

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 4 June 2015

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

Bills

CLASSIFICATION (PUBLICATIONS, FILMS AND COMPUTER GAMES) (PUBLICATIONS - PARENTAL GUIDANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Firstly, I would like to take the opportunity to thank and acknowledge my colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place for her extensive work and research on this topic back in 2010 when she successfully passed this legislation in the upper house. Unfortunately, when I took the same bill to the lower house with the full support of the Liberal Party, Labor opposed the bill and it failed.

In 2008, the Senate Standing Committee on the Environment, Communications and the Arts held an inquiry into the sexualisation of children in contemporary media. The committee's findings outlined a number of recommendations to the then Rudd Labor government in relation to the inappropriate sexualisation of our children through the electronic and print media. The committee recommended that publishers consider providing parental reading advice based on the Office for Film and Literature Classification systems of classification and consumer advice on magazine covers indicating the presence of material that may be inappropriate for children of certain ages.

We have since had a change of government and, during Labor's term of government, nothing was actually changed in this area. We have since had a change of government so much so that now former committee member Senator Dana Wortley is now in this house as the member for Torrens which I welcome, and I hope that I will—

The SPEAKER: It would be better if the member for Adelaide did not quite deliberately breach standing orders by using people's Christian name and surname. We have that rule—

Ms SANDERSON: Senator Wortley?

The SPEAKER: —for a compelling reason. Now, that the member for Adelaide does not understand it is beside the point.

Ms SANDERSON: But when referring to a senator, you do use their name.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms SANDERSON: And that is where I used it.

The SPEAKER: And should be referred to as the member for Torrens.

Ms SANDERSON: Right, thank you. Extensive worldwide research indicates that tweens by definition are children aged nine to 13 years and a particularly vulnerable and impressionable group of our society. This age group has a very slick advertising and marketing drive focused on it, and tweens often receive a level of independence from their parents to purchase with their own pocket money magazines such as *Total Girl*, *Girlfriend* or *Dolly*.

Such magazines, particularly *Dolly* and *Girlfriend*, were the focus of the 2008 Senate committee. After that Senate inquiry, there was actually a lot of public awareness and lots of lobby

groups were set up. Along with Michelle, I attended quite a few of the forums that were held in different schools throughout South Australia and there were different websites such as Kids Free 2B Kids, Young Media Group, and Collective Shout organisations.

There really was a lot of interest in this topic and a lot of movement, so much so that the YWCA actually presented a paper and proposed that the South Australian government either amend the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act, as I am suggesting today, or introduce new legislation for the purpose of establishing a PG-type classification for girls' magazines sold in South Australia. I will read from their paper:

There is growing evidence in Australia and overseas that the sexualisation of children is having real and lasting health impacts. The 2007 American Psychological Association's 'Taskforce on the sexualisation of girls' has reported that:

- 'ample evidence indicates that sexualisation has negative effects in a variety of domains, including cognitive functioning, physical and mental health, sexuality, and attitudes and beliefs.'

The research indicates that viewing material that is sexually objectifying is a contributing factor for:

- body dissatisfaction
- eating disorders
- low self-esteem and depressive effects
- physical health problems in high school aged girls and young women.

In Australia, experts in children's health and welfare agree that premature sexualisation places children at risk of a variety of harms, including disruption to healthy psychological development.

The most powerful sources of premature sexualisation are magazines and advertising which targets girls. Television programs, especially music video shows; teen soap operas and reality TV shows also play a role.

But magazines were found to be the most powerful source:

Each month, 26% of six year old girls and almost 50% of ten and eleven year old girls read at least one of the most popular magazines—Barbie Magazine, Total Girl and Disney Girl.

The 2008 Senate Inquiry considered the issue of girls' magazines at length and focused exclusively on *Girlfriend* and *Total Girl*. The report raised concerns about sexually explicit content as well as the age of readers.

Information supplied by Pacific Magazines—

the distributor of *Girlfriend* magazine—

in answer to a question taken on notice indicates that, although the average reader age is close to 16, around 20 per cent of *Girlfriend's* readership is between 11 and 12 years of age.

Recommendation 6 of the report of the 2008 Senate Inquiry is focused on girls' magazines:

'The committee recommends that publishers consider providing reader advice, based on the Office of Film and Literature Classification systems of classifications and consumer advice, on magazine covers indicating the presence of material that may be inappropriate for children.'

The YWCA of Adelaide supports the recommendation for a system of classification on magazine covers indicating the presence of material that may be inappropriate for children. We believe that the current classification system, under which children's magazines are classed as unrestricted publications, is insufficient to enable parents to make informed choices about the type or amount of sexual content seen by their children.

Responding to the rising community concern about the early sexualisation of young girls, the YWCA held a public forum...in 2009. The forum was chaired by Senator...Wortley, a member of the 2008 Senate Inquiry. The forum was overwhelmingly in favour of the proposed PG classification. Feedback since the forum and our online survey show strong community support to take action to protect girls from the negative impacts of early sexualisation.

The YWCA of Adelaide proposes that the South Australian government take the lead and introduce state based legislation to protect children. The YWCA also acknowledges that the National Classification Scheme is a joint enterprise of Federal, State and Territory Governments. However, the Scheme is not strictly uniform across all states and territories. For example, the South Australian Classification Council or Minister, may make classification decisions despite a Commonwealth classification being in existence, and such a classification will be afforded priority over Commonwealth classifications. South Australia also has a unique system of classifying theatrical performances. Theatrical performances can be, amongst other things, classified as unsuitable for children by the South Australian Classification of Theatrical Performances Board.

Whilst other media sources of sexualised messaging remain significant policy issues, particularly advertising and music video shows, these are difficult to address at the state level, and the YWCA of Adelaide believes that the focus on classification of girls' magazines is a meaningful way for the state government to provide leadership in the national debate, while acting to balance these different interests.

Whilst I realise the difficulty in having magazines distributed in South Australia that require a rating of PG, or M, or even a recommended age group on the front does have complications, I would refer the house to the fact that we are the only state that has a 10¢ deposit on cans and bottles. We are also the only state that has a system where you have to purchase plastic bags, so we all take our recycle bags to the supermarket. In this state, where there is the will there is a way to make a change on this very important issue.

Since 2010, when I first brought this through to the house, I have done a bit more work on it and recently I went to Sydney to meet with magazine companies; I met with ACP and had a conference call with Pacific Magazines. ACP, which distributes *Dolly* magazine (along with a few others) was fairly supportive, and I am trying to work them around to the idea that it would be better for them to show that they are responsible corporate citizens and that they would of their own volition put on the front of their magazine the suitable age category and be self-regulated so that we do not have to have people imposing fines and regulating.

I think that would draw awareness to their editors of the importance of being mindful of what is in the magazine and who that is aimed at and putting that on the front of the magazine. My preference would be that they take this up willingly, and I am still working with them and hope they will come around to that view. However, if they do not, we still have the legislative power, through the minister, to present guidelines that recommend the 'suitable for' or an age classification on the front or otherwise go with the PG or the M rating.

This year, with the number of schools I have in my electorate, I have probably toured several hundred school-age girls through Parliament House, and I have brought up this issue each time. There is overwhelming support for this—not only from children but from their parents and teachers who also attend the tour groups—and that it is confusing for a parent. A friend of mine who had a 16-year-old child at the time and one who was 11 was in the supermarket and picked up *Girlfriend* magazine for her 11-year-old daughter, and her 16-year-old daughter said, 'Mum, you can't buy that magazine; it's not suitable for her.' My friend said, 'Well, how would I know that? It's a young girl on the front, and it's all bright colours and pink.' How would a parent know that?

The use of a rating, or even just a 'suitable for' or 'recommended for ages over 12 or 13', whatever they determine their target market is, would make that so much more simple. To highlight that point, this year I went to a newsagent and asked for magazines that would be suitable for teenagers in an effort to go through and see if there had been many changes since 2010; even the girl who to me looked 17 or 18 and was working in the store could not easily identify for me which magazines were suitable for what age group—and this is a person working in a newsagency. How realistic is it to think that parents who are time poor, who are rushed at a supermarket by a child nagging them to buy a magazine, have time to read through a magazine cover to cover before either making the purchase decision or purchasing it and then reading the whole magazine before they decide whether that magazine is suitable to give to their child or children.

There was recent media on this story, when I first mentioned it was being introduced. The family that were in the photo shoot had one older child and two younger children, and they even said that it was important that there was a recommendation on there for even children within the one family so parents would know who that was aimed at and who it would be suitable for.

I must say, when I was comparing the magazines from the bill in 2010 to the magazines now, there has been a vast and dramatic improvement, which I am very pleased about. There is less touching up of photos and I have not seen any sealed sections in there that there used to be, so I do commend the magazine companies for their improvement, but I think they can take this further and they really can show that they are good corporate citizens and that they do care about young people and the importance of their brain development and having information and visual pictures that are right for their age group.

I see my time is running down, so let me say in conclusion that I do believe this is important. I believe that the early sexualisation of children is detrimental to their cognitive, emotional and social

development, as quoted by Rita Princi as well as even David Penberthy. When I spoke to him on FIVEaa he said, and I quote:

I think giving a parent an extra tool to make an informed judgement is a good thing.

I think there is more work to do on this, and I am hoping to work with government to see if they have any other ideas on how best to bring this bill through or what we can do to work with magazine companies. But it is all about protecting our children and letting parents be parents and making the decision but giving them the tools in order to make that right decision. I think that an easy 'suitable for' or 'recommended' or a 'PG' will make that easier for parents. I commend the bill to the house.

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

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (SURROGACY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:47): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me great pleasure today to introduce into the House of Assembly the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill. I acknowledge and appreciate that the Hon. John Dawkins MLC is in the gallery today to see the House of Assembly first give consideration to this bill.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, it is always disorderly in the course of debate to buttress one's debate by the presence or absence in the gallery of individuals.

Mr GARDNER: Thank you, sir; I appreciate your guidance and I take it. The Hon. John Dawkins has worked on this matter for eight years to ensure that families seeking to have surrogacy arrangements to assist in their reproductive opportunities are able to access those in a reasonable manner. The Golden Gate Bridge took four years to build and the Hon. John Dawkins has been working on this for eight years. In 2007, he first introduced legislation into the Legislative Council. It was sent to the Social Development Committee to consider how best a framework might be developed to allow for surrogacy arrangements to be put in place for South Australian families seeking assistance in reproduction. I know that the member for Hammond served on that committee as did a number of other members, and they did good work.

In 2008 the Legislative Council passed the first surrogacy bill, which then sat in this house for 18 months before eventually, at the end of 2009 in the twilight of that parliament, the surrogacy bill came into law, and for the first time families in South Australia were able to have the hope and the joy that comes with being able to have children, despite the fertility problems that they may have had, with the assistance of a surrogate.

In 2010 further legislation was passed which enabled some technical improvements to that bill to take place, and now here we are in 2015 and we have further improvements that were brought by the Hon. John Dawkins to the Legislative Council at the end of last year, and then reintroduced after the prorogation of parliament at the beginning of this year. Now, having passed the Legislative Council in early May, we have the opportunity in this house to make this a law.

Having taken eight years I just say to all members that this is an opportunity for us to show the community of South Australia that these improvements which will bring hope and joy to so many families are things that can be done expeditiously. I indicate to all members now that, after those who wish to make a contribution to this debate today, we will be no doubt adjourning off and I will seek on 2 July to progress the debate further and if possible get to the committee stage and a vote.

I indicate that now so that all members are on notice that for the next month the Hon. John Dawkins has undertaken to make himself available to any member who wishes to discuss details of the bill because, of course, through the Legislative Council process there were a number of amendments that came forward. Parliamentary counsel has been working closely with the Hon. John Dawkins to access some of those refinements, and so the opportunity is there, and for anything that members wish to raise in the committee stage the standing orders, of course, provide for that too. But I think there is the opportunity to do this expeditiously and I hope that the parliament takes the opportunity to do so and that we can have that further debate on 2 July.

The purpose of the bill in summary is, as I say, to enable those families who wish to seek surrogacy arrangements to have greater opportunity and greater access to do so. I will quote from something that John Dawkins said:

Often it is the ability to find a willing surrogate that presents the biggest hurdle for couples seeking to have a child through this method. However, by establishing a 'surrogacy register', these reforms will improve access to potential surrogates across South Australia, hopefully diminishing this barrier and increasing the viability of surrogacy as an option for those who cannot conceive naturally. This bill seeks to introduce a range of measures that will ultimately make surrogacy more accessible and attractive for potential surrogates by increasing the financial and psychological assistance available throughout the entire process.

It is critical to understand, this bill seeks to maintain the offence and clarify the offence of commercial surrogacy. This is not about commercial surrogacy, this is not about setting up an industry whereby people will undertake these measures for profit; this is altruistic surrogacy where those who are willing to assist families who are struggling to conceive can join a surrogates' register and those who wish to access surrogacy will have far greater opportunity to find a surrogate to assist in that process.

At the moment surrogacy is restricted to where a family is able to identify somebody known to them already who can assist with the process, and that is, of course, the greatest hurdle, and it means that many families, who do not have somebody readily identifiable who is willing and ready to assist in that process, seek other alternatives.

I think the community has been troubled by some of the alternative pathways that a number of families have taken, especially when those families do not fulfil the obligations that any respectful or reasonable society would expect of them. We were appalled at the situation of baby Gammy in Thailand, and we were appalled at the way that that family treated that surrogate mother in Thailand and what happened with poor baby Gammy. The community responded in that case with an outpouring of emotional and financial support to that mother.

I think the establishment of international agreements, which this bill will provide for, will enable the facilitation, where it is appropriate, that families go overseas, and that it recognises that we have a responsibility in this parliament to ensure that vulnerable women are not exploited overseas. So the minister will have the opportunity to set up arrangements with a framework around which those may take place rather than having this complete free-for-all where we have effectively washed our hands of what happens overseas, and 'What happens in Thailand stays in Thailand' would be the unfortunate way that it might be presented.

This bill would do a good measure to make it more accessible in South Australia thereby reducing the level of people who are seeking to access surrogacy overseas, and it will provide a framework within which those overseas matters may take place. Because the joy and the hope and the love that may be brought to South Australian families by virtue of surrogacy arrangements should not come at the expense of the exploitation of vulnerable people in other countries: the human cost must be taken into account.

I commend the Hon. John Dawkins for the work that he has done over eight years and particularly, in relation to this bill, over the last six months. He has consulted very widely. He has consulted with other members, he has consulted with the community, with experts, and a range of people.

To the particular measures of the bill, the bill seeks to create a surrogacy register which will enable individuals willing to become surrogates to place their name on a list which can be provided to prospective parents, making it easier for both parties to connect. The bill will establish a state framework for the advertising of surrogates, conduct of those involved in the organisation of surrogacy agreements, and a criteria for approved international surrogacy agreements.

The bill will make counselling for surrogates and their partners, whether that relationship is marital, de facto or domestic, both before the pregnancy and after the birth available at no cost to them. It will become a requirement that the commissioning parents will in fact make that counselling available to give further support to those surrogates, and it will expand the out-of-pocket expenses that surrogate mothers may be reimbursed for in the fulfilment of the agreement. We are not talking about commercial surrogacy, we are not talking about fee-for-service and payment, but it is necessary that the current restrictions to ensure that there is not commercial surrogacy on what may

be paid to the surrogate be relaxed so that all legitimate out-of-pocket expenses for that surrogate are able to be met and their family.

The bill will also seek to clarify any ambiguity that currently exists for fertility service providers when it comes to the timing of when eggs may be harvested. It is the intention of this bill to ensure that fertility service providers can harvest and freeze eggs at any point, regardless of whether a recognised surrogacy agreement is in place. The bill seeks to reinforce the fact that a surrogate mother, insofar as it complies with the surrogacy agreement in place, may conduct her pregnancy as if the child was her own. The bill provides for the minister to establish a process for approved international surrogacy agreements to prevent situations such as baby Gammy from occurring again and ensure that the welfare of the child is the primary concern when such agreements are put in place.

The bill has been the result of input from a number of individuals and organisations over a lengthy period of time. Specific thanks should be given to Stephen Page, an expert surrogacy lawyer from Queensland; the Law Society of South Australia; Dr Christine Kirby of Repromed; and Kerry Faggotter, a mother who has lived the benefits of surrogacy first-hand.

John Dawkins and I have also both had contact with a range of constituents who have both used and are hoping to use surrogacy, and their feedback has been substantially incorporated into the bill. I also recognise the work of Mark Herbst of parliamentary counsel, without whose efforts and assistance the bill would not be a reality, and we thank him and his team for their efforts. We acknowledge also the Attorney-General's office, who have been helpful in keeping the Hon. Mr Dawkins informed regarding the work of this area in COAG and the state committees of attorneys-general.

I note that there have been discussions that some of these matters should be dealt with through a national framework, and that would be of benefit, but if we wait for COAG and for the state committees of attorneys-general on such matters, it will be years longer. We could build another Golden Gate Bridge in the time that we were waiting for that work to take place. It would be terrific if this was a prioritised matter for a department or for the COAG; the reality is it is not, and we have the opportunity as parliamentarians to bring this to a conclusion and to enable these benefits to take place.

For the Liberal Party, this matter is a conscience vote. I understand that for the government it is also a conscience vote, so it is up to each individual member of parliament to form their views. The reasons for a conscience vote on these matters are well understood: things to do with reproductive rights are often conscience vote matters. However, I do note that, even by the scale of things that are classified in this house as a conscience vote, this bill does not actually grant a new opportunity for a new right for potential parents. That right currently exists; this is a change to the way these things are facilitated.

This actually will restrict the, I would suggest, exploitation of potential surrogates overseas, and it will do little more, in terms of the local level, than provide extra counselling for those who are undertaking the process and the potential for advertising and for an altruistic register to take place.

I would suggest that, if members who have significant concerns about the philosophical issues behind the introduction of surrogacy in the first place actually look at what the provisions of the bill are seeking to do, they may well find it within their hearts to support the bill. I encourage them to consider it in those terms, because it is administrative and it is pragmatic.

I would like to identify the main sections for those members who wish to turn to the bill itself and consider these matters. The guidelines for the state framework for altruistic surrogacy are outlined at clause 4, which seeks to insert new division 1A—section 10FA—State Framework for Altruistic Surrogacy. The matters relating to the surrogate register are again at clause 4, in new section 10FB, and are really quite simple: that the register be established by the department and the restrictions on it. I note that clause 7(6) refers to:

any reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the surrogate mother in respect of the agreement and that subclause (7) provides:

commissioning parents will...ensure that the surrogate mother and her husband or domestic partner, if any, are offered counselling (at no cost to the surrogate mother or her husband or domestic partner) after the birth of a child to which the agreement relates (including, to avoid doubt, a stillbirth).

I think that is one of the key components of the legislation.

The other key part that members should familiarise themselves with, if they are looking into the detail, is at clause 8—Insertion of section 10HAB—Medical decisions affecting surrogate mother or child, which provides that questions relating to any medical treatment to be provided to a surrogate mother or an unborn child to which a recognised surrogacy agreement relates are to be determined as if the recognised surrogacy agreement did not exist. So, consideration of matters while the surrogate mother is pregnant are treated as if the surrogate mother's own child were at stake and as if the agreement was not in place. That is a critically important matter.

I reiterate that this bill will significantly enhance the opportunities for families in South Australia to undertake surrogacy within South Australia and, thereby, potentially reduce the challenges that come from overseas surrogacy. Those who continue to use the overseas method will have a framework in place whereby we can reassure ourselves that the opportunities for exploitation are reduced. I hope that all members will consider and support this bill, which will facilitate that and put the welfare of the child at the centre of matters in relation to those international agreements.

I congratulate the Hon. John Dawkins for his significant efforts over eight years in dealing with this matter in the South Australian parliament—long hours, long years. I hope that members will take the opportunity to inform themselves between now and 2 July. I look forward to the other contributions in this place, and I hope that the house will work with us in four weeks' time to deliver a resolution.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:03): I rise to support the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill. This bill was introduced by my colleague and good friend the Hon. John Dawkins MLC from another place. It seeks to amend the Family Relationships Act 1975 and to make a related amendment to the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988. Obviously, this all relates to the Statutes Amendment (Surrogacy) Act 2009.

An investigation was undertaken to improve the existing law in South Australia, firstly, to ensure security for children who are born through surrogacy; secondly, to try to make the existing surrogacy arrangements accessible in this jurisdiction more extensive; and, thirdly, limiting the use of the overseas commercial surrogacy process while also ensuring that commercial surrogacy remains banned in South Australia.

As stated before, commercial surrogacy at the moment remains banned in South Australia. However, various forms of altruistic surrogacy are legal. As of 26 November 2010, recognised surrogacy arrangements were also permitted. Altruistic surrogacy is where the surrogate mother does not receive any compensation and may only be reimbursed for the medical costs incurred during the pregnancy.

One of the amendments that the Hon. John Dawkins has made is to provide a suitable allowance for reimbursement costs which the surrogate mother may have incurred during the pregnancy period. This amendment may attract more women to be surrogates. At present, the number of willing surrogates is minimal. This is due to the lengthy process without any sort of reimbursement of the cost which may have been acquired during the gestational period.

Before the commissioning parents have the access to begin a surrogacy arrangement, they must provide the following evidence. They must show that the woman is or appears to be infertile, or there seems to be a significant risk of a serious genetic illness being transmitted to a child born. The commissioning parents also have to be legally married or have been living as a de facto husband and wife. If possible, at least one of the commissioning parents' gametes are to be used, and it is understood that, in some circumstances, this is not possible. It is also a requirement that the commissioning parents live in South Australia, and all parties participating must be 18 years of age or over.

I would like to make mention of a second amendment, that being the desire to build a register of approved surrogates which is to be accessed only by approved medical institutions. Creating the surrogacy register would minimise the difficulty of finding a willing and reliable surrogate. Many commissioning parents find themselves having to travel overseas and engage in a commercial surrogacy arrangement. As I mentioned previously, at the moment, commercial surrogacy is illegal in Australia. The current proposed amendment reads:

- (1) The Minister must establish a register (the *Surrogate Register*) of women who are willing to act as a surrogate mother within the meaning of section 10HA.
- (2) The Surrogate Register must be kept and maintained in accordance with the *State Framework for Altruistic Surrogacy*.
- (3) A woman cannot apply for registration on the Surrogate Register unless—
 - (a) she is 18 years of age or older; and
 - (b) she is resident and domiciled in the State; and
 - (c) she is a permanent resident of Australia; and
 - (d) she satisfies any other requirement set out in the regulations for the purposes of this subsection.
- (4) The Surrogate Register is not available for public inspection.
- (5) The regulations may make further provisions in relation to the Surrogate Register (including, to avoid doubt, provisions relating to inspection of the Surrogate Register by specified persons, or persons of a specified class).

Having a certified register of surrogates may provide the commissioning parents with a sense of security when deciding to enter into a surrogacy agreement. People want to be certain that the selected surrogate mother bringing their possible child into the world is reliable and suitable to conceive and carry a baby.

Another amendment that I would like to note is a similar procedure that is in place for overseas adoptions. Any proposed international surrogacy must go before the relevant minister to review and assess each proposed surrogacy agreement case by case. Before approval, the minister must consider that the welfare and security of the possible child is secure, and any unsuitable parents would be discouraged from access to use the option of surrogacy. This amendment would regulate overseas surrogacy arrangements. In regard to offences in the bill, there is an amendment that involves the substitution of section 10H. It deletes the previous section and substitutes it with:

10H—Offences

- (1) Except as authorised by or under this Act or the *State Framework for Altruistic Surrogacy*, a person who, for valuable consideration, negotiates, arranges or obtains the benefit of a surrogacy contract on behalf of another is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 12 months.
- (2) A person who, for valuable consideration, induces another to enter into a surrogacy contract is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 12 months.
- (3) For the purposes of subsections (1) and (2), the prosecution need not prove that—
 - (a) a surrogacy contract was, in fact, entered; or
 - (b) a woman became pregnant, or a child born, pursuant to a surrogacy contract.

This bill has been amended in a way to ensure security, wellbeing and a healthy lifestyle for all parties involved.

The bill supports the welfare of the child being born, which in my view is the top priority. Certainly, and as the member for Morialta mentioned earlier, I was involved in the Social Development Committee in my first term in this parliament, and surrogacy was a major reference which we debated for a considerable length of time before the original legislation came several years ago.

There were some very heart-rending stories and evidence provided by people who had been involved in an interstate surrogacy arrangement, including the evidence provided by Kerry Faggotter, and others. It was tough, because essentially what was going on was that these people were having to go interstate and, by the time they went through the whole process, it was costing in many cases at least \$50,000.

What the Hon. John Dawkins sought to do with part of the original surrogacy bill was to stop people having to spend that amount of money so that they could enjoy the joy of having a child. It was a very interesting reference to deal with, and I know on our side of the argument the Hon. Stephen Wade from the other place was working on it with me.

I think that this just brings the legislation into line and takes on the reality of the world of what is happening at the moment. We have obviously heard of the case in Thailand and baby Gammy, and there are obviously other things that are going on where people are trying to pick the sex of a baby and that kind of thing in overseas surrogacy arrangements. It is just wrong, and this kind of legislation will avert that practice to a great degree.

I think it is just sensible legislation, updating what has already been brought to the house. As I said, all the amendments I have mentioned today are a significant contribution to improve the current act, and I commend everyone who has had input to this and all of the agencies, and certainly the eight years, or so, of work that the Hon. John Dawkins has put into this cause to get something right for the good citizens of South Australia and for people who for whatever reason cannot conceive a child of their own.

My wife and I had the ability to have a couple of kids. We did not need to use surrogacy arrangements. There is nothing better than witnessing childbirth. It is such a great thing; and if this opens up the world for couples and opens up the state for couples to have the opportunity to have children what greater thing can we do in this place. Certainly, with those few words I support the bill.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:12): I rise to support the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill 2014, as I did to its predecessor, and I thank the Hon. John Dawkins for his ongoing work, and certainly the member for Morialta for carrying on this work in the House of Assembly.

I agree with everything, I must say, that the honourable member for Morialta had to say except his analogy about the Golden Gate Bridge. I was talking to the member for Colton about this, and we think that probably a better example would be the two-way Southern Expressway. We should probably use a local example to talk about the length of time it takes for things to happen; and, in my case, being the member for Ashford, I remember very strongly the length of time it took for the rail electrification, and I am sure there are other members who would understand my angst of that whole process, especially on a local level.

I rise to support this bill because, one, it makes common sense. It actually adds and improves the arrangements that we have in place. I think it is really important that we try to support families to seek a whole lot of arrangements and options when they are not able to look at the usual methods of having children; and so for that reason I support different ways of making sure that we do give that support to people.

I think the register is a really good idea and I also think it is good that it will not be for public viewing. The register will make sure that people do not have to rely on just friends and family to make those arrangements, and I think that is really important. I understand that surrogacy, as it happens at the moment, really does have to rely on who you know and who is prepared to be involved in that process. I think the register will help join up people who are interested in that program.

It is a really important point that out-of-pocket expenses and issues to do with surrogacy are supported, and I also agree that this should not become a commercial business or proposition. One very important aspect of this is the counselling that will be made available. It is really important that people going through the process get as much support as possible to go through what is a different way of having a family.

The overseas framework is important, and I agree with the comments that have been made by the member for Morialta, and I assume the views of the Hon. John Dawkins. If we wait for some

sort of national framework we might be waiting a long time, so it is important that we get our act together and make sure this important service is available in a safe and secure way in South Australia.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:16): I think the only banks we should be referring to here are not the State Bank debacle or the one-way expressway, it should be sperm banks and egg banks, and even there they are not concerned with this particular piece of legislation.

This is the fifth time I have spoken in this place on this legislation in various forms. I spoke on both the Statutes Amendment (Surrogacy) Bill and the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill on a number of occasions, and this is another reiteration. In fact, we spoke on this matter on 13 November 2008, 19 November 2009, 1 July 2010 and on 29 March 2012, and here we are again speaking on this bill on 4 June 2015.

There have been variations to the bill. Each time it has either been getting the legislation in place or improving the legislation, tidying up some technical issues. I am not going to go through this particular piece of legislation now. Members can go back and look at what I have said in the past about this issue and how I have supported my colleague the Hon. John Dawkins in the upper house. I appreciate his determination in this area, as in many other areas in which he is involved. We all know he is a champion in the cause of suicide prevention.

The members for Morialta and Hammond have summarised this bill rather well. I will let the people who read *Hansard* look at what is involved in this piece of legislation. Again, it is about giving people in South Australia a fair go, it is about giving them some justice. We make many laws in here. We have a legal system, but we should have a justice system where we put laws in place that give South Australians the right to go about their lives peacefully and achieve the best outcomes for themselves and for those they love. That is what this legislation is about.

I hope I do not have to come back in here for a sixth time to talk about this and I hope we do not have the delaying tactics with this piece of legislation that we have had previously, when certain people in this place with particular views on the world obfuscate and obstruct when they do not agree with some of these social causes. Let's hope that that does not happen now.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Morphett imputing improper motives to any member?

Dr McFETRIDGE: I think their motives are pure and honest.

The SPEAKER: At least that is clear.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

NATIVE VEGETATION (ROAD VERGES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 May 2015.)

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:20): I rise to speak briefly on the Native Vegetation (Road Verges) Amendment Bill 2015. As the member for Davenport, bushfire prevention is a top priority, not just for my electorate but for the whole of South Australia. It is important to remember that, according to the CFS, more than 35 suburbs on Adelaide's fringes are in bushfire-prone areas, including the majority of suburbs in my electorate, along with over 75 towns in the Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island areas.

As legislators, we must do all we possibly can to reduce the ever present danger posed to this state by bushfires. With winter well and truly upon us, it is all too easy to forget the catastrophic bushfire danger this state faces each and every fire season. It was only a mere six months ago that we witnessed the devastation of the Sampson Flat fire, the worst fire to hit the Adelaide Hills since the Ash Wednesday bushfires.

The bill introduced by the member for Morphett proposes a sensible solution to the problem of overgrown vegetation on road verges. The first danger to be prevented by the bill is the serious bushfire danger posed by overgrown vegetation on road verges to those who are fleeing bushfires.

Overgrown vegetation on road verges can catch alight on both sides of a road and trap those who are trying to flee a bushfire. If the fuel load on road verges was reduced then some of our country roads would not be in the tinderbox situation they are currently on extreme fire days.

By allowing South Australians to reduce the fuel load on road verges it does not just make it safer for residents to flee areas in the path of an oncoming bushfire, it also makes it safer for our emergency services personnel, who are putting their lives on the line to protect us. I have always believed that, as a parliament, we should protect those who protect us.

We are bombarded by advertisements each summer urging residents to have a bushfire survival plan and to clean up around their properties to reduce the risk of a bushfire destroying their home. As a parliament, we should be allowing residents to clear overgrown vegetation on road verges in their own area without filling out a mountain of paperwork. If the bill passes, roads in bushfire-prone areas will be safer to travel on in the event of a bushfire.

There is another danger posed by overgrown road verges which is addressed by the bill. The second danger is the risk to road safety posed by overgrown vegetation on road verges. At the moment, people who are coming onto a road cannot see oncoming traffic safely because of the overgrown vegetation. Overgrown grass is often higher than one and a half metres, and this is all too evident in too many of our peri-urban areas. South Australians should have a legal right, as proposed in this bill, to cut back, within reason, vegetation on road verges that hinders their vision of approaching traffic without filling in form after form seeking approval to do so.

At the moment, many councils are not trimming back road verges, especially on unsealed roads. In the member for Morphett's speech on the bill, he quoted the District Council of Mount Barker's current policy, which can be found on their website, which states:

Due to current resources and budgetary constraints it is current Council practice not to slash the roadsides of unsealed roads.

I can confirm that Mount Barker is not the only council with such a policy. I am attaching no blame to councils by stating this, but it is clear that many councils, especially in regional areas, are unable to keep up with the amount of maintenance that road verges require to be safe during fire season. It makes sense to allow people to clear road verges of excess vegetation so as not to pose a bushfire or road safety danger to the public, as proposed in this very bill.

A further benefit of the bill is that not only will local residents be permitted to clear road verges but so will the CFS, without filling out the onerous paperwork that is required today. CFS members and volunteers are sick to death of filling in form after form after form on many trivial matters.

Senior officers of the CFS have said that some of the best training provided to volunteers was going out and doing burn-offs. As the old saying goes, you fight fire with fire. It is better to have a controlled burn-off and reduce the fuel load than wait for a major bushfire to start on a windy, 40° day and have it potentially destroy lives and property.

The CFS philosophy is that we must 'Prepare. Act. Survive.' It is similar to the scout motto of 'Be Prepared'. Preparation is a key element of bushfire prevention, and anything that helps people prepare their local area for a bushfire should be supported by this parliament. The essence of this bill is to allow local residents to prepare for the fire season by allowing their roads to be clear of overgrown vegetation that, left unchecked, could prove to be a fatal catalyst. I commend the member for Morphett for introducing this bill and I commend the bill to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:25): I also wholeheartedly support the member for Morphett in this bill. In essence, what he is trying to achieve is that adjoining property owners, where their property adjoins a road, would have the ability to clear native vegetation without any restrictions or permission required for two key purposes: for road safety and to reduce the fuel load. That seems very sensible to me.

I accept the fact that road verges can provide very important habitat areas not only for native vegetation but also for lots of animals. There are benefits, but there comes a time when you have to make a choice, and I think it is very important that if the adjoining landowner believes there is a serious road safety issue or there is an unacceptable fuel load, then that adjoining landowner may clear the native vegetation.

The member for Morphett is not saying that has to happen; I do not think anyone needs to fear that all of a sudden every single, little bit of vegetation between the road and the fence will be razed down to some sort of nuclear scorched-earth situation. That is not what he is intending at all; he just wants responsible landowners to have the opportunity to clear it, for these two primary reasons, when it is responsible to do so. I think that is very responsible.

These landowners already have an obligation to get rid of weeds in exactly the same manner, and if they fulfil that responsibility then they are very often already getting rid of native vegetation anyway. It will be the responsible people who are currently trying to get rid of the weeds, it will probably be those same people who are trying to do this in a responsible fashion. In my observations in Stuart and in many other parts of the state, very little attention is paid to this with regard to weeds. That is unfortunate, but it is very often an obligation that landowners are not aware of or that they do not know how to fulfil properly, or they just do not have the resources or the time; they are flat out trying to get rid of the weeds on their own property let alone trying to do it on what they consider to be somebody else's property.

This is pretty sensible, as the member for Davenport said. The CFS would overwhelmingly support this, and I can tell you that in the electorate of Stuart there are many tracks where this native vegetation on the road verge would create a very serious fire risk under the right—or perhaps the wrong—conditions. So I think this is very serious.

Road safety is, of course, incredibly important. Visibility is one thing, and the member for Davenport touched on that, but I can tell the house that there are other road safety risks on road verges as well that are created by native vegetation. As a member of the CFS I have attended more motor vehicle accidents than fires—because that is just how things work, that is exactly what the CFS does across the state; it attends way more motor vehicle accidents than it does fires or any other type of incident—and I have seen situations where the native vegetation has contributed to the accident on the side of the road.

Primarily it is through visibility, but occasionally native vegetation has actually encumbered the rescue and retrieval effort in trying to get people who may be trapped in cars out of those cars. Then, of course, there is the combination of the two together, where a motor vehicle accident might be in native vegetation on the road verge and then all of a sudden there is fuel and sparks and a range of other things. That can create a very serious fire risk and turn the whole incident into a much more serious issue. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

COMMUNITY SPORT AND RECREATION

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:30): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the benefits of grassroots community sport and recreation to South Australia; and
- (b) urges the state government to reverse its decision to reduce funding to the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program by \$3.5 million per annum from 2015-16.

I rise to introduce a motion that I think is very important to every member in this chamber and to every aspiring sports person in South Australia. The motion recognises the importance of grassroots community sport in South Australia and also urges the state government to reverse its decision to reduce annual funding to the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program by \$3½ million.

Grassroots sport in South Australia is one of the key components to healthy living, to growing up and to building a great society. What we are seeing at the moment—and it has been condemned by all sporting clubs, all sporting codes, Sport SA and even the government's own Office for Recreation and Sport—is that a reduction in this funding is going to have a significant impact on the grassroots level of sport. Let's remember that grassroots sport is a pathway to elite sport. So, let's not kid ourselves about the fact that, while we spend many, many dollars on the glossy Adelaide Oval and the conduits to Adelaide Oval—we all think that is a great stadium—all sporting venues right

across this great state, whether they be metropolitan or regional facilities, will be impacted by this reduction in funding.

This funding obviously creates vibrancy around local sporting clubs, but it also expedites projects for facilities or equipment or a number of projects, which could range from between \$3,000 and \$2½ million. In my role as shadow minister for recreation and sport, I visit many sporting clubs right across the state in both metropolitan and regional areas, and what I am seeing is a growing trend of ageing facilities. I see change rooms that are outdated and toilet facilities that need an upgrade.

The number one area of concern is the kitchens because today we live in a much more regulated world where occupational health and safety standards need to be overseen on a regular basis, and that puts pressure on those sporting clubs to have to invest in those facilities. They are always looking at fundraising, they are always seeking volunteers and sponsors, but they are also looking at that conduit of government support and government funding to expedite the sporting club programs which our children and, in some cases, our grandchildren attend and which are part of the fabric of our communities.

At the outset, I mentioned grassroots community sport, and we cannot forget that the grassroots level is the fabric of all our community sports clubs. It is the initiation of our juniors entering sport. Every junior we know who plays sport or competes in sport wants to strive for something better.

They are always looking to better themselves, always looking for personal bests, always looking to outscore the other team, but to be able to do that and to be able to have the facilities that are of a standard to be able to compete, we do need these funding programs so that we can have good sporting facilities and great role models. I was recently down at the Fleurieu with the member for Finnis and was a guest speaker with a couple of sporting greats. They talked about the grassroots experience.

Gavin Wanganeen—we all know Wangers, as he is fondly known, an AFL great—talked about coming from the Salisbury footy club, but he came up through the ranks, through that grassroots level. There were pathways there to the elite level. We also talked to Travis Head, another speaker at the event, he too coming from the northern suburbs. He attended Trinity College, but as a young South Australian sportsman he has memories of those grassroots pathways. He is a 21-year-old South Australian, a great example of what every junior cricketer in South Australia would want to achieve. He has done it all: he has done limited overs cricket in India and played county cricket in the UK. He is now captaining the Redbacks here in South Australia, but his fond memories are of his club sport and what it presented to him and what it presents to every one of the young cricketers in South Australia.

I have touched on the footy and the cricket. Over time, we will see the reduction in funding impacting on every sporting club. It is quite ironic that, while the state government is handing out \$50 sports vouchers to families, it is cutting grassroots sports funds. Potentially, that will drive up membership fees and put more pressure on the sponsors, on the parents and volunteers who support those clubs.

My challenge to everyone in this place, both sides, in government and in opposition, is to come in here and make a contribution to what their sports clubs mean to their electorates. As politicians, we regularly visit our sporting clubs and we all know that they come to their local member looking for better facilities, looking for more government support, so that they can have a better sporting club and provide a better experience for their juniors and seniors.

In 2013, when this was announced, there were media campaigns run through both *The Advertiser* and Messenger community newspapers. There was a 'Fund our club' campaign, and there was outrage when the minister made the announcement. He was a sportsman back then, as he is now—a little bit less now, but I am sure he supports his children's sports—and he knows that they rely on that funding to make their sporting clubs, that grassroots sports experience, much better.

Along the way, there was a lot of criticism, but there was constructive criticism and it was all about the government retaining that funding and keeping that program in place. Some of the sporting clubs said:

We were happy to put our hands in our pockets, but without the funding it would not be possible. For that amount of money, without government grant funding, it would take us something like 15 years to achieve what this grant fund would to upgrade our sporting facility. Clubs are looking for something to get our kids off the streets and out there playing sport, because we can only do so much with the resources that we have. Having spent so much money on the Adelaide Oval the government should be spending much more money on grassroots sport.

Again, I reflect on Adelaide Oval, a great facility, one of the great stadiums in this country, but for those elite sportspeople to be able to play on that oval they have to start at the grassroots. Grassroots is the start of a pathway from that entry level of sport to the elite level. The member for Stuart was lucky enough to be able to play elite sport. He would know first-hand what sporting clubs need, the resources they need to have. We have other local members on both sides of this chamber, and in this place I think the older we get, the better we were.

Let's make no mistake about this. This funding program is very important to South Australians and the grassroots sporting clubs. It is great for our society. What we are going to see with this cut in funding is an impact and we cannot say that the \$50 voucher is going to be the saviour because it is not. I am sure that every MP would say that one of the great parts of their job is going out and handing out the Active Club grants cheques, making that presentation to them and understanding what that money will do and how it is going to make the club a better place. When you go back to visit the club to see what that money has achieved, you see the benefit to the participation rate and how those juniors, in particular—and we know there are some seniors. I am looking at a few seniors on this side over here who would enjoy that upgrade to grassroots clubs.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: No. I want to touch on an FOI that showed how even the government's own Office for Recreation and Sport had said that this cut in funding will have a serious impact on sports programs here in South Australia. The sports minister requested cuts. The overwhelming majority of sport and recreation facilities were built before the 1980s and they are now coming to that age where they need this funding support. The government's responsibility is to make sure that those sporting facilities are up to scratch, that they are there for the betterment of our sport and they are there for creating that pathway.

More than a million South Australians were active in sport and recreation in 2013-14. That multiplier means that there are more than 13,000 people who are making an economic contribution and that adds about \$1 billion to the state's economy. There are 225,000 South Australians who volunteer their time, and I think these are the understated people in South Australia, they are unrecognised, unpaid. For them to be proud of a sports club, a sports facility, makes it such a great story to tell.

South Australia has a very proud sporting history. Remember that every elite sports person started somewhere and normally at club level, coming in and excelling, always trying to achieve a personal best or always trying to achieve a team win. Without having a facility, a competitive sports ground, without good club rooms, change rooms and toilets, it is a disincentive. People will turn the other way and look for something else to do.

An honourable member: Chess.

Mr WHETSTONE: Well, we talk about chess. I do not know whether there would be too many of us in here who would be looking for a chess—

Members interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: I didn't say that, I said not too many. As a sports lover, the older I get the better I was, but today I am a bit more of a couch potato. What I do is I support my kids, I support their friends, taking kids to sports clubs, and we are proud to turn up at a sporting ground that has a good pitch, in some cases that has lights, that has a good change room, a good kitchen and a good vibe about it. I think that giving this funding to a lot of these grassroots sports clubs is what it is all about. It is about creating sustainable sport here in South Australia. It is about making sport a great destination. Every child who trains during the week, every child who competes on a week night or a weekend, they strive and they get up in the morning looking forward to playing sport. I am sure that every child will frown upon the government taking away a pathway for financial support to their club.

What I am calling for today is that the Minister for Sport make an announcement that he is prepared to overturn that funding cut and uphold this great sporting program. Again, the \$50 voucher is not the saviour, but we see that upgrading sports facilities and giving them grassroots support is. It is a great opportunity and I wish that this government would see the importance of grassroots sport to South Australia.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:45): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out all words after (b) and replace with:

supports the many clubs and organisations which have received funding from the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program.

The new motion would read:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the benefits of grassroots community sport and recreation to South Australia; and
- (b) supports the many clubs and organisations which have received funding from the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program.

There has been a significant investment in club sports over a very long period of time by both sides of politics in this state and, in fact, when we came to power we eventually increased the amount of money that was—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Continue, member for Newland.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: The government, in fact, increased the amount of money that was spent through the Community Rec and Sport Facilities Program which had not gone up for quite some time. We have the Community Rec and Sport Facilities Program, the Active Club Program, and the state facilities fund. To date, in 2014, they have been awarded roughly \$7.7 million, rounding to one decimal figure, which is 46 per cent of the grant's budget which has been approved towards 104 facility-related projects.

The state government has provided grassroots funding to the community of \$7 million which has been invested in 46 facilities and facility plans throughout the Community Rec and Sport Facilities Program. The total grants budget of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, the Office for Recreation and Sport, for 2014-15 is \$16.8 million, with \$7.5 million (44 per cent of the grant's budget) available for facilities and related projects through the Community Rec and Sport Facilities Program and the state facilities fund.

While it is well known that there was a reduction in the amount of money, it continues. It has not been completely cut and it is being put to very good use, and it has been for a long time by both sides of parliament. I do not think anyone here would find that a regrettable thing because, as the member for Chaffey has said and as I think we all agree in this house, the local community clubs do an enormous amount of work for our community. They provide a great good, and what the state government seeks to do with these grant programs is to assist them to do that good.

It is not the state government that runs their clubs. It is not the state government that turns up every Saturday morning to mark the lines or be the umpires, team managers or coaches. It is the community themselves—parents, friends and supporters of the club—that come and do that. The clubs would not exist without those facilities, so what the state government can help to do is provide facilities and some support to those clubs which, by their very existence, provide a great service to our community. The community would be so much the poorer for it were they not to exist. I think with the general decline in religion across our community—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hartley!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I said 'general decline' across the community—what I think we have seen in some ways is that sports clubs have become more important in their community. Whereas religion may have provided some of those community building facilities, as that has

declined sport has taken on more of those roles. That is a great community building asset for the communities and it certainly should be supported.

All of us do on this side, and we are very proud to turn up often in support of our clubs. All of us will regularly write on behalf of clubs in our electorates seeking to support them in their applications for funding. As the member for Chaffey pointed out, we are all very happy to turn up with the cheques when they arrive. Sometimes, in my experience, the only time people are really happy to see me as a member of parliament is when I have a cheque in my hand for their sports club or a rum bottle in my hand at the ANZAC Day service after breakfast, when I put a little bit of rum in each of their coffees. They seem to have a big smile for me then and are not so smiley generally at other times. I am always a fan of turning up at a sports club with a cheque in my hand, just if I can get a few more smiles from my constituency.

As members would know, the facility programs are generally dollar-for-dollar programs; the Active Club grants are not: people apply for up to \$5,000 for programs and equipment grants or up to \$20,000—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have a point of order from the member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: I just seek to have the amendment that has been tabled struck out by you as the Chair, ma'am, because the substance of the amendment does in fact abolish the entire substantive part of the original motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I have not seen a copy yet. You can take that up with the table, just while the member finishes his contribution.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: As I said, these facility programs and the Active Club, as well as the program and equipment grants, are very useful programs for clubs. What I find often is that we need to run around and make sure that all our clubs do apply because regularly clubs think that they are not entitled to apply or that they would not be successful. One of the roles I found as a local member, and I know my colleagues are the same, is that running around talking to your clubs regularly and encouraging them to apply is very useful. With those words, I encourage all members to support the amendment, and I look forward to debate in this place.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we continue, as probably the member for Morialta knows, he will have its opportunity to speak on this and to vote against the amendment if he is not happy with it. Member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:51): I rise to support the member for Chaffey in his original motion. It is a very good, positive motion, and I do not believe that in their hearts members opposite would actually disagree with it, to be honest. I think it is churlish and obstructive to move the motion the government has to amend the motion.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If you just look through it quickly, Deputy Speaker, it recognises the benefits of grassroots community sport and recreation. Of course we would all do that. There would not be a member in the house who does not do that. Even those members who are not particularly sport inclined or whose lives and interests have not taken them that way would all accept and understand how important sport is, particularly for people early in their lives.

Of course, the benefits do not disappear with regard to health and fitness and teamwork and ambition, and even in solo-type sports you are still a member of a club, so you benefit from those sorts of things. You benefit from taking on challenges, facing difficult situations, working through them and training so that you can achieve. There are many things that are very important there.

Paragraph (b) urges the government to reinstate the \$3.5 million for the recreation and sports facilities program. What member of parliament, Liberal, Labor or anybody else, would not want that to happen? Who would not want that to happen? I bet if every single member opposite were visiting one of their sports clubs and said to them, 'Do you think it would be good if the \$3.5 million was

reinstated?' they would all say, 'Yes, I think it would be good if that were to happen.' So, to try to cut that out of the member for Chaffey's motion is dreadful.

He is trying to replace it with 'supports the many clubs and organisations which have received funding', but what about the ones that have not received funding? The government supports the clubs that have had a handout, but they do not support the clubs that have had a handout? That is ridiculous, and I refuse to believe that the member for Newland, the former minister for recreation and sport, actually believes that. I do not know where that has come from, who has told him to come down here and make that change. I would challenge any member opposite to tell me that they only support the ones that the government has already given money to and do not support the ones that the government has not yet given money to; it is crazy.

Part (c) of the member for Chaffey's motion calls on the state government to ensure that all community and sport and recreation grants are indexed. That makes good sense. If you want to keep giving the same sort of support, you need to index it with inflation, Deputy Speaker. It makes great sense. Now, Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you talking about a (c) that we do not have? We are doing our best to keep up with you, member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I apologise, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are doing our best.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It would be good if it was there.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So you are actually pre-empting the member for Chaffey and reading his mind.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The member for Chaffey is a very sensible bloke. He takes things in bite size chunks at a time, and he will be back, I have absolutely no doubt, he will back!

The overall recreation and sport grants are fantastic things with three main components: active clubs, facilities and major infrastructure developments—absolutely outstanding. I cannot understand why the government would be wanting to withdraw money from those in any one of those areas. It is actually very short-sighted. Sport and recreation investment actually saves the government and the taxpayer money in the long run with regard to reduced health expenditure and reduced crime.

People who participate actively throughout their lives in any sort of positive community club, and particularly sport, tend to stay on the straight and narrow far more than others. There is a significant multiplier effect of this money as well. The member for Chaffey talked about volunteering. Any money that goes to a sporting club to invest specifically in the facilities upgrade of that club is going to be partnered by other funds from other sources—typically fundraising from that club—but perhaps more importantly, it is going to be partnered with time and effort and skill and capacity that comes from volunteers in those clubs. There is a very genuine and serious multiplier effect of that money. This is not the place for the government to be removing contributions to the public.

I accept that rural areas benefit more than other areas. The reality is that there is less access to other activities, and sport is very strong in rural areas, even if that access is limited just by distance and travel to get to other towns or to Adelaide. In rural areas, sport and recreation is incredibly important, but it is equally true in the city. All the people who participate in grassroots sport in the city, all the way through to an elite level, all benefit.

I would like to put very clearly on the record that, since the government has made it very clear that it disagrees with paragraph (b) of the member for Chaffey's motion and wants to turn it upside down and just support clubs that have already got money, I put the challenge to the government to come out and tell us what it will do with the money that is earmarked to go to sport from the Adelaide Oval, starting out at \$200,000 and working its way up to \$1 million per year to come out of the Stadium Management Agreement and the overall management of the Adelaide Oval.

The government will eventually receive \$1 million a year directly from the Adelaide Oval and the government at the moment is trying to take back \$3.5 million. At the very least, it could say that

when it receives the extra \$1 million it will put it straight back into the facilities program of the recreation and sport grants. I am very passionate about this and I of course have a very strong sporting background, but this is something that is actually about communities. It is not about me because I love sport and when I was growing up that was my thing. It does not matter if sport was not your thing; it is indisputable the positive benefit that this program has to our community—whether it is ongoing health, whether it is keeping kids off the streets and productively engaged in other areas, it is very important.

I think it is dreadful that the government is taking money out of it and I think it is even more dreadful that it has an amendment to the motion that says that it supports the clubs that have already received money and ignores the clubs that have not received any money.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:58): I rise to support this excellent motion by the member for Chaffey which reads:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the benefits of grassroots community sport and recreation to South Australia; and
- (b) urges the state government to reverse its decision to reduce funding to the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program by \$3.5 million per annum from 2015-16.

This is vital money that should be going into communities. I see with my own children that they are so keen on their electronic equipment, but also they are keen on their local sport. I think anything to get the masses of kids these days out on a sporting field, whether it is a netball court, footy oval, soccer field, basketball court, whatever sport they can get into, is a great thing, not just for their health but for the future health of the whole state, so that people can start from an early age leading healthy lives and getting fit. It is certainly a pleasure to follow a couple of elite sportsmen: an elite water-skier and an elite basketballer. I must admit, I am still trying to be an elite bowler after about 20 years, but I am certainly proud to be the president of the South Australian Parliamentary Bowling Club.

Ms Vlahos: Hear, hear!

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely.

Mr Pengilly: You've got strange aims.

Mr PEDERICK: Hey, look, it is a good sport. Some people say in regard to bowling that they are not old enough to join it yet. Well, they need to have a look around and see how many young people are taking up the sport, such as the member for Taylor, a very young bowler, who is an excellent bowler, and I hope to see her on the next bowling trip.

This money is vital right across the board, whether it is for lights for facilities or resurfacing courts of any kind—tennis courts or netball courts. In the Mallee league, we play at the Murrayville Cricket Ground (the MCG). We were only there last weekend, and they have just (over the border, I must say it is, but it is in our league) resurfaced their netball courts, and they look magnificent.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: The home of Rachael Sporn.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, the home of Rachael Sporn, absolutely. You talk about coming from the grassroots—there are many Sporns, Willersdorfs and Cranes and a whole range of names that come out of that area who have been significant sportspeople, not just in Victoria but throughout South Australia, and they come from grassroots.

This year our own footy club actually accessed a council grant to put in a pop-up irrigation system on the oval. The beauty of how that worked was, yes, the grant was there to pay for the infrastructure, and then it was up to the club to provide the volunteers to dig out the slots and the lanes for the pipes. I think the only true expense that was not voluntary work was the guy with the rock saw, because there is plenty of rock in the Mallee.

I certainly had a good day on the holiday Monday of a long weekend, just before the season, with a group of kids and a couple of other blokes filling it in with sand to get it into place. Yes, that was a council grant, but that was just one thing that I have been personally involved in along with the

other people at Peake to make water use more sustainable. There should be more commitment to those sorts of things across the state to assist clubs of any kind to support grassroots sport.

Look at what has happened recently with Adelaide Lightning Basketball, and we think of teams in netball, the Thunderbirds—and I know of local young ladies who are playing in the junior teams at the Thunderbirds. In fact, I have a few nieces who do that as well. The sporting elite have to come from somewhere, and I know that certainly through the country football leagues. I know our league in the Mallee is paired with West Adelaide and their elite junior sporting program. It is great to see the boys go along to that. I would just like to acknowledge Abby Ballard: she is one of the best young footballers at Peake, and she can certainly show a few blokes how to play football, I can assure you.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: She's up there. She was only just below in the best player awards last year, but she will be right this year. In winding up, the elite sportspeople have to come from somewhere and they can come from anywhere in the bush. I acknowledge the player from East Murray, whose name escapes me, who got an AFL contract.

Mr Whetstone: Maynard?

Mr PEDERICK: No. To show that you can come from anywhere and compete at an elite level, East Murray, sadly, does not even have a football club any more. You can come from anywhere and you have to come from the grassroots to get there.

I certainly commend the motion by the member for Chaffey and push for its speedy progress through the house. I think the government's amendment is just not genuine. It would be easy for the government to reinject that \$3½ million of funds, considering that in the forward estimates they will get at least \$1 billion in unbudgeted GST revenue. I commend the motion.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:05): I want to spend a few minutes speaking in support of the motion brought to the house by the member for Chaffey and, obviously, speak against the amendment which, I understand, the government member has moved.

I have spoken at length in this house over a number of years concerning the continual need for the provision of a satisfactory level of infrastructure services, particularly in the growing area of the townships of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne where, over the past 15 or 20 years, we have seen a significant increase in residential development as a consequence of fairly large tracts of land being rezoned from farming and other uses to residential use.

Notwithstanding that the tri-town district of Littlehampton, Mount Barker and Nairne continually requires an ever-increasing level of provision of infrastructure services, particularly sporting and recreational facilities, my electorate is no different from anybody else's in relation to the provision of sporting and recreational facilities. When I talk to my colleagues and people in the community, there is a significant issue of the lack of funding and the lack of support this government has provided over a long period of time for sport and recreational facilities.

This issue is obviously not just confined to districts that are experiencing significant residential development: it is right across the state and, as has been outlined by a number of members, particularly on this side of the house, the government is failing in relation to the provision of a satisfactory level of funding for sporting and recreational facilities at a grassroots level.

I do want to turn specifically to my meeting just recently in Mount Barker with Mr Scott Filmer and Mr David Tonks, who are representatives of a body called the Mount Barker Arts, Recreation and Sports Community (MARSC). They met with me on 20 May and highlighted the critical need for every level of government to turn its mind to the provision of arts, recreation and sporting facilities and resources in that Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne district.

As we all know, and I have spoken at length about this previously in the house, the government made a decision to rubberstamp the rezoning of 3,000 acres of land in one fell swoop, without any real consideration of the concerns of the community and local government at the time. They rezoned 3,000 acres of land for residential development without what we call a structure plan. They poured all that responsibility back onto the council at a significant cost.

The local Mount Barker council had to spend several hundreds of thousands of dollars to prepare a structure plan, which covered roads, sporting facilities and different siting for a whole range of requirements, as a consequence of that unilateral decision the government made a number of years ago. We are finding ourselves in a position where the sporting facilities are under critical pressure as a consequence of this residential development and obviously increase in population, with families, children, teenagers and adults across the whole demographic of society needing sport and recreational facilities.

A gentleman came to see me the other week, and we discussed the critical need for those facilities and resources to be applied to particularly the Mount Barker township. Some land has been purchased, and the government had provided some assistance to purchase what is locally known as the Stephenson land, on the corner of Bald Hills Road and Springs Road, heading out towards where the new freeway interchange is to be constructed.

A master plan is being developed for that land for a shovel-ready project, so I will be making some representation to the government and to the relevant ministers in relation to that in the very short term. I know we want to keep our comments as brief as we can, so with those remarks I wanted to highlight the issue that the Mount Barker Arts, Recreation and Sports Community (MARSC) representatives have come to see me about. There will certainly be more representation and more said about that as we move forward.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:11): I also recognise the benefits of grassroots community sport and recreation to South Australia, and I also urge the state government to reverse its decision to reduce funding to the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program by \$3.5 million per annum from 2015-16. I also call on the state government to ensure that all community sport and recreation grants are indexed by CPI.

If the government helped, and if the government kept the \$3.5 million figure I spoke about, projects in my electorate would be more likely to happen. I just want to point out some of these because I want to support these local clubs in my community. We all know that sport is fundamental and fantastic for our young people. It teaches them how to win, it teaches them about losing, it teaches them about discipline and it teaches them about sportsmanship, hard work and teamwork.

Azzurri Sports Club would love to have some of that \$3.5 million to upgrade their ground. Burnside Rugby Union Football Club, as the member for Newland knows, would love a new kitchen. They would love a new clubroom but, under the government's measures, they will not have access to the \$3.5 million. Campbelltown City Soccer & Social Club would love an upgrade to their pitches. East Torrens District Cricket Club would also love an upgrade to their clubrooms. Hectorville Sports and Community Club are in dire need of new lighting. They will not be able to tap into the \$3.5 million under the government's proposals.

Payneham Bowling Club have grand plans to upgrade their facility. Payneham Norwood Union Football Club is my old football club, where I won two premierships and learnt how to win. They, believe it or not, have to carry people with disabilities upstairs at the moment because they do not have a lift. It is an absolute shame. This government wants to cut funding from these sorts of clubs—that is disastrous; that cannot happen.

Tranmere Bowling and Tennis Club would also like to upgrade their facilities. They will not be able to tap into funding if the government cuts it. East Torrens and Kensington Gardens Hardcourt Tennis Club also need money for their court upgrades. East Torrens Payneham Baseball Club and East Torrens Payneham Lacrosse Club will also not have access to the \$3.5 million if the government cuts it. Another organisation in dire need of an upgrade to their facilities is 1st Magill Scout Group; if the government cuts funding, that is going to be hard to do.

Kensington Gardens Bowling and Tennis Club is another one, as is the Payneham Swimming Club. The Payneham pool, as we know, benefits many families in the area. Pools are where young children, especially, learn how to swim. It is a fundamental asset in our area but, again, if the government cuts this sort of funding it is going to be much harder for these sorts of clubs to tap into this funding.

I commend the member for Chaffey for raising this motion, and I really do feel very strongly about this area. Sporting clubs and community clubs in our area are the backbone of our community,

and it is incumbent on us, as local members of parliament, to do all that we can, and the government is certainly not doing that. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:15): I rise today to support the motion put forward by the member for Chaffey, which:

- (a) recognises the benefits of grassroots community sport and recreation to South Australia; and
- (b) urges the state government to reverse its decision to reduce the funding to the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program by \$3.5 million per annum from the 2015-16.

I have a long history of involvement in community sport, and I am proud to say that a lot of the life lessons that I learnt from being involved with community sport has helped shaped me into the person I am today. My playing days are long behind me. I now coach and give back in that way and have done so for more than a decade. I also support my wife who coaches my daughter's netball team. I am the official drinks carrier and do no more in that role, as much as I would like to.

We must do all we can to promote community sport because it is vital to help develop healthy, happy and good citizens in our community. As I said, I have been lucky enough to be involved more recently with the Brighton footy club over the last decade or so coaching a lot of young people through there, and I hope that I have a positive influence on their lives and help shape them into good citizens as well.

One of the great jobs, as was pointed out by a few members before, on both sides of the chamber, and, in fact, one of the great parts of this job is that we get to go to a lot of community clubs, and I have met a lot of wonderful people that I would like to acknowledge for the work they do, and I am sure they would support this motion to keep the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program and its \$3.5 million per annum funding.

Some of those clubs include Club Reynella in the south of my electorate which is a really well-organised club. Dave Denyer has done a wonderful job there. They have a footy club and a cricket club. The cricket club, of course, won the A2 premiership this year, as well as the LOD premiers. Daniel Rabbeter was the senior cricketer of the year. David Green does a great job down there. Brett Julien also has been heavily involved, and Brett Thompson was the club person of the year. This is a great club that really gives back to its community as well.

There is also the Small Bore Air Rifle Club, which does a great job and which has a couple of potential Olympians in its midst. Also the bowling club down there does wonderful work in that community and really gives back and is a key part of the community. Also, Keith Noble heads up the Cove Club and runs its operation. They have got a footy club. Craig Harwood, a good mate of mine, is involved with that footy club. They do a marvellous job again with the juniors and the seniors.

They have a cricket club as well as the soccer club. Andy Fry and his lovely wife do a great job running the soccer club, and the development that they have brought on through their junior program is outstanding. I actually studied junior coaching at university and to see what they are doing with their soccer program, I can tell members, is absolutely first class.

Also, the BMX club is there. Trevor Wigg does a superb job marshalling the troops and keeping the BMX club running. He has got some great vision for that club in the future. The Fleurieu Swimming Club does a great job. Liesl Moundfield has done a lot of work for that club, and I really commend her for the great work she does in the community and giving back to both juniors and seniors, and to see the kids involved with that club and the benefits they get out of the work that they put in is absolutely outstanding.

I mention the Marion Club, and Craig Virgo does a great job running the club side of things. They have got a cricket club which is superb and which has a number of teams. James Burden is involved there, along with David Evans. They do an outstanding job, along with the Marion Football Club where Min Adams has been working tirelessly as president for that club for as long as I can remember. Min does a marvellous job with the Rams, together with Wayne Slattery as the head A grade coach.

In fact, Mitch Powell, the young trainee in my office, plays a bit of A grade and B grade football down there, and he is a very passionate Ram. He just cannot speak highly enough of what

that club does in our local community. Even though it does sit just outside my electorate, it really does encompass a lot of the community that I support.

With respect to the Marion Swimming Club, Anthony Slade is the President. I played a bit of footy back in the day and he was a very, very good footballer, but now he is just giving back through his kids and to the community by being president of that swimming club. A lot of great names have come through that swim club too. Keep an eye out for Kyle Chalmers; he will be an absolute beauty in the years to come, if not at the Rio Olympics he will be beyond that, that is for sure.

I mentioned the Reynella Community Bowling Club, the cricket club and the footy club as well. Riding for the Disabled is also in my electorate, and John Dicker and Lynne Hargreaves do a great job with that facility on Majors Road. The people who go through there get a great kick out of what happens at Riding for the Disabled. I had a good tour of that facility and it is coming along very nicely. We hope to get a few more things done for them.

It was remiss of me not to mention the Reynella Tennis Club. They have a great group of people there who give back to the community. Graeme Green is the person I have a bit to do with there and he is absolutely outstanding. Also, the Hub Netball Club on the same premises do a marvellous job. We know how the Aquatic Centre services the community, and Adam Luscombe does a marvellous job there.

I have been fortunate enough to go up and see the Southern Field Archers as well and present them with one of those community grants that are now fading away under this current government. They were very appreciative of their community grant. They do a marvellous job up there on O'Halloran Hill. They have one of the greatest venues to do their archery, with great views of the city. I know Mr Shuttleworth does a fantastic job with that group as well.

The Sheidow Park Cricket Club, a smaller club again based in my electorate at the Sheidow Park Primary School, also really appreciates these grants when they come along. I know they will be extremely disappointed if they disappear. Equally, the South Adelaide Basketball Club, another club that falls just out of my electorate, and the work they do in giving back to the community, I must say, is absolutely outstanding. The number of kids that go through that facility is absolutely superb.

The Sturt Pistol Club and John Robb, the secretary, do a marvellous job. I commend John. I have some personal family friends who are involved with that club at O'Halloran Hill. It is absolutely outstanding. The Trott Park Fencing Club is a new one. Jenny Cassidy is the head coach there. It is great to see a more alternative sport getting involved and establishing themselves in my electorate. I am very happy to keep supporting them. Again, I know that they will be disappointed that the grant funding is being removed by this government.

The Warradale Park Tennis Club is another one. Mark Flynn does a great job. They recently received one of these grants and I know they were very appreciative. I know they would be looking for more to try to continue to develop their tennis club because they do a marvellous job in our community. They are just a few clubs in my electorate and I am very lucky to have them all. It is great to support and help them wherever I can.

As I say, my experience of being involved in community sport began on Kangaroo Island with the Wisanger Football Club, a great football club. It did a lot to help me as a young person and all the way through. What young people get out of community sport is outstanding, and it is a way of realising and learning how you can give back to the community when you get older, as I am now, be it through coaching or as a team manager. I had some great team managers and people who helped out with my football team and it was really appreciated. It is a great way to give back to our community. I am very disappointed to see this funding go and I fully support the motion put forward by the member for Chaffey and commend it to the house.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:22): I too rise this morning to speak in support of the original motion put forward by the member for Chaffey and against the amendment, which I think, and as the member for Stuart said, is quite a disgraceful amendment and detracts from some very good conversation we can have in this place today about the need for community sport and for government support of community sport.

Community sport is a great equaliser in our community and it is a great community development opportunity, bringing communities closer together and giving people opportunities to know each other and get out and about and keep fit and healthy as well, which is a great benefit of sport.

To follow on from the member for Mitchell's discussions today, many of the clubs that the member for Mitchell went through are significant organisations that serve my electorate as well, because the member for Mitchell's electorate and the communities that he represents have a strong affinity to the areas that I represent as well, and vice versa. Often we find that some sporting organisations are located in one electorate but many of those who serve them and play in them live just across the boundary in another electorate.

There are two main sporting precincts in the electorate of Bright, which sit right on the boundary (pretty much) of Bright and Mitchell and serve both electorates very well. They are the sporting precincts at Hallett Cove and Brighton. It would be remiss of me to stand up and talk about community sport in this place and not make reference to the disgraceful broken promise that came to light in May 2014 when it was revealed that the previous member for Bright, Chloe Fox, had written to members of my electorate making a promise, which of course she did not run past the bean counters within the ALP.

The former member for Bright made a public written statement that if re-elected, and she did not say if she were re-elected, she said that if re-elected the Labor government would supply \$1 million worth of funding to enable the Brighton rugby club to pursue an upgrade. That money probably would have acted as a catalyst for a broader upgrade of the Brighton parklands sporting precinct, which is a vision of several groups down there: the rugby club, the football club, the lacrosse club, the croquet club and the cricket club, which all meet on site at the Brighton parklands area. There has been a vision developed over recent years to upgrade the very downtrodden and significantly outdated facilities there. So, \$1 million was put on the table for just a few hours on Friday 14 March 2014.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

Mr SPEIRS: To be snatched away, as the member for Morphett says. Many constituents of the member for Morphett would also have benefited from the \$1 million but, of course, it was snatched away. It was a thought bubble, a pipedream of the former member for Bright, and it smashed the dreams of the rugby club at Brighton. When we asked the Minister for Sport when this money would be forthcoming he looked shocked, surprised, and revealed that he knew nothing of it. Then, I was able to stand here, holding up the letter, the written promise, and reveal that the former member for Bright had made that false promise. It was a complete fairytale, complete Disneyland, and, unfortunately, the Brighton rugby club does not get its \$1 million.

I will continue to fight for the Brighton rugby club and work with the City of Holdfast Bay to try to get the funding to see that project go forward. There is no doubt that the facilities there, as the member for Mitchell would know, the football change rooms, the toilets, are a complete joke. They would not meet any occupational health and safety standards. I think the football players who go there put up with it, just, and no more. I have heard stories that people go home for showers, they hold on and they go home for the toilet because the toilets do not even flush on game day. That \$1 million would have been a vital catalyst for making that project go ahead. It is an absolute disgrace that the government has withdrawn that money and will not honour it.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:28): I also rise to support the motion. For some level of balance to exist I put on the record my appreciation for two significant grants that have been received in the Goyder community: the Wallaroo Sailing Club received over \$200,000 and the Cougars football club, based in Maitland, received over \$200,000, also from the state government. Those funds being available made an enormous difference to the capacity of those clubs, which had saved and worked hard for years to carry out extensions and, in the case of the football club, to build new rooms, which were opened only about a month ago. For those of us old enough to remember, Rick Davies, a great Sturt footballer, and one season at Hawthorn, I believe, who came from Port Victoria, had the honour of opening it. He was a little bit colourful in his language but it was a great evening.

There are many things that regional members of parliament are contacted about, but the one clear thing that shines through for me is sporting facilities. It is a constant stream that comes in seeking assistance with kitchen upgrades, bowling green replacements, lighting upgrades and support for junior sport that occurs in the area, so it is such a retrograde step to remove \$3.5 million that it has to be seen as penny pinching in the extreme because the return to the community is enormous. By involving people in sport it provides that social opportunity, that health opportunity, it brings communities together, it binds them, it gives them a common cause and it works out to be such a positive that it has to be supported.

An amount of \$3.5 million in the scope of a \$16 billion budget is not a lot, but it is a significant amount of money, and I respect that. However, it has to be returned to ensure that regional communities, metropolitan communities and suburban communities have access to a funding stream that they know will be there. They know that in many cases it is not an automatic right to the grant; indeed, they know that in many cases it will take two or maybe three years of dedicated effort in writing the application, making sure they have accurate quotes, working hard to raise money locally, getting support from local government in the area and also trying to get some federal government money. However, the collaborative effort returns many times to the community, and I hope that the government supports this.

I am disappointed by the member for Newland's amendment; I believe it is a retrograde step because it gives no hope to those who have not received any funding yet. However, the funds being there is a positive step and the member for Chaffey has done the right thing by bringing it to the community's attention.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:30): I also rise to speak very briefly—30 seconds—on this debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thirty seconds? Okay.

Mr DULUK: Well, the member for Chaffey told me that is all I have. Sporting clubs and community groups are definitely the backbone of many of our local communities, and in my electorate of Davenport I have two fantastic sporting clubs of note: the Flagstaff Hill Football Club and the Blackwood Football Club. They really are the centre of their communities and really do bind the communities together.

Support for our communities is most important, and it does more than just bring communities together. It brings out the best of volunteering in our communities and it gives someone like my good self, who has never been the best sportsman but who is a really strong enthusiast, the ability to get involved in sporting clubs. For many years, up until last year, I was heavily involved with the Adelaide University Football Club as a team manager and a great support staff. Whilst I did play a few games for the Blacks I was never knocking on the door of the first 18 in division I, but it gave someone like me a great sense of community, pride and place.

That is what local communities do, and it is the same with the footy clubs in my area, Flaggies and Blackwood. They rely on volunteers and they provide many options to the community. Of course, they double up with many other sports and sporting hubs as well. The Flagstaff Hill Rotary Club meets at the Flagstaff footy club, as well as the netball club and the tennis club; they all meet at that same complex.

Funding our local communities is extremely important, and it is really a shame that over the last couple of years local clubs have had their funding reduced. It is in supporting local communities that we ultimately get a better society.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:32): I would like to thank all those members who have made a contribution and who have highlighted the importance of sport. I am very disappointed that government members—bar the member for Newland—have not spoken. This is a really good news story, that every member in this place takes pride in their sporting clubs, yet not one government member will be going to their sporting clubs and saying, 'We are going to reduce the capacity for you to access support funding.' I think it is a sad indictment of sport here in South Australia.

It was remiss of me not to mention some of the sporting groups in the electorate of Chaffey. I have three footy leagues and I attend 15 teams of footy, we have 15 netball teams that play together

at those venues on the Saturday, and we cannot forget the soccer, the cricket, the hockey, the many club teams. We should also not forget that school sport in the Riverland and the Mallee comes away as school sport but it is a pathway to club sport, and they are great representatives of our region when it comes to state competition.

The Tour of the Riverland, of which I am a patron, was a recent event, the second biggest cycling event in the state, and it was great to see that those sporting clubs were there to support that tour. The Riverland is probably one of the motorsport capitals of South Australia, between speedway, go-karts, motocross, all types of off-road sport. It really is a great sporting area.

In closing I would like to make one comment, and want to refer to a media article, a mention from the member for Waite. He said that clubs would not be able to maintain grounds and clubrooms if the proposed cuts went ahead. He further stated, 'It condemns local sporting groups to a future with ageing clubrooms and infrastructure that may not comply with current standards.' However, we have not seen the member for Waite come in here and make a contribution. He was passionate about it some time ago, yet we have not heard one word from him today. The same goes for the member for Frome: he was equally as vocal and yet we have heard no contribution from him.

I am quite disappointed that the member for Newland, who was the minister for recreation and sport, has moved an amendment which is contrary to what this motion is about. I think that he and all his colleagues will be hanging their heads in shame because they know in their heart that sporting financial programs are really what sporting clubs need in South Australia.

Again, I thank those who have made a contribution and who recognise the importance of sporting clubs and recognise the importance of what funding programs mean to their sporting clubs, but I do not support the member for Newland's amendment.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 21
Noes 18
Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Atkinson, M.J.	Chapman, V.A.	Hildyard, K.
Bell, T.S.	Snelling, J.J.	Marshall, S.S.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

CAMPANIA SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:43): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 2015 is the 40th anniversary of the Campania Sports and Social Club;
- (b) acknowledges the wonderful work that this club has done over the years in the promotion of Italian culture, food, language and support of Italian Australians and the broader community; and
- (c) pays tribute to the activities of this club, and others like it, which enrich the life of our state as a whole and contribute to a better and more diverse South Australia.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the Campania Sports and Social Club. On Saturday 20 June, I and many members in this place will have the pleasure and honour to attend a fun day at the Campania club to celebrate its 40th birthday. We will assemble at the Benevento hall and be welcomed by Cavaliere John DiFede and Steve Maglieri, who is president of the 40th anniversary committee. We will hear from a number of dignitaries, especially the president of the Campania club, Roberto Corsini. I want to thank Roberto for the wonderful work that both he and the committee have done not only this year but also in the years before, especially the original founders of the committee.

Migrants from the Campania region maintain their local and regional identity through clubs like this, through clubs they have established. It is a very special club. Many members may have visited the club in the past, perhaps just for a pizza or a bowl of tagliatelle, fusilli, orecchiette or any other wonderful pasta that they serve. But, it is not just about the food, it is also a meeting place—there are many halls there. The club is a successful club, and it has opened its arms to the wider, broader Australian community so that they may also share in it. It also features a wonderful library. The library is important because they keep so much of our history.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: And who funded it?

Mr TARZIA: Absolutely, and governments, of both sides, in a bipartisan manner have over the years contributed to the club, and I do appreciate and thank them for that. Language classes have also been undertaken at the club as well.

I wanted to talk a little about the Campania migrant story to Australia and South Australia particularly. When you look at the estimated resident population of Australia as at 30 June 2014 with regard to Italy, it said that we have about 1 per cent of Australia's population. It said that 201,800 people born in Italy were in Australia as at 30 June 2014. When you look at the estimated resident population of South Australia, as of 2011, it said that still in South Australia alone there were 22,100 who were born in Italy.

From Campania, obviously migrants came from an array of towns and villages, namely: originally Benevento, where there were 6,315 migrants; Avellino, where there were 2,522; Napoli (of course, we like the Napolitano) 570; Salerno, 379; and, Caserta, 359. Members will note that an array of clubs from this region have since set up, not just the Campania Club but a range of other clubs in the region, namely, San Giorgio La Molara, the Molinara Club, the Altavilla Club, and, close enough, but a little bit into another region, Le Marche Club and Fogolar Furlan up north. It is a wonderful migrant story that we have these clubs here in South Australia that promote their regions, their origins, so that future South Australians can share in that proud migrant heritage.

From the viewpoint of regional origins, it is said the highest ranked, in terms of comparative percentage of birth place of South Australia's Italo-Australians, is: Campania, 27.9 per cent; followed by Calabria, 23.5 per cent; Veneto, 10.5 per cent; and Abruzzo, 8.6 per cent. I wanted to quote some of those figures, because it puts things into perspective and shows how many in the community, especially in my area, fit into that picture, and especially myself and my grandparents, and many residents in my area who were products of this post World War II migration to Australia.

We are grateful to the people of Campania, who have made an array of sacrifices to leave their mother country many years ago, the sacrifices they made and the contribution they have made to South Australia. South Australia is certainly much more diverse, much more culturally sound and certainly has many more food options available to it since the people of Campania chose to migrate

to South Australia. We are very grateful to the Campania Club for all that it does. I wish them well in June, when they have their 40th year celebrations, and I commend motion to the house.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:49): I rise to speak in favour of this motion by the member for Hartley in congratulating the Campania Sports and Social Club on its 40th anniversary. As we all know, the settlement of Italians in South Australia is one of the great chapters in the migrant history of our state, particularly in the years between 1945 and 1972 when approximately 30,000 Italians settled in South Australia, many of them from the Campania region.

According to the 2011 census, there are now about 21,000 Italian-born South Australians and more than 85,000 have Italian ancestry. I, along with the member for Light, am one of them. The Italian migrants and their descendants have excelled in every aspect of South Australian history, from the law to education, business to the arts, medicine to trades, and so many communities and sporting clubs and associations. In the South Australian parliament we have members past and present on both sides of the chamber who are of Italian background.

I know that all members of the government join me in acknowledging the enormous economic, cultural and social contribution the Italian community has made to South Australia for more than 1½ centuries. A significant part of the contribution can be traced to the establishment of regional clubs and associations like the Campania club. Most cultural clubs and organisations established by migrants who have settled in our state are born from humble beginnings or the dream of an individual or small group of people. The Campania Sports and Social Club is no exception.

According to the publication *The migrants from Campania and their lives in South Australia*, the Campania club was founded in 1975, owing much to the foresight and planning of Cavilieri John Di Fede, who had visited similar clubs in the USA and been impressed by the role of these clubs played in maintaining cultural heritage and social connection among Italian migrants. Today's members of the Campania club are the heirs of the legacy left by the visionary pioneers in the mid-1970s and the beneficiaries of their sacrifice and hard work which turned a dream into reality.

Four decades on the club continues to enjoy great support and patronage from Italian migrants from the Campania region, as well as members of the Italian community more generally. The club enjoys a very healthy membership of about 600 people and its facilities, in the heart of the electorate of Florey, are well utilised with 200 to 300 people visiting several nights every week.

The club should also be recognised for what it gives back to the community. Be it locally or internationally, the club has a history of raising money for many charities and natural disasters. These include the 1980 Irpinia earthquake in Italy where 290 people lost their lives and 300,000 were left homeless, the 2004 Indian Ocean Boxing Day tsunami, and the 2009 Victorian bushfires.

The club has also worked hard to foster and promote cultural links with the region of Campania in Italy, with leaders of the Campania club accompanying ministers and members of the South Australian parliament on trade and cultural visits to the region. The club celebrated many milestones in its 40-year history. The 35th anniversary of the club in 2010 was marked by a special concert with renowned Italian tenor Dario Sebastiani paying homage to many of opera's most treasured arias.

In April 2012, the Premier officially opened the newly renovated club rooms. The upgraded club includes a new air-conditioned forecourt bocce stadium, a large hall (The Benevento Hall), bar and kitchen, offices, a children's play area with two pizza ovens. I do not think the pizza ovens are in the children's play area, though! The entire project was undertaken by volunteers with sponsorship from some 69 businesses or organisations, once again reinforcing the club's reputation for self-sufficiency. In February 2014, the centre's new library was officially opened, as was previously mentioned, by His Excellency the Ambassador of Italy, who is a native of Benevento. The club received \$3,000 in state government funding via the Multicultural SA group for the library project.

In June last year, the club hosted the annual Festa della Repubblica reception. The club's 40th anniversary celebrations, as was mentioned, are being led by Cavilieri Serafino (Steve) Maglieri and will comprise a full weekend of activities. On Saturday 20 June the club will hold an open day with a free sausage sizzle and drinks with the aim of inviting the local Modbury North community to tour the club's facilities and participate in activities. This is yet another wonderful example of a cultural

club opening its doors to the local community which can only increase the understanding and respect between different cultural groups in our community.

The main event on Sunday 21 June will be the official anniversary celebrations followed by a gala stand up reception in the club's Benevento Hall. In addition to the speeches and musical entertainment, the club's pioneers and past presidents will be presented to guests, underscoring the high esteem in which this group of people is held. The club will also show its appreciation to its loyal members by inviting them and their families to join the official celebration. I am also advised that the broader Italian community will be invited to join the anniversary with representatives from some 200 Italian based clubs, associations and organisations.

I congratulate all who have been involved in the success and growth of the Campania club over the past 40 years. I particularly want to congratulate the club's leaders from the early pioneers to the current president, Mr Roberto Corsini. I also want to acknowledge the dedication, hard work and commitment of the hundreds, if not thousands, of volunteers who over the past four decades have given their time, love and passion to ensure that the club has not only stayed alive but thrived.

The 40th anniversary of the Campania Sports and Social Club not only represents the significant milestone in the settlement of Italians in South Australia, it also represents an example of a long-term commitment of Italian migrants, their children and in many cases grandchildren to promote and preserve their culture. I will be there and I hope any other members will also attend this month's celebrations as they will be a fitting tribute to the magnificent achievements of all involved. I wish the club all the best in its future endeavours. Viva Campania!

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:54): Viva Campania, indeed. It gives me great pleasure to support the motion. I thank the member for Hartley for bringing it forward. I agree with everything that he said, as the member for Florey has said and, I imagine, the member for Light is probably going to try to say if there is any time.

The committee of the 40th anniversary of the Campania Club, led by Cavaliere Steve Maglieri, is doing a terrific job and I, like others, am looking forward to attending on 21 June to recognise the amazing contribution that this group has made over 40 years.

I particularly want to put on the record and pay tribute to the incredibly inspiring and visionary founders of the club who worked for many years to actually get the land, worked with councils, raised money in the community, and built the club. Over the years their legacy has been extraordinary. For the record, and to recognise in this house the founders of the club in 1975, they were: Cavaliere Giovanni Di Fede, Ezio Spina, Pomeo Ranaldo, Clemente Maione (a very good man indeed), Giovanni Di Matteo, Mario Mignone, Sabatino Ranaldo, Michele Luongo, Raffaele Barone (my friend), Feliciano Zirillo, Liberantonio Limongelli, Michele Carofano, Erminio Ranaldo, Antonio Rotolo and Nicola Minicozzi.

In acknowledging that group, I also pay tribute to the thousands of volunteers over the years who are the dozens, probably hundreds, of committee members. My very good friend Fedele Catalano takes me there for dinner about once every two or three months. It is a joy in my life that that happens. I can tell all members, and anyone who has not been to the Campania Club, that without a doubt the best pizzas in South Australia are served at the Campania Club. I know that I am offending the Campbelltown soccer club. I know that I am offending the member for Hartley's family at the Altavilla Iripina Sports and Social Club. I know that the good people at the Rostrevor Pizza Bar are upset with me right now. But the Campania Sports and Social Club is the best and there is no doubting it. It is a wonderful contribution that they make and I think that it is appropriate this house recognises their achievements over 40 years. I commend the motion to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Light, I would just like to acknowledge the presence of the former members for Reynell and Hammond, and also note that the former member for Lee was with us this morning.

*Motions***CAMPANIA SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB**

Debate resumed.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (12:57): I would also like to congratulate the Campania Club on their 40th birthday. The region is the region where I was born, which comprises the provinces Benevento, Napoli, Caserta, Salerno and Avellino.

The importance of clubs like the Campania Club, amongst other clubs in South Australia, is that they provide an important opportunity for friendship for new arrivals in Australia. Often I think we forget what a challenge and how difficult it is for the early migrants in this country, particularly, as an example, my own parents. The first time my mum left her village was to come to Australia with her family not knowing English.

Clubs like this play a very important role in terms of helping people, not so much hold onto their heritage, but to bring forward their heritage to the new country, get acquainted with the language, and importantly provide an opportunity to transition to the new communities. They provide people, in this case people from the Campania Club, with an opportunity to, if you like, go into the wider world of Australia with friends and family. The importance of clubs like this is that they help people to celebrate those things which are important to their culture. In this case, like many others, family, church and festivals are probably things which are very important to people from Campania.

One thing I would like to mention is that a lot of people from Campania probably also hold dual citizenship in this country. I mention that because it is very important. People use dual citizenship not just to acknowledge their place of birth but also because they are quite proud Australian citizens. I think any government who wishes to tinker with citizenship rules should be very careful about that because the essence of citizenship is that you are equal before the law, and once you start tampering with that you start to go into dangerous territory. I would caution our federal government and federal opposition very carefully about what laws they do change in terms of citizenship. I think that these clubs are very important. They help many people to become successful in this country and I commend the hard work and the pioneers of this club, and many others in this state.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:59): I thank all honourable members for their contributions today. I once again take the opportunity to thank the Campania Club and the volunteers of the club, and I wish it all the very best for its 40th year celebrations.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

*Petitions***QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT**

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 2,033 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to ensure that critical care services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital are maintained and not to implement proposed changes to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department under the Transforming Health plan.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart): Presented a petition signed by 56 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain and index state government concessions on council rates.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Police (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Australian Crime Commission, Chair of the Board of the—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Natural Resources Management Board—Alinytjara Wilurara Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Aboriginal Lands Trust—

Annual Report 2012-13

Annual Report 2013-14

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:02): I bring up the 87th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2015-16.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ministerial Statement

TAXI AND CHAUFFEUR VEHICLE INDUSTRY REVIEW

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Today the government has announced a review into the taxi and chauffeur vehicle industry. Taxis and chauffeur vehicles are vital for our tourism industry and they are an important part of our public transport network. They must be attractive to customers, affordable and support the image of South Australia that we are trying to project interstate and around the world.

However, the industry is changing. Globally, transport industries are experiencing rapidly evolving markets, changing consumer demands and developments in technology. Our regulations and requirements must keep pace with these changes. In my time as minister, I have met many drivers and operators who provide an exceptional service, but there is concern that service standards must improve to meet these changing demands.

These changes present a significant opportunity to review the taxi and chauffeur vehicle industry and the various regulations that govern these services. In broad terms, the key elements of this review will focus on the public expectations of safe, reliable and cost-effective travel, the working conditions and remuneration of drivers, opportunities for innovation and competition, and the future viability of the industry as a whole.

I am determined to ensure that a level playing field is maintained within the industry and that neither current operators nor new entrants to the market are disadvantaged. Our regulations should foster innovation—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —encourage fair competition—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and provide peace of mind to all commuters about the safety and reliability of their service.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet; just sit down. We need to have question time so that members can actually hear what each other are saying. I am here to look after the house and give you all equal time so, if you could just listen in silence, that would be great. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. In the terms of reference outlined today, the government has made it clear that we are working with both industry and the public to ensure our industry is providing the best possible service. Both the Taxi Council of South Australia and the Chauffeur Vehicle Association have supported the government's efforts to improve standards for both passengers and the industry.

Three eminent South Australians have been chosen to lead this review: Greg Crafter, Michael Luchich and Jane Jeffreys. Greg Crafter, a highly-regarded former South Australian government minister and member of the Passenger Transport Board from 1994 to 2004, provides a knowledge of the industry and its regulations that is second to none.

Mr Michael Luchich has more than 20 years of commercial experience across a range of industries and, with experience leading organisations such as Telstra, Dimension Data and the Australian Information Industry Association, provides first-rate insight into emerging technology and its application to the benefit of consumers and industry. Jane Jeffreys has extensive experience in tourism and hospitality as a board director of the South Australian Tourism Commission and the Adelaide Convention Centre, and delivers a primary focus on ensuring tourists and visitors to our state are welcomed and keep coming back.

This experienced review panel will produce a discussion paper in consultation with the industry and stakeholders and be released publicly for feedback. The final report and recommendations will be presented to government by the end of this year for consideration. Public feedback is not only welcome but highly encouraged and can be directed to DPTI.TaxiHireCarReview@sa.gov.au.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we continue, I would like to acknowledge in the gallery today a group from the Women's Education course at Port Adelaide TAFE, guests of the member for Port Adelaide, and welcome them to parliament. We hope they enjoy their time with us today and learn a lot about how well behaved everyone can be here.

Question Time

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Will students now be expected to pay up to \$3,000 for the 210 hours of certificate III training required for the Construction Pathways program in order to complete their SACE qualification?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:07): I will have to take that on notice and refer to the minister for the specifics of which courses—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —are on the fully funded list.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My supplementary to the minister is: are you seriously telling us that you have got no idea about the impacts of the changes that have been made on people who have already undertaken the Construction Pathways program in South Australia?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:08): I have not brought with me into the chamber the list of courses—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —that are on the fully funded list.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the minister could sit down, I just remind members of standing order 142. This early in the day, it would be terrific if you could observe it and listen to each other in silence. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. What I am aware of is that the arrangements for school students who are undertaking certificate II and III courses that are regarded as having high public value and, therefore, are on the fully funded list are those from which they are likely to get employment. The purpose of providing VET training in the high school years as well as afterwards is not simply to acquire a qualification, not simply to acquire a certificate, but to acquire a certificate that will lead to employment.

The Department of State Development has undertaken a process of identifying which courses those are and, therefore, which will be fully funded. Over the next few weeks, we will be leading up to the time when students will start to select courses for next year. All those who are studying this year will be able to complete their courses regardless of whether they are on that list or not.

As we see that occur, as we see the choices that those students wish to make and they reference that against the list that's available, should there be issues that I regard as being serious in terms of the ability of students to continue at school, or anomalies in terms of particular locations where there might be sufficient people who are qualified in those positions for vacancies generally but perhaps not in a particular region, then I have already indicated that I will be taking that up with the relevant department.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Is the minister suggesting to the house that somebody who is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary or a new question?

Mr MARSHALL: Absolutely.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Alright, just asking.

Mr MARSHALL: Is the minister suggesting to the house that, in fact, somebody who is studying certificate II in year 11 this year may be forced to pay the full amount for certificate III for their year 12 studies next year?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:10): As I thought I explained yesterday and the day before, there will be a large number of courses that are available completely free for students to undertake—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order.

The Hon. P. Caica: He's being rude.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And so is the member for Colton.

The Hon. P. Caica: Well, I'm not being rude; he is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But you're being called to order.

The Hon. P. Caica: Yes, that's alright.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! No, the Speaker would do what I have just done—that's called him to order and written it down. If you could all just keep a grip, the minister is answering the question.

Mr Marshall: Not very well.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, the leader is being disrespectful, I think.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Question time can stop straightaway, if you would like it to. Minister.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, don't be rude. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: From the briefings that I have received, it is relatively unusual for students to go from a certificate II in one particular subject to the certificate III in that particular subject. There are some where that is a clear progression, and the ones that we have identified are, indeed, on the free list, and that's where I have said that, although the briefings to date have given me some assurance that there won't be a challenge that has been identified, I am prepared to look at any anomalies that do crop up. I am not comfortable with the suggestion that is implied in the nature of the question, that I disregard this is an important matter—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It matters extremely to me that students both have the opportunity to finish school and that they finish school with the kind of qualification that will get them jobs. I will therefore be monitoring this extremely carefully over the next few weeks. As I say, the subject choices I believe start in about six weeks' time. We will be working very closely with the Department of State Development to ensure that students have the choices that are consistent with their existing study and that provide them the best chance of both completing school and getting employment.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, and this is the third supplementary.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): Is the minister suggesting to the house that prior to offering her support in cabinet to support this move, she didn't make any inquiries as to what the effects on school-based traineeships and apprenticeships would be?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:12): No, I'm not.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): Supplementary: we're really not getting a straight answer here. We would like to know whether the minister is aware, prior to actually voting for it, that there are going to be students who are studying certificate II in year 11 who will be precluded from doing their certificate III in year 12? Can we get a straight answer?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That seems to be the same question. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:13): I will try again. Students will be able to continue to study completely for free in high school certificates II and certificates III and undertake school-based—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader is warned for the first time.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: A question has been raised about whether a student undertaking certificate II that is not on the free list but is completing it this year would then wish to go on and do that subject as a certificate III level. I am advised that that is very unusual, that that is not the way—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —that on the whole—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is called to order.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I'm advised that on the whole that is not the way in which students are selecting from stage II, which is essentially generally preparatory to III, which is much more specific.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: If there is an anomaly where a student finds themselves both in that situation and that that course isn't free, because many of them are, then I will have a look at that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader has a question.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Has the Construction Industry Training Board or any other training provider contacted the government advising that the certificate III component of their school-based training programs is at risk because of the government's recent changes to vocational education and training?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:14): They have not contacted me and I am unable to answer for the entire government, as the leader very well knows.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It may be that such a matter has been—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It may be—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I have asked her to sit down. I can't hear her answers because you are all screaming so much. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: So, to return, I have not been advised or contacted by the board. It may be that they have made contact with the relevant minister who is responsible for WorkReady.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Given the answers that the minister has already provided to the house, does she stand by the Premier's statement made in the house on Tuesday of this week, and I quote:

We are still supporting in a subsidised fashion the conclusion of the training processes for those people who have begun their courses, which we think is a generous offer.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:15): As I said, if students are undertaking a course this year, then there will be absolutely no change. WorkReady comes in on 1 July, but that is not relevant for the students who are studying this year; they get to complete their study this year. You have then subsequently asked about students who complete their certificate II but wish to go on to a certificate III. I am keeping an eye on where there might be a situation of a student who wishes, having undertaken certificate II in a course that is not on the free list, to go on to certificate III, and I am keeping an eye on that.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order. Member for Elder.

RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Minister, can you update the house on progress towards meeting the government's economic priority of unlocking the full potential of our state's renewable assets?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:17): I thank the member for this question and the opportunity to provide all members with an update of the substantial work that is being carried out in this state to meet this important economic priority.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is warned. Can you just sit down, minister. I honestly can't hear him; if you keep shouting out, I can't hear him. So, if you are going to need me to make a ruling on the answer, I can't help you. I remind you all of standing order 142 and let's hear the answer from the Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government is committed to unlocking the full potential of our resources, energy and renewable assets. It is no accident that all three of those assets have been grouped together, as each sector needs to work in balance to achieve our overall aim: creating a state where people and business thrive. As part of this economic objective, the government is now committed to generating \$10 billion of investment in low carbon generation by 2025.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How is Port going? Exceptionally well. Port are going exceptionally well.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. It is really disappointing that you are not defying me, you are defying the Chair and the house. I ask the minister to continue and ask you to observe standing order 142 again. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As part of this economic objective, the government is committed to generating \$10 billion of investment in low carbon generation by 2025. This investment target aligns with the goal of generating 50 per cent of our state's energy from renewable sources by 2025. We are already beginning to make significant inroads towards those targets. I am advised by the Department of State Development that we have already generated \$6 billion in investment in low

carbon generation to date, and such high levels of investment have helped create 1,330 direct full-time equivalent jobs in the state's renewable energy sector in South Australia.

I am informed that for every direct construction and maintenance job created in the wind industry, two indirect jobs are created elsewhere in the economy. Because wind farms are predominantly located in regional areas, it is those communities that benefit most from these jobs and investment created in this area of the renewable energy sector. It is especially important for those years when drought creates challenges for our rural sector, as regional communities are able to rely on a more diverse economy to help them withstand the pressures of low rainfall on their productive capacity.

Most importantly, South Australia's renewable energy sector embraces innovation. An example of that innovation is Sundrop Farms near Port Augusta. The 20-hectare greenhouse expansion project currently under construction and due for completion in mid/late 2016 relies on solar energy. Sundrop Farm's breakthrough technology allows this trailblazing company to produce high quality food in the Upper Spencer Gulf using solar energy and desalinated sea water. The project is the first in SA to integrate, at a commercial scale, leading technologies across solar thermal energy, solar seawater desalination and freshwater neutrality.

Here we see South Australia embracing innovation to generate investment, create jobs and provide premium food using renewable energy technology to support our regional communities. In February, we welcomed the Hornsdale Wind Farm's success in winning the Australian Capital Territory's reverse auction for 100 megawatts of wind power. That is due to begin construction in November 2015, and wind-powered energy generated in South Australia's Mid North will assist the ACT with its target to secure 90 per cent of its energy from renewable energy.

Today, the Premier and I attended a ceremony to mark South Australia becoming the first state in the nation to capture carbon emissions from a power station. To be built at Torrens Island, the CO₂ recovery plant will be the only plant in South Australia to capture CO₂ from existing emissions and will be the first plant to capture CO₂ from a power station for the CO₂ market in South Australia—a remarkable investment in partnership with AGL that says to the world that South Australia is a state that welcomes new ideas.

Even better, this innovative partnership increases investment in the state by Air Liquide of France, one of the world's leading suppliers of industrial gases. The multimillion dollar recovery plant will be built and operated by Air Liquide at the AGL Torrens site to capture and purify 50,000 tonnes of CO₂ emissions from the power station's exhaust per year. Those captured emissions are then re-used by the industry to carbonate drinks and to treat wastewater and swimming pools.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Has the government received advice that the Skills for All funding arrangements left TAFE SA exposed to legal risk of litigation and federal penalties?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:21): The cabinet has taken into account all of the advice and is absolutely certain that it is on strong footing in introducing the reforms that it is undertaking. Indeed, these reforms—

Ms Redmond: That wasn't the question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is reminded she is on one warning.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: One needs to remember that, across the nation, the skills and higher education sector is largely comprised of government-run training organisations: TAFEs. As it happens, South Australia is further down the path of introducing a competitive set of arrangements than almost any other jurisdiction, with the possible exception of Victoria.

The context of this question is anticompetitive conduct and the advice that we received about how Skills for All should apply and how new arrangements would apply. All of these arrangements are in the context of us moving towards a more competitive model, and South Australia is further down that process of transition than any other state or territory, so it is passing strange that people

are advancing against us suggestions that somehow we are in breach of some competitive model when we are further advanced than any other state or jurisdiction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: These arrangements that are put in place are the next step—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned a second time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Contestability was opened up in a more substantial way under Skills for All. It will continue in a more substantial way as we transition TAFE to this new competitive environment where basically you will have the TAFE sector competing on an equal footing with the non-government and private sector for what are—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —essentially commercial courses and it will get a community service obligation and subsidies for what are regarded as non-commercial elements of their operation. That is the model we're moving towards. We are advancing along that path—

Mr Pederick: It's the Kim Jong-un version.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and the advice we have is that we are on sure ground in implementing the arrangements that we have.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary?

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, I call the member for Hammond to order for his interjection that it was the Kim Jong-un version and I call to order the member for Schubert.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary to the Premier: what action has your government taken in response to the Crown Solicitor's advice received by your government in July 2014, which states quite clearly that the potential for TAFE SA to use public funding to subsidise commercial operations, including below cost pricing, exposes TAFE SA to legal risk?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:24): The world is full of risks, what we do is we manage them. We make our decisions based on a range of input and advice, and we make the best available decisions having regard to the public interest, but we will not be canvassing legal advice we receive except to say this: we have taken into account all of our advice. The steps that we have taken manage all of the relevant risks associated with implementing these reforms.

As I repeat: we are heading down the path of a competitive TAFE system which is more advanced than any other jurisdiction in the nation, and that is because we are a reformist government that wants to have the most efficient and effective training arrangements. However, we will not be sacrificing quality, we will not be sacrificing access to people—especially disadvantaged people—and we will not be sacrificing access for people who live in regional areas who need to receive these services, and we will always be ensuring that there is service that is provided at the highest quality. So, we will not be sacrificing any of those principles as we move towards this more competitive arrangement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know those opposite are very fond of the market. They think the market is the solution to every problem, but we believe that the market has a proper role to play, but the public interest overrides the application of pure market principles and that has always been the value system of this party. I understand that there are those opposite who are addicted to the market. The market titillates them. They are excited by the market. In fact, they read extensively

about the market. Many of them have a copy of Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* under their bedside tables which they read every night. It excites them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I understand why they get excited by the market. It is a very powerful and useful servant but it should not be a master, and that is why we are interested in ensuring that the public interest also gets a proper look in.

The SPEAKER: Before the leader asks his next question, I call the members for Mount Gambier and Morphett to order. I warn for the first time the members for Schubert, Morialta, Hammond and Mount Gambier, and I warn for the second and final time the deputy leader and the members for Heysen, Morialta and Hartley. Leader.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My supplementary question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received any contrasting or mitigating advice to that of the Crown Solicitor when he corresponded with the government in July 2014, and I state:

The application of a differential subsidy to TAFE SA as part of the Skills for All funding arrangements also appears to be contrary to the principles of competitive neutrality which exposes TAFE SA to complaint and possible investigation.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:28): I think I have answered this question, sir. The risks that have been identified from a whole range of different areas were taken into account by cabinet when it reached the decisions that it took. Can I say that, when we wrote to the federal minister about this, and actually the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, when we met with him on 31 March where we advised of the WorkReady policy to be announced on 1 April and the principles and intent, including all of the principles which bear on this question of competitiveness—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is very close to leaving.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —when on 8 May 2015 the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills provided information to the Council of Australian Governments' Industry and Skills Council on the WorkReady policy, when the deputy chief executive of the relevant department wrote to the deputy secretary of the skills training department (the federal department) on 13 May providing and attaching a copy of the WorkReady policy, and on 29 May when we had a telephone conversation between senior state and commonwealth officers responsible for the National Partnership on Skills Reform, where we inquired, 'What was your minister talking about?', and they confirmed, 'We don't know what Senator Birmingham was talking about' when he was talking about withdrawing funding on the basis of our Skills for All announcements—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: When all of those things are said to you, I think you can naturally assume that it is politics that is being played on the other side of the debate about this important reform.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned a second and final time and now may ask a question.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): I just would like a straight answer from the Premier. Will he tell us whether or not the government received separate legal advice to the Crown Solicitor or whether cabinet made their decision based upon the risk assessment that they did themselves? If he did receive separate legal advice, can he provide that to the parliament?

The SPEAKER: The Premier should ignore the rhetorical introduction of the leader, which is out of order. I am not sure that the question is in order, but the Premier may wish to answer it nevertheless.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:30): The first thing is that we do not just divulge the deliberations of cabinet, we do not release legal advice and we certainly do not discuss—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, we certainly will not be identifying what source of advice we have. All of the relevant advices and risks associated with this decision were taken into account by cabinet. They were communicated to the relevant federal agency. The relevant federal agency did not raise any concerns with the policy that we announced. The reason why they did not raise any concerns was because they know this is responsive—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will be quiet.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The national partnership agreement had been reached between the commonwealth and the states, and they know that this state government leads the nation in relation to training and further education reform. And they know, for instance, that we are exceeding by a rate of sixfold the obligations that we committed to under the national partnership agreement. That is why when we contacted them to say, 'What on earth is your federal minister on about—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —when he's threatening to withhold our funding?' they said, 'We don't know. We don't know—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —what he's on about.' The real question here is why did Senator Birmingham, who said that they will not be receiving the \$65 million the federal government has agreed to give to them under the partnership agreement, make that threat when his own agency had no knowledge of the fact that he was about to make that threat. Why did he make that threat in circumstances where his own agency had not reached a conclusion that we had breached that agreement? This is politics, base politics, which is directed by a federal government against a state government that is seeking to actually do the difficult work of reforming government to make its state more efficient so that it can grow its economy for the prosperity of its citizens.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. How does having the worst outcome for unemployed VET graduates equate with the high levels of efficiency in South Australia's training system announced by the Premier yesterday? Yesterday the Premier told this house that the report on government services showed South Australia's training and further education system consistently comes at the very highest levels in terms of efficiency of the system. Yet when we take a look at the report on government services, it actually shows that South Australia has the worst outcomes in the country for unemployed VET graduates.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:33): When you increase the general level of skills of your population, as we have through our Skills for All arrangements, which have actually increased during the course of the application of Skills for All, the increase in the level of skills pre Skills for All—training investment through Skills for All for the 2013 calendar year increased 44 per cent on pre Skills for All levels. Over the same training period, training investment

in regional South Australia increased by 62.1 per cent, investment in non-metropolitan regions accounted for, and TAFE students in relation to government funded schools, funded VETs in South Australia, was the highest in the nation, and we have lifted the general level of skills in our community by in the order of 5 per cent, one of the highest in the nation.

Of course, the capacity of our students, after they gain their qualifications, to obtain employment depends on the general levels of economic activity and the jobs that are going on in our economy, and of course those two things are related. In terms of the things that we can directly control, the efficiency, the regard with which these courses are had by employers, the state of satisfaction of the students themselves with the services, all of those things rate amongst the highest in the nation.

Once again, the Leader of the Opposition comes in here and in many and varied ways repeats the nature of the challenge; that is, that South Australia has challenges in terms of declining industries and the growth of jobs sufficient to ensure that its citizens—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Can I take you back where the week started, to your review: the reason why you are so unutterably unsuccessful in relation to your performance is that you do not have a single idea to advance—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: I fear that his comments about you were debase and strange.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You can't think ahead.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a first time. The member for Chaffey is warned a first time. The member for Mount Gambier is warned a second and final time. The Premier hasn't finished.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Part of the response to improving the capacity of our economy to grow jobs is to ensure that we reform government so that all of the service systems of government are as efficient and working as effectively as possible, but reforming government agenda is difficult work. It involves the planning system, it involves the bureaucracy, it involves our regulatory systems, it involves our TAFE system, and that is what we are embarked upon: reforming our TAFE system. If there is an alternative proposition that those opposite want to advance—

Mr Marshall: Competition. Competition.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We are further advanced along the process of competition than any state or territory in the nation.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will be quiet.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Any state or territory in the nation. That is an irresistible proposition. It is only Victoria and South Australia that have taken these steps to reform their TAFE systems in this way and South Australia is more advanced along that path and WorkReady takes us even further down that path. They are the simple facts of the matter. Instead of simply, when we do the difficult work of reform, which of course involves change, which necessarily involves people engaged in complaint, instead of just joining in, why don't you for once recognise a quality reform when it's actually occurring and get in behind it.

The SPEAKER: I am very reluctant to remove the leader from the house under the sessional order and I give the leader a lot of scope and do not warn him when I probably should do so. I ask him to exercise some restraint.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Thank you for that advice, member for Colton, and I hope you will receive with equanimity your first warning. Leader.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. What was the basis for the government arriving at the figure of 5,000 training places for the non-TAFE training providers in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:38): It is fundamentally based on the size of the pie that we had available to us, which was returning to pre Skills for All funding levels, which incidentally for the non-TAFE sector is both a larger sum of money than pre-Skills for All and a larger number of training hours than pre Skills for All. So, where we are now is where we were pre Skills for All. I know that involved a level of adjustment for the non-TAFE sector, which is unfortunate. I know that's causing some grief and we are working through that with them at the moment, but essentially we needed a sustainable TAFE, a platform for TAFE from which we can take further reform efforts and, make no mistake, there are very significant reforms which are on the way for TAFE.

There will be a reducing proportion of the total pie of TAFE as a guaranteed, if you like, sector of the total training budget. There will be a larger contestable section of the TAFE and non-TAFE section of the training budget over time but this year, having regard to the available pool of funds, there is a sufficient amount of money which is necessary to ensure we have a sustainable TAFE. The balance has been applied to the non-TAFE sector, and I repeat: that is larger than in both absolute dollars and in training hours than it was prior to the pre Skills for All arrangements.

AUSTRALIAN GIANT CUTTLEFISH

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you inform the house about the findings of the latest report into giant Australian cuttlefish in the northern Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:40): I thank the member for Giles for the question and I genuinely acknowledge his fierce interest in the cuttlefish population. I have to say, member for Stuart—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No—in 2013, when I first became Minister for Tourism, we went out and did all those meet-and-greets around the state, and you were at a couple—Port Pirie and the Flinders Ranges. Member for Flinders, we were there. The former member for Mount Gambier and the member for Frome were at a couple. I think the most controversial thing that happened was that my speech went on a little long and someone did a face plant when I was with the member for Chaffey up at Banrock Station. I did not hear a whimper—there was great bipartisan support from every member—but I went to Whyalla and the then candidate for Giles turned up with a protest group. There were all having a go at me about these giant cuttlefish and expecting me to fix the problem. I said, 'There is a lot of things I can do as tourism minister, but I can't get these cuttlefish to come back.' So, the member for Giles has been a fierce advocate for them and he has been diving with them. He said it was the most amazing experience.

Anyway, I am glad to report to the house that 2013 was a bad year for the cuttlefish in Whyalla, but we have seen in the following 12 months a 325 per cent increase in the number of giant cuttlefish. These things are an amazing tourist attraction, they are fantastic, and there is nowhere in the world where they gather in such dense numbers. It is terrific to hear that they are back and they are attracting the tourists. For anyone who wants to go for a bit of a swim up there and have a look, now is a good time (between now and August), which is the season. I think maybe if the member for Hammond and I went up and we went in, we would probably set off some tsunami warning systems. I can certainly—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: I've done it twice.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The member for Stuart has done it twice and highly recommends it as well. I know that former tourism minister Jane Lomax-Smith did it a few times, so I am keen to get up there and do it in the next couple of months as well. It is a terrific tourism attraction.

We worked with the federal government and we got about \$800,000 worth of funding to do six or seven research projects, and they have had a look at a whole host of reasons why the cuttlefish may have gone away and then not come back. I remember one of the reasons people were talking about was that BHP Billiton were looking to put in a desal plant. They had not built a desal plant but maybe the giant cuttlefish were reading about it in the paper and thought, 'Gee, we'd better not go back there!' So, that was ruled out as one of the reasons, the fact that they might have done it.

The research was led by the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) with support from the University of Adelaide, the South Australian Museum and the Environment Protection Authority. The research projects completed to date investigated the abundance, water quality and habitat conditions of giant cuttlefish at Point Lowly, alternative breeding sites, artificial spawning habitats, commercial fishing by-catch, accumulation of metals in the giant cuttlefish, and the impacts of shipping noise. This is in addition to SARDI's annual population surveys.

Currently, six out of the seven projects have been completed and the results of the projects can be found in the SARDI report 'Surveying, searching and promoting Giant Australian Cuttlefish spawning activity in northern Spencer Gulf' which is being released today. The final project is in the advanced stage of completion which is looking at movement and population genetics.

To date, the strongest signal for explaining the recent interannual variation in both abundance and biomass of the giant cuttlefish spawning population has been the daily average temperature over an estimated 120-day embryo development period. Although it should be noted that temperature is not the only determinant of favourable spawning conditions, as other factors such as the abundance of predators may also have an impact on these wonderful creatures that are such a terrific tourism asset for the people of the Spencer Gulf. Again, I thank the member for Giles for his interest and his great passionate support for the giant cuttlefish.

WORKREADY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. What is the outcome of the regional impact assessment on the WorkReady program undertaken as required under his agreement with the government? Is he aware that funded cert. III training places in agriculture will drop from more than 300 per year to just 20 new enrolments at the Mount Gambier TAFE?

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is called to order.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:46): What is said to be a consequence of the WorkReady introduction of reforms is not actually a consequence of the WorkReady reforms. It is, indeed, a consequence of the end of a time-limited program, which is the Skills for All program.

Ms Chapman: Where's your regional impact statement?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Regional impact statements are not to be applied to the end of a program that has a beginning and an end. As it happened, though, a brief regional impact statement was undertaken but not of the same depth and analysis that is ordinarily undertaken for a program that is a change in policy.

This is the beginning and end of an existing policy. It is an entirely different matter from a government decision to close a service or introduce a new scheme which has the effect of, essentially, closing off some former arrangement. This is the beginning and end of something which was announced which had a beginning and an end. Therefore—

Ms Chapman: Well, what did it say?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The reality is that this is a program that has actually run its course. It's been highly beneficial and, indeed, I mentioned the figures earlier. This scheme actually had massive benefits for regional areas. The investment in regional South Australia increased by 62.1 per cent. The investment in non-metropolitan regions accounted for more than 25 per cent of total investment in Skills for All, so this was a highly beneficial program for the regions. Sadly, it's not capable of continuing. That will have an effect but it's not an effect that has been the subject of the introduction, a closure, or some cut in government services.

WORKREADY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:47): Supplementary: based on that answer, the Premier has indicated that there will be a major impact on regional areas. I just want to be very clear that no regional impact assessment has been undertaken.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:48): A limited regional impact statement has been undertaken but not of the same depth and type that—

Ms Chapman: What did that say?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It says that actually maintaining TAFE—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —during the course of this year is actually highly beneficial for regional areas. TAFE is a significant provider of regional services. TAFE, though, will be the subject of some further decisions about which there will be further regional impact statements—

Mr Pederick: Millions of dollars of reinvestment—that's what's needed.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —which will be released in due course. Consistent with our obligations about providing regional impact statements, where government decisions have a direct bearing on changes to government services that impact on regional areas, there will be a properly published and full regional impact statement. This is something that the Minister for Regional Development has insisted upon.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He, in fact, has. He insisted upon it in relation to the TAFE changes, which we understand are expected to be announced by TAFE in due course, and that will be made available when those decisions are announced.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond interjected that millions of dollars of reinvestment are needed. For that interjection, he is warned a second and final time.

Mr BELL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary?

Mr BELL: Yes, sir.

WORKREADY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:49): To the Minister for Regional Development: minister, do you support the WorkReady program as it's being rolled out?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:49): I think there has been a fair bit of discussion in here. Certainly, the Premier and everybody else have explained it. I do support the process going forward. As the minister responsible in the other house has indicated, she is still continuing discussions with other providers out there.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:50): My question is for the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister reassure students in my electorate in the west of the state that they won't have to travel to Mount Gambier to compete for just one of 20 places in Certificate III in Agriculture that will be available under the new program?

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is having trouble controlling—

Mr Pengilly: Breathing.

The SPEAKER: —yes, controlling his breathing today. I warn him a first time. Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his question. That question has been in part responded to by the Premier already and also the Minister for Education, and those sort of details—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well, I represent the minister for TAFE in this chamber. The minister is working through those issues, as has been advised to the house already today.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles.

Mr Pengilly: Two, Eddie!

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:51): Yes, two—a shower of riches today! My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister outline how the government is creating new opportunities in regional South Australia through the Regional Development Fund?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:51): As part of my agreement with the Premier, the government has committed to a range of initiatives, including increasing the Regional Development Fund from \$1.6 million per annum to \$15 million per annum—an investment of \$60 million in regional projects over four years. This fund, which aims to boost economic growth and productivity in regional South Australia and create jobs, has made an excellent start.

So far, in its first year of operation, that's 2014-15, grants have been awarded to 41 projects. These projects represent around about \$337 million in total investment in our state's economy, with a projected 665 new jobs being created in regional areas when these projects are completed. Bearing in mind also that some of these projects will take time to actually come to fruition, it's estimated that around about the same number of jobs are being created during the construction period of, in some cases, up to two years.

Expressions of interest for the second round closed recently, and I can inform the house that 88 applications have been received from across the whole of the state. These include seven from the Adelaide Hills region; 16 from the Barossa, Light and Lower North region; eight from the Eyre and Western region; 19 from the Limestone Coast; 11 from Murray Mallee; 12 from Yorke and Mid North; five from the Far North; four from the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island; and six from the McLaren Vale Character Preservation District.

This strong and widespread response is similar to the first round, which clearly indicates several very positive things to me. Local businesses and industry in our regions are up to the challenge. They are keen to develop new ideas and products, keen to innovate and find new markets for those products and, above all, they are willing to put their own money in to back their judgement, with support from the government. It's been tremendously heartening to see the range of projects, large and small—the Treasurer has already indicated some of the projects that are in Port Augusta; Sundrop is one of those—taking shape, and I look forward to travelling around the state and announcing more projects later this year.

The response to the enhanced Regional Development Fund has been very positive from the regions, and I am sure that all of us here will see the best and most innovative of the 88 projects now up for consideration starting to come to fruition later in the year. I commend this fund to the house as a stimulator of regional activity and jobs growth.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. How does the minister see the significant reduction in places for Certificate III in Agriculture as possibly supporting the government's commitment to regional development, food production and agriculture?

Members interjecting:

Mr Whetstone: And you guys are sitting back there, hey?

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is on two warnings. The Deputy Speaker tossed him under the sessional orders earlier in the week. We wouldn't want to see him go again.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:55): The entire point about the way that the WorkReady program is being constructed is to allow people to study something that will lead to a job. What we don't want is to have courses where people are spending time getting a qualification for which there is not enough work. So, with the very heavy data-driven process that has been gone through to determine where there are vacancies and where there is an inadequate number of qualified people, we'll have a fully subsidised approach.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:56): Supplementary: is the minister aware that there is a shortage of skilled workers in agriculture?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:56): Not being the minister for WorkReady, what I would do is offer for anyone to have a comprehensive briefing on the way in which this is being determined. This is being done with a particular outcome in mind, which is to qualify people for jobs.

TRAMLINES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Will the minister confirm that his government will not meet their 2013 promise to deliver trams to the western suburbs as outlined as a short-term project in the government's 30-year transport plan?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:57): I thank the deputy leader for her question. I think the question was: will I confirm that we won't be meeting our commitment in 2013? No, I won't confirm that.

HEAVY VEHICLES

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the implementation of the government's 90-day project into heavy vehicle productivity for primary producers?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:57): I thank the member for her question. In November 2014, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA partnered with Primary Producers SA for a 90-day project into improving heavy vehicle productivity for this important sector of South Australia. Over 600 submissions from primary producers and stakeholders across the state were received throughout this process. The response was so significant that the government needed to extend submission times to allow all proposals to be considered as part of this 90-day project.

In March, and as part of the Mid North country cabinet in the member for Stuart's electorate, I joined the Minister for Regional Development, the Minister for Agriculture, and Primary Producers SA chairperson and former premier, Rob Kerin, in Burra to release the final report. The

report details a suite of short, medium and long-term measures to improve heavy vehicle productivity across the state for South Australian primary producers.

I am pleased today to announce to the house the implementation of one of the first of the short-term measures from the report. The National Heavy Vehicle Regulator has today gazetted the approval of two combinations of quad road trains on sections of the Stuart and Olympic Dam highways. Specifically, quad road trains will be permitted from the commencement of the 53.5 metre road network at Port Augusta to the Northern Territory border and also between Pimba and Olympic Dam along the Olympic Dam Highway. South Australian transport and agricultural industries, in particular the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association of South Australia, strongly supported this change as part of the project, and this will bring South Australia in line with the Northern Territory. Importantly this change will allow heavy vehicle operators to uncouple road trains and continue their trips without having to reconfigure truck and trailer combinations. I am advised that this will create productivity improvements of at least 8 per cent for the primary production sector.

I am advised by industry that, through the use of these quad road train combinations, operators will be able to carry at least another 3.5 tonnes on their vehicle, a great outcome for primary producers and heavy vehicle operators. This is all about improving the productivity of our road freight network in South Australia's economic competitiveness, particularly for our agricultural sector.

This is noting the quarterly Rabobank Rural Confidence Survey released this week showing that confidence in the South Australian farming sector was at its highest level since early 2011. However, we know that there is more to do. The government will be implementing more of the short-term measures outlined in the 90-day report over the coming months.

I am advised that the approval of tri-axle dollies, which will further increase productivity for primary producers and truck operators, is progressing through formal local government consent processes, and I have asked for this to be resolved as soon as possible. I look forward to providing further updates to the parliament as this work progresses.

TEA TREE GULLY STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister advise the house about the recent outstanding efforts of the volunteers of the Tea Tree Gully State Emergency Service unit?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:01): My life wouldn't be worth it, would it? I thank the honourable member for his question and I would also like to acknowledge the interest of the member for Florey in this topic as well, as I understand this unit supports those two regions and those areas.

The South Australian State Emergency Service has been coming to the community's aid during our hour of need for more than 50 years. Some of the brave exploits of the SES are documented in a new book I officially launched on 16 May, called *In Times of Need*. The book charts the rich history of the SES. All 67 SES units, as well as past staff and volunteers, were asked to contribute material and photos to the book. I would encourage all members who would like to read this book and do not have a copy to contact my ministerial office and I am happy to provide their electorate office with a copy of the book for themselves and also their communities, because it is certainly a history worth reading.

One of the oldest units in South Australia is the SES Tea Tree Gully unit. I also acknowledge the Prospect State Emergency Service, which turned 50 just recently, and the Enfield State Emergency Service, which turns 50 later this year, which started as civil defence units back in the Cold War period. I am sure that there will be plenty of well-deserved celebrations and I congratulate the unit on their achievement and ongoing support to South Australia. As I mentioned, I would like to recognise the members for Florey and Newland who have been strong supporters of the Tea Tree Gully SES unit, as well as the other emergency services in their electorates.

The unit, based on Tolley Road, St Agnes, has 45 members who provide a host of services and capabilities to the community 24 hours a day, seven days a week, including general rescue, land

search, and responding to storm damage. The unit also provides a specialist response to the Northern Adelaide District encompassing swift water, vertical and confined space rescue. The unit also assists the other emergency service agencies when needed.

In January this year, 14 members of the unit provided critical support to the CFS during the Sampson Flat fires. The other volunteers from the unit were utilised in managing their regular responses for the Tea Tree Gully area as well as assisting and backfilling neighbouring units that were supporting the response at Sampson Flat. The unit manager, Phil Tann, does a fantastic job running the unit and all of his volunteers are recognised across the state for their dedication, experience and specialised skills. Consequently, the unit often has a waiting list of members wanting to join.

Many of the members here today will be aware of the SES State Rescue Challenge which is held every two years. The event was held over two days last month at the CFS State Training Centre at Brukunga in the Adelaide Hills, which I was able to attend. The challenge involved many scenarios where SES units competed against each other, including in the simulation of a mass casualty exercise involving a plane crash.

The team representing the Tea Tree Gully unit comprised a number of members, and on the day they won another challenge. They not only won this challenge but they now have 12 consecutive times since 1992—an absolutely amazing and dominant achievement spanning three decades. As the South Australian winners, Tea Tree Gully will travel to Canberra in September this year to represent the state in the National Disaster Rescue Challenge. I have no doubt that the unit will continue punching above their weight on the national stage. I wish them well. I would like to congratulate all the competitors of the day.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. Member for Mitchell.

SEAFORD RAIL LINE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Given that the first breakage of the high-voltage electric wire near Honeypot Road on the Seaford rail line was 12 months ago, did the minister see the report or receive a briefing on the metallurgical investigation ordered by his department to determine the cause of the faults, and what conclusions did he follow from that report?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:05): I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. I know he continues his keen interest in this matter. I think I referred yesterday, and I can't quite recall whether I said it in the chamber or in a radio interview that the member for Mitchell and I were jointly doing, that after the first occurrence of the cable parting in June of last year a full line inspection was done. I mentioned that after the line inspection, and given the cable had parted, it was thought to be a problem with the installation, and in fact there have been references to the installation of the line and whether it was welded appropriately.

Given that no further faults were found at that inspection, it was thought by the department that it was likely to be, at that point in time, an isolated incident. So, after that particular matter was dealt with, it was repaired and services were restored. It hasn't been until the subsequent line issue that a further full inspection of the line was undertaken and further problems, not just relating to the one that has been identified as causing the issue for the outage on I think it was 15 May, were determined, and a section of wire has been identified to be replaced.

I appreciate the concern, and I think it is a natural concern, that this happened approximately a year ago and yet it has recurred and why the issue we have suffered in the last two weeks wasn't previously identified. But I am advised that it has only been from the subsequent occurrence of the parting of the line in proximity to Christie Downs that further issues have been identified with the cable.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is that part of your policy development? How's that going? Have you got one yet? No, I didn't think so.

Grievance Debate

AUSTRALIA POST

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:07): In recent weeks, there has been a number of speeches in this place about the quality of service provided by one of Australia's oldest and best-known organisations. This organisation has been operating for over 200 years and has been a steadfast provider of a vital public service. It appears, however, that this hallowed institution has lost its way in recent years, and I am afraid that my own personal experience, coupled with regular complaints from constituents, reveals a broken culture where customer service is well down its list of priorities. That organisation is Australia Post.

I listened with interest when the member for Colton and the member for Kurna regaled us with interesting yet sad tales about the bureaucratic bangles, the poor customer service and the excuses about why Australia Post did not seem to care about basic customer service and complicated basic services with bureaucratic processes.

I looked up the vision and mission of Australia Post on their website. It is not a very exciting vision. It is motherhood central, but the maternal goodness reaches a crescendo with this particular piece of fiction: 'innovative easy-to-use products and services' followed by 'friendly service from knowledgeable staff'. Well, I would wipe out all of Australia Post's mission and vision, replacing it with a succinct phrase: 'The computer says no.'

I want to put on record just a couple of anecdotes about Australia Post's less than admirable customer service. This week, my office was contacted by a Hallett Cove resident who was making a complaint on behalf of a range of residents living in neighbouring streets with similar names. It appears that those residents often have mixed-up deliveries from Australia Post. Residents have complained on numerous occasions about this matter and have had no joy.

This week my office decided to contact Australia Post on behalf of these residents and had mixed success. The first person we contacted simply dismissed the issue; they did not want to have anything to do with us and came up with excuses and said that this was a personal matter which could not be dealt with by an MP's office and so must be dealt with directly with the constituent. Our interest was not in the contents of the letters: it was getting the letters into the letterboxes.

We rang back a few hours later to try our luck again and to find an employee who had read the mission statement, and suddenly the computer said yes. The issue is now being looked into because it seems that this is no longer a privacy issue, and we even have a customer reference number to help us follow through the complaint. That is one Australia Post story. Let me share another.

Recently, my personal PO box was due for its annual renewal, and I have to admit that I was a few days late in paying it. Tardiness, yes, but, as soon as I realised I had missed my annual payment, I popped online to Australia Post's special computer portal (they call it SecurePay because you cannot use your regular internet banking BPAY system with Australia Post), but alas the computer said no. It seems that if someone misses the payment deadline it is not possible to pay online any more. Australia Post makes it even more difficult to clear one's debt, insisting that customers must front up face to face in an Australia Post office in person. This is obviously challenging for people who work between 9am and 5pm, or longer hours.

Yes, I admit tardiness in paying my bill, but surely I should have been able to pay it online, even if a couple of days late. And another story: this week my office was organising a mail-out where we were required to get a reply-paid service. We had had a reply-paid service a year or so ago so we called up and asked whether we could use it again. Did the computer say no? Well, it seemed in this instance the computer did not even know.

The Australia Post employee we spoke to had no idea—not a clue. We asked whether we needed to pay an annual subscription and whether it was up to date. We were told that we should know this, not them. We said that we did not know and that was why we were checking with them,

because we did not want to put a reply-paid address on something that would not get back to us. The computer did not know and the Bright electorate office remains clueless.

Australia Post seems to have been a good organisation which has lost its way. My few examples added to those of the members of Kaurana and Colton, and no doubt many of my colleagues paint this same picture. Much has been made out of the pay packet received by Ahmed Fahour, Australia Post's CEO (and also unfortunately a director of another lacklustre organisation, the Carlton Football Club). Mr Fahour may have been brought in as an axe-wielding toecutter, but it is time he focused on creating an organisation with a culture that truly puts the customer first. I will be writing to minister Turnbull to raise my concerns about the performance of Australia Post and I will keep the house abreast of any response that I receive.

Time expired.

VOLUNTEERS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:12): I rise today to thank South Australia's 900,000 volunteers—900,000 out of a population of 1.6 million, that is an incredible effort. Their efforts contribute to an estimated 1.7 million volunteer hours per week. While we recognise National Volunteer Week in May and celebrate Volunteers Day in South Australia on 8 June (on Monday), it is important to reflect on this outstanding contribution to our community, socially and economically.

From a financial perspective, just in our state alone, volunteering is estimated to be valued at almost \$5 billion annually. Volunteers also keep our not-for-profit sector afloat. Of the 600,000 not-for-profit organisations in Australia, only a tenth of those employ paid staff. What our volunteers contribute may be skilled or unskilled, from auditing the books of an organisation, teaching a language, administering first aid at events, cooking meals or coaching a children's sports team, to collecting donations, driving a community bus or sharing a cup of tea with someone who is lonely or confined to their home.

Volunteer work is vital too within the many hundreds of groups, clubs and associations in my electorate of Elder, including the great team of Edwardstown Meals on Wheels, those in aged-care facilities and retirement villages, businesses, childcare centres, kindergartens and schools, churches, charities and religious groups, councils, emergency services, environmental groups, health providers, lobby groups, multicultural groups, Neighbourhood Watch chapters, resident action groups, RSLs and service clubs, senior groups, recreation and sports clubs, and the list goes on.

Another organisation from my electorate I would like to mention is the Maria Goretti Social Group, which has been offering a weekly social and recreational gathering for over 50s of Italian heritage for many years in Ascot Park. In addition to weekly bingo, cards, bocce and yoga, they host a home-cooked lunch on the last Monday of the month, and I can attest to the fabulous quality of the cooking.

About Time: South Australia's History Festival 2015, which was held last month in May at sites around the state, was an important reminder to all of the great volunteer work done to unearth, preserve and pass on the stories of our local heritage. Here I make mention of the Marion Historical Society and the great work that volunteers do in this area, as do all the Marion Historic Village Display Centre volunteers, who ensure the past of Marion continues to be told through stories and displays. I can attest to the outcomes of their great passion and commitment.

As well as helping people of all ages throughout our community, volunteers are helping themselves. As research shows, just a few hours of volunteer work makes a positive difference to people's state of mind and wellbeing. Adelaide's National Volunteer Week parade and Volunteer's Day Concert are timely reminders to thank our volunteers, wherever they might be working, and whether it be in times of crisis, catastrophe or celebration.

Last month, I was honoured to represent the Minister for Volunteers (Hon. Zoe Bettison) at the St John Community Care National Volunteer Week function in my area, a great group of people with an infectious love of community. In the same week, I also had the pleasure of representing the health minister, the Hon. Jack Snelling, at the SA Ambulance Service event for those who have volunteered for service for 25 years or more.

I am pleased to recognise and applaud the merits of the people who volunteer for these magnificent life-saving services as well as help our community in a vast range of ways. In the case of both groups, their service and commitment to the South Australian public is without doubt inspiring. As well as giving of their time and talents to raise money and awareness, St John volunteers also form the back bone of the service's wonderful Community Care program. Through this program volunteers help the frail aged, the sick, the isolated and the disabled by taking them on social outings or shopping.

The SA Ambulance Service is also an integral part of our health system and, last financial year, volunteer ambulance officers treated around 15,000 patients across the state. These are just a few of the ways our volunteers make our communities a better place to live. Thank you to all of our volunteers, both in Elder and across our state and nation, for all that you do. We salute you and thank you.

BLACKWOOD TOTALLY LOCALLY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:17): I rise today to talk about Totally Locally Blackwood. Last Saturday, 30 May, saw the launch of Totally Locally. You may ask: what is Totally Locally?

Mr Gardner: What is Totally Locally?

Mr DULUK: Totally Locally, to quote Totally Locally, is about opening your eyes to the great independent shops and businesses which, in this case, are the gateway to Blackwood streets and nearby areas. Thirty-three small and local businesses in Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Hawthorndene and Eden Hills participated in the launch, and I would just like to mention these businesses: Blackwood Butchers, Blackwood Florist, Blackwood Lingerie, The Pilates Studio Blackwood, Willywags, Cherub's, The Artisan Tuck Shop, The Artisan Café, Blackwood Pharmacy, Country Meats, Habitat, Travis Hairdressing, Deb Smith Photography, the Meeting Place, Hillbilly's Café, My Girl Lollipop, Butterfly Press, Market on Main, Blackwood Village Chicken, Seafood & Chargrill, Amanda's Flowers, Urban Spirit, Blackwood Hire Centre, Strike A Light, Blackwood Book Exchange, Elegant Images, Suzies Hair Studio, Blackwood Natural and Remedial Solutions, French Wish, Cutting Connection, Blackwood Recreation Centre, Joan's Pantry, GD Wholesale Fruit & Veg and Coro Continental Meats.

Totally Locally is a concept that began in the United Kingdom in 2010. It is an award-winning social enterprise and shop local movement. Totally Locally supports independent retailers, producers, growers and services, be it legal, accounting, real estate, bakeries, florists or any type of small business service.

Essentially, the aim of the campaign is to promote the value of local shopping, celebrate their unique independent businesses and shops, create community events and a sense of community and ultimately lift the local economy. Today, Totally Locally has gone worldwide. It is in over 50 towns in the United Kingdom and many in Australia and New Zealand, including Birdwood, Roxby Downs and now Blackwood in South Australia. It is estimated that in Blackwood, and indeed as part of the greater Davenport area, if every adult spent \$10 per week in local independent shops instead of at the supermarkets, chain stores or online, that decision to spend that \$10 at a local business would inject an extra \$10.6 million into the local economy.

The structure of Totally Locally works on a grassroots basis and is estimated to return a tenfold benefit to that community. In an economic environment of rising unemployment, high youth unemployment, sluggish retail conditions and an inefficient and inflexible state taxation system, the concept of Totally Locally is refreshing. It is proactive and it is a positive step in the wider community ensuring that our small businesses are supported. As we know and as has been said many times, small business is the backbone of our economy. According to national accounting firm BDO, small business enterprises account for approximately 90 per cent of business conducted in South Australia.

The state government has its part in supporting small business and in many ways the government needs to get out of the way of business. In the same BDO survey I mentioned previously, conducted in February 2015, 64 per cent of respondents had encountered state government barriers to operating or expanding their business, with 32 per cent of those respondents advising that the main barrier to their business success was red tape and regulation. Education standards and

outcomes, especially in our vocational education sector, WorkCover rates and return to work, a federal wage award structure and many other issues all affect South Australian small business.

Totally Locally is a fantastic concept. It brings down to a community level the importance of supporting our local shops and the vibrancy they give our communities. I encourage other small business hubs to embrace the Totally Locally concept and support and promote small business in their local community. Congratulations to Heather Holmes-Ross, proprietor of The Artisan Tuck Shop & Café in Blackwood, for being the driving force behind this and for encouraging me to dress as the town crier last Saturday, spruiking the benefits of Totally Locally.

CLINICAL RESEARCH

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:22): I would like the member for Davenport to say 'Totally Locally' ten times in a row without tripping up! I rise today to speak to the fantastic work being done by our clinical researchers, as they work to connect and collaborate statewide, nationwide and internationally to combat the scourge of some of the most awful diseases. In this house again this week we have paid tribute to a wonderful trailblazing political leader in Joan Kirner. A role model and community leader whose legacy will ensure that this house is a truer representation of society than it ever was. This wonderful woman has, in recent years, succumbed in the cruellest way to cancer. Seventy-six really is too young in our modern world. It is with no fear that I make the assumption that every person in this house and in the other place has been personally and deeply affected by cancer, as well as many other cruel progressive and, most times, fatal diseases.

I have spoken before in this place about the need for support from all governments and community and corporate sectors for our research projects. As a country, but more importantly as a state, we have developed a reputation for outstanding and innovative medical research. I have many friends who use their amazing clinical skills to support trials in a vast array of fields, including cancer, cardiovascular, respiratory and neurological therapies. This work is recognised worldwide and we have a reputation that is a well deserved consequence of investment in and fostering of our universities, research institutes and clinicians. We have a culture of excellence in our health care and medical research.

On Tuesday night I was privileged to represent our Minister for Health at a dinner hosted by the Australian Society for Medical Research (ASMR). Colleagues from this and the other place were truly inspired by the work of Professor Ashok Saluja. This professor, over a career spanning nearly 40 years, has worked tirelessly in the field of cancer research. He is a man on a mission to cure pancreatic cancer. He was originally educated in India before moving to the United States where he gained a doctoral degree in biochemistry and spent 20 years at Harvard before joining the University of Massachusetts Medical School.

The life of a researcher is often a lonely one with many hours of hard work going unrecognised with the determination to succeed and truly change the course of history being a driving force. Pancreatic cancer is one of the most aggressive cancers with the five-year survival rate being amongst one of the lowest of all cancers. Around 2,500 Australians are diagnosed with exocrine pancreatic cancer each year and many of those people succumb to the disease within months. Over 30 years of sustained funding, Professor Saluja is now making some progress. It is fantastic news.

It was also inspiring to spend time with the amazing Australian Research Specialist, Dr Phoebe Phillips. She is the current president of the ASMR and she has been mentored through her PhD with Prof Saluja. She works with teams across Australia, including those from our own centre of excellence, SAHMRI. This centre sits within what will be one of the largest precincts of its kind in the southern hemisphere and is expected to have 8,000 clinicians, researchers and support staff working within it on completion, as well as supporting the development and launching the careers of 6,000 students.

Research underpins the work we do in all evidence-based practice prevention programs, not only in health but in education and crime prevention just to name a few. These areas of social policy are vital pillars to our wellbeing. We must keep the pressure on the federal government to ensure research funding is not diminished. We risk squeezing out our next generation of brilliant minds. There are many old quotes and cliches that support research as a best practice starting point approach to effecting social policy, so I close by saying that prevention is better than cure. There is

no point in closing the gate once the horse has bolted, and an apple a day will surely keep the doctor away.

LEADERS OF ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND PROTECTION

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:26): I am very pleased to have the opportunity to talk about the St Ignatius Leaders of Environmental Awareness and Protection group. St Ignatius is a proud school in my electorate. I am very pleased to participate with all of my local schools and, as members who listen to the grieves would be aware, I am always pleased to talk about the Morialta Citizenship Award. I was at a St Ignatius careers expo last week and a former winner of the Morialta Citizenship Award from St Ignatius, Claudia Floreani, came up to me and wanted to talk about this and that and to learn about the career that members of this house have participated in. For the record, my advice to everybody who is interested in what to do to become a politician, I encourage them to go and get some other skills and then think about coming in here down the track. Relying on running for politics can be a cruel twist of ambition for many people.

Claudia was pleased to tell me about the group that she is working with, Leaders of Environmental Awareness and Protection, and I am very proud of this group of young people in my electorate who run a number of projects at their school. They look after part of Fifth Creek that runs through St Ignatius. This year the group is fundraising and raising awareness of the opportunities related to Pavegen tiles, which is one of the clean renewable energies available that we have in the modern world.

The group is aiming to raise \$5,000 for the installation of Pavegen tiles at the school so that they can have an installation at the school so that when students step on the tiles it will power a light of some description in the corridor. The hope is that the installation will spark conversations about renewable energy in the local community and provide a way for students to interact with a fun, interesting source of renewable energy.

Seeking to raise the \$5,000, they are running numerous fundraisers and events, for which I am pleased to offer some support, looking to raise awareness. As it is a worthy cause and one that I imagine a number of other members of parliament might have interested young people in their communities and in their schools, I thought it would be useful to bring to the house an awareness of what is happening at St Ignatius. I am sure a number of youth leadership groups, environmental groups and student councils around the schools where we all attend school councils might find it of interest.

I note that Pavegen's CEO Laurence Kemball-Cook came to Australia late last year, in October, to raise awareness of the work they are doing. It is a concept that was invented in 2009, whilst researching kinetic off-grid energy solutions in environments where low carbon technologies, like solar and wind, are not practical. Pavegen tiles can be used indoors and outdoors and they work best in areas of high footfall, such as transport and retail hubs and, of course, schools, because they are stepped on, obviously. The technology is integrated discreetly into the existing environment underfoot.

Installations include Heathrow Airport, the West Ham tube station in London and Federation Square in Melbourne, to name a few. I congratulate the St Ignatius Leaders of Environmental Awareness and Protection (LEAP) on the work they are doing and thank them for bringing it to my attention.

MINING SECTOR

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:30): Just over one year ago, I gave my maiden speech in this chamber. In the speech, I discussed the importance of mining in the Giles electorate and the importance of mining as a contributor to the economic wellbeing of our state. I pointed out the significant increase in the number of jobs in the iron ore sector in South Australia as a result of the export of haematite. Iron ore mining jobs went from approximately 250 jobs in 2002 to close to 1,500 jobs at the time of my maiden speech.

In the speech, I did flag a serious concern when I said that we were entering a period of oversupply in the iron ore market, and we were doing so at a time of softening demand from China. The consequences of those two factors are now with us, following the mothballing of two iron ore

mines in the north of our state and the associated job losses. The headline figure from Arrium, as a result of the mothballing of Peculiar Knob near Coober Pedy, was the loss of 580 jobs. Since that announcement, there have been further job losses near Whyalla in the Middleback Ranges. The first casualty in South Australia due to the fall in iron ore prices was the magnetite exporter, IMX.

Arrium has gone from exporting close to 13 million tonnes per annum to nine million tonnes through its port at Whyalla. There is ongoing uncertainty about the future of iron ore prices. Currently, the price is bouncing around the \$62 a tonne mark, but it did recently go under \$50 and it could go under \$50 again. The impact of job losses in Whyalla has been significant with additional jobs lost at the steelworks, independent of the iron ore price. The impact of the mothballing of Peculiar Knob was not concentrated in one community, given the fly-in fly-out nature of the operation.

One community that has experienced concentrated job losses is Roxby Downs. I said in my maiden speech that Roxby Downs had taken a major hit with the loss of approximately 800 jobs on the heels of the decision not to go ahead with the expansion. There have been additional job losses since then, partly as a result of operational problems. Unfortunately, further large job losses look likely in order to drive productivity improvements. By the time the job losses have finished, we might be looking at a figure not far short of 2,000 over a period of a few years.

When you consider that the population, not counting fly-in fly-out workers, was 5,032 in 2014, you can appreciate the magnitude of the losses. The impact on employees, families and Roxby Downs based businesses has been very hard indeed. Clearly, Roxby Downs and the Olympic Dam mine will be there for many years to come and, looking to the future, there is the potential for additional growth. The next few years, however, are going to be very difficult.

The two major population centres in my electorate are undergoing major challenges. The two centres differ when it comes to demographic make-up and population movement. Whyalla has a relatively stable population with a large number of long-term residents. Roxby Downs experiences a far greater population turnover, with census figures indicating that 28 per cent had arrived in the year before the census and 58 per cent of the population did not live in Roxby Downs five years prior.

Roxby Downs does have long-term residents, but there is a large number of people who work there for three to five years before leaving. We need to turn our minds to how we can assist the north of our state over the coming year or two. We cannot control commodity prices but, as I said in my maiden speech, we can control how we plan as a state to take advantage of our mineral resources over the long term. There are a number of specific things that we can do that I intend to canvass over the coming months. Although exploration and mining have taken a hit, they will remain an important element of the state economy.

Motions

JUMPS RACING

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:36): I move:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report on jumps racing in South Australia, and in particular:

- (a) whether or not it should be banned; and
- (b) any related matters.

Yesterday, I gave notice that I intended to establish a select committee to investigate and report on jumps racing and whether it should be banned in South Australia. I come before the house to commend the motion.

As I have said on previous occasions, there is continuing community concern about this form of racing, particularly since the South Australian Jockey Club announced in 2014 that it wanted to cease jumps racing at the Morphettville Racecourse. Thoroughbred Racing SA, which is the overarching body that looks after racing in South Australia, insisted that the SAJC continue with jumps racing at Morphettville.

Before that went ahead, I said to Thoroughbred Racing SA that I thought it would have been a good idea for them to just let that happen, let the SAJC have its way and not have jumps racing down at Morphettville. They went ahead with it. It caused more community angst and discussion, so I think the best way to get to the bottom of it is to set up an inquiry, actually ask the questions and get the facts and what people think from all sides of the debate.

I know that there are somewhere between 24 and 26 jumps horses trained in South Australia. I know there are people within the racing industry who think that jumps racing has no future in South Australia or anywhere, for that matter. By the same token, I do realise that there are people with differing views, and that is why it is very important for us to establish an inquiry of this kind so that the government, the opposition and other people involved in politics can be informed.

We can give people a voice. We can let people have the opportunity to come before the committee as witnesses or to write submissions to the inquiry. I have been fortunate enough to be on some of these committees before, and I think they work in a very good way. You sit there and you listen to both sides of the arguments and then, at the end of it, you come up with a report.

When I earlier proposed that we have a joint committee, the opposition here tried to change the wording of the motion to take out the question of whether jumps racing should be banned in South Australia. There is not much point in setting up an inquiry if you do not actually have a question that needs to be answered.

The opposition claimed that there was some bias in setting up the committee and that it was all angling towards a ban on jumps racing. That is just ridiculous because the question was: should it be banned? The answer could be yes or no. It was not saying that it would be banned, it was asking should it be banned. It just showed a very sensitive underbelly of the opposition to this issue. We heard—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, we have reintroduced it. That is what we want: we want an answer at the end of this process. We do not want an inquiry that does not come up with an answer to the question that many South Australians are asking themselves. When I got up to speak to that initial motion, I think I was the most balanced and fair speaker who came into this house and spoke to the motion.

Mr Gardner: Even if you say so yourself.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Well, go and check the *Hansard* if you have a disagreement with it. I got up and said, 'One side of the argument says this, the other side of the argument says this.' The member for Chaffey got up and said that 'this must remain a parliamentary committee that looks at the facts and is not swayed by personal opinion'. I agree wholeheartedly with that, but the member for Chaffey then basically spoke from the notes provided by Thoroughbred Racing SA about the percentages of increases, and things like this, and swayed it all one way, so he showed his bias. Then we had speaker after speaker on that side get up and show their bias towards the continuation of jumps racing.

I have a personal opinion on jumps racing: I think it is a thing of a bygone era. There are 24 to 26 horses being trained in South Australia to go over jumps. Do we really need to continue it? I do not think we do, but I did not put my hand up to be on the committee. We are going to propose three members from this side of the chamber to be on the committee, and I have no idea what their views are on jumps racing, and that is exactly the way these committees should be set up. I think any person who spoke on the opposition side with their very biased opinions about jumps racing should rule themselves out of being on the committee.

I think that would be the decent thing to do and it would concur with the statements of the member for Chaffey when he said that 'this must remain a parliamentary committee that looks at the facts and is not swayed by personal opinion'. Well, you have just ruled yourself out and a few of your colleagues have ruled themselves out on your very basis, on what you have said—that 'this should remain a parliamentary committee that looks at the fact and is not swayed by personal opinion'. Your personal opinion and the member for Mount Gambier's personal opinion, the member for Morphett's personal opinion, the member for Hammond's personal opinion—

Mr Whetstone: Everyone's got an opinion.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —are very, very clear.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Not everyone's got an opinion.

The Hon. P. Caica: You talk about preconceived—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I'm on my feet. Sit down!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down and be quiet, all of you. Goodness gracious me, you are all on two warnings. I would not push it any further than I had to. I remind you all of 142; I remind you that you are not defying me, you are defying the Chair and bringing the house into disrepute. I ask the minister to continue his remarks—

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I don't think it's going to be a worthwhile contribution.

The Hon. P. Caica: I'm already on one warning, ma'am.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I am looking at you, and you will be on two in a minute. Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thanks again, Deputy Speaker. Members of the committee should be prepared to listen and consider all evidence for and against, regardless of their personal views. Just to recap on where we are with jumps racing in South Australia, it is held at Oakbank, Morphettville, Gawler, Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge. As I mentioned before, many people within the racing industry do not think there is a future for jumps racing, so it is not a matter of people who are against jumps racing all being outside the industry; people should take that into consideration.

In 1991, a Senate inquiry concluded that serious concerns about the welfare of horses participating in jumps races were based on the significant probability of a horse suffering serious injury or even death as a result of participating in these events. The committee concluded that there is an inherent conflict between these activities and animal welfare and recommended relevant state governments should phase out jumps racing within three years. That was in 1991; it is now 2015, and nothing has been done in South Australia or Victoria, the two states where it is still legal for jumps racing to continue. I understand that the opposition want to have some time before they come back and continue the discussion on—

Mr Gardner: It was on the *Notice Paper* yesterday.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, and we would be happy to go along with that. I look forward to the contribution of other members of the house when next we discuss this.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

Bills

NATURAL GAS AUTHORITY (NOTICE OF WORKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 March 2015.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:44): I am very excited to speak about the—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: —yes, it would be handy—Natural Gas Authority (Notice of Works) Amendment Bill. I indicate that I am not the lead speaker, and I am sure that the member for Stuart and other members will have fascinating contributions to make in due course. Obviously, this is an important area of public policy, and the purposes of the bill are significant because it needs to be

amended to require landowners and others, such as road builders who wish to perform certain types of work, such as excavating, drilling, planting trees or shrubs or using explosives on land subject to statutory easements on which natural gas pipelines are situated, to give consent to that work.

The opposition's case more fully will be put by the member for Stuart in his typically forensic, detailed and considered manner, supporting of course as he does, and as the opposition does, the industry.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a thrill in store for us.

Mr GARDNER: I think, Deputy Speaker, you are going to be very excited by what is ahead—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And knowledgeable.

Mr GARDNER: You will become deeply informed. I just wanted to say for myself that I have appreciated the opportunity to spend a bit of time looking into natural gas matters. I appreciated the opportunity to go up to Moomba a couple of years ago and meet some of the workers and some of the executives who have been working on these issues. The operations are very important for South Australia, and its continued and positive development as an industry will be appreciated by all South Australians.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:46): I apologise if I held the house up a little. I was expecting this to be the bill after one at the moment, but that was clearly a mix-up. Let me say at the outset that I think this is a pretty straightforward bill, and I appreciate the information briefings from the minister and his staff on this issue. Essentially, what we are really talking about here is the Natural Gas Authority Act 1967, which applies to the Moomba gas pipeline and the Katnook gas pipeline and their associated spurs to Port Bonython, for example, and, as I understand it, just trying to get things back on track the way they were.

The Natural Gas Authority Act 1967 was amended in 1995 when the pipelines were sold to Epic Energy. These amendments extinguished the previous registered easements and replaced them with statutory easements. However, this did not include a requirement for landowners to give notice to or gain the consent of the pipeline owner for work near the pipeline which did previously exist.

An important aspect of what the government is establishing here is that the pipeline owner may not object to the proposed work, unless the owner of the pipeline is of the opinion that the work would interfere with the safety or operation of the pipeline or associated equipment, and that the owner of the pipeline would have to set out very clearly reasons why the owner of the pipeline was concerned. That seems pretty straightforward, and the opposition supports this bill.

I have a few questions which, hopefully, we can resolve quite easily, but for the benefit of those who read *Hansard* I will put a few things on the record to summarise really clearly what we are talking about in a little more detail. One of the key distances is: what is near the pipeline and when do people really need to come and ask for this permission? The bill and the act specify that easements subject to this bill may vary between 15 to 25 metres in width for the main pipeline and 3 to 15 metres in width for the small lateral/spur pipelines.

The bill requires landowners, lessees and other parties such as road and rail operators to seek permission for prescribed work near pipelines. The bill also outlines the process to be followed to reach a resolution if consent is not granted. Prescribed works, and this is really getting to the nub of it, include the following:

- (a) excavating, drilling, installing or erecting any pit, well, foundation, pavement or other structure; or
- (b) disturbing or altering the grades and contours of the servient land; or
- (c) planting trees or shrubs; or
- (d) storing plant machinery, equipment or materials; or
- (e) using explosives.

The bill proposes that the way the communication would work, whenever a landowner wants to do any of these activities, is that landowner or other parties must give 21 days notice of proposed work on the pipeline easements. Within 14 days of receiving the written notice, the authority must consent

or object to the proposed works with an option to extend this period by mutual agreement or negotiation. I note on that point that it would be possible for the pipeline owner to come back to the party that would like to do the work sooner if that was practical, and I am sure in many cases that would be sensible, particularly for very minor and routine, regular work that that landowner or operator did on a regular basis that the pipeline owner/operator was very familiar with.

The next stage in the communications is the pipeline owner must not object to proposed work—and I say this again, because this is actually very important—unless the owner is of the opinion that the work would interfere with the safety or operation of the pipelines, and must set out the reasons for the objection in the notice to the landowner or other party. That is obviously very important and that gives some comfort to the people who would need to do this work from time to time: the pipeline owner cannot be obstructionist. I have no reason to believe that they would or have any interest in that, but it is important that that is clearly on the record.

If the owner of the pipeline gives notice of an objection, the owner must notify the minister of the objection. So, that is saying, if there is a problem, at least some broader understanding and notification of the problem or perceived problem must be given to the government, essentially, so it is not just the two people directly involved. The minister may mediate between the parties in order to arrive at mutually satisfactory terms under which the landowner or other party may carry out the proposed work. So, the minister may choose to get involved or may just leave it up to the parties.

If the minister decides to attempt mediation, the minister must give the involved parties notice of his or her decision within 21 days of receipt of the notice. If the minister does not give notice after 21 days, it will be taken that the minister has decided against personally attempting to settle the dispute, and let us hope that that would be because the minister believes that it would be very easy to have the issue resolved between the two key parties. If the dispute is not successfully resolved by the minister or the minister does not attempt mediation, the landowner or other party may apply to the Warden's Court for resolution.

That is really just a quick summary of what we are talking about here, and it all seems pretty straightforward to me. This is, of course, so that the pipeline, which carries gas, is as safe as possible. It makes great sense. You would not want people without permission or knowledge coming and doing any sort of work, particularly deeper drilling or excavating pits or wells or any of the other issues that I mentioned before, without at the very least the pipeline owner/operator knowing about it. This gives the pipeline owner/operator the opportunity to actually give permission and potentially just adjust the work into sort of, 'We're not quite comfortable with exactly what you have planned, but if you were to change your work plan this way or that way, that would be fine with us.'

An area that I would like to receive some clarification from the minister on when he has the opportunity to speak shortly is just with regard to exactly who has to seek the permission, because largely the bill talks about the landowner. If we think about a pipeline running through a farm, for example—freehold land—and that farmer wants to do some quite sensible work, it seems logical, of course, that the farmer would go and seek that permission, or if it was through a station, as much of this pipeline is in the north, that it would be the station lessee. But, minister, I would like some clarification on whether at different times it would be the landowner/lessee or licensee of the land versus the actual operator.

I am thinking specifically with regard to railway lines; so, where railway lines might intersect. For example, where national Highway 1 might intersect the pipeline. As I understand it, in those situations, typically but not necessarily, the state government would still be the landowner. So, if you think about a tract of land that might be leased long term to an operator, such as Genesee & Wyoming Australia, would it actually be Genesee & Wyoming Australia as the lessee of that land that needs to seek the permission? Would it be the state government talking to itself because it is the landowner? Would it be potentially ARTC as a company that might be involved in the operation, or if they were to bring in a significant contractor to do a significant piece of work, would it be the contractor who would be required to seek the permission?

There are multiple layers of involvement in the work that takes place, and it may not even be possible, of course, to say definitively how it works, but even just to provide some guidelines to operators with regard to how they would go about trying to deal with that sort of situation.

The other question that I have for the minister, which I am pretty sure could be dealt with easily and straightforwardly but which I would love on the record, relates to emergency situations. Say you happen to have a train or a road train accident right where the railway line or the road happens to intersect and some emergency work is necessary, I am sure that the government would not expect written permission, 14 days' notice, etc. I am sure there would be an expedient way in which those sorts of issues could be dealt with, but I would be grateful if the minister would just put on to the record how he would expect the government and subsequent governments would deal with that sort of thing.

You imagine a train derailment. Bad luck if it happens to be right where the railway crosses the pipeline, there would not be clearly time for the process that is required under this bill to be dealt with, but there would be a very common-sense approach, I am sure, and I would be grateful for the minister to put that on to the record.

Let me close by saying that, clearly, this is so that we do not have the very significant type of disruption that the communities of Port Pirie and Whyalla experienced recently when the gas pipeline was—and it is still to be discovered—either damaged or not maintained to a significant standard, or whether, perhaps, there was a natural disaster, such as an earthquake, that might have impacted upon it. That information I do not believe has been made public yet. That is not actually the issue, this is about protecting gas supplies both with regard to immediate safety in the vicinity of a potential breach of the pipeline and also with regard to the supply of the gas, because, of course, that would create significant disruption.

As I say, the opposition supports this bill. We think that it is quite straightforward, but I would be grateful if the minister could just respond with some guidelines, perhaps, with regard to who would actually have the technical obligation to seek the permission in the situations where there are multiple layers of involvement—so, landowner, land lessee or significant contractor doing the work, and then, of course, the emergency services situation as well. Thank you.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:58): I rise to speak to the Natural Gas Authority (Notice of Works) Amendment Bill 2015. Essentially this bill is about making sure that we have safe and sure access to gas, and the member for Stuart reflected on the recent breakdown of the line in the Mid North which caused significant disruption to both Port Pirie industry and homes and Whyalla. It is interesting to note what we are dealing with here when the owner of a property has to give notice to the owner of the pipe. Quoting from the bill, prescribed works means:

- (a) excavating, drilling, installing or erecting any pit, well, foundation, pavement or other structure; or
- (b) disturbing or altering the grades and contours of the servient land

I might be assuming too much, but I assume that means cultivation; however, the minister might be able to clear that up. I would expect that with a gas pipe—and I do not have gas pipes traversing my property, but I do have several telecommunications lines, a couple of fibre-optic cables and that kind of thing traversing my property, or they are just inside a fence on my property at Coomandook. I assume that you have to give a clearance anyway with any surface tillage next to a buried pipeline, but I will be interested in the minister's response to that. Also:

- (c) Planting of trees or shrubs; or
- (d) storing plant, machinery, equipment or materials; or
- (e) using explosives.

That is fairly obvious, to say the least. Certainly in regard to the legislation—I think this was where the member for Stuart was heading—in relation to statutory easement, '4—Amendment of section 11—Rights conferred by statutory easement' has to do with the owner of the pipeline. One of the amendments involves the words:

, and to carry out work on outlying land related to the installation, maintenance, repair or replacement of a pipeline across the servient land

Then we come to:

Section 11—after subsection (1) insert:

- 1(a) Any associated equipment installed on or under the servient or outlying land for the purposes of this section remains the property of the owner of the pipeline.

There is certainly a broad definition of associated equipment on top of the equipment that is already listed in the act. It adds telecommunications equipment. Obviously an Optus line or a Telstra optic fibre line technically would not be the owner of the pipeline. It would not own that line, but I would like that clarified by the minister, and also whether there is some sort of sub-leasing arrangement if it is on the same easement as the gas pipe.

In relation to cultivation, as I said, I do not have a gas line going across my property, but we can cultivate across where the telecommunication lines are because they are buried about a metre deep. Certainly the last guys that came through used a very good machine that basically ate rocks and spat them out in a thousand pieces. So they did a good job with anything they ripped up and the cleaning up.

It is great that there are a lot of conversations in this place and the other place about access to land, and it involves miners, and also access to land in regard to telecommunications, whether it is main trunk lines for water or other activities. In the main, personally, we have had very good conversations with people involved in that work because obviously we are on the main route between Adelaide and Melbourne and they need to have that access.

With respect to the owner of the land, they have to give notice of prescribed works on the land subject to statutory easement:

- (1) An owner or occupier of servient land must not carry out or permit the carrying out of prescribed works on or under the servient land without the prior written consent of the owner of the pipeline on the land.

There is a maximum penalty of \$60,000. There is a whole range of clauses involving the owner or occupier having to give at least 21 days' notice and the owner of the pipeline having to give notice in writing to the owner or occupier of servient land within 14 days after receiving that notice. One thing I am intrigued about is if the owner of the pipeline has to do work on the easement, but on the property owner's land, does he need to get permission from the property owner? What are the rules around that situation?

I would be interested to hear what because there is a lot of information that, in my mind, refers to the owner of the property getting permission from the owner of the pipeline so that the owner of the property can do works, which can be, as I said, as simple as planting trees or shrubs. Certainly, many farmers do that along fence lines and that is pretty well where an easement could be. So, I would like to have that clarified. Also, and it is probably covered under another act but whether the sea gas pipeline which comes up through our area from Victoria and the South-East is covered under this legislation. It is not printed in the explanatory documents. It talks about all the Katnook lines around Penola and then it is all about the main trunk lines out of Moomba.

There is no doubt of how careful you have to be with gas. I know the member for Chaffey has worked in the Cooper Basin, as have I. One of my first jobs up there when I was earthmoving back in 1982 was to dig some rubbish pits close to the main camp and close to the main Moomba plant with all those gas trains running and associated works. We made sure we had plenty of safety officials and plenty of people on hand because when you have a 70-tonne scraper and you are digging a rubbish pit, the last thing you need to do is scrape the edge of a gas pipe and get blown to wherever. So, you sort of had your heart in your mouth a bit. You had to trust the people and that the maps with the underground pipes, of which there were dozens and dozens of those in the area, were in the right place so that we could dig in the appropriate area.

There have been some horrific breakdowns of gas pipes. Thankfully, they are very rare events, especially the big dramatic ones. There was one on the Sydney pipeline (I think that was during the eighties) and it caused quite a problem, obviously, for gas supplies to the East Coast of the country. What I am saying is this seems like very sensible legislation but I am just wondering, in the main, what rights the actual owner of the land has in relation to the owner of the gas pipe or their associated contractors coming onto the owner's land, the freehold land, to do works. Yes, it is authorised under a statutory easement but I think there has to be each way communication.

As I said, I had easements put through our property and we know where they are and we had great communication from the companies. It is a lesson that a lot of companies could learn, and some do it far better than others, whether it is related to access to telecommunication lines, water pipes, gas lines, or whether it is access for mining arrangements. If people approach it the right way and everyone sits down sensibly and negotiates an outcome then, at the end of the day, that is the best way to do it. It does not cause bad blood or an outbreak of hate from the people whose properties are being accessed. With those few words, I commend the bill. I will be interested to hear the minister's clarification of some of the things I have spoken about. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:08): I will make a brief contribution. It is mostly around understanding the requirements of the permission to undertake works in near proximity. As I gather, when the pipeline was sold to Epic Energy there were some bits missing in the agreement with the permission to act anywhere near the trunk line or within those spur lines off that main trunk line. I worked in the industry for a number of years, and what I have seen in recent times, with the rupture in that spur line, was that that line is obviously made up of a high pressure line. I guess it would probably be a schedule 80.

However, what I would like to know from the minister is about the schedule of the pipe, the main trunk line and all of the other spurs with regard to those lines. If you are going to ask permission and consider the legalities around what it might mean, that recent rupture on that pipeline under pressure just highlights the vulnerability of that line. If anyone is going to undertake works near that pipeline—and it is not about whether they disturb the soil—it is about whether there is anything acidic on that pipeline. I understand that pipeline would be wrapped and would have weatherproof guard put in place so that it is not conducive to any external pressures, if you like.

My concern is the internal condition of the pipe. I understand that the internal condition of the pipe is not right down the line of what we are talking about today, but it will impact on whether permission is needed to do any of those works near the pipeline, just how vulnerable that pipeline is, just what sort of condition it is in from the inside, not from the outside in.

I note that this amendment bill is really about understanding if there is any intrusion into the area close to the pipe and whether there are any works that will interfere with that pipeline. In doing that, it is important to know that when any high-pressure pipe has external factors such as earthquakes, heavy equipment, a train derailment, or whether it be any anything that has come out of left field, it will impact on that pipe. If that pipe is in sound condition, it will probably weather the storm but if that pipe is scoured, if that pipe has any form of degradation internally, that will create some serious safety issues.

Anyone who comes within the close vicinity of that pipe—and it might be a matter of doing any earthworks in a close proximity and only releasing a small amount of pressure on one side of the pipe that will allow that to become unstable—and in a matter of a millisecond we could have another rupture. There could be maintenance teams, it could be anyone's life that could be in jeopardy, so one of the questions I would like to know is: if we are going to have the amendment bill require permission to undertake works within an area of that pipeline, do we know the condition of that pipeline? I think that is a critical question that needs to be answered because it is all very well that, while it is buried and out of eyesight, once any of those earthworks are undertaken it poses a risk, particularly if the pipe is not in good condition.

What I would like to learn today is: have there been any audits done on the condition of that pipe, the trunk line and the spare lines? What sort of vulnerability is there for anyone who is undertaking any earthworks in the close proximity of that pipe? That really is the essence of my contribution. In understanding that permission needs to be undertaken, anywhere you work in the oil and gas industry there is heavy regulation around permits, job requirements and work permits. I understand that, as does the minister I am sure. However, what we do not know is the condition of that pipe. Where is the audit that tells us that that pipe is safe to have any work undertaken in any close proximity? I look forward to the member for Stuart's forensic questioning of the minister and his team and I look forward to them perhaps answering some of the questions that I have just raised.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:14): I will start off by thanking the opposition for their support, I assume. I thank them

for the speedy passage and I thank the members for their comments. Some interesting questions have been raised, especially by the member for Hammond, about access. I think the comparison he made to mining companies having access to farmland versus pipeline owners is slightly different and nuanced. I do not mean any offence when I say this, but I think they are completely different.

Pipeline is also private property and the government has allowed an easement below the surface. Access to that land for work that may be required is not the same as a mining company seeking to do exploration or to do works on that property, so they are nuanced and different. For example, if a gas company has been advised by its maintenance team that an occurrence is imminent, it is not the same as a mining company wishing to do exploration on a farmer's freehold land and gaining access. Access has to be gained, and gained immediately, because there is a risk to life, a risk to industry, guarantee of supply, etc., so they are nuanced, but I do think—

Mr Pederick: What I'm talking about is 'in good faith'.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I agree, and that is where I think we are of one mind. There is a common-sense rule that applies to this sort of behaviour. If a government is continually hearing of owner-operators of these pipelines continually disturbing agricultural land for maintenance that may be unnecessary, or if no notice is being given at all for non-emergency work, the government will act.

I think what we are trying to do with this bill is keep the integrity of the pipeline to avoid there being any disturbance to the pipelines. We saw what happened to those regional communities when a pipeline did go down. It is quite dramatic, especially for small business. Often, when a pipeline goes down, the focus is on people not being able to have warm showers and people losing amenity in their homes.

Often the people who suffer a greater loss are those with businesses that cannot trade because landlords do not give exemptions for rent. People just lose trade and it does quite a bit of damage. Maintaining pipelines is very important, but I do think there is a lot of common sense that needs to be in place so that people are informed and there are people actively on private property to do work.

I cannot imagine a situation, unless it is an emergency, where the property owners are not notified in advance of works. If the member has examples of that occurring regularly, I am more than happy to have a look at making further amendments to the bill, because I think it is common courtesy that people are given notification that someone is about to enter their property. But, again, I also point out that there may be other circumstances that require immediate access, so I think the common-sense rule applies.

In terms of the questions the shadow minister raised concerning railway lines and emergency response to accidents—if a road train hits a train, for example—those pipelines are deeper at those intersections. I cannot imagine a situation where excavation below a certain level would be required to seek as an authorised event—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Grading the surface, so you can drag a truck out, that sort of thing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, the pipeline is at a depth of between 750 millimetres and 1.2 metres and, as we get to those intersections, they do get deeper. If there is going to be an interface between that occurrence, then there is a requirement. I am advised that it becomes a specified action under the act and you will have to notify, but if you are talking about an accident where a road train hits a train, train lines are usually elevated. Between the houses, I will try to get a more detailed answer about this for the member because I think what he is talking about is remedial work after the incident.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Some of the prescribed works that you would have to seek permission for could easily happen if you were just trying to clean up after an accident. Even tree planting requires permission—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are we going into committee over this?

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: I'm trying to avoid it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are trying to avoid it. This is not a quarrel between the parliament, surprisingly. I will get a more detailed answer for the member between the houses, and if he is not satisfied with that we will deal with it in the upper house where the government does not have the majority and he will have more influence. Obviously, the purpose of this bill, I think, is to try to put in place as much common sense as we can. The government is not attempting to take away people's private property rights but attempting to make sure we have a continuous supply of energy for our industry and households.

I thank the opposition. I have forgotten, sorry, the comments made by the member for Chaffey, but I will endeavour to speak to him after the debate and have them answered between the houses. I thank the members for their contribution, I thank the team at Energy for their hard work and diligence, and I thank the opposition for the speedy passage of this legislation.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:22): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:22): I just want to clarify some things. The issue I did not hear the minister address was about clarifying who needs to seek the permission when there are multiple layers of involvement. You could have a landowner, a land lessee or a licensee, and you could even have a—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I think we have missed the chance for that, haven't we?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, we have, but this really should have gone into committee, because if you have another question now it is all a bit late.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, it is my third reading speech.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But if you have another question—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am clarifying; I do not have another question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is good. I was just saying that if you did, it would be different—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am trying to save the house's time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, in the end we haven't.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: There is an issue I am happy to have resolved between the houses. Just to put it on the record again, I did not hear the minister address it and I am sure it was accidental. When there are multiple layers of ownership and involvement—an owner, a lessee, a licensee, a significant contractor who will take full responsibility for all the work on behalf of somebody else—who really needs to seek the permission?

There is another section I will touch on briefly just to clarify my question, and the minister can address this in his third reading contribution or between the houses. There are situations where there could have been an accident—and it could be a train derailment, or it could be a car or a truck accident—where it is physically nowhere near the depth of the pipeline but where there are many other prescribed works like tree planting, or even just storing machinery, plants, equipment or materials are prescribed works. Technically, even just parking a vehicle as part of an accident recovery process would be a prescribed work requiring permission under the bill.

For the minister's benefit, it is really not necessarily something that goes to a depth that is anywhere near the pipeline, but the bill does require that to do that sort of work, to even bring a piece of equipment onto the land surface within the easement to jack up or drag off a vehicle that has been

an accident, would technically require permission to be given. I am just seeking some clarification that that would be expedited in a common-sense way.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:24): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and thank you for your patience between the shadow minister and myself.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No-one is happy up here because it really should have gone into committee.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer the opposition spokesperson to the bill. The 'owner' as defined by the bill is:

- (a) if the land is unalienated from the Crown—the Crown; or
- (b) if the land is alienated from the Crown by grant in fee simple—the owner (at law or in equity) of the estate in fee simple; or
- (c) if the land is held from the Crown by lease or licence—the lessee or licensee; or
- (d) if the land is held from the Crown under an agreement to purchase—the person who has the right to purchase;

If a rail line goes through some private property, the rail line would have to tell the owner of the property that work is required. If there is an easement, the person who has the easement is the one who makes the application, but I will give the member a more detailed briefing from the department on that issue.

In terms of prescribed works, parking your vehicle is not a prescribed operation so the bill describes what 'prescribed works' means:

- (a) excavating, drilling, installing or erecting any pit, well, foundation, pavement or other structure; or
- (b) disturbing or altering the grades and contours of the servient land;—

which I think is the part that you are talking about in terms of grading, but removing a vehicle from an accident would not be prescribed work, I am advised. You are correct in saying the planting of trees and shrubs is prescribed work near a pipeline because some of the root systems could do damage.

- (d) storing plant, machinery, equipment or materials; or
- (e) using explosives.

In terms of parking emergency vehicles on top of a pipeline to deal with an emergency event, it is not a prescribed activity, I am advised, but storing plant and equipment permanently is, but if that is incorrect between the houses—that is the advice I have received—I will get that for you.

I understand the anxiety that members have and we do not want this to go crazy where all of a sudden there is an accident on a private road that goes over a pipeline and, as happens in regional areas, communities bond together to try and do the right thing and an excavator is brought along to try and get someone out of trouble, and all of a sudden they find themselves in breach. This is not what we are attempting to do, it is not a prescribed work, and that will not come into effect. If the member has examples of that occurring, I would be more than happy to come back to this parliament and remedy it.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (PARENTAGE PRESUMPTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

*Adjournment Debate***STOCK THEFT**

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:29): I am pleased to have this opportunity to advise the house of a very serious concern I have which affects my electorate but would certainly affect many other country electorates around the state, that is, a continuous and ongoing issue with regard to stock theft from farms and stations. This is a very difficult and delicate issue for quite a few reasons. I start by saying that it would actually be extremely difficult to swiftly and effectively steal sheep or cattle from a farm or station without having significant experience in the management of those animals—probably mobile yards, a truck or two, dogs, more than one person most likely, and importantly, a pretty good understanding of the lie of the land around this area. Having said that, this issue then always casts doubt upon neighbours when these sorts of things happen.

I am not saying that we have a big problem in rural, regional and remote South Australia with regard to neighbours stealing each other's stock. I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is that stock does go missing, and it is a very difficult thing to get on top of for another reason, too, because the more remote a property is and the larger a property is, the less frequently stock is actually handled. It could actually be weeks and sometimes even months before the owner of the stock realises that it has been missing because, while they might be diligent and responsible with regard to their management of stock and they are checking the condition of them and that the water and feed and all the other requirements are all there for them to be healthy and well maintained, they are not actually counting every single head of cattle or sheep on the place when they go about that work.

It is not hard to imagine five or 10 per cent potentially going missing without the owner actually realising for quite a long time. But, of course, five or 10 per cent is a relatively valuable amount. Stock prices at the moment are quite high, so unfortunately the higher the price of the stock, the more incentive there is for dishonest people to steal them. It is hard to get on top of because it is not something where you just wake up one morning and realise that the stock is missing, and then there is also that other delicacy about it, that awkwardness about it, to ask who on earth could have done this? Who could be the perpetrator, given the skills and knowledge that I mentioned before?

The government, with a fair bit of pride, a few years ago announced that it was reintroducing the stock squad, and that sounded great. It really did sound fantastic. It is a lovely title; it sounds like there will be well-resourced, active people out there on top of this job trying to make sure that everybody is very concerned of the risks of getting caught if they dare do this sort of thing, and if they do go about it successfully that the stock squad will be after them. That sounds good, but the reality is that the police officers currently tasked with this work in South Australia, and I believe there are only two of them specifically—there might be more and I stand corrected if necessary—do not have any extra resources.

It is not as if an officer has been told, 'This is your regular work and we would now like you to work on stock theft instead.' These are detectives who have just had said to them, 'Now you have an extra job, and by the way, you don't actually have any more time in the day, resources or equipment.' So, to be quite blunt, not much has been done about it. I can tell you: I know there are very capable SAPOL officers who would like to do this work, many of whom have the hands-on skills, interests, capacity and knowledge to be able to do it in rural areas. It is nothing wrong with SAPOL; it is just that they do not have the resources and capacity to do it because it is just thrown in as an extra job and, to be blunt again, it is an extra job that does not have a great deal of priority put on it.

In the electorate of Stuart, it happens very regularly that graziers will say, 'I know I have had 20 sheep stolen. I can absolutely guarantee I have had 20 sheep stolen,' or 30 cattle, or whatever, and it is a very difficult thing to track down because there is an interstate aspect, a freight aspect, and a processing through the abattoirs aspect to this. I have people come to me and say, '50 head of cattle went onto this truck and went down to the abattoir, but the abattoir only recorded 45 as going through their books.' So, 50 got off the truck, 50 went in the front door of the abattoir but on paper 45 went out in pieces through the back door of the abattoir. What happened to the other five? Well, they were probably processed as well but there is no record of that happening. If there is no record of the processing, there is no record of the financial transaction, who got money and how it all went.

It is a pretty complicated issue, I acknowledge, right from the recognition of the crime and the reporting all the way through to the local area sensitivities about how it might have happened—through transport and through processing—and how on earth do you recognise one chop, or one piece of steak or one sausage from another in trying to determine where it came from. It is a difficult situation.

However, the point that I would like to make in taking this opportunity to speak here is that the government can do more to address this issue. There are South Australian police officers who would gladly apply themselves to this work if they were given the time at work and the resources to do it. We also need to address very seriously the issue of NLIS identification working its way all the way through to the back door, or the refrigerator, if you like, of the abattoir, because that would then make it much more difficult for people to dispose of stolen stock.

Of course, the only reason that people steal something valuable is so they can dispose of it, either by trading or selling. There is a very real opportunity to clamp down on that. Queensland is the national leader, in my opinion, with regard to managing this problem, and I think that South Australia could look very closely at Queensland and learn a lot of lessons.

Queensland provides its officers who are tasked with working in this area with dedicated time to do it and with the appropriate equipment. South Australia Police, I understand, have just disposed of motorcycles that were acquired to do this work. They have just disposed of the motorcycles, so how on earth is an officer meant to get out and about and do it properly? Also, Queensland supports the people trying to do this sort of work with legislation that gives them more capacity to do the work when they are on a property.

Right now, if the police had good cause to believe that there was stolen stock on a property and if they could get the appropriate permission to essentially be allowed access to search the property—so, no different from looking for stolen goods in a house—they can look for stolen stock on a grazing property, but then what do you do? If they happen to find it, what do they do then? They are in the middle of the outback with 500 head of cattle. They have identified that a certain number of them are not meant to be there, they are not tagged appropriately, or perhaps even tagged inappropriately (although that does not happen too often because the people who steal the stock are clever enough to get rid of the wrong ear tags), but then what do they do?

They have no capacity to use the yards on that property. If hypothetically they are on a property because they believe that there is stolen stock there and they come across stolen stock, they are in the middle of a gigantic paddock and they say to the owner of that property, 'We want to use your yards. We want to draught the stock so that we can identify exactly which stock belongs to whom, etc.,' the owner of that property can say, 'No, you can't.' The owner of that property can say, 'Yes, you have a right to enter this property,' but the owner of the property can say, 'But you are not getting any permission from me to use my yards.' Then what do they do?

They are out in the middle of the outback—dust, flies, heat—they know they are the stolen cattle and they cannot do a thing about it other than just take some photos, which slows the whole process down. There is much more to say on this issue. I am nearly out of the allotted time, but this is an issue that this house needs to be advised of and this is an issue that the government needs to provide SAPOL with the appropriate resources to address rather than just talking about a stock squad that does not really exist.

ST CLAIR RESERVE

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (16:39): On 3 December 2009, on the last sitting day before the general election of March 2010, David Winderlich used parliamentary privilege to allege that I was guilty of corruption and 'worse than corruption' in connection with Charles Sturt Council's St Clair land swap.

After making the allegations, David Winderlich walked into the Parliament House bar and announced, 'I've just tipped a bucket of shit on Atko.' It was to be his last day in parliament. I believe that Kirsten Alexander, David Winderlich, Winderlich staffer Sandy Biar and a Ridleyton woman contributed to the speech about me that Mr Winderlich (now the owner of John Davis Records in the city) read into the *Hansard* and via parliamentary privilege into a full page spread in *The Advertiser*.

At the March 2010 state election, David Winderlich and Kirsten Alexander ran for the Legislative Council on a ticket called Independent Communities against Corruption. Mrs Alexander adopted the Winderlich speech by partnering him on a ticket bearing that name, although she had already by that time had input into Winderlich's speech.

The Ridleyton woman, whom I will not name for reasons of medical ethics, was on Kirsten Alexander's ticket at the 2010 Charles Sturt election and was pictured alongside her in the principal campaign photo. The woman's character can be judged from her Facebook site and Facebook messages, which I will not quote here for reasons of taste.

Winderlich, Biar and Alexander accused me of offering unlawful benefits to Charles Sturt councillors in return for the St Clair land swap. They allege that two witnesses claimed that one councillor was offered a position as a chair of a council committee if he rejoined the ALP. During the inquiry this turned into just one witness, Councillor Robert Grant. The alleged offer was years before the land swap was ever thought of and he had no direct evidence that the offer had been made. It was conjecture. They went on:

One councillor who had opposed the land swap recently changed his vote late in the piece. Residents assert that this was because he had been promised Mr Atkinson's support for a Labor seat.

It is my assessment, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the St Clair land swap was driven by the council staff, not the state Labor government or the elected members. If the Save St Clair campaign had grasped this, they would have been far more effective in their campaign than they have been, and I note that they have just withdrawn their final court action against the government.

Moreover, had Save St Clair been privy to the debate within the Rann cabinet about the controversy, they would have given the cabinet a means of dignified retreat, rather than resort to criminal defamation. How senior Charles Sturt council staff must have laughed behind their hands as they saw Save St Clair barking up the wrong trees, but they laughed no more when Cyclone Kirsten hit them in November 2010.

The land swap was carried by a big majority in late 2009, and the subsequent change of Councillor Brian Massey's vote from a vote against to a vote for was of no consequence. He is now living with his wife and children in Dernancourt, following his professional vocation, no longer an ALP member; indeed, a Liberal Party member who worked on a Davenport polling booth. We enjoyed reminiscing about these falsehoods, as we did at Woodville Oval on Sunday at the game against Sturt. Oh that preselection for a safe seat could be obtained so cheaply.

Winderlich, Biar, Alexander and the Ridleyton woman said that I and members of my staff had been the subject of four complaints to the police, that the Ridleyton woman had been photographed in a public place by someone whom she recognised as working for the Attorney-General's Department in Port Adelaide. It is odd that someone I hardly knew and whose presence I had not been in for five years and with whom I had not communicated for the five years to 2009, since I declined an unsolicited invitation to her wedding, should say that she feels threatened by me. Winderlich, Alexander, Biar and the Ridleyton woman know that mud sticks.

Winderlich, Alexander, Biar and the Ridleyton woman went on to allege that I or persons associated with me had pulled down the Charles Sturt ratepayers and residents online forum, hacked the site, damaged the administrator's property, and the Ridleyton woman commented in the speech, 'It's just creepy.' Among my other crimes were 'running counter-pamphlets when our pamphlets were just coming out.' Mrs Alexander and Save St Clair characterised anyone who disagreed with them as corrupt and the disagreement as ICAC-able.

From 2009, public debate in South Australia was coarsened by some of those opposed to the Rann government expressing their disagreement in a formulaic accusation of corruption. As a result of the Winderlich, Alexander, Biar speech and the enthusiasm of the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. David Ridgway for these allegations, an Ombudsman's inquiry was launched that had the powers of a royal commission, lasted two years and cost taxpayers and ratepayers about \$750,000. None of the allegations was proved. Worse, no evidence was offered to support any of the allegations. It was the principal finding of the Ombudsman's inquiry that the threshold St Clair land swap vote on 9 November 2009 was taken without any influence from me, let alone improper or undue influence.

At the recent Charles Sturt council election, Councillor Angela Keneally defeated Mayor Kirsten Alexander 13,483 votes to 10,307. Kirsten Alexander demanded a recount, and this was not granted by the Electoral Commissioner. Kirsten Alexander has since made serious allegations of electoral fraud without the slightest substratum of fact and has been appealing on social media in vain for readers to give her examples of it. Her allegations of electoral fraud bear resemblance to those of her political allies, Mark Aldridge and Jim Jacobsen. The technique here is to make the serious allegations first and then wait for evidence to sustain it to emerge.

Angela Keneally's campaign relied on suburb-specific letters, starting with dot points of the local issues residents of those suburbs had raised with her. The letters then shifted to generic paragraphs about her and finished with a paragraph about the future of the suburbs and expressing the wish that she would be a mayor for that suburb. In the ward where I live, Woodville, Oanh Nguyen was re-elected with a convincing 37.4 per cent, or 1,117 votes, in a record eight-candidate field. Her posters were, as we expected, spray-painted, adorned with defamatory slogans and torn down, while those of another candidate, Save St Clair's Lenny Brown of Belmore Terrace, Woodville, were left unharmed on the adjacent pole.

Save St Clair's veteran protester and veteran white supremacist, Robert Brown, has picketed my office and my street corner meetings for the past five years, expressing his opinion that the White Australia policy was an excellent policy, that Labor was allowing the western suburbs to become 'a dumping ground for Africans and Asians and that the government should ban all Indian immigration. Members may have seen him waving his National Action flag and placing placards on the steps of Parliament House.

Councillor Bob Grant, who had been on council for 27 years, saw his vote reduced from 1,097 in 2010 to 591 at this election. Madam Deputy Speaker, I hope to continue my remarks on another occasion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It would be normal, sir, to grant you an extension of time if the standing orders allowed it, but they do not.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BOARDS AND COMMITTEES - ABOLITION AND REFORM) BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 14, page 12, lines 6 to 7 [clause 14, inserted definition of animal ethics committee, paragraph (b)]—Delete 'for the purposes of this Act' and substitute 'under section 23A'

No. 2. New clauses, page 12, after line 7—After clause 14 insert:

14A—Amendment of section 6—Establishment of Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

(1) Section 6(2)—delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Minister'

(2) Section 6(2)(b)—delete 'the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated' and substitute:

Primary Producers SA Incorporated

(3) Section 6(2)(f)—delete 'Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Act 1982' and substitute:

Health Care Act 2008

(4) Section 6(3)(a)—delete 'the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated' and substitute:

Primary Producers SA Incorporated

(5) Section 6(4)—delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Minister'

(6) Section 6(5)—delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Minister'

14B—Amendment of section 7—Term of office of members

Section 7—delete 'Governor' wherever occurring and substitute in each case 'Minister'

14C—Amendment of section 8—Allowances and expenses

Section 8—delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Minister'

14D—Amendment of section 11—Secretary

Section 11(2)—delete 'Public Sector Management Act 1995' and substitute 'Public Sector Act 2009'

No. 3. Clause 15, page 12, line 8—Delete 'Animal ethics committees' and substitute 'Establishment of animal ethics committees by licensee'

No. 4. New clause, page 12, after line 15—After clause 15 insert:

15A—Insertion of section 23A

After section 23 insert:

23A—Approval of animal ethics committee by Minister

- (1) The Minister may approve a body as an animal ethics committee for the purposes of this Act.
- (2) The Minister may only approve a body under subsection (1) if satisfied that—
 - (a) the body is constituted in accordance with the membership requirements for an animal ethics committee (within the meaning of the Code) as laid down in the Code; and
 - (b) the body has appropriate procedures and standards in place to enable the body to comply with the Code in performing functions for the purposes of this Act; and
 - (c) the body is otherwise suitable to act as an animal ethics committee for the purposes of this Act.
- (3) An approval under subsection (1) may be conditional or unconditional.
- (4) The Minister may vary or revoke an approval under subsection (1).

No. 5. Clause 16, page 12, after line 24—After line 24 insert:

- (1a) The quorum for a body approved as an animal ethics committee under section 23A is to be determined in accordance with the Code unless the Minister specifies otherwise.

No. 6. New clause, page 39, after line 6—After clause 136 insert:

136A—Amendment of section 53A—Review of decision of Minister under section 53

Section 53A(1)—delete 'South Australian National Parks and Wildlife'

No. 7. New Part, page 46, after line 16—After Part 27 insert:

Part 27A—Amendment of Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989

173A—Amendment of section 12—Establishment of Pastoral Board

- (1) Section 12(2)—delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Minister'
- (2) Section 12(2)(a)—delete ', will be appointed on the nomination of the Minister'
- (3) Section 12(2)(d)—delete 'the South Australian Farmers Federation' and substitute 'Livestock SA Incorporated'
- (4) Sections 12(4) and (5)—delete 'Governor' wherever occurring and substitute in each case 'Minister'

173B—Amendment of section 13—Conditions of office

Sections 13(2) and (3)—delete 'Governor' wherever occurring and substitute in each case 'Minister'

173C—Amendment of section 14—Allowances and expenses

Section 14—delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Minister'

173D—Amendment of section 25A—Establishment of pool of persons for the purposes of section 25B

Section 25A(2)—delete 'the South Australian Farmers Federation' and substitute 'Livestock SA Incorporated'

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

At 16:51 the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 June 2015 at 11:00.