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund, the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund and the Community Development Fund. I would like the government to then also compare those originally allocated amounts with the amounts that were allocated in the last financial year and provide that transparency.

I am aware that under the Community Development Fund falls a live music fund, and the act provides that 'at least \$500,000 must be applied from the fund in each financial year towards programs that will be of benefit to the live music industry'. Certainly that \$500,000, since the fund's inception 10 years ago, has not been increased; it sits at \$500,000. I asked the library to calculate the amount had it been increased according to CPI and it was a little over \$844,000.

I will be urging the government to ensure that it at least looks at increasing the fund to \$850,000, given the effect that the poker machine industry has had on live music in this state and given that, when we first introduced poker machines into this state, it was recognised that the effect on live music would in fact be detrimental. Also, let us provide some transparency about how much money we have been diverting into the supports to address the harm that we know is significant and, indeed, the supports that we need to ensure a healthy sport and recreation sector, as we were promised. Let us pick apart those funds.

I also ask the government to provide information to this council on the organisations that have received funding and the amounts they have received over the past 10 years, since the funds' inception. That would also be helpful to the debate in terms of whether or not we are distributing the revenue from these licences in the way that reflects what this council previously decided and whether some new decisions need to be made about addressing areas of need.

The Casino does stand to benefit significantly from this bill, and we will certainly be seeking further details from the government regarding the arrangements it has with the Casino and, indeed, the revenues it expects to receive as a result of this bill. We asked the government to put on the record the amount in gaming-machine revenue that it expects to receive in this financial year and in

the next two financial years and how that correlates with its claim that we are reducing gambling harm with the passage of this bill.

With those remarks, I look forward to a robust and detailed committee stage. I would like to believe the Premier's words when he says that he will be leading the charge to address gambling harm and ensure that these reforms really do so. With that, the Greens will support the second reading but we reserve our judgement on the third.

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (12:23):** I will speak at the second reading stage of this debate with many questions rather than a resolution of my exact position on this bill. It is nearly two decades since we introduced gaming machines into this state, so it was not long after I commenced my junior years at primary school. I know there are many people like myself who rue the day that these machines were introduced. The battle against them has, of course, launched the political careers of some, such as Senator Nick Xenophon and other colleagues in this very place.

Perhaps it would have been better if state parliament had never legislated to allow them, but the fact is that we have gaming machines (or pokies) in South Australia and, despite some reductions, I understand that there are still more than 12,800 poker machines currently operational around the state, with more than 90 per cent located in hotels, including the Casino.

At this point I thank Brad Green from the Attorney-General's office for the comprehensive and frank briefing he provided to my office staff on this bill. It is appreciated, and the complexity of this issue is, of course, not lost on me. I also thank Bill Cochrane from Clubs SA for briefing my office and me. I also thank the many sporting clubs that have contacted my office, raising their concerns over this bill. They have mainly been SANFL clubs. I appreciate the concerns they have but note that these would be the wealthier clubs that stand to lose from reforms in this bill, whereas I have not heard from some of the very small grassroots clubs such as the Glenelg Women's Soccer Club about what they believe the impact of this bill would be on them. I would hazard a guess that they would, one, have much tighter finances than your average SANFL club and, two, have less awareness on their voluntary management boards and committees of the reforms and fewer resources to lobby their local state MP. I certainly appreciate those pressures.

I think it is essential that the government takes the small sporting clubs that support children, people with disability, women, and migrant and refugee communities with, say, a soccer club and the impact that this has on their financial viability. All four of these sectors in our sport and recreation community are marginalised in some way in their ability to access sport and recreation options. They have fewer financial resources and receive a tiny portion of corporate sponsorship dollars committed to sport in this country.

The people in communities I am referring to are not professional sportsmen—and I say men because so few women receive any sort of wage or sponsorship dollars in the Australian sporting environment at present even when they perform successfully at the same level as their male peers. I would like to know what modelling has been done by the government to assess this bill's impact on these communities.

At this point I note the total value of grants from the Office for Recreation and Sport stands at only \$6.7 million, yet I understand that the state government profits about \$270 million from poker machines and it seems a huge disparity in profits versus what is given to sporting and recreation clubs. I believe those grants can only be given to clubs which do not have gaming machines. This state government is now in a situation where it is very dependent on the profits it draws from poker machines and as other revenues fall. Despite there being obvious harms involved in those who end up with problem gambling habits, it puts any government in an obvious conflict of interest situation.

I have some concerns that the SkyCity Casino and other large venues will now have increased capacity to offer gaming machines, and I believe this should be of concern to us all. Intuitively I would have thought it a preferable scenario if more clubs with smaller numbers of poker machines were allowed to have them rather than large venues with hundreds of poker machines run by pokie barons, but I understand that the expert research in relation to problem gambling arguably shows otherwise. It seems more people sharing in smaller amounts of profits would make better economic sense but, as I say, apparently this does not stem problem gambling.

I have a few questions that I would like answered about this bill before I make further deliberations on it. For example, what is the total revenue on gaming machines in South Australia? What is the total profit to state government from gaming machines in this state? How much is spent on support programs and financial management training intervention and support programs for

problem gamblers? Why does this bill not have a \$1 maximum bet as recommended by SACOSS and Uniting Communities?

For small clubs that will lose gaming machine revenue as a result of these reforms, what other funding mechanisms will the state government implement to ensure that these community organisations can still be financially viable and provide support and services to their local communities? Given that we are discouraging sports clubs from entering the gaming machine market, or reducing their interest if they are already in the market, why has the overall funding for sport and recreation grants through the Office for Recreation and Sport been cut in the past six months? What percentage of gaming machines in South Australia are owned by multinational companies, and when will the state government agreement with the Casino regarding the increasing of gaming machine numbers from 955 to 1,500 be finalised?

That is all I have to say for the moment. I have more questions than a statement of position at this point, and I look forward to further discussions with the government on this bill and also the opposition and the Hon. Mr Darley, who I believe both have amendments to the government's bill that are at least worth considering.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (12:30):** There are quite a few things Family First wants to put on the public record and in *Hansard* during the second reading of this bill. First, we would have preferred a parliamentary select committee rather than the mess we now have that we are trying to manage in the parliament. The reason is that, if you go back to the mid-1990s, the then responsible minister, the Hon. Graham Ingerson, as the transition into gaming through poker machines came to be a reality from the debate in 1993 through to existence, it was clear there were problems. The select committee, where all parliamentarians and the public had an opportunity under privilege to put forward their concerns, I believe gained a lot, including the first minister for gambling, which was my privilege to be able to take up and set up, and of course the IGA and Rob Chappell, who is still there as the head of that today.

I think down the track now some 15 years or more, 17 or 18 years in fact, we should have had a select committee that was open and transparent. Unfortunately, we have seen six years of hard work by all sectors involved directly or indirectly in a profitability exercise or in picking up the pieces where the damage of gaming and gambling addiction occur, putting in six years of goodwill and effort, only to be overridden by the government at the end of the day and now forcing us to debate a bill fairly quickly.

I say at this point that the government was happy to procrastinate for at least two years when it came to the original proposition that the Casino put forward for expansion, but all of a sudden, I know for a fact, SkyCity, its directors and the parent company in New Zealand, where all the profits ultimately go back from Adelaide to deliver fatter wallets and purses in New Zealand, were getting very frustrated with the procrastination of the government, but suddenly we have to fast track through this legislation.

It is with regret that a government, which now says that it actually consults, considers and then announces, basically totally ignored the responsible gambling working party, and to me that is disappointing. The select committee would have been a way forward to come up with long-term planning and strategy for this industry and those affected adversely by the industry.

One of the things that frustrated me when I had the privilege of setting up, as the first minister for gambling, is that Treasury always kept control of the financial revenue. Since then and to this day you have the Treasurer, who is the Premier, controlling what happens with the revenue from gaming, but you have a minister trying to manage the damage that occurs daily throughout the community and society, and really we should have given the government of the day—and I appeal to this government to reconsider this—full responsibility for the portfolio of gambling to one minister, rather than splitting the role. We all know who wins in cabinet, and it is the Treasurer, the Premier and the Deputy Premier over and above the portfolios which individual ministers may have.

It is worth putting on the public record that it was actually the former Labor government that decided the policy would be to have gaming in both pubs and clubs; many of us would prefer that there was not any gaming at all. There are a lot of people who come to Family First and say that they would like to see all poker machines removed from the state, but the reality is that that is not going to occur; therefore, we have to deal as best we can with the situation as we see it today and for the future.



Gaming machines and gambling will continue in clubs and pubs into the very long-term future, as I see it. What we will be looking at and considering as we hear the debate from colleagues in different parties will be what is possibly achievable within this bill based on the premise that gaming and gambling are here for the long-term future, and how we can best manage the industry on that premise.

One of the things on which I want to take issue with the government is that one of the strong debates from government has been, 'Well, with this legislation that we are putting up now, we will give the Casino another 505 machines,' and they will also be able to set up these super venues—I call them 'mini-casinos'—of up to 60 machines. I do not see those being set up in the country, because I do not think there would be a significant return in the country for those machines and the capital cost involved in developing them.

Certainly, we would, if this legislation goes through, see super venues. The government says there will be more responsible gambling management as a result of that. I ask the minister, when we get into committee, to actually table the scientific evidence they have around where there will be more responsible management of problem gambling with those bigger venues.

It is my observation, whilst I will not play and do not enjoy gaming machines at all, when you go into the local tavern like the one in my home town of Mount Compass, where they have around 12 machines, that those owners are very responsible when it comes to keeping an eye on people. They know them well, and they know when they may have had enough. I do not see that as being a strong argument at all from the government that, by setting up these super venues, the smaller hotels and clubs are not as responsible. I ask the government to actually table the evidence and research with that information.

One of the things that Family First has been really critical of has been the issue around the buyback. I just want to put on the public record a national story that I was involved in on the ABC's *7:30 Report*, together with Mr Geoff Tester from the Peterborough Hotel. During that interview, Mr Tester said:

I can't sell the hotel because the hotels aren't selling at the moment. There's no money around, banks aren't lending money, so the only option we've got really is to sell the poker machines. Once I've sold the poker machines then I've got a freehold hotel that you could probably sell for two or three hundred thousand, without any problems.

The interviewer then said:

The licences for his 16 machines are worth close to a million dollars, but to sell them the odds are stacked against him. He's up against the most restrictive trading laws in the nation. Other states like New South Wales and Victoria allow operators to offload pokie licences whenever they like, but the South Australian government only permits two trading rounds a year.

Mr Tester, to this day, still has not been able to sell those machines. I would have thought it would have been a good situation for Peterborough to have had a reduction in machine numbers available to their community like any other town or metropolitan area, but the reality is that he just cannot get a buyer.

I believe this government has committed to the state's longest-ever broken election promise, failing to deliver the full 3,000 poker machine reduction target. In fact, this government, as of today, is now eight years late in delivering that reduction; they are about 800 machines short, and that has been the case for some time. The trading rounds are critical for that reduction, with every fourth machine sold by hotels cancelled, and every fourth machine sold by clubs and community hotels transferred to Club One.

In the recent June trading round, 57 entitlements were sold, seeing six hotel entitlements cancelled and nine transferred to Club One—six entitlements cancelled when the government is almost 800 short of the 3,000 reduction target from 2004. When this was supported through both houses of the South Australian parliament, then minister Michael Wright was adamant that we would see that reduction occur in a fairly quick amount of time. As I say, that is over eight years ago.

At present there are still only two trading rounds per annum and yet, as I said, it is unrestricted in New South Wales and Victoria. Labor have also mucked about with a fixed price and finally at a floating price but the trade is still far too slow. The convenient thing for the government, of course, that we probably miss, is that the longer it mucks about and dithers the more revenue it gets from machines that it should have removed eight years ago.

In 2010-11 the government made \$291 million in gambling taxes; \$290 million in 2011-12; and was estimated to be \$287 million this year. In 2013-14, at the completion of this financial year, they estimate that it will be \$300 million, rising to \$311 million in 2014-15, \$331 million in 2015-16 and, in the most outward year of the forward estimates, it will be \$344 million in 2016-17. These figures include contemplations of this regulatory regime. Clearly, as Budget Paper 3 states:

The revised growth projections reflect the maturing nature of the market as well as the introduction of regulatory reforms within the industry.

The structure of this bill is in response to the Casino's demand to be given an extra 505 gaming entitlements to support its approximately \$300 million redevelopment. As we see it, to make that work under the existing restrictive trading round system, the government needed to create a stimulus to entitlement trade by giving entitlement owners opportunities to trade machines.

They have done that by creating a time frame with a deadline of 2017 by which time venues will either have to be under 20 machines and operate under existing regulation or have a right to have as many as 60 machines but be ready for greater regulation. Of course, for the right price paid by the Casino, the trade will get underway. If they bid high enough, sellers will trade.

The clubs industry is happy to expand the Casino's entitlement but not allow the other part through, as I understand it, hence the Hon. Rob Lucas talking about splitting the bill. The clubs industry is very concerned about consultation—and I will not go into that further because the Hon. Rob Lucas has outlined it at length. I understand the government does not want to split this bill.

I am negotiating at the moment with people within my own party about other ways that we could look at improving the issues around problem gambling and the stalemates that are clearly before my colleagues in this chamber. However, again, we do need to see the reduction of poker machine entitlements to 3,000 and put the interest of communities first in how we make the ultimate decision on these issues.

In completing this, I want to put a couple of other points on the record. During committee I said that the minister needed to explain very precisely and clearly the different tax regimes for hotels, clubs and community-owned hotels and for the Casino. We need to get absolute clarity on what the situation is because, from documentation that I have, it appears that the Adelaide Casino is doing very well and will do even better with the propositions that have been signed off by the government regarding its tax rates compared to others.

For a profit venue, every dollar of net gaming revenue over \$3.5 million is taxed at 65 per cent plus 10 per cent GST of the total \$1; in a non-profit venue, they are taxed at 55 per cent; but in the Casino on non-VIP machines, every dollar of NGR from zero and beyond \$3.5 million, with no maximum threshold, will be taxed at only the average of the hotel/club sector to a maximum of 41¢ plus 10 per cent. In the Casino on the VIP machines every dollar of NGR from zero and beyond \$3.5 million, with no maximum threshold, will be taxed at only 10.9¢ plus 10 per cent GST. Any for-profit venue seeking to move from 40 to 60 machines would obviously be paying all additional revenue generated at 74¢ in every dollar; however, the Casino machines in the VIP area—up to 1,500 of them—will only be taxed to a maximum of 50¢ in every dollar. That is how I understand it from advice given to me and I ask the minister to confirm that. I want to place on record some questions for the minister:

1. To what extent does this bill reflect the findings of the Fifth Report of the Responsible Gaming Working Party?
2. Is it correct that the precommitment component of this bill, or accompanying this bill, will see South Australia as it currently stands be the first in the nation to implement precommitment in 2017, ahead of the national phase in 2018?
  - (a) Was that the Responsible Gaming Working Party's recommendation?
  - (b) What reasons—our government may have good ones—does the government have for going into that arrangement earlier or is it just as the Hon. Rob Lucas has said, calling it a race to be first?
3. What is the current tax rate for the Casino on all their gambling products?
4. What is the basis for a person to qualify as a high roller to come within that taxation regime and could it be that a South Australian citizen spending as little as \$1,000 in a year could qualify to go into the high roller new venue development?

5. It has been said—and I have seen the evidence of this—that \$20 million is going to come to the government if this bill goes through now. If so, what commitments has the government given to the Casino on that front? My understanding is that the government is going to get an up-front \$20 million cheque from SkyCity if this bill goes through.

I ask colleagues to cast their mind back a little bit to what happened when we were asked to push through the expansion of Roxby Downs. Whilst the government hid behind commercial confidentiality, a deal was done there where the government was to get kickbacks. The government can table the evidence and if I am wrong I will apologise to the government, but I do not think I am wrong with this.

What I am worried about, under the democratic processes of the Westminster system, is there tends to be a trail now looming where this government sits down with the private sector, signs off on a commercial in-confidence agreement, gets a kickback or an up-front amount of money to help it offset its mismanagement of its budget or to put assets into marginal seats before the next election, and then expects us to rubberstamp it. I want to see what the truth is behind this and I want to see it tabled in *Hansard* for every South Australian to see. What I want to say is, if this is true, then the community and the media and all of us as parliamentarians need to know exactly what deal was done.

In conclusion, we will listen to the rest of the debate. We will make our decisions based on what develops over the next week or so until we come back to sit, because I assume we will not get through this bill today, but there are a lot of answers the government needs to put on the table transparently with respect to this legislation proposal.

**The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON (12:48):** I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Reform) Bill. This bill amends various acts, with the stated aim to reduce harm from gambling. The government intends for these measures to commence on 1 July 2013. The government also intends to introduce further measures aimed at responsible gambling to commence on 1 July 2014. These will include a simplified barring system, and the government proclaims that these will create the strongest gambling measures in Australia.

The government is seeking to introduce precommitment legislation so that by 1 January 2016 only major venues that have implemented both precommitment and automated risk monitoring systems will be able to retain loyalty systems and current opening hours. By 1 January 2017, only major venues will be allowed to operate more than 20 gaming machines, and by 1 January 2020 only major venues that have implemented both precommitment and automated risk management monitoring systems will be able to retain automated coin-operated machines.

In addition, it is intended that by 1 January 2017 machines will have a \$5 maximum bet. This bill also proposes to make amendments to the Casino Act 1997, the intention being to enable the Casino to become an internationally competitive premium gaming product, comparable to those interstate and overseas. As part of the changes to the Casino, it will be required to purchase additional gaming machines entitlements through the approved trading scheme.

This bill also provides for minor gaming venues. These are characterised as venues that achieve responsible gambling outcomes by the removal of a range of automated systems, along with an increased focus on staff and customer interaction. Minor gaming venues will be limited to no more than 20 machines.

Just to go back to the intention of reducing gambling in this state, if we believe that this bill is focused on that particular outcome I think we should be saying our name is Billy not Silly because we all know that to decrease or reduce any kind of addiction—and that is what problem gamblers are: they are addicts—funding rehabilitation, counselling programs, whatever, would be the way that we would truly tackle problem gambling but, as we heard from the Hon. Tammy Franks, the service Gamblers Anonymous is not funded at all by the government and struggles to keep its doors open.

This is a theme with this government—talk big, talk compassionate, but do very little to achieve those outcomes. As I have said in this place many times, it is a government of paper policy. As long as it reads well in the newspaper, sounds good over the airwaves, that is all that is really required. It never, never puts its money where its mouth is. We are talking about the cost to human lives in this particular place.

The Hon. Iain Evans in the other place indicated that the opposition had received briefings from Clubs SA, the AHA and the government itself. They were incensed that the government had

pushed the bill through so quickly. Apparently, the Independent members had not even been briefed. As we have been informed by Mr Bill Cochrane, the AHA and Clubs SA were not consulted until late in the piece. It is clear that they had a draft bill, which was essentially presented as a fait accompli, but it was embargoed so they could not even discuss it with their own membership. It appears that Clubs SA were only able to discuss the bill with their members two or three days before the bill was introduced.

It was also rightly pointed out that there is nothing urgent in any of the provisions of the bill—none of the provisions relating to clubs or pubs, or the gambling tax, or the precommitment scheme, or the responsible gambling measures, or the Responsible Gambling Working Party recommendations, or the powers of the commissioner, or the Independent Gaming Authority. The opposition suggests the only urgency the government needs is a private sector project to be announced before the election campaign.

I remember when I came in here that I spoke to someone in the hallways, and they said, 'Give it time and you'll become another cynic.' I said, 'Oh, no, not me. I don't believe that I could ever be that cynical.' But here I am, just 7½ years later, and I believe absolutely nothing this government says to try to push through its legislation or to push through policy that sounds warm and fuzzy on the outside. At the end of the day, it is all about money: it always is and always will be with this government.

I was absolutely horrified, when Mr Bill Cochrane came to see me, to learn of the attempts that were made to have talks with various members of the government in order to discuss this bill and perhaps negotiate a reasonable position for the clubs to be able to survive. I will put on the record just what those measures were that were taken by Mr Cochrane and others from Clubs SA:

- on 31/5/2011, Clubs SA wrote to then treasurer Snelling seeking a meeting;
- on 16/11/2011, Clubs SA again wrote to then treasurer Snelling;
- on 17/11/2011, Clubs SA received a letter from then treasurer Snelling, but no meeting occurred;
- on 5/1/2012, Clubs SA wrote again to then treasurer Snelling;
- on 6/6/2012, Clubs SA wrote to then treasurer Snelling;
- on 6/9/2012, Clubs SA wrote to then treasurer Snelling;
- on 16/12/2012, Clubs SA wrote to then treasurer Snelling;
- on 16/12/2012, Clubs SA also wrote to Premier Weatherill, the Deputy Premier, and ministers Kenyon, Hill, Hunter and Wortley;
- on 5/12/2012, Clubs SA called Treasury and Finance to inquire whether the government was preparing a white paper;
- on 20/12/2012, Clubs SA met with Treasury and Finance and confirmed that a white paper was being prepared to be released in the new year;
- on 25/1/2013, Clubs SA wrote to Premier Weatherill seeking urgent dialogue with government in relation to the club industry;
- on 4/2/2013, Clubs SA received correspondence from Treasury and Finance with the draft bill, and an explanatory note, embargoed until further notice;
- on 12/2/2013, Clubs SA wrote to the Deputy Premier expressing concern over the absence of consultation—another absolutely regular theme when government wants a bill pushed through;
- on 26/2/2013, Clubs SA wrote to the Deputy Premier expressing concern over lack of consultation;
- on 27/2/2013, Clubs SA received a letter from the Deputy Premier acknowledging the letter of the 26<sup>th</sup>;
- on 5/4/2013, Clubs SA wrote to the Deputy Premier regarding the draft bill, noting changes and outlining other changes sought; and

- on 9/4/2013, Clubs SA received a letter from the Deputy Premier committing to work with Clubs SA and Sport SA to address industry change.

Clubs SA has attempted to consult with government over that two-year period, and what did it get? It got a copy of the bill two to three days before it was ready to be introduced into parliament. That has been the extent of the consultation, according to Mr Cochrane.

We have the lowest allocation of revenue to sporting clubs from poker machines in the country. As a matter of fact, in New South Wales it is about 75 per cent to clubs and 25 per cent to hotels; in Queensland, it is 55 per cent to clubs and 45 per cent to hotels; and in Victoria it is legislated that it is exactly a fifty-fifty split. In South Australia, I think they get 7 per cent.

These sporting clubs, whether members in here on the government side want to acknowledge it or not, keep our junior sporting clubs going in our communities. I will give you a very typical example of where they step in and help. In my son's soccer team, we had three players of Sudanese background who were dearly loving to play soccer. Their family did not have a car and those kids were not able to get to the away games for soccer. I was told last Saturday that the club received a cheque in support of these three kids to provide them with transport and also pay their club fees for them.

That is gold. That is gold to a small club and it is gold to kids who want to get out there, kick a ball, have some fun and meet other kids in their neighbourhood, but this government has no view of anything that small anymore. It has no sense of community and no sense of community support. I know, from speaking with Mr Cochrane that, if this bill goes through in its current form, the clubs are going to suffer and those sorts of little helping hand gestures will not be able to happen.

We need to really pull our heads in here. I am supporting the Liberal Party and their suggestion to split the bill. It should have been done. It should have been dealt with as two separate issues: pubs and clubs and get the Casino stuff through. I will support any amendment that gives the sporting clubs in this state a fairer go than what they are going to get if this bill goes through. I would like to say that I am surprised or aghast at how this government conducts business, but I am not. This is not the first time that we have had a really bad piece of legislation put before us that we are expected to make a judgement call on very quickly.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins):** Is the Hon. Ms Bressington about to conclude?

**The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON:** I am.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins):** Thank you.

**The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON:** I will support the Liberal Party amendments and I will consider Mr Darley's amendments. Anything that makes it tough for this bill to go through the way it is, I will gladly support.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

*[Sitting suspended from 13:02 to 14:15]*

## PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. G.E. Gago)—

Codes of Practice under Acts—

Liquor Licensing Act 1997—Late Night Trading Code

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

Reports, 2012—

Flinders University

University of South Australia

## QUESTION TIME

### FORESTRY MAPS

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Forests a question regarding forestry maps and broken promises.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Three generations ago, the Morgan family established a sawmill at Jamestown in the Mid North. Its timber came principally from the Wirrabara and Bundaleer forests. Bundaleer was the state's first plantation forest, planted in 1876. Morgan is proud of its quality and proficiency but is very concerned about the long-term supply of timber from ForestrySA. The company wants to know how much timber will be available, not just for three years but for 40 years.

Last September the company met with the Department of Primary Industries and Forestry at Jamestown and an agreement was made. It was a promise. The CEO of ForestrySA Mr Islay Robertson committed to complete detailed mapping of the Wirrabara and Bundaleer forests before the end of 2012. For the sake of clarity, that was last year and this is this year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** My questions to the minister are:

1. Why was the mapping not done before the end of 2012?
2. If the mapping has been done, why have the results not been made available?
3. Can the minister understand that any sawmiller needs security of timber supply?
4. Does the minister agree that this important Jamestown business, with 40 employees, deserves to have government promises and commitments honoured?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:18):** I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. Indeed, we know that our timber industry is currently going through a very challenging time. We know that the national and international climate has made it very difficult. Our construction industry has collapsed and we see a range of very cheap timber being available internationally, which makes it difficult for us to compete, particularly when our dollar was very high. The climate is very tough for us, very tough indeed, so it is most important that wherever we can we give whatever reassurance that we can to the industry; that is a most important commitment.

I am not aware that a commitment was given to this particular timber mill, but I am happy to look into that and to investigate what the commitment was, if there was a commitment, and to determine if that commitment has not been fulfilled, why it hasn't been fulfilled, and I am happy to then bring that information back to the chamber.

### WATER INDUSTRY ALLIANCE

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:20):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Regional Development questions regarding the Water Industry Alliance program.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** In estimates earlier this week the member for Chaffey asked the Minister for Environment about the guidelines for irrigators to access the \$265 million allocated to the Water Industry Alliance program. The minister advised that that falls under minister Gago's responsibilities, so I ask the minister: can she advise the chamber whether those guidelines have been finalised? If so, when will they be made publicly available?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:21):** I thank the honourable member for her most important questions. Indeed, honourable members would be aware that a historic signing of the

IGA recently occurred with the South Australian government involving the Murray-Darling Basin river plan. The signing of that IGA is incredibly important for us to be able to proceed with finalising the details of that \$265 million that has been committed to our Murray-Darling Basin program.

On Wednesday 26 June, a letter was received from Tony Burke, Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Water, confirming arrangements for the \$265 million program. The letter, I understand, confirmed that the commonwealth will fund the South Australian River Murray communities to the tune of \$265 million, including \$240 million for the Water Industry Alliance South Australian River Murray Improvements Program that aims to return 40 gigalitres of water to the environment and provide opportunities for the reconfiguration and renewal of the South Australian River Murray irrigation industry, and \$25 million for the South Australian regional economic development initiatives.

The letter sought agreement on a number of terms and conditions to be formalised in the form of national partnership agreements. I am advised that the terms and conditions specified in the letter were reasonable and enabled the outcomes sought by the state, the Water Industry Alliance and the River Murray irrigation industry and its communities to be realised through the implementation of the program.

To confirm arrangements set out in the terms and conditions to the national partnership agreement, minister Burke sought the state to sign the intergovernmental agreement, and on 27 June the Premier signed that. This confirms South Australia's commitment to implementing the historic basin plan reforms and also it confirmed arrangements to secure the \$265 million of the sustainability program. Therefore, the signing of the IGA on the basin plan has resulted in South Australia's realisation of a historic win for the river through a stance based on robust science and an uncompromising Fight for the Murray campaign which resulted in an increase in the volume of water to be returned to the river by 450 gigalitres. We know that the Liberal opposition were prepared to sell us out down the river.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** They were. They wanted to sell us out down the river, sell us short. Anyway, it was the Labor government that stood its ground and fought for the river, and now we see the benefits of this, not just in terms of the additional water but also in terms of this incredible set of program initiatives to the tune of \$265 million that will also provide significant industry development to our Murray Darling Basin region.

#### **WATER INDUSTRY ALLIANCE**

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:25):** By way of supplementary question, I asked about guidelines for irrigators. Does the minister have a response on that?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:26):** I am happy to take that question on notice and bring back a response. I am not sure what work is being done on that, but I know that we are still negotiating with the commonwealth government in terms of finalising details, but I am happy to take it on notice and bring what details are available back to the chamber at the earliest possible time.

#### **BRIGHTON CARAVAN PARK**

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:26):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for State/Local Government Relations on Brighton Caravan Park.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I refer to comments of the state government in support of the residents of the Brighton Caravan Park. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the government support the residents by funding a legal challenge to their eviction?
2. Will the government provide compensation to help residents relocate?
3. Will the government provide social housing support and coordination to help the residents relocate?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for**

**State/Local Government Relations) (14:27):** I thank the honourable member for his most important questions on this quite sad predicament. We have seen the Holdfast Bay council making changes to its local caravan park that involve somewhere between 30 and 40 long-term residents of the caravan park. We see that, in relation to the changes they propose, the council has made a decision not to continue with the long-term leases in and under the new arrangements and so therefore intend to remove or evict those tenants from the caravan park.

They have indicated that they will attempt to assist them to find suitable alternate accommodation, but the reports I have received back is that very little has been done by the council in relation to that. This is a matter for the local council; they are the ones who have the power and authority to deal with this matter and, as I have made very clear to that council and to other interested people, as Minister for State/Local Government Relations I have no power or authority to intervene in the matter. I do not have the power to overturn their decision or to intervene in any way in the decision they have made.

The decision they have made, I am advised, is in accordance with the legislation, so unless they are in breach of the act in some way I do not have powers to intervene. I have been very clear and up-front about that. When I wrote to the council after it had made a decision to extend the time arrangements for those tenants in relation to changes to their leases, they extended that and within a matter of almost a month they reconvened and rescinded that motion and put the original time frame in place, which only gave those tenants a short period of time to respond.

The council has a moral obligation to these tenants. Some of these people have lived there for many years: this is their home, this is their local neighbourhood, their community. They have very strong attachments to the people and to the place. They have invested considerable amounts in their vans and also the annexes around the vans—they are, if you like, permanent and semipermanent structures.

For many, this is their life's asset. Many of them are on limited fixed incomes and would find it very difficult, for instance, to sell their current home to provide funds to invest in alternate accommodation because their current accommodation would not be a significant asset when converted into monetary terms. However, it is their home, and it has been, for many of them, their home for many years. The council has a moral obligation to look after these people. I have made it very clear that I believe the bottom line is that at the very least this council genuinely work with this group to assist them to find alternate accommodation.

Apparently, there was a resolution put at its last meeting (an oddly worded resolution) that was basically that they would call on me, the minister, not to intervene but to act as a negotiator or conciliator, or to have a role in assisting them to move forward, and it was voted down. That is how much this council wanted any assistance from me: they voted it down. It is nothing short of a disgrace. Clearly, the council does not want me there in that space to assist in any way, shape or form.

I will continue to say publicly that I think their behaviour is disgraceful. As I said, the reports I have received are that very little has been done by the council to assist these residents to find alternate, suitable accommodation.

### **BRIGHTON CARAVAN PARK**

**The Hon. M. PARNELL (14:32):** I have a supplementary question. Does the minister have any concerns about the confidence that the community might have in council decisions, given their ability to rescind earlier decisions, such as the one the minister referred to where an additional nine months was granted, which decision was then subsequently rescinded? Is there a broader issue for the confidence that the community can have in local council decisions?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:32):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, he makes a very good point in his question, and that is that these people have completely lost confidence in their local council. What's more, there is a large part of that council's community—the general community who do not have a particular relationship with these people, other than to share their community—who have come out in thunderous support of this group of residents.

Again, I think the behaviour of the council has been nothing short of a disgrace in the toing and froing. We are all well aware of the bad blood between a number of the councillors which has



gone on for a protracted period of time and the infighting. I have talked about that in this place before, in relation to councils generally, that they need to focus less on their own internal relationships and focus more on the purpose of being there, that is, to look after these communities. They have a responsibility to these communities. They should stop the infighting and look to serve the communities that they are elected to take care of and get on with the job.

#### **BRIGHTON CARAVAN PARK**

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:34):** My supplementary question is: given that the minister asserts that the Holdfast council is intransigent in not being willing to provide support to these residents in relocation and finding alternative housing, at what point will the state government support those citizens in meeting their basic needs?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:34):** The state government has a number of housing supports in place that these residents can access, so there are a number of housing and other community support services that the state government and the commonwealth government provide to assist and support people.

All of those services are available, but the bottom line is that the Holdfast council has a moral obligation to look after these people. They have a moral obligation at least to assist these people to find alternate accommodation, and it is within their power to do so. They have the resources to do it. They need to get on and do it, and I think it behoves us to hold this council responsible to fulfil its obligations, not to provide a scapegoat for them.

#### **WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP**

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:35):** I seek leave to ask the Minister for the Status of Women a question regarding the Premier's Women's Directory and the Australian Institute of Company Directors.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** The Premier's Women's Directory is an online resource of women who are seeking appointment to boards and committees. The government has also supported women who are seeking positions on boards and committees by offering scholarships through the AICD. My question to the minister is: can the minister update us on the Premier's Women's Directory and the AICD Scholarships?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:36):** I thank the honourable member for his most important question. The Premier's Women's Directory is a key tool that has assisted the state government to improve women's representation on boards and committees. Since its launch in August 2004, this online resource has promoted women to those responsible for putting forward candidates for appointment to boards and committees.

The PWD has enjoyed enormous success, and as of June 2013 the Premier's Women's Directory contains the CVs of over 850 applicants or nominations. This is a significant increase from 450 in July 2007 and includes 20 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, 22 women with disability, 91 women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and 149 women are from regional areas. The directory is accessed by password, of which approximately 460 have been issued to date. The passwords are obtained on request from the Office for Women to those seeking women for board appointment.

I am pleased to be able to advise today that the Premier's Women's Directory will be moving to a completely online system. This change means that women will now be able to register for the directory online; those current members of the directory can update, edit and view their data, and this ensures that those who are searching the directory for candidates will have the most up-to-date details. The Office for Women will continue the maintenance of the database and approve all adjustments and new submissions before these are made live.

The update to PWD ties in closely with other work the Office for Women is doing to promote women's networking online. In September 2012, the Office for Women established a LinkedIn group for members of the directory. This group provides a forum for women to discuss issues associated with being on boards. It is a place where they can share ideas and information

about issues associated with women's leadership and board aspirations. Information on events and board vacancies are also shared in this forum. The LinkedIn group has proved to be popular with more than 100 women joining in less than 24 hours. As of June 2013, the group had 268 members. An additional 60 women, who are not currently registered on the directory, have sought information on how to register via the LinkedIn group.

In keeping with this government's commitment to ensuring that South Australia continues to be one of the leading jurisdictions in Australia for the inclusion of women on boards and committees, I am also pleased to announce today the successful applicants for the Australian Institute of Company Director Scholarships who have been selected. The Australian Institute of Company Directors is an internationally recognised, member-based, not-for-profit organisation for directors, and its principal activities include education, conducting professional development programs and events for boards and directors, producing publications, etc.

The Premier and I previously announced 25 scholarships, and the nomination process showed a high amount of interest among women. I think there were something like 300 expressions of interest and almost 100 applicants. I am further advised that the successful applicants are currently in the process of being notified, including women from CALD backgrounds, Aboriginal women, regional women and those other priority groups.

These differing programs highlight this government's commitment not just to increasing representation of women on boards and committees but also to ensuring that women have access to training programs. This is of particular importance to those women who, for very good reasons, might not have this opportunity. I would like to congratulate the Office for Women on its work on both of these initiatives, along with extending my congratulations to the successful applicants for the scholarships.

#### SA WATER

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:41):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question regarding SA Water pipes.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY:** I understand that 70 per cent of the state's reticulated water piping infrastructure is composed of asbestos fibre light pipe and that these water mains are maintained by SA Water's major contractor, Allwater. Given the recent controversy surrounding the Telstra contractors who were exposed to asbestos when undertaking work for the NBN, can the minister advise what precautions are taken to protect the public and employees of Allwater when work is done on the mains and exposure to fractured asbestos may occur?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:41):** I thank the honourable member for his most excellent question. I will take it on notice and bring back a response at the earliest possible moment.

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (14:41):** Will the minister outline the importance of the recent signing of the 'Rolls Royce' Murray-Darling Basin Plan?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:42):** I thank the honourable member for his most important question about the quality of the River Murray plan that we have signed up to and acknowledge that we have, of course, gone for the higher quality model as opposed to the, I think it was, pimped-up Mazda the Hon. Ms Lensink said the Liberal Party was proposing for the state. Whilst I have no aspirations whatsoever to having a Rolls Royce myself, I understand the quality connection the honourable member was making.

Sir, as you are aware at least, and members on this side, perhaps, the Premier did sign up to the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Plan. Signing the plan represents a great victory for South Australia. It is a significant win for the River Murray and a significant win for the communities that rely upon it. Our state's signature was, of course, conditional on a receipt of a letter from the Hon. Tony Burke MP, which my leader today spoke about earlier. The former minister for sustainability, environment, water, population and communities confirmed the arrangements for

funding of the \$265 million South Australian River Murray sustainability program, which the leader outlined to the house earlier this afternoon.

Throughout the development of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, the South Australian government has actively championed the interests of the River Murray and its communities. Key to this was our non-negotiable point that an amount of water that ensures a healthy river system that restores environmental values and provides for viable and productive industries and communities into the future must be able to flow downstream. This was, of course, based on the best available science, and I make the point again that members opposite do not seem to understand that, when you have new evidence, when you have new information, the sensible approach, the approach you expect governments to make, is to change their mind. When scientists are telling us that this is the best available science and that this is what you should be basing the decision on, we listen. Obviously that does not apply to everyone in this chamber.

We brought together industry, irrigators, Riverland communities and everyday South Australians who care about the future of the river and our state. We took up the fight with upstream states and ultimately secured a basin plan. We secured the health of the basin long into the future.

As you would be aware, Mr President, central to this process was our Premier, Jay Weatherill, establishing the Murray-Darling Basin Plan Task Force. This task force comprised key ministers and chief executives from across government, as well as the Chief Scientist and chair of the Goyder Institute for Water Research. These experts oversaw the coordination of the state's response on the basin plan—

*The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, could you repeat that? I could not hear it.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** I will repeat that paragraph, sir, for your benefit.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** I am interested, minister.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Mr President, the task force comprised key ministers and chief executives from across government, as well as the Chief Scientist, Professor Don Bursill, and chair of the Goyder Institute for Water Research, Dr Ian Chessell. These experts oversaw the coordination of the state's response on the basin plan, and the task force led the development of the state government's policy positions and formal submissions on the basin plan based on science, expert policy analysis, and community input.

The government made four formal submissions on the various iterations of the draft basin plan as well as submissions to five related parliamentary inquiries, I am advised. The government also promoted a number of regional development, water recovery and environmental works, and measures project proposals. Importantly, the government undertook significant community and industry engagement, including the Fight for the Murray campaign, which saw over 19,000 people pledge support, attracted over 28,000 followers through Facebook and Twitter, and resulted in over 5,000 letters demanding a better plan be sent to the Prime Minister. These efforts delivered a better basin plan.

Everyone who was involved in the campaign—river locals and South Australians concerned about the future of our most important natural resource—deserves our congratulations. We could not have done it without the community coming together, and together we achieved a great win for South Australia, including commitments that will support improved environmental, industry and community outcomes in South Australia as well as for the basin.

There is now, of course, the commitment to return more water to the River Murray so that environmental outcomes consistent with recovering 3,200 gigalitres of water can be achieved, and this is written into the basin plan. The plan also includes improved salinity targets and a minimum water level objective for the River Murray below Lock 1, and it requires the authority to develop the constraints management strategy to remove constraints to successful environmental water delivery.

Commonwealth funding of \$1.77 billion has been committed to recover the additional 450 gigalitres of water required to achieve the 3,200 gigalitres of water recovery and to address constraints, and it is unfortunate that the New South Wales and Queensland governments did not sign up to the plan so that they might get their share of that money. However we did, and some \$200 million of this funding will be spent on addressing constraints. I can advise that the additional

450 gigalitres will be recovered in a socioeconomically neutral or even beneficial manner, including through on-farm efficiency measures or alternative arrangements which will be agreed by the states.

Throughout this process we have been concerned about the effects of climate change and groundwater extraction. The plan requires that the risks from climate change must be assessed and considered in any future reviews, along with better information on groundwater and surface water connectivity. Furthermore, groundwater sustainable diversion limits (SDLs) have been significantly reduced from those proposed in earlier versions of the basin plan, reflecting a more precautionary approach.

Additionally, the plan includes a mechanism to increase or reduce groundwater SDLs based on better knowledge of recharge rates, surface and groundwater connections, and usage as our information improves. Most importantly, the Jay Weatherill government has secured commonwealth government commitments of \$445 million in funding for water recovery, industry regeneration, regional development and environment works and projects in our state. I should also add that the government has released—

*The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Minister, I cannot hear you.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Thank you, Mr President; I will speak up. I should also add that the government has released the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Plan implementation strategy. This will guide the state's implementation of the basin plan and related programs between 2013 and 2019. The strategy outlines key actions that will be pursued to ensure that the basin plan is fully integrated into South Australia's ongoing water management arrangements.

Significant effort will be required to work with the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and other basin states—we understand that—to develop new working arrangements for the implementation of the basin plan that ensures all basin governments—all of them—meet their obligations. State officials are currently working with the other jurisdictions and the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to develop a basin plan implementation agreement.

I have said before that this is a great win for our state, but I want to take the opportunity to remind everyone in the chamber that the win was the result of a team effort—a team effort by government, non-government organisations, the community, industry and even the media. I am very pleased that even the Liberal Party are coming on board, even at this late stage. We are all ready to take them with us on this grand campaign for our state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Simon Birmingham came on board before this mob did. Senator Simon Birmingham came on board before this mob over here did, but he didn't convince any of you. You still wanted the clapped out Mazda.

*The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Lensink, I am not pleased to hear you.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Everyone who got on board the campaign—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I am not pleased to hear you.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** —whatever their affiliations, deserves congratulations. A healthy River Murray will be a testament to these efforts.

**The PRESIDENT:** A supplementary question, the Hon. Mr Parnell.

#### **MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN**

**The Hon. M. PARNELL (14:51):** My supplementary question to the minister: is the additional 450 gigalitres that he referred to guaranteed or is its inclusion in the plan better described as an aspirational target?

**The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:** Aspiration, pie in the sky.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:51):** I don't think the honourable member could have heard—

**The PRESIDENT:** I thought I heard an answer from the Hon. Mr Brokenshire.

**The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:** Just helping the minister, Mr President.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** And he always is a great help, sir—sometimes, though, not to great effect.

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, you have the call.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** But, no, I can advise that the 450 gigalitres has been locked in as a result of our Premier campaigning for a better outcome for our state.

#### APY LANDS, FOOD SECURITY

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:52):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation on the topic of food security and the administration of AARD.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Members will be very well aware that, back on 9 April in this place, the minister made a statement about the changed machinery within government of the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division. In that, he said that AARD:

...within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet will sharpen its role as a provider of policy advice to government while its remaining service delivery functions will be incorporated into operational agencies. Implementation of the new administrative arrangements will be managed by a working group overseen by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. These changes will enable...agencies to focus on improving service delivery outcomes for Aboriginal people.

The South Australian government is also committed to enabling local Aboriginal organisations and communities to contribute to the delivery of services and opportunities for Aboriginal people at the local level. The Aboriginal Reconciliation Division will continue to be the government's lead agency on Aboriginal Affairs matters.

Consequent to this, within the framework of the Budget and Finance Committee, I asked questions of DPC-AARD, the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, and the Department for Education and Child Development as to who would be managing the food security project and in what components they would be undertaking that management come 1 July this year.

I have received conflicting answers. I have been told, just a week before 1 July, by Joslene Mazel of DCSI that discussions were still in train. I was told by Nerida Saunders, and indeed the Hon. Michelle Lensink was told by Nerida Saunders, that gardens had in fact been replanted at Sandy Bore and Railway Bore and that discussions were happening at a local community level with the Stephanie Alexander garden project, only to have a letter in the last week from Ms Saunders correcting the record and saying that that was not in fact the case. Indeed, I had a response from the Department for Education and Child Development's CEO that they have no knowledge of where the gardens project is up to. Given that we have had conflict in accounts from these three departments, I ask the minister to put on the record:

1. What components of the food security strategy have been allocated to which departments?

2. What level of funding has been allocated to those departments, and for what purposes?

3. Have the gardens been replanted, as the minister promised, in these cooler months and, if not, how much cooler does the minister want it to get?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:55):** I am very pleased to take this question and I am sorry that the honourable member was confused when she was given some answers, so I will put it to her straight. As of 1 July, food security is the responsibility of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** —the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion. Discussions about the handover are of course still in train, but the responsibility lies with the Department of Communities and Social Inclusion.

The gardens, as I have said in this place before, will be transferred through to the Department for Education and Child Development (DECD). That process is happening, as I understand it. In fact, I was talking to a gentleman the other day who is responsible for some work at Sandy Bore garden, and he says that it is flourishing. They are getting a lot of tomatoes at the moment and some other fruit, and he tells me that he loves the garden. Sandy Bore, at least, seems to be working very well and, as I said, the process of the transition of the other gardens through to DECD will be ongoing.

The other aspect of food security which is very important, although not recognised as such sometimes, is our incredible increased funding for roads. We are going to get the roads from the highway through to at least Pukatja, I think; it is going to be given to DPTI and they will be putting in a proper road which will allow for better, all-weather transport through the system.

**The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:** Bitumen or what?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Well, no, Hon. Mr Brokenshire, it will not be bitumen. I have told you in this place before what it will be, but it will not be the old graded level of road that sits below the road surface and, as such, prone to flooding. That is the best information I can give to the honourable member. DCSI will be responsible for food security, DPTI for road funding and the gardens will be transferred to education and science, functioning through DECD.

#### **APY LANDS, FOOD SECURITY**

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:57):** Is the minister concerned then that the head of DCSI, a week out from 1 July, had no idea of whether or not the NPY Women's Council on Mai Wiru would be part of the food security projects?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:57):** I am not responsible for the chief executive of another department, clearly, but what I can say—and I am relying on the honourable member's recollection of a discussion with Ms Jos Mazel, and apparently she said that discussions are still in train. That is exactly what you would expect would be happening.

#### **GAMBLING ADVERTISING**

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:57):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to gambling reforms made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier, Jay Weatherill.

#### **QUESTION TIME**

##### **RIVERLAND SUSTAINABLE FUTURES FUND**

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:58):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Regional Development a question relating to the Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE:** The Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund was announced in February 2010 and aimed to boost community and economic development by offering \$20 million to businesses. With \$5.1 million remaining in the fund in December 2012, minister Gago announced that unallocated money would be used to leverage federal funding through the \$100 million Murray-Darling Basin Regional Economic Diversification Program. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the remaining \$5.1 million be leveraged from the \$100 million Murray-Darling Basin Regional Economic Diversification Program as announced in December 2012, or will it be leveraged from the \$265 million River Murray Improvement Program as suggested by the minister in estimates this week?

2. When will the remaining \$5.1 million be available?

3. Can the minister advise how many Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund businesses have not yet claimed approved funds?

4. Can the minister provide certainty in funding commitment to the Riverland's business community?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway will begin to relax.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:00):** I can't answer the question. He is interjecting, Mr President, so I couldn't possibly proceed with my answer while he is interjecting.

**The PRESIDENT:** Try to ignore him like I do.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Thank you for your advice, Mr President. It is an easy thing to do.

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** It is very easy to ignore the Hon. David Ridgway, I have to say. Indeed, as I have indicated in this place on a number of occasions and on many parts of the public record, this government has committed to a \$20 million Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund, a series of grants to be made available to the Riverland region. It was in response to the devastating impact that the drought had on that region. They were particularly disadvantaged by that drought, so it was to assist that community to get back on its feet to help inject business and industry and diversification. Those funds—

*The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Well, you keep coming back into this place—the opposition keep coming to this—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** —and they keep asking the same old questions over and over again. They keep coming in here time and time again and then they complain when I give them the same information because it is the same old question. I give accurate and concise information every single time—\$20 million for the Riverland, over the four-year period, we are still committed to that time frame. We are still well within that time frame.

The money will be committed to generate this economic activity in this region, so our intentions for the way we spend that money, we are still committed to those intentions, nothing has changed. The only thing that has changed is—goodness gracious me—we have the ability to double the government contribution to the remainder of the fund. Double our money! That is what is before us. We have an opportunity to double our money and what did the local member, Tim Whetstone, say on radio today? He doesn't want to wait around to double our money. No, just grab what is in the fund and spend it now, he says. What an idiot! What an irresponsible fool! How irresponsible is that, to deny his electorate of doubling government—

**The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:** He knows more about his electorate than you do.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** He does not. He is an embarrassment to the electorate. Every time I go there they apologise for him.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Every time I visit I have these people come and apologise, 'We are so sorry.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** 'We are so sorry for Mr Whetstone's behaviour.' He is an embarrassment to them. Fancy being that irresponsible to say, no, we'll just grab what is out of the fund, grab what is there and spend it now. Don't double your money. There is a potential here for us to double our money out of the fund and to leverage what is left of that fund. As I said, the intention is to commit within the same time frame as we always have for the same sorts of projects that we have always intended to spend it on. But no, the Liberals don't want that, they don't want to double the money. It is just irresponsible. I am out there doing the work of Tim Whetstone because he is too lazy and indifferent to look after his own region.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

### LAMBEX CONFERENCE

**The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:05):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about agriculture.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS:** South Australian agriculture is one of the strengths of our economy. While it is a diverse picture, as far as livestock is concerned sheep remain the most widespread farm animals raised in South Australia. Can the minister provide details on the successful bid by South Australia to host the 2014 Lambex conference, which focuses on lamb production?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:05):** I thank the honourable member for his most important question. Sheep, both as producers of wool and meat, obviously are a very important part of South Australia's primary industries, and sheep-derived products make a very significant contribution to our South Australian economy. In 2011, about 10 million sheep in South Australia produced almost 60,000 tonnes of wool and lamb and mutton products, with a gross revenue value of more than \$1 billion. South Australia has about 14 per cent of the national sheep flock. South Australia contributes approximately 15 per cent of national wool production, with recent figures indicating that more than 47 million kilograms of wool and skins are produced annually to a value of \$250 million.

With this in mind, we are very pleased to announce today that South Australia was successful in winning the right to host Lambex 2014. This biennial event will be held at the Royal Adelaide Showground's Ridley and Wayville pavilions from 9 to 11 July 2014. This event consists of a two-day conference program, a significant trade show, and a gala lamb dinner, and provides an opportunity to bring producers, processors, exporters, service providers and food service professionals together in one venue.

It is expected that up to 600 delegates from all parts of Australia and overseas will attend, and, although planning for this event is obviously in the early stages, the intent is that the trade show will highlight the product and services of more than 50 businesses supporting the sheep industry. Between 20 and 40 speakers from Australia and overseas will provide cutting-edge information, addressing issues facing the sheep, meat and wool industries, and this event will showcase nationally and internationally South Australia's sheep industry and the services supporting and including SARDI, which has been involved in research and development initiatives as part of the Sheep CRC and the new School of Veterinary Science at the University of Adelaide (Roseworthy).

Oversight of the Lambex 2014 event is the responsibility of a 15-person organising committee, and includes representatives from the Royal Agriculture and Horticulture Society of SA, stud and commercial producers from wool and meat sheep sectors, rural media, SA sheep meat producers, Meat & Livestock Australia, Rural Solutions SA and the SA Sheep Advisory Group.

The chair of the committee is Allan Piggott from Illoura, and there is no doubt that the event would not be possible without the strong support and involvement of local producers. There is strong support for Lambex 2014 from the state's industry, reflected by the fact that they initiated the bid to attract Lambex to Adelaide, and have agreed to underwrite the event using their sheep industry fund, about which we are very pleased.



The SA Sheep Advisory Group, which provides me with advice on the SA Sheep Industry Fund, amongst other industry matters, has been a big supporter of the benefits of the Lambex event to industry. In 2012 the SASAG provided \$5,000 in financial assistance so the group of young producers and industry leaders could travel to the 2012 Lambex conference held in Bendigo, Victoria. Inspired by what they experienced and keen to showcase South Australia's sheep industry, a collection of these producers took it upon themselves to organise a bid for the 2014 event, and I congratulate them for their efforts and look forward to the event.

### ANDAMOOKA COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS SCHEME

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:09):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for State/Local Government Relations a question regarding outback communities, in particular the community of Andamooka.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** The former minister, the Hon. Russell Wortley, told this place in February 2012:

The proposed expansion of the Olympic Dam mining project has created an expectation that the township may attract new residents seeking accommodation and work outside of Roxby Downs.

I, like the former minister—and I suspect and hope the current one—commend the Andamooka Progress and Opal Miners Association, and particularly Mr Peter Allen, for their volunteer work in promoting and growing their community and its infrastructure.

I read with interest an article in the *Roxby Downs Sun* on 30 May about the Ombudsman's finding that the Outback Communities Authority (OCA) breached section 25(1)(a) of the Ombudsman Act and that their community consultation on new management structures for Andamooka was inadequate. Before asking questions, I note that section 21 of the act governing the OCA allows for a community contribution scheme (CCS) to be raised. I understand that an annual \$400 has been imposed on all Andamooka landholders and, together with a proposal for Iron Knob, these are the first CCSs to be applied thus far in the OCA areas.

The same section of the act allows for the creation of an asset sustainability levy which I understand will in future be used to fund systems across the whole OCA area such as sewerage and aerodromes at various communities which are currently paid for out of general revenue.

My questions are as follows, and I acknowledge that the minister might want to take some on notice:

1. How much money has the CCS raised in Andamooka and Iron Knob respectively?
2. Given that this is the first CCS implemented under the act, will the minister promptly bring to the parliament an accounting of the income and itemised expenditure of the CCS moneys?
3. Does the minister find it odd that out of the whole Andamooka community only one person has been granted the full CCS concession?
4. I acknowledge that the community needed a town manager but has the government reconsidered its approach on the Andamooka governance model, given the Olympic Dam expansion is either off the table or not happening in the immediate future?
5. Where is the planning and implementation up to on the OCA-wide asset sustainability levy?
6. How much is the ASL expected to be in total revenue per annum and per landholding in the OCA regions?
7. What consultation is underway or will be underway for that levy?
8. What sites need to be paid for via that levy?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:12):** I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. Indeed, in a number of ways the arrangements at Andamooka under this new community contribution scheme have been a real success story and a real testament to very tough and resilient characters in that community who are faced with enormous challenges but are able to

make the best of what they have and get on with the job. They have a very strong sense of community and a preparedness to work together.

The honourable member is quite right. With the expected growth in Andamooka and the general demand for services in that region, it was completely unsustainable and unrealistic to expect that a volunteer organisation could continue to deliver basic community services in that area. APOMA sought urgent assistance from the outback communities (OCA) in relation to that. They were pretty burnt out. They had worked so hard for so many years and really just could no longer sustain the amount of work or provide the resources needed to provide basic services and amenities.

The authority and APOMA, with state government support, agreed to establish the Town Management Committee and appoint a town manager to oversee public services and essential infrastructure and to provide advice and plans for the future. There was a committee chaired by Cecilia Woolford which included APOMA representatives, including Peter Allen, and OCA representatives as well.

APOMA and the town management committee have recently consulted the Andamooka community on the future government options for the ongoing management of the township, and feedback has been received about that, so that is an issue that they have been very preoccupied with. I have also met Ms Woolford, and she has given me an update on the sorts of developments they have undertaken in that area, and I certainly congratulate them.

In terms of introducing the community contribution scheme for the township of Andamooka, my understanding is that the scheme will raise just over \$250,000 that was planned for the 2012-13 financial year, so that is \$256,000 to help fund the provision of services and support for the Andamooka community. The scheme was intended to apply to most properties in the Andamooka township and nearby White Dam area.

The scheme was requested by the Andamooka Progress and Opal Miners Association (APOMA) on behalf of the Andamooka community and in accordance with the Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act. The scheme is authorised by the Community Affairs Resourcing Management Agreement between OCA and APOMA. I am advised that the Andamooka Town Management Committee, established by OCA, conducted extensive consultation with the Andamooka community on the policy for calculating and also the methodology for the community contribution scheme, and the consultation included a mail-out to all property owners and two information sessions.

The community contribution is similar to an annual service charge applied by councils for community wastewater schemes, and it is not based on the value of the land. OCA has determined that the community contribution will be \$400 per property and that the amount will vary according to various property values. The honourable member did mention the Ombudsman's investigation, so I just want to briefly put that on the record.

The Ombudsman found that OCA had failed to comply with requirements of subsection 17(4) of the outback communities act to consult with the Community Affairs Resourcing Management (CARM) agreement for Andamooka in accordance with its public consultation policy and that OCA did not have valid authority to impose the community contribution scheme. In summary, the Ombudsman found that OCA failed to comply with section 17(4) of the act because, prior to the execution of the CARM agreement with APOMA, OCA had consulted on its policy for CARM arrangements, the draft community scheme policy and the Andamooka Town Management Community Plan financial and annual budget.

However the Ombudsman did not consider that the three consultations were specifically about the Andamooka CARM agreement. Although the ATMC's documents did flag the introduction of a community contribution, it failed to comply with its public consultation policy, as it only allowed a three-week period for feedback, not four as stated, and only placed public notices in the two Roxby Downs newspapers and not the other regional newspapers as stated. The Ombudsman commented that it was a technical error.

You can see that they had gone to extraordinary lengths to consult extensively and rigorously. It was the first time they had done it. They were very disappointed in the outcome. However, the Ombudsman did comment that it was a technical error and also that he did not consider that OCA had acted without due diligence and good faith. He held the view that the error had resulted from the OCA's inflexible public consultation policy and its belief that by consulting with APOMA it was consulting with the community at large.

OCA is obviously aware of this and has taken the Ombudsman's findings into consideration and will make changes accordingly. The Ombudsman did not recommend any changes to the current community levy arrangements or any other changes in collection or activity. It was really around that consultation process that the technical error did occur. That will be rectified. There were some other quite detailed questions asked. I am happy to take those on notice and to bring back a response.

### ELECTORAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 3 July 2013.)

New clause 17A.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I move:

Page 8, after line 19—Insert:

17A—Amendment of section 78—Right of elector to receive ballot paper

Section 78(2)—Delete 'Where a person claiming to vote' and substitute 'Subject to this Act, where an elector who'

I would suggest to the committee that [Wade-6] 5 is consequential to [Wade-6] 1, and I seek the support of the committee as it is a consequential amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clause 18.

**The CHAIR:** The Hon. Ms Bressington, you have a number of amendments to clause 18. They are consequential?

**The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON:** Yes, they are consequential.

**The CHAIR:** And therefore you will not be proceeding with those?

**The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON:** No.

Clause passed.

Clauses 19 and 20 passed.

New clause 20A.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I move [Wade-5] 4:

Page 8, after line 29—Insert:

20A—Amendment of section 100—Reviewable decisions

Section 100(1)—after paragraph (c) insert:

(ca) a decision by the Electoral Commissioner as to the registration of a how-to-vote card; or

I suggest that this is consequential to [Wade-2] 1, but if it is not regarded as consequential I suggest at least that it is appropriate. This amendment allows a decision of the Electoral Commissioner regarding the registration of how-to-vote cards to be appealed to the District Court. As the council has agreed to the how-to-vote provisions proposed by the opposition earlier, I would suggest, as I said, that this is either consequential or appropriate. Without this provision there would be no opportunity for a person to appeal against the decision of the commissioner to reject the registration of a how-to-vote card.

New clause inserted.

Clause 21.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I move:

Page 8, after line 36—After inserted paragraph (ab) insert:

(ac) if the advertisement is authorised for a relevant third party—the relevant third party's name appears at the end; and

(2) Section 112—after subsection (2) insert:

- (3) In this section—
- relevant third party* means an organisation or other person, other than a registered political party, candidate or natural person, who—
- (a) as at the day of publication of the advertisement to which subsection (1)(ac) relates, intends to spend more than \$2,000 on electoral advertisements—
- (i) if the advertisement is published in an election period—during that election period; or
- (ii) in any other case—during the election period for the next general election due to occur; or
- (b) spent more than \$2,000 on electoral advertisements during the election period for the general election immediately preceding the day of publication of the advertisement to which subsection (1)(ac) relates.

This amendment proposes to extend the disclosure requirements on authorisations so that they apply to relevant third parties in a similar form to those placed on parties and independent candidates; that is, that the organisation's name appears in the authorisation line for electoral advertisements.

Relevant third parties are defined as organisations or other persons, other than a registered political party candidate or natural person, who intend to spend more than \$2,000 on electoral advertisements during the election period. Electoral advertisements are advertisements containing electoral matter that is calculated to affect the result of the election. The definition is based on the New South Wales statute—that is, section 4 of the Election Funding, Expenditure and Disclosures Act 1981—and includes the same threshold of \$2,000. This would exclude most community organisations and there would be no need for third parties to disclose their expenditure.

The threat to third parties who wish to spend more than \$2,000 without disclosing the organisation's name is that they would be in breach of section 112, which carries a maximum penalty of \$10,000. In the opposition's view it is reasonable that, when an organisation engages in political advertising that is intended to influence the outcome of the election, the organisation identifies itself. It would otherwise be possible for a political party to set up a front organisation to distribute on its behalf, but free of those disclosure requirements. This provision promotes transparency and therefore the integrity of our electoral system.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I rise to oppose this amendment. The amendment introduces provisions that look reasonable at face value; however, the government agrees that there is benefit in considering the involvement of third parties in the electoral process. The government has concerns about how the amendment will be workable. The notion that a relevant third party can be adequately captured by an intention to spend more than \$2,000 on electoral advertisements is of concern. This appears to make the provisions difficult to enforce.

The government is interested in implementing a regime for the regulation of third-party campaigners but believes there are matters such as unmasking the influence of companies and money in setting up fronts, or using otherwise unrelated individuals to hide the money trail. The government will continue to work on doing this in a comprehensive way, and opposes this amendment.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I appreciate the minister's indication that the government is interested in the issue, and that does confirm that it does attach to the integrity of the system. There may well be issues of 'with intention', certainly in a criminal matter; in fact, in the Hon. Mr Darley's bill yesterday, in relation to dishonest dealing with children, one of our concerns was intention, so I appreciate that that does raise evidential issues.

To me, the issues do not seem so great that they cannot be considered in the context of this bill. I respect the fact that the minister may not have been aware that the relevant third party definition and the threshold we are using are actually already being used in New South Wales, albeit for different purpose. However, in that context I put it to the government and to the committee that this would be an appropriate amendment to support so that we could have discussions to see whether it is possible, in the time frame, to find a workable phrasing.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** We support the amendment.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I will just ask the mover a question because I agree with the sentiment that we need these third parties not to be anonymous and to be named—that is the starting point. The difficulty relates to the definition of 'relevant third party'. The definition is split into two: there are people who have spent \$2,000 already and then there are people who intend to spend \$2,000.

With the people who have already spent \$2,000, it might be possible to work that out. If you have a full-page ad in *The Advertiser*, chances are it costs you more than \$2,000, but you do not know. If you have something on social media that has gone viral, you will not know to what extent it was paid promotion that led to that or whether it was simply word-of-mouth sort of passing it on or a combination of the two. So, I think the past spending is easier but still not that simple.

Could the honourable member explain how the first part of the definition of 'relevant third party' might work, given that the party has to, at the date of the publication of the advertisement, intend to spend more than \$2,000? Evidence-wise, how does he see that working?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I will certainly address it as best I can, but let me stress again that, in the implementation of such a regime, we would benefit from the experience of New South Wales because they use it for a similar purpose. I imagine that the reason why New South Wales has put in 2A is that you want to catch the first ad. If you are putting a full-page ad in the paper, you know it is going to be more than \$2,000, so make sure it is on the first ad. You would not have much luck in a prosecution on this matter by saying, 'When I placed the ad, I did not intend to spend \$2,000.'

I take the point the member makes about internet advertising and the complexities there. These things will have to be addressed; let us, if you like, not shy away from strengthening our system because of that. The intention might be proven by the bookings, if you like. You might have booked a whole series of ads and, okay, you have not done it—there is no invoice that has been raised or cheque that has been written in fulfilment of those—but there would be evidence. You have an intention to spend it because you have booked the ads. I think it is a workable first step. I urge the council to put, as the Hon. Bernard Finnigan might say, the post-it note on the bill, and let us have a conversation about it.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY:** I will be supporting the amendment.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** Yesterday, the Hon. Stephen Wade encouraged us to support amendments that clearly were not perfect and borrowed the phrase from another honourable member about the post-it note. We did not accept that yesterday because the amendment that we were being asked to support was so imperfect that it was not a post-it note, it was a post-it phone book or something—it was just far too significant.

This is slightly different, I think. In light of the member's answer, this does need more work. The Greens are happy to support this amendment for now, but on the understanding that, no doubt, it will come back, otherwise we might find that it is just an unworkable provision on the statute book that is impossible to prove. We want to keep this conversation alive because, at the heart of it, we want the third party's name to appear on these ads and we need a mechanism for making that happen.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** If I can briefly comment, because I must admit I was disturbed by—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** No, I was—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** The Hon. Mr Wade, I was about to put your amendment.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I might be ruled out of order on relevance, but I am actually picking up the point about the post-it notes.

**The CHAIR:** I will judge that.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** It was raised by the Hon. Bernard Finnigan yesterday, and I take his point that our job is to progress the legislation. I have been here for seven years and most of my work as an opposition member has been putting in post-it notes, putting in amendments that the government might not like now but it is a foot in the door, if you like, for further conversation. So I urge honourable members not to get carried away with the Hon. Bernard Finnigan's post-it notes, because I think we would completely disempower this chamber.

**The CHAIR:** The Hon. Ms Bressington.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! I want to hear what the Hon. Ms Bressington has to say.

**The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON:** Thank you, Mr Chair. I am supporting the amendment. I think if we are so concerned about how we would implement this particular amendment, somebody could make a phone call to New South Wales and ask them how they do it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 22.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I move:

Page 9, line 3 to page 10, line 24 [clause 22, inserted section 112A]—

Delete inserted section 112A and substitute:

112A—Distribution of how-to-vote cards

- (1) During the election period for an election, a person must not distribute, or cause or permit to be distributed, a how-to-vote card.

Maximum penalty: \$5,000.

- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply to the distribution of a how-to-vote card—

(a) that has been submitted for inclusion in posters under section 66; or

(b) that has been registered under section 66A; or

(c) that is a compilation of more than 1 how-to-vote card of a kind referred to in paragraph (a) or (b).

- (3) The presiding officer at a polling booth may request a person reasonably suspected by the presiding officer of distributing, or causing or permitting to be distributed, a how-to-vote card at or near that polling booth on polling day—

(a) to produce for inspection any how-to-vote cards in the person's possession; and

(b) to hand over all how-to-vote cards other than ones referred to in subsection (2)(a) or (b).

- (4) A person who fails to comply with a request under subsection (3) is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$1,250.

- (5) In this section—

*distribute* includes make available to other persons.

I am happy to address this amendment, but I will perhaps indicate to the government that we think it is consequential. The government does too, so unless honourable members want to discuss it, I am happy for it to be put.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 23 and 24 passed.

New clause 25.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I move:

Page 10, after line 40—Insert:

25—Amendment of section 126—Prohibition of advocacy of forms of voting inconsistent with Act

Section 126(2)—delete 'marked so as to indicate a valid vote in the manner prescribed in section 76(1) or (2).' and substitute:

—

- (a) marked so as to indicate a valid vote in the manner prescribed in section 76(1) or (2); or

- (b) identical to a card—

(i) submitted for inclusion in posters under section 66; or

(ii) registered under section 66A.

This amendment is required to allow open tickets to be distributed, and I would suggest that it is therefore consequential on [Wade-5] 1.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I think we might need some guidance from parliamentary counsel because I still need to move my proposed insertion of 25, which is very close but not identical to the Hon. Stephen Wade's. I am happy to take some guidance with the committee's indulgence. I will not be moving the insertion of the new clause 25 because the contents of that are incorporated within the Hon. Stephen Wade's amendment. Even though the amendment is different, it incorporates all of mine.

New clause inserted.

**The Hon. M. PARNELL:** I had a further amendment on a different matter but it is consequential on something that failed earlier, so I do not need to move it now.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:43):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REFORM) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:45):** I understand that all second reading contributions have been completed, so with that I wish to make a few brief concluding remarks. I thank honourable members for their second reading contributions, and I will provide detailed responses to specific issues raised by members in the relevant parts of the committee stage.

At this point, however, I would like to make a few broad comments about the government's position on the bill and proposed amendments. The bill proposes amendments to all South Australian legislation established to regulate lawful gambling in this state. It is built upon an evidence base collected through successful collaboration between the industry, community, the union and government. The Responsible Gambling Working Party's willingness to trial new ideas—some that worked and some that did not—mean that South Australia is ready to take the next step.

The next step is about providing tools to customers to help themselves to gamble within their own limits and tools for staff and venues to identify problem gambling behaviour and confidently offer assistance. These tools are needed wherever lawful gambling occurs in this state. This bill addresses for the first time these issues in a consistent, holistic way across the different types of lawful gambling venues in South Australia. I urge the house to pass this bill as a whole package to ensure that the issue of problem gambling is dealt with consistently, regardless of venue type.

A number of amendments on file seek to unbundle the package; the government intends to oppose those amendments. A number of amendments also seek to lock in time frames for implementing elements of the package. The government has a clear plan for implementing these measures in the coming years. This plan has already been set out in *Hansard* and subject to extensive discussion with the sector. The plan is built around gaming venue investment cycles and key changes to underlying technology in the gaming sector. This will minimise venue compliance costs.

Some of the proposed amendments show a disregard for the cost associated with underlying technology and have unintended consequences which, if successful, will negatively impact on smaller club and hotel venues. The government intends to oppose amendments that constrain the time frame for implementation.

In 2004, this parliament, with a conscience vote, amended the Gaming Machines Act, with the goal of reducing the number of gaming machines operating in South Australia by 3,000. These amendments included a mandatory reduction that fell well short of the target and a trading system

with a fixed price that was flawed from the outset. In 2010, the government introduced amendments to replace the fixed price with a market-determined price.

The evidence from three trading rounds is compelling: there is an excess supply of gaming machine entitlements; that is, there are venues that voluntarily want to exit the gaming machine market that are not able to because there are not enough buyers of gaming machine entitlements, and this bill proposes to implement measures that will increase the demand for gaming machine entitlements.

It is important to remember that, under the approved trading system, no venue is compelled to sell their entitlement and, because of the progressive nature of gaming tax, smaller venues face lower rates of gaming tax. If a venue chooses to leave the gaming sector, they receive the market value of their entitlements, which can be reinvested into the venue or, in the case of clubs, into community facilities. The government intends to oppose amendments to the bill which, if successful, would continue the problem of an excess supply of gaming machine entitlements.

I acknowledge support for the implementation of many of the measures contained in the bill. I acknowledge that there is support from members for a number of elements, and I look forward to a vigorous committee stage, where no doubt a wide range of views are sure to be expressed. As noted earlier, I will provide detailed responses to specific issues raised by members either at the commencement of or where relevant in the specific stage of the committee. Again, I thank honourable members for their contributions and look forward to the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

#### **PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (FUNCTIONS OF ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 May 2013.)

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (15:51):** I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak to the Parliamentary Committees (Functions of Environment, Resources and Development Committee) Amendment Bill 2013, but I will not speak for terribly long. This bill is a response to the select committee into grain handling in the House of Assembly. The committee consisted of quite a diverse group of people, including the member for Frome (Mr Geoff Brock), Adrian Pederick and Tim Whetstone (two members of the Liberal opposition), Leon Bignell (now minister Leon Bignell) and Tony Piccolo (now minister Piccolo), who were all on that particular committee.

One of the recommendations, from recollection, was that the South Australian parliament establish a standing committee on primary industries with the following objectives: (1) to ensure that primary industries continues to be a valuable part of our state's growth and economic success; and (2) to succeed in developing policies and practices that promote the state as a producer of premium food from a clean environment. My understanding is that Tony Piccolo, Leon Bignell, Geoff Brock, Adrian Pederick and Tim Whetstone unanimously supported all the recommendations, but particularly that one.

It is my understanding that, when the final report from the select committee was tabled and before the House of Assembly and all members spoke to it, it was received unanimously, so it is somewhat baffling to see that we have the Labor Party in the House of Assembly, and its members, unanimously supporting a standing committee on primary industries. It is somewhat baffling now to see the minister in this chamber (the minister for primary industries) wanting to amend the committee's act to morph, if you like, into the Environment, Resources and Development Committee a term of reference in relation to agriculture and primary industries, which is not in the spirit of what the select committee had found.

I am the shadow minister for primary industries, and both the Hon. Robert Brokenshire and I made our entire living from primary industries prior to being elected to this place. Brokey did have a small stint as a member of the House of Assembly, but there was a period, before he came in here that—

**The PRESIDENT:** Who?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** The Hon. Robert Brokenshire.

**The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:** Thirteen years.



**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Thirteen years—a small stint! Maybe he had lost a little bit of touch with his farming roots. I also put on the record that I am the only person in the parliament—maybe not now that Tim Whetstone is here—whose entire living was reliant on irrigation prior to coming into parliament as well.

**The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:** How many calluses have you got on your hands?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! You will ignore the Hon. Mr Brokenshire, who will be speaking after you, sir.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** How many what on my hands? He is talking about calluses on his hands. I am not sure which bill he is talking about. I come to the parliament with as good credentials in agriculture and primary industries as anybody, and I think it is important that we recognise the importance of this industry. It is worth about 25 per cent to our state's economy, given the revenue it brings in, and it is an industry, of course. We have a great grain harvest, for example, where the wealth is spread right across the state from Coorabie, 200 kilometres west of Ceduna, right down to the bottom of the Lower South-East in the Millicent and Mount Burr area—I think where Mitch Williams lives, the member for MacKillop—where quite a lot of grain is grown. You can see that the primary industries sector delivers wealth right across our state, and I think much more than most people give it credit for.

It just seems a little strange that we would be accepting the select committee's recommendations from the House of Assembly, as I said, unanimously supported by the committee which includes two ministers of the current government. So, two members of cabinet supported that, yet now we find the minister has only, if you like, a half-baked approach to let us just squeeze it into the ERD Committee, and I think that is an insult to the industry. If you are going to have a focus on primary industries in any committee, it probably does not really fit with the ERD Committee and it may well even fit more appropriately with the Natural Resources Committee.

I will quickly address the couple of amendments before us. It seems as though it is just a halfway measure to try to appease the select committee. I note that one of those members, Adrian Pederick, was recently on radio discussing all the other recommendations. My understanding is that virtually none of them has been implemented by the government. On one hand they have ignored all the other recommendations and this one is a halfway house.

**The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:** The others cost money and this one does not.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** The Hon. Robert Brokenshire interjects that the others cost money and this one does not. I remind members that the industry generates about 25 per cent of the revenue for the state's economy. I note that there are a couple of amendments, and the one that the Hon. Robert Brokenshire has just tabled I will have to take back to our party room. I think his amendment is to refer this to the Natural Resources Committee. I note that the Hon. Mark Parnell has an amendment, and my recollection of it is that it seeks to make the ERD Committee a Legislative Council-only committee, to remove the House of Assembly.

*The Hon. M. Parnell interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Administered? So, not just Legislative Council only. There are a couple of amendments on the table, and obviously the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's I will have to take back to our party room. The opposition thinks that the committee structure here in this parliament probably needs some review, and we have a subcommittee of our party room actually looking at the committee structures here. We have a number of standing committees and select committees, and I think everybody recognises the great work done by the Budget and Finance Committee, which is chaired by the Hon. Robert Lucas. I am sure that, if there is a change of government—

*The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** —the new opposition and the crossbenchers will want to establish a budget and finance committee, and the Hon. Robert Brokenshire is offering to chair it. It is very generous of him to do that, but nonetheless—

*The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Well, in fact, it is only \$12.50 a day for the one that the Hon. Robert Lucas chairs, so it is not about financial reward; it is about serving the people.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Ridgway, if you want to have a conversation with the Hon. Mr Brokenshire, I invite both of you to leave. You are either addressing the motion before us or you are having a conversation with the Hon. Mr Brokenshire; you can decide.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Thank you for your guidance, Mr President. We have a subcommittee of our party room looking at the structure of committees—and I said that we have the Budget and Finance Committee here and a range of other standing committees—because it is our view that it is probably appropriate to have a look at the committee structure. I know the NRM committee has a large number of members. We have changed membership to accommodate people who have come in and people who have left and, if you like, to hand out some extra benefits to some members in the House of Assembly, because they did not want to have a fight or because the Labor Party factions did not want to lose a committee position.

We actually think it is time to take a big deep breath, look at the committee structure and make sure that the structure we have going forward represents the industries that are important to the South Australian economy, and also to make sure that the community and the environment are represented and the state's finances are well and truly aired in a sensible, open and transparent way. With those few words, I indicate the opposition will not be supporting the government's bill to put a term of reference of agriculture and primary industries into the ERD Committee's standing orders.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Brokenshire, you have more to offer?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (16:01):** I have, sir. I rise to indicate opposition to this bill. However, I foreshadow an amendment that I believe will rectify the immediate issues, or will be a compromise at least, by putting this referral to the Natural Resources Committee. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. David Ridgway, that we clearly need a full restructure of all parliamentary committees post the election. I say post the election, irrespective of whether it is a Liberal or a Labor government, because the reality is that we are on the eve of an election now and frankly this is the wrong timing.

When we look at committees, I believe we should set up an ongoing budget and finance committee similar or very close to, or identical to even, what happens in the Senate, so that the Legislative Council at any time, with all the powers, can fully scrutinise the minister of the day for that agency and that department, the CEO and everyone else. I think that would augur well for a much better government than sometimes we see.

I query the benefit of the government's bill therefore, given that we are eight months up to an election, when no referral is likely to occur in the interim and certainly none that will deliver a report, and this arguably should be a policy taken to the election. I just want to mention the select committee into the right to farm issues. That was moved by the member for Schubert, Mr Ivan Venning. The government used its numbers to manipulate it into one about sustainable farming, which I am still very concerned about, because sustainable farming could become—

**The Hon. A. Bressington:** No farming.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** Well, indeed, no farming, from the point of view that the environment and the Greens of this state could take over and say, 'You can't do anything to keep it sustainable,' whereas right to farm is about ensuring that it is sustainable. This was at first chaired and supported by Labor members with some agriculture and/or horticulture in their electorate, namely the members for Light and Taylor, and now we see members from the government who have no connection to agriculture, farming, the land and the country.

When we look at the select committees of this parliament we can see the merit of a broad-based committee to investigate agriculture and regional development issues. In this parliament alone, there have been select committees on—and I will highlight them to you, sir, because I know you are very interested in agriculture—grain handling industry; harvesting rights in ForestrySA plantation estates (which found that the forests should never have been privatised; but it was done for short-term government benefit, not for the state); Port Augusta power stations; Roxby Downs indenture ratification; school bus contracts; sustainable farming practices; and wind farm developments in South Australia.

In the previous parliament there was a select committee inquiry into the conduct of PIRSA and fishing of mud cockles—something you are very interested in, sir—Kapunda Hospital (Variation of Trust) Bill, the Penola Pulp Mill Authorisation Bill, and the Renmark Irrigation Trust Bill.

So, arguably, a great many select committees could instead have been references to a broad-based agriculture and regional development standing committee. The demand is clearly there.

For a moment I want to look at what happens in Canberra and interstate for comparison. In Canberra, there are 15 House of Representatives committees, which include two of note. Agriculture, Resources, Fisheries and Forestry has existed in that form since September 2010. Interestingly, it received a resources reference in the 42<sup>nd</sup> parliament; prior to that it was agriculture, fisheries and forestry only. It was then extended to resources.

Mr Dick Adams, a Labor MP—probably one of your good friends, Mr President—chaired an inquiry and tabled a report saying, embarrassingly for state Labor, that forestry was in good health in Australia, when the state government was saying that it was in dire straits and that forestry had to be sold. This committee previously inquired into 'Skills: rural Australia's need' in 2007 and 'Taking Control: a national approach to pest animals' in November 2005, before it even had a resources reference.

The second committee of relevance in the House of Representatives is the Committee on Regional Australia, also in existence since September 2010. Its most recent report was 'Cancer of the bush or salvation of our cities? Fly-in, fly-out [and drive-in, drive-out] workforce practices in regional Australia'. I think they were done when Julia Gillard was prime minister, before she was hijacked by 'Mr See Through the Window I Know It All Kevin Dudd'.

Previous parliaments in Canberra had the following committees: Primary Industries, Resources and Rural and Regional Affairs in the 38<sup>th</sup> parliament, Primary Industries and Regional Services in the 39<sup>th</sup> parliament, Transport and Regional Services in the 40<sup>th</sup> and 41<sup>st</sup> parliaments, and Primary Industries and Resources in the 42<sup>nd</sup> parliament.

There are 16 Senate committees, including the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee, which I think the Hon. Bill Heffernan chairs; it is a very powerful committee and a strong advocate for country Australia. A understand that today, some are taking evidence into the status of the citrus industry in Mildura, just over the border from our Riverland citrus region. In New South Wales, State and Regional Development is one of 30 standing and select committees; in Victoria, the Rural and Regional Committee is one of 14 joint standing committees; and in Queensland the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee is one of 10 standing committees.

There is merit in there being a committee reference. Family First argues for a committee such as the federal government and the larger states have, but setting the right committee with the right fit. Family First believes that, ideally, there should be a separate standing committee dedicated specifically to agriculture, resources, regions, fisheries and forestry. As the Hon. David Ridgway said, 25 per cent of all South Australia's income—and I believe it will certainly be more in the future—comes from agriculture. Family First advocates that we have a separate standing committee. Notwithstanding that, at the moment, to deal with this bill if it were to proceed, we ask colleagues to carefully consider our amendment to put the reference into the Natural Resources Committee.

One of the things I am very disappointed about is that, after a lot of fanfare, I do not believe we saw any positive outcomes from the 2012 Year of the Farmer in South Australia. I challenge colleagues to name one. Something needs to happen to give us—

**The Hon. A. Bressington:** They put some tents up in the mall.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** They put some tents in the mall; well, that was good. I was not there, but that must have been an achievement, putting them up, I gather.

**The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:** You obviously didn't get over to any field days, Robert, to see them. They were at the field days.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** It is an interesting point that the Hon. John Dawkins talks about, and I will digress slightly to field days. No, I did not get to field days because often field days occur when this parliament is sitting. On that, I find it really interesting that I wrote to the former government leader of business (the Hon. Patrick Conlon) saying, 'Given that you are prepared to change the parliamentary sitting calendar to adjust for the Festival of Arts, and all the things to do with the Festival of Arts, so that we do not actually sit during that period of several weeks, would you please, sir, consider the biggest field days in South Australia—the Eyre Peninsula Cleve Field Days and, in alternate years, the Yorke Peninsula Paskeville Field Days—and consider actually changing the sitting week so that we sit the week before or after?'

**The PRESIDENT:** I've attended a couple.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** Guess what happened?

**The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:** It wasn't on a sitting week last year.

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes, I've attended a couple.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** Right, well, guess what happened, Mr President?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes, I've attended a couple.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** Because this government is so—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** I've attended some.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** —uninterested in agriculture—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** —they took no notice of my request.

**The PRESIDENT:** Well, there's a surprise.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** So, we can have three or four weeks off so that the members in the city can run around the Festival, but we cannot change one sitting week for the 5,000 or 6,000 country people who generate 25 per cent of the economic wealth of this state and we cannot go and see our constituents. I think this government needs to be condemned for that because, if you look at the diary, we have plenty of weeks either side when we are not sitting, but we cannot go and see our constituents at the biggest field day for the year. Back to the point—

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Brokenshere, you might want to return to the issue—

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** Yes, sir, and I thank you for your well-chaired guidance.

**The PRESIDENT:** —mainly because you are straying—

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** I want to finish with this.

**The PRESIDENT:** —into foreign territory.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE:** We ask colleagues to strongly consider the merit and the wisdom of this. If we are going to have this before the next term of whoever is in government, let's put it to the Natural Resources Committee because the Natural Resources Committee already focuses on a lot of agricultural issues; as an example, one at the moment is looking at sustainable water for agriculture and mining on Eyre Peninsula.

With that, that is enough from me on this point, except to say that, if we do not get that amendment, we will be joining with the Liberal opposition to knock this bill out because to put it to the ERD at this point in time we believe is not the way it should be headed.

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

## **FIRST HOME AND HOUSING CONSTRUCTION GRANTS (BUDGET 2013) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 June 2013.)

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:13):** I rise just to make a brief contribution regarding this bill. In summary, it is a good bill that Family First wholeheartedly supports. The First Home and Housing Construction Grants (Budget 2013) Amendment Bill is a very welcome proposal to extend the present housing construction grants scheme for a further six months.

Family First believes that family life is indeed the foundation of a good society. A home is essential for any family, and Australians have traditionally looked to home ownership as an important aspect of their life. As far back as the first century AD, Pliny the Elder made the famous statement, 'Home is where the heart is.'

The fact is we need more houses to be built in South Australia. This is not only to maintain a supply of houses but to provide employment and keep good tradespeople in South Australia. The statistics bear this out. The latest unemployment figures show that South Australia's unemployment rate had a modest increase from 5.8 per cent to 5.9 per cent between April and May this year. The housing finance commitments figures for South Australia also show a modest increase in commitments over the last six months to April 2013, while the scheme has been operating; clearly, something is working.

The figures for private sector houses approved are almost steady over that six months, but there has been a long-term decrease over the last six years, and that is the major issue. This long-term decrease is obviously of substantial concern. The home building industry needs a continuous supply of work in order to survive. Economic conditions are very tight at present, and it is important to assist those who create the demand for home building.

The amount of the grant is modest in comparison with the amount that is paid in all taxes during the building process. A report prepared for the Housing Industry Association last year found that the amount of taxes paid on a house and land package of \$400,000, being the median house and land price in South Australia at the time in Adelaide's northern suburbs, was some \$85,000 or more than one-fifth of the total cost of the house and land. That, of course, is passed on to the purchaser, so any attempt to give some of that back is most welcome.

Australia, unfortunately, rates very poorly in housing affordability compared to the rest of the world. One survey of major centres around the world found that our housing affordability was well behind the United States, Ireland, Canada and the United Kingdom, and only Hong Kong was worse in this particular survey. Anything that can be done to stimulate the housing industry has a very substantial multiplier effect as well. When people buy a house and land package and build a new house, they obviously then engage in employing fence contractors, they put in driveways, they plant trees, they might put in a pool, they buy refrigerators, they tile, they carpet, they paint, they wallpaper—whatever else it may be.

This is an industry that our state is vitally dependent upon. I think this is a good move from the government, and Family First is not shy to give credit where credit is due. This is a step in the right direction. In fact, the Premier was kind enough to invite me to the launch of this policy and I was quite pleased to be there. As I said, Family First wholeheartedly support this move.

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

### MAJOR EVENTS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 June 2013.)

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:16):** I rise to indicate my support for the Major Events Bill. This bill represents a timely and appropriate response to the evolving requirements of the burgeoning events scene here in South Australia and to the fact that we will shortly be in a position to attract even larger and more significant local, national and international events to our state.

It is time that South Australia and Adelaide resumed their former fabled status as the Athens of the south. So many of the things that make Adelaide a great place to live and to share with visitors today can be sheeted home to premier Don Dunstan's foresight and initiative. Don Dunstan put Adelaide on the cultural map both locally and abroad.

The Dunstan decade, in terms of the cultural renaissance it embodied, was built on his support for the Adelaide Festival Centre, the Adelaide Festival and the State Theatre Company. He took action to protect the historically significant buildings in which we take such pride. He established the hugely successful South Australian Film Corporation. He was a champion of multiculturalism and of cultural exchange with our near neighbours.

Our arts festival was the most prestigious in the country, and the template it created had been followed with commensurate success by other states and territories. We owe Don Dunstan so much, and I take a moment to acknowledge his towering achievements.

In the intervening years, it can be fairly said that there have been periods of complacency concerning our position in the cultural fabric of the nation, and to me that is a great shame. However, Adelaide and South Australia are returning, particularly under this government, to their rightful place: in the vanguard of cultural, sporting, gastronomic, multicultural, community, professional and special interest festivals, events and conferences.

These festivals, events and conferences are far from being bread and circuses, or the experiences that some naysayers in our community would say are too expensive, unworthy of government assistance or simply frivolous and unnecessary. Nothing could be further from the truth. Benefits in terms of social and community harmony and cohesion—the benefits that spring from the creation of friendships between people from diverse parts of the world, from interest and participation in sport, from the creation of employment related to these events—are manifest. The economic benefits of such showcases in terms of business investment and tourism for our communities, our city and our state are beyond doubt.

A study carried out by Festivals Adelaide, an umbrella group that includes the Adelaide Festival, Fringe, WOMADelaide, Cabaret, OzAsia, Come Out, Feast, Film, SALA and the International Guitar festivals, was published earlier this year. It found that these festivals returned to the community about \$5 for every dollar of government funding in 2012. It found that visitors to and artists in these events combined spent more than \$58 million, excluding the proceeds of the sale of the 590,000 tickets—\$58.1 million for the state economy in new income.

Meanwhile, in just one example on the sporting front, the 2012 Clipsal 500 generated more than \$34 million and attracted 760,400 people. Let me mention just a couple of figures from the current year. *The Advertiser* revealed last week that the recent Cabaret Festival increased its box office takings by more than 20 per cent on last year—a runaway success with 40 sold out shows. The Santos Tour Down Under which was attended by more than three-quarters of a million people, including 40,000 from interstate and overseas, generated \$43.6 million for our economy.

You only need to look at the 2013 events calendar released by Events SA to see the multiplicity and broad spread of the 94 festivals, sporting and other events listed and to note that the list is but a selection of what is available across the state and is designed to be a summary only. It is in this context of these issues that I turn to the bill. Our calendar of events is a precious asset in an increasingly competitive environment and it has become increasingly clear that, just as a number of interstate jurisdictions have already perceived, we require specific, dedicated major event legislation to regulate commercial activities so as to attract, retain and facilitate major events. As my colleague the minister pointed out in her second reading:

For the private sector to invest in a major event, the private sector has the right to expect that the integrity of its commercial investment will be protected and the smooth running of the event is ensured.

The minister also added that legislation such as that which we discuss today may be a significant or determining element in a private entrepreneur or international body deciding whether to bring an event to South Australia and cited the requirements of organisations such as FIFA, the IOC, the ICC, the International Rugby Board and the Commonwealth Games Association with regard to protection against infringement of activities associated with their events.

Our bid for matches as part of the 2015 Cricket World Cup is in fact contingent on enactment of appropriate legislation which must be in place for at least 12 months prior to that event. Infringements of sponsorship and other commercial arrangements are many and they can be very ingenious. Let's look briefly at some of these ploys. They can include ambush marketing, where a company associates itself with an event without paying the cost of being an official sponsor. Such infringements, particularly around the Olympic Games, have been numerous, and we are all familiar with those. These infringements reduce the value of event sponsorship and are unfair to event organisers and sponsors alike.

The sale or distribution of certain articles with the intention of profiting from a competitor's legitimate sponsorship investment is closely related to ambush marketing. One such instance is where, say, a sporting apparel manufacturer might distribute its goods, insignia or identifiable colours or symbols at a sports event where a competitor has purchased sponsorship rights. This is obviously to the detriment of the sponsor's commercial interests. Ticket scalping is also a well-known phenomenon. This needs little clarification.

Broadcasting regulation is important where a particular broadcaster invests large amounts in exclusive broadcast rights only to find that another broadcaster is covering, say, a part or stage of an event. Airspace and aerial advertising are also avenues for a company to try to leverage on another's events. Car sponsor X certainly would not want non-sponsor car company Y's aerobatics team appearing in the airspace above a sporting event for which X had paid a costly sum to secure exclusive advertising rights.

Meanwhile, logos, symbols, colours or branding can be used to suggest that an item is endorsed by an event's sponsor or perhaps a government body. Such paid endorsements are

generally taken to denote a certain quality in the product and a legitimate link to an event. If a non-sponsoring merchandiser taps into and applies these logos or symbols the results are obvious. Sales of the legitimate products, the overall profits and the value of the business investment are all decreased.

Also within the ambit of the bill is public safety at major events. The government invests a huge amount of planning, logistical support and coordination in large public events, including police, transport, traffic management, emergency services, crowd management and venue hire. Crowd management in general, and in particular at entry and exit points, is of particular concern, needless to say as are the procession of incendiaries, obstruction, interference with events or other inappropriate behaviours. These matters are therefore addressed within the provisions. Clearly the value of private sector investment in major events in our state must be protected if these events are to be attracted and maintained. Without regulation, some investments may be compromised or withdrawn to the detriment of the event, the host and the community.

The opening of our redeveloped Adelaide sports stadium will herald a new era for South Australia. The best of new technology and design will combine with Adelaide Oval's famous heritage to provide a world-class, 50,000-seat facility, hosting football, cricket and a plethora of other major sporting and entertainment events for the revitalised Riverbank Precinct. Now is the time for us to seize the opportunities that present themselves to our initiative and our imagination.

The bill I have canvassed today will protect and enhance our investment in major events, safeguard the commercial interests and the certainty of organisations that have invested in these, enhance our local, national and international profile, provide an environment for the growth of current events and the attraction of new events, enhance the safety and enjoyment of patrons, provide suitable powers to organisations, police and other relevant parties, and provide appropriate penalties for those who seek to profit unfairly from the investment of others. For all those excellent reasons, and looking forward to the future of our vibrant city and our unique and beautiful state, I support the bill and commend its passage.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee.

### APPROPRIATION BILL 2013

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

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (16:28):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I take this opportunity to remind members that the Treasurer's budget speech was tabled in this house on Thursday 6 June 2013. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

##### 2—Commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2013. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

##### 3—Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

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

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

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

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

6—Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

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

7—Additional appropriation under other Acts

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

8—Overdraft limit

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

Schedule 1—Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 2014

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.W. Ridgway.

At 16:30 the council adjourned until Tuesday 23 July 2013 at 10:15.