

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Wednesday, 17 June 2015**

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:17 and read prayers.

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:18): I bring up the ninth report of the committee.

Report received.

*Ministerial Statement***MOOMBA GAS SUPPLY HUB**

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement from the Treasurer, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, on the gas supply hub from Moomba.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement from the Minister for Investment and Trade, the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Your good friend.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —my good friend—on the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement.

*Personal Explanation***AUTOMOTIVE WORKERS IN TRANSITION PROGRAM**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:19): I seek leave to make a personal explanation in relation to a statement I made on 5 May and following a question from the Hon. Andrew McLachlan yesterday.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: He caught you out.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: He is very good. On advice from the department, I made the statement in relation to the Automotive Workers in Transition Program that:

Training can be accessed through 15 pre-approved registered training organisations that have been identified through a comprehensive selection process.

I can inform the chamber that this was incorrect advice: training can be accessed through any training provider. There are, however, 15 organisations that are able to provide skills recognition advice to workers through the program.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Hon. Mr McLachlan accept his explanation?

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: Yes, sir, and I thank the minister for it.

*Question Time***TAFE SA**

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about TAFE.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We have been well aware of real concerns that have been raised by private training providers on the withdrawal of support for their operations. Often when we ask questions of the minister she refers to them as being operational matters and suggests that we should seek a briefing from TAFE or speak to the TAFE chief executive. She says that TAFE is run by a board and that perhaps we could even contact the board. The opposition has been reliably informed that the chairman of the board, Mr Peter Vaughan, has been described as somewhat missing in action during this last debacle in relation to the withdrawal of funding for private training providers. My question to the minister is: can she advise the house of the whereabouts of the chair of the board, Mr Peter Vaughan?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for his question. He comes into this place with incorrect information. He refers to—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister answer the question; you might find out where he is.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Yes, well, they do not like to listen to real facts and figures. In his opening statements he suggested that we have withdrawn training support from rural regions here in South Australia, and that is just not true; it is simply not true. In fact, we have increased the subsidised training activity to 81,000 subsidised places for 2015-16, and that is an increase from about 80,000 this year. So, again, we see another example of the Hon. David Ridgway coming into this place with inaccurate information.

In relation to the chair, Mr Peter Vaughan, I suggest that the honourable member historically has been incredibly lazy and inactive in this place, and I would be saying to him that I have no problems at all accessing Mr Peter Vaughan. He is incredibly diligent and regularly makes himself available. I suggest that the honourable member get off his lazy tail and either make a phone call, write a letter or request a meeting, if that is what he wants. But, as usual, we see that the honourable member is simply too lazy to do that himself, and he comes into this place with his bombastic attitudes.

TAFE SA

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): By way of supplementary question, will the minister answer the question I asked: can she advise the house of the whereabouts of Mr Peter Vaughan, the chair of TAFE?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:23): It is a completely irrelevant question to be asking the minister. If the honourable member is saying that he wants a meeting or a phone call with him, or for whatever purpose wants a briefing or whatever, let the honourable member put that request to the chair. Why does he not get off his lazy tail and actually request that? Why would he not do that? He is lazy! The opposition is lazy and indifferent, and they increasingly come into this place ill prepared, with misleading information, and are just too lazy to get off their tails and do stuff for themselves.

GREYWATER COMPLIANCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Water and the River Murray on the subject of greywater compliance on the River Murray.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Honourable members may be aware that at the height of the drought working groups were established to look at greywater systems for houseboats for the River Murray, which led to the production of the 'Code of Practice for vessel and facility management (marine and inland waters)', in particular the greywater section for inland waters. A number of different stakeholders had different roles on a working group, including the EPA, which was to develop checklists and certificates for slipway operators, reporting systems, issue authorisations to slipway operators involved in a trial and provide ongoing support to slipway operators involved in a trial. My questions for the minister are:

1. Can he provide a status update on this particular program and, in particular, the number of staff from the EPA who are still involved?
2. Are there any compliance matters that may have been detected within the last two years?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. As honourable members will know, I have commented in this place previously about our greywater programs on the River Murray. Largely, they are to do with upgrading the pumping stations and refurbishing the holding tanks. We have been doing that progressively over a period of 24 months, I understand, and we are about to come to the end of that refurbishment program. In terms of the EPA's program for audits, I do not have that information presently before me, but I will seek that out and bring back that information for the honourable member.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills in relation to employment in the mining and energy resources sectors.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On 11 August 2014, Premier Weatherill announced that the government had identified 10 economic priorities to guide the transformation of the South Australian economy. Soon afterwards, the government established an economic priorities website where information on each priority was made publicly available. The website includes an economic dashboard that tracks the specific targets and objectives that have been established as part of the 10 economic priorities process.

One of these objectives is to increase the value of our mining and energy resources production from \$7 billion to \$10 billion, creating an additional 5,000 jobs by December 2017. A number of government ministers have highlighted the government's commitment to create these additional 5,000 jobs since the economic priorities were announced. For example, on 13 November 2014, the Treasurer highlighted this commitment in a media release entitled 'New record for mineral and petroleum production in South Australia'.

More recently, on 15 January this year, the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills drew attention to the 5,000 jobs targets in a media release entitled 'SA's headline employment rate decreases to 6.5 per cent'. In that release the minister said she was 'encouraged by the growth in South Australian job numbers over the past 12 months' and that she was 'anticipating significant growth in the mining and energy industry that could see up to 5,000 jobs created'. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister stand by the government's commitment to create an additional 5,000 new mining jobs by the end of 2017?
2. How many of the additional 5,000 jobs have been created since last August when the Premier announced the 10 economic priorities?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. Indeed, this government has set itself a series of 10 economic priorities for this state. We have set ourselves a range of key performance indicators or specific targets to ensure that we fulfil those strategic commitments, and one of those is in relation to increasing jobs in the mining and energy resources sector. My understanding is that we are well underway in relation to that; that sector has done particularly well and that target of 5,000 still stands. In relation to where we are at, I would need to take that on notice, and I am happy to bring back a response.

The PRESIDENT: A supplementary from the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Can the minister explain how the number of 5,000 is calculated? Was there a formula used or is it some sort of spinning wheel you have in cabinet or a hat you just draw a number out of? Can you actually explain how you arrive at the figure of 5,000?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:30): I am happy to provide that information. It was done with advice from the department in relation to the sector's potential for growth. I am happy to bring back that information to the chamber.

ADULT COMMUNITY EDUCATION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about providing learning pathways for all South Australians.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Foundation skills such as language, literacy and numeracy, and skills such as problem solving and digital literacy, are important underlying issues in assisting people getting entry-level work.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: My question to the minister is: can the minister tell the chamber about Adult Community Education?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his ongoing interest in these important policy areas. According to the ABS, in 2006, 512,000 South Australians between 15 and 74 years of age failed to meet the literacy and numeracy levels required to meet the complex demands of work and life in modern economies.

This government values providing South Australians who have low levels of education and digital literacy with learning gateways. In order to help them participate in learning, training and work, \$11.7 million has been committed to the Department of State Development to Adult Community Education between 2010 and 2016.

The Adult Community Education (ACE) program is the community learning gateway which can be accessed by people who wish to improve their foundation skills. These skills, which are also basic and necessary in order to improve employability, include literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and

suchlike. It's always an important way in which people are able to then transition into further education, training and work. Over 115,000 people have participated in courses since the program commenced in 2005-06.

ACE providers are not for profit. Most of them are community-based organisations who are funded to deliver accredited and non-accredited foundation skills based on the Certificate I in Education and Skills Development curriculum. In 2015-16, the ACE program funding model comprises:

- \$1.212 million to be allocated to 32 ACE providers (accredited and non-accredited training) in the form of triennial agreements; and also
- \$1.157 million released through an annual contestable application process which I announced in February of this year.

As a result of this contestable process, I am pleased to report to the chamber that 41 organisations will receive the annual funding of \$1.157 million which will be used to deliver an estimated 85,578 training hours to 2,113 participants who will be involved in both accredited and non-accredited training.

The benefit to employers of lifting foundation skills is significant. As little as 1 per cent improvement in adult literacy levels can lead to a 2.5 per cent improvement in productivity, and that's from the Standing Council on Tertiary Education, Skills and Employment National Foundation Skills Strategy for Adults.

ACE forms an important part of the state government's new WorkReady policy and builds engagement and strong foundations which support training and jobs at the local level and connects people to training and supports that are best suited to their own particular individual needs.

The Department of State Development is working with Community Centres SA to increase the delivery of ACE courses in regional South Australia and build provider capacity. There is an SDS website where people can find more information in relation to ACE courses.

ARTIFICIAL REEFS

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions regarding artificial reefs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I understand that prior to the 2014 state election, the government announced plans for an artificial reef in partnership with RecFish SA. My questions are:

1. Can the minister provide an update on this matter?
2. Has a site been identified for an artificial reef?
3. When is the artificial reef due to be completed, and at what cost to the taxpayer?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for his most important question in regard to the artificial reef that we will be building in the waters of South Australia. I understand that public consultation is coming to a close with recreational fishers on this matter. The questions to be assessed essentially are: what sort of reef do we want to build? Where do we want to build it? What species do we want to target? Is it a species, for example, that is going to be of interest to recreational anglers; or is it a species that is going to be targeted because of, for example, environmental conditions and species under pressure? All these issues will be considered.

The government has allocated \$600,000 for the construction of this one reef, and it will be constructed in an area of this state which will return, hopefully, multiple benefits. Essentially, it was designed for recreational angler purposes—notionally—but that information will come from RecFish about what they want to target. They may say, for example, 'We want to target seagrass and we want to encourage the growth of seagrass around a particular reef.' So that, in turn, will encourage species that rely on seagrasses and, as I understand it, depending on the species you want to attract,

you will build the reef in different ways. That decision, as I said, will be taken in the near term and I will be happy to come back to the Hon. Mr Darley and give him advice about that when the consultation period is over.

GREYWATER COMPLIANCE

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:37): Whilst I am on my feet, I might address a couple of comments to the question asked by the Hon. Michelle Lensink about the EPA's houseboat audits. I have got some advice I can offer her now. The EPA recently completed a number of houseboat inspections for black and greywater management in the River Murray region.

Greywater is predominantly waste from the kitchens, laundries and bathrooms of houseboats. A code of practice for vessel and facility management requires that all vessels operating on marine and inland water contain or treat any greywater that is produced on board and, in the past six years since the EPA first implemented the vessels program, compliance levels have reached around 80 per cent, I am advised, for both commercial and private houseboats.

The recent houseboat greywater management inspections took place in Renmark involving 62 private vessels. I am advised that most people are doing the right thing. For those vessels that weren't compliant, the EPA is working with those to make sure they satisfy the code of practice. If the Hon. Michelle Lensink would like a breakdown of those numbers I am happy to bring that back for her. She also asked a question about the number of EPA staff involved in that audit, and I'll come back with that information at a later time.

ENVIRONMENTAL VOLUNTEERS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:38): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions about environmental volunteers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: On 14 May, the minister answered a question in this place regarding the contribution of volunteers to the management of South Australia's environment. As part of his answer, the minister said:

Volunteers work on a huge array of projects, including soil and land management, revegetation, native animal and plant surveys, fire management, trail maintenance, weed and pest animal control and heritage site restoration. As you can imagine, this is an important contribution to the successful implementation of our environmental program.

As most members will realise, these efforts epitomise the voluntary work of members of the Friends of Parks network across South Australia. In particular, I have personally had a long association with the Friends of Para Wirra group and the work that its members do in most—if not all—of those facets of environmental work. With this in mind, my questions are as follows:

1. When will the minister advise the Friends of Para Wirra group whether he will allow mountain bikes to be used in the natural bushland which that group has revitalised over a number of years?
2. Will he take into account the potential impact of mountain bike activity on the breeding cycles of wildlife in those bushland areas?
3. Is he considering reversing the decision to maintain the recreation park classification for Para Wirra park made early last year despite DEWNR's recommendation that it be declared a conservation park?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and, in particular, his longstanding association with Friends of the Parks at Para Wirra. It is a very important job that he does out there, as do all of our volunteers. I know the Hon. Mr Dawkins is out there weeding as often as he possibly can.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: No, he's not.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: He's not? He has given that up. We have got rid of most of the weeds in Para Wirra because of his sterling efforts with our volunteer group. The Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources contributes to the South Australian Strategic Plan: Target 72—'Improving volunteer participation' through a range of volunteer efforts. For example, the department engages volunteers to undertake conservation activities in parks and across landscapes through the regional natural resources management model.

In 2013-14, volunteers spent an estimated 8,085 days on land management activities across the state and of these days approximately 591 days were spent on land management activities and projects specifically in our parks. Activities conducted by volunteers vary across locations but include important work such as weed removal, habitat restoration, raising community awareness through guided walks and events, and assisting with wildlife research and monitoring.

The department has a number of initiatives in place to increase environmental volunteering. A Friends of Parks business plan has been developed, the Campground Hosts program has been revitalised and is incredibly successful, I am advised, and annual regional initiatives involving community groups are organised frequently.

The Friends of Parks model began in the early 80s and has been the department's largest and longest running volunteer program, with more than 111 groups and several thousand active volunteers across the state. The department assists the Friends of Parks Incorporated board to develop business plans for improving and increasing the Friends of Parks program into the future.

The business plan is designed to provide support to Friends of Parks members groups, as well as raising the profile of the Friends of Parks brand as we try to recruit more and younger participants in that program. In order to roll out the business plan, a statewide consultation process is being implemented between the Friends of Parks board and members. Training workshops are being offered to board member groups that are subsidised by the Friends of Parks board, and a new Friends of Parks website is also being developed.

I give that information by way of background to our holistic approach to friends groups, but in terms of Para Wirra, and particularly mountain biking, it is a fantastic success story in how we come to terms with multiple uses in parks and how we reconcile sometimes different ambitions from different user groups in terms of bushwalking, mountain biking or just bringing young families to have picnics in parks.

There is often competition for the resources in our parks, and in Para Wirra what we manage to do is bring together all these sectors in the community to discuss their individual needs and come up with a way forward where everybody can get a share of those resources. We have built bike trails, walking trails and dual use trails in Para Wirra, and that seems to be working very successfully.

The great advantage of having bike trails built into our parks is that it actively encourages mountain bikers out of sensitive areas of parks where they would cut their own trails and go through sensitive areas, particularly where there may be, for example, rare orchid species in association with particular shrub land. Instead of allowing that to happen we actually encourage them to use the purpose-built bike paths.

In effect, those users become self-policing of their community group and also our eyes and ears in the park. They will report for us anyone who does the wrong thing, transgresses, and goes and uses their mountain bikes in places where they should not. It is a fantastic success story of bringing the community together to resolve competition problems in our parks.

It is something we are emulating elsewhere in terms of multiple uses in our parks. As the government proceeds with our consultation in the communities north and south about how to expend those moneys that have been allocated for upgrading our metropolitan parks, that is a process we will be using to bring users together to advise us how they want those moneys best spent. And, yes, I will not be changing the dedication provision in terms of the park. The policy as it currently stands will stay.

ENVIRONMENTAL VOLUNTEERS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:44): Supplementary question. Will the minister commit to actually advising the Friends of Parra Wirra group about any extension of the mountain bike activities off they paths they now use into the bushland paths that I described?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:45): My understanding is that the friends group is kept constantly advised of these processes and changes. That is the process I have asked the department to engage in, to engage with all the users of the parks, to bring the groups together and discuss how we can share those parks as best we can, and also to discuss with those users how we actually allocate the moneys that are provided by the department in upgrading those parks. There is not much point in having an engagement program if you do not actually engage. I will certainly—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: That is exactly right, but you are not engaging.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I do not agree with the Hon. Mr Dawkins about that—

The PRESIDENT: No debate, just give the answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Quite right, Mr President. The Hon. Mr Dawkins is out of control sometimes in this place; I am pleased you have snapped him back into parliamentary decorum. As I said, if the requirement is that I remind my agency about the engagement process then I am happy to do that.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY AWARDS

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister inform the chamber about South Australia's winners and finalists in this year's World Environment Day Awards presented by the United Nations Association of Australia?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. I am advised that the United Nations Association of Australia was established in 1946 to promote the aims and work of the United Nations in this country. The association engages Australian citizens in the work of the UN through a range of activities, including education programs and advocacy work.

As you probably know, Mr President, 5 June is World Environment Day. On this day each year the United Nations Association holds its annual World Environment Day Awards to recognise innovative and outstanding environmental programs and initiatives from across the country. The awards invite nominations from individuals, organisations, leaders, businesses, councils, schools, journalists and other groups whose work serves to protect, manage or restore our natural heritage.

These awards play an important role in raising awareness about key environmental issues and challenges, and also in encouraging organisations to reach new goals. They are designed to inspire and motivate individuals, organisations and businesses to take positive steps toward sustainability and environmental excellence in their homes, their schools, their local communities and workplaces. The 2015 awards were presented in Melbourne on World Environment Day, and I understand that the calibre of submissions was particularly high. I am pleased to report that several South Australian groups were commended as finalists and winners in a number of categories.

Engaging the youth of Australia in the work of the UN is a particular priority of the United Nations Association of Australia. It is therefore particularly pleasing that two South Australian youth leadership programs were shortlisted as finalists this year. The River Murray Youth Council is a ground-breaking youth leadership program modelled on the Natural Resources South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Education Team, and the Young Environmental Leaders Program for students in years 5 to 8 who want to get involved in looking after natural resources with their school was another program commended.

Each of these programs is quite fantastic, and they deserve the recognition they have received through their nomination, not just because of the great work they do to raise young people's

awareness of environmental issues but also because they raise awareness of the environment generally in the community at the same time—particularly when they go home and tell their parents about what they have learnt at school that day.

I am pleased to advise that KESAB Environmental Solutions was the winner of the sustainability education category. As the United Nations Association of Australia Awards committee noted, KESAB impressed through its 'creative and innovative approach to leading sustainability education for over half a century in South Australia'. In another nod to us, Kangaroo Island Council won the local government category for Best Specific Environmental Initiative with their Visible Solar Project. This project involves a state-of-the-art, dual-axis solar array system installed at the Kangaroo Island airport. The system tracks the sun, increasing the energy output by 30 per cent compared to a fixed system, and generates enough power to cover 80 per cent of the needs of the Kangaroo Island airport, saving the council at least \$24,000 a year in power bills.

These are some of the outstanding examples of the great innovative environmental work done at a local level in our state, and I congratulate all the nominees and winners of the 2015 Environment Day Awards for their contribution to the environment. Most importantly, at a time when the federal government continues to ignore the environmental challenges we are facing as a nation and as a world, local communities are showing just how much it is possible to step up and combat climate change with the right motivation and commitment and the right people.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills questions concerning TAFE training places, or I should say the lack of agricultural training places.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: We know the debacle and the disgrace we currently have with respect to the government's initiative (so-called) to make it tough for private training providers, but the concern particularly is in rural and regional South Australia, an area where we have seen one of the few job growth opportunities of 7 per cent compounding per year over the last three years.

Recently, the minister met with training providers to discuss WorkReady issues. I have been informed that, during one of these meetings, the providers were assured that the training subsidies would still be available for Australian school-based apprentices and that training was guaranteed for traineeships with SACE students. This, by the way, is very different from published WorkReady statements.

I understand the minister has told the private providers that there have been some changes and that there will be some opportunities for those people working on farms and associated agricultural industries to still get subsidised training. However, when you drill into it, you find that all may not be as it seems. My questions are:

1. Can the minister confirm that there are definitely now only 20 training places for people working on farms and that the training places will be at the Mount Gambier TAFE campus?
2. Can the minister explain how in my own personal situation where I do have a trainee who, on this occasion, will work towards an apprenticeship, she expects to see that person trained as an apprentice if the places are at Mount Gambier and he is working at Mount Compass?
3. Can the minister explain how an apprentice farmer at Wudinna on Eyre Peninsula can get training with only 20 places available from the Mount Gambier TAFE campus?
4. Given that there are at least 150 positions for certificate III alone needed in South Australia in the next 12 months, how will this work when there are only 20 positions being made available?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:52): Again we see the honourable member come in here with confused information, but anyway I am happy to—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order, Mr President. I draw your attention to standing order 110 which says that in answering any question a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers. I indicate that I believe that the minister is debating the matter rather than answering the question and ask that you rule.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, continue.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am just pointing out that we were presented with confused information which I will take great pleasure to sort out. The government funding in the VET sector will adequately support industry demand for skilled workers in key agriculture, food and fisheries occupations in the coming years. According to modelling undertaken by the Training and Skills Commission (TASC), industry demand for skilled workers in key agriculture, food and fisheries occupations requires the completion of 2,500 to 5,000 relevant VET courses over five years, that is to 2017-18, or between 500 and 1,000 completions a year.

Taking into account modelling by TASC of current take-up rates and completions, we are on target to ensure that the industry demand for skilled workers in key agriculture, food and fisheries occupations is met over the five years to 2017-18. We see a lot of scaremongering going on here, but since 1 July 2012, the commencement of Skills For All, 5,200 qualifications have been issued for these courses, or approximately 1,700 per year in publicly subsidised training alone. In addition, there are currently 8,500 training accounts open with students undertaking training. For the relevant agriculture, food and fisheries VET courses, which are undertaken through training contracts, in the second half of 2015 there are an unlimited number—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Subsidised?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Unlimited subsidised apprenticeship funding—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! No debate, just answer the question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The honourable member, as I said, comes into this place with incorrect and inaccurate, confused information. There are no caps on—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: I got this from the horse's mouth.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Well, you're wrong.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, don't engage with interjections.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: You are wrong as usual. As usual, Mr President, the honourable member comes into this—

The PRESIDENT: Point of order, the Hon. Ms Vincent.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: The minister is well aware that she should direct her comments through you.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Of course they're directed through the President—of course they are. All of my comments are directed through the President. They always are, so I don't know what the honourable member is banging on about.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, just sit down for one second, please. When a question is asked and a minister is trying to answer the question, an interjection is basically creating debate, so I call upon all members not to interject and I call upon the minister not to react so you get into a debate. Let's just answer the question and get on to the next question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you very much—

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Point of order.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: When points of order are brought to your attention, it is your place to respond to them. I think in many cases the minister just keeps going and ignores your right to actually respond and I think you should do that.

The PRESIDENT: As far as I know, the minister is so involved and so incredibly excited about the answer that she often doesn't hear, but the reality is, from now on, there will be no debate. Just the very fact that you interject creates a debate.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: No, it doesn't.

The PRESIDENT: It does create debate. If she responds, it creates a debate. If you want to debate it, we will keep on debating.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable minister, please answer the question and let's get on to the next question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you, sir, and as I was pointing out, the information that the honourable member put on the record in this place is incorrect. I have put on the record in this place before that there are an unlimited number of subsidised training places for trade-related training contracts for apprenticeships. For these trade apprenticeships, there are an unlimited number of places.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: It is demand driven. I have come into this place time and time again—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister is trying to answer the question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: See, they don't listen, sir. They just don't listen.

The PRESIDENT: They're out of order, so just continue.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Exactly. Thank you for your guidance. As I have said in this place before, the apprenticeships or those under contract arrangements that result in those direct jobs at the end are demand driven and that is as they have been and that is as they continue. WorkReady does not change that. So, the honourable member is just completely wrong. These can be undertaken through either TAFE SA or non-TAFE providers, and that can continue.

So, in terms of the private providers, if they go out and recruit apprenticeships in those areas, they are able to be subsidised. We see subsidised funding for that. The honourable member, as I said, is simply incorrect. It does not matter how many incorrect sources he quotes from, the information he has brought into this place is incorrect. I hope that he has finally listened and got that straight.

For courses outside the on-demand training contracts (so those outside of those apprenticeships), for 2015-16 it is estimated that the government will subsidise at least 2,000 training places for VET courses and support the agriculture, food and fisheries sector. The majority of these will go to TAFE SA, and I have made that quite clear. For non-TAFE SA providers, additional training places may be available through the Jobs First initiative, which is a submission-based element of WorkReady that will fund training courses and tailor employment projects that are directly related to real job outcomes. They can occur anywhere in the state, so whether it is the South-East, Eyre Peninsula or wherever, all the private sector training providers that are eligible can apply for training under that Jobs First initiative.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:00): By way of supplementary question, based on the minister's answer: if TAFE already has the capacity to deliver training in the regions, why does the chief executive officer say that TAFE is 'busy scouting community and industry facilities in order to find somewhere where they would possibly deliver training'?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:00): The honourable member comes in this place time

and again, quoting all sorts of inaccurate sources. TAFE SA (and I have also put this on the record in this place before)—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister has the floor.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: TAFE SA has indicated that it has the capacity to fulfil the training allocations that have been prescribed to it for 2015-16. It has indicated that it can do that and it has the capacity to do that. It has a range of different arrangements in place involving various partners, particularly in niche areas, and no doubt it will continue those sorts of arrangements into the future.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:01): My question is directed to the Leader of the Government. Given the unemployment figures announced last Thursday of 7.6 per cent in South Australia, will the minister explain how she made the statement quoted in *The Advertiser* that 'one part of those figures in relation to participation rates may indicate an increased level of confidence in the state's job market'?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. I can say that quite confidently because the participation rate increased for South Australia for two months in a row. I think in the last month, the most recent figures for May, we were the only jurisdiction where participation rates increased, which is a very positive sign, particularly two months in a row.

The increased participation rate generally means that there are more people working and also more people out there looking for work. So, although that resulted in a very disappointing increase in our overall unemployment rates, nevertheless it is a positive sign. If more people are out looking for work it generally means that they have the confidence that jobs are available for them.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:03): Supplementary question: does the minister think that it was insensitive of her as the Minister for Employment to have been gloating or boasting that the unemployment figures had indicated an increased level of confidence in the state's jobs market at a time when so many people were becoming unemployed, and the recorded level of unemployment was 7.6 per cent?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Joe Hockey will give you a lesson in being insensitive. 'Get a good job!' Hypocrisy!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable minister please allow your leader to answer the question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:03): It is gross hypocrisy in terms of the federal Treasurer's recent comments, but I will not be distracted. I was asked to comment on a number of the outcomes in terms of ABS figures that were released for May that included comments around the increased unemployment rates, and I certainly expressed my disappointment with that and talked at length about what sort of things might be causing that to happen and what sort of things this state government has put in place to address that problem. I was also asked to comment on the participation rates, and I did so, and also was asked to comment on the youth unemployment rate, which dropped significantly by 10 points.

Again, being completely open and honest, when the commentator suggested that that was a very positive result for South Australia I indicated that, although it was a move in the right direction, it was a figure that I felt was completely unreliable. A drop of 10 points in a one-month period is a very unreliable figure and would indicate that it is probably due to the very small sample size and not a real indication of what is happening with youth. As I said, I gave a very honest and open outline of a range of the key figures that were released and, in particular, as I said, the very disappointing result

of the increase in our unemployment rate and our intense efforts to put initiatives in place to address that.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Lucas.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:05): Given the minister's claims that she has just repeated in her answer, can the minister confirm that South Australia's participation rate, which she is boasting about, is the lowest in mainland Australia and actually lower than it was 12 months ago in June 2014?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:05): I never said that. They are assertions that the honourable member has made up. What I indicated was that for two months in a row our participation rate increased, and that was a positive sign. That is what I indicated.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Lucas.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:06): Is the minister denying that the participation rate in South Australia is the lowest in mainland Australia?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:06): I cannot verify that. I do not have those figures.

ABORIGINAL POWER CUP

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Minister, will you inform the chamber about the 2015 Aboriginal Power Cup held last weekend as part of National Reconciliation Week?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for his question, his interest in Aboriginal affairs and his interest in football in general, and particularly the Power. As many members would be aware, the Aboriginal Power Cup was recently held during Reconciliation Week. This annual three-day event has a focus on cultural activities, health and education and, as the leader of the this house pointed out, it has some very good benefits. Of course, there are footy games played by the teams that attend. The culmination of the three-day carnival is the grand final that is played before the Port Power game at the Adelaide Oval. It is a great thrill for both the young people involved and also their families, friends and spectators.

This program has grown in leaps and bounds since the inaugural Aboriginal Power Cup eight years ago. The Aboriginal Power Cup uses sport and the passion for football to engage young people to consider education, training and employment. Students are required to complete one or two units of their SACE as part of the program. This aims to increase attendance and retention rates. There is also strong encouragement and emphasis on healthy lifestyle choices, supported by workshops conducted in schools. The program also highlights the importance of culture in the shape of each student's identity.

The program eight years ago started with just 133 students and now has more than doubled to almost 400 students from right across the state. The opportunity to meet some of the young people participating was one of my favourite activities during Reconciliation Week. I was fortunate to launch the Power Cup at Alberton on Thursday a couple of weeks ago, and even more fortunate to spend half of one game goal umpiring one of the girls' games. The skill and aggression shown by the girls on that field made me quite scared and I was thankful to be off the field and in the goals for that particular game.

The program will no doubt engage those young people to become leaders of the future at home, at school and within their communities. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate

Power staff, partners and others who have contributed with their ongoing dedication and support for this successful program.

The government of South Australia supports the Aboriginal Power Cup and is very proud to have been contributors over a number of years. We have also placed a strong emphasis on strengthening governance and recognising Aboriginal culture and identity. I hope the young people who attended and played as part of this year's Power Cup kept that in mind as they took the field and engaged in a whole range of programs that were on offer.

The government of South Australia is committed to empowering Aboriginal people to have a stronger voice in decisions that affect their lives. We are also supportive of a range of activities taking place within our communities that support young Aboriginal people who want to further their career aspirations and perhaps even their football goals. I may well have seen the next Gavin Wanganeen playing in this year's Aboriginal Power Cup. In fact, I understand that there are a couple of participants from last year's cup program who could be picked up in the draft and there has been some real potential for next year's draft.

Again, I would like to extend my congratulations to all those who were involved. I would also like to thank the organisers of the cup for inviting me and others to participate in the before the bounce event before the Port Power v Western Bulldogs game a couple of weeks ago. It was a great experience and a privilege. The winning teams and those who participated received trophies from the Governor of South Australia, His Excellency Hieu Van Le.

Particular congratulations go to the winners of this year's Aboriginal Power Cup: Christies Beach for the girls and Coober Pedy/Ocean View for the boys. I was there when they were handed their trophies. All those who participated were grinning from ear to ear, and it was certainly a real privilege to see how much they enjoyed playing that grand final at Adelaide Oval. I look forward to next year's Aboriginal Power Cup, and I am sure the program will be even better once again.

MEDICAL CANNABIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, representing the Premier, on the topic of medical cannabis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The New South Wales medical cannabis trials under Premier Baird and supported there by the Labor opposition will soon commence. They will treat children with epilepsy, the terminally ill and people suffering from nausea as a result of chemotherapy.

The premiers of Victoria and Queensland have confirmed that they will allow residents of those states who are terminally ill or suffering with life-threatening conditions, as well as those with epilepsy and those undergoing chemotherapy, to participate in those New South Wales clinical trials. In April 2015, Queensland's Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk said that her state would, and I quote, not 'sit on the sidelines', but, disappointingly, Premier Weatherill is doing just that by saying South Australia is supportive of the trials, but we will wait.

Meanwhile, children like Charlotte, the daughter of medical cannabis campaigner Mark Elliott, suffer with up to 40 seizures each week because of their condition called febrile infection-related epileptic syndrome (FIRES), a condition which currently means that, each day, she is taking a cocktail of 40 meds: 20 with her breakfast in the morning and then another 20 just before bed. She still has trouble functioning (walking, talking), she suffers awful side-effects and she still has these seizures.

Studies suggest that medical cannabis might reduce these seizures by as much as 50 per cent, but Charlotte's family risk going to gaol if they were to give her this treatment. Instead, this young girl is currently given medications that can cause awful side-effects including mood swings, body hair growth, facial deformities, sedation, impaired memory, slurred speech, decreased coordination, confusion, dizziness and headaches.

My question to the Premier is: when will South Australia actually stop sitting on the sidelines and get in the game? While political leaders of all colours across this nation are supporting those who wish to access medical cannabis to have that treatment, when is the Premier going to support kids in South Australia like Charlotte?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I thank the member for her questions and will refer them to the relevant minister in the other place and bring back a response.

APY ELECTIONS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Minister, will you update the chamber with regard to the results of the recent APY elections? Is the minister confident that those elections were carried out in a fair and proper manner?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his questions and his very genuine and ongoing interest in Aboriginal affairs, particularly matters to do with the APY. I might answer his last question first in relation to the conduct of the elections.

My office has had a number of discussions with the office of the Electoral Commissioner, who investigated any concerns that people had in the conduct of the elections and was satisfied that the elections were conducted as they usually are. I think in most elections—not just elections in the APY lands but elections everywhere else, including state elections—there are concerns that people have sometimes over how things were conducted.

Certainly, I know that there were some concerns raised, and the Electoral Commissioner's office did investigate some of the concerns and reported back that, as far as they were concerned, things happened as they had in the past and were in order in the elections.

I can inform the honourable member that the results of the elections were: in the Amata ward, Owen Burton was elected; in the Railway Bore/Wallatinna ward, Ronnie Brumby was elected; in the Turkey Bore ward, Gary Lewis was elected; in the Iwantja ward, Bernard Singer was elected; in the Irintata ward, Murray George was elected; in the Kanypi ward, Anton Baker was elected unopposed; for the Mimili ward, Ken Pumani was elected; for the Kalka ward, Milyika Paddy, or Mrs Paddy, was elected; for the Pukatja ward, Trevor Adamson was elected; and for the Watarru ward, Charlie Anytjipalya was elected unopposed.

I can further inform the honourable member that earlier today the newly-elected APY Executive met for the first time and elected a chairperson from amongst their own. I am very pleased to say that, from the Kalka community, Mrs Paddy was elected as Chairperson of the APY. I think she is the first woman to be elected to that position, and I have put a call in but wasn't able to speak to Mrs Paddy. She was still in the APY Executive meeting, but I will be talking to Mrs Paddy as soon as I can and congratulating her on her election as Chairperson of the APY Executive Board. I look forward to working with Mrs Paddy and continuing some of the positive steps that we have made over the last couple of months, and certainly since the appointment of the new general manager, in increasing accountability and transparency within the APY.

APY ELECTIONS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:16): Supplementary question: can the minister advise us if they have elected a deputy chairperson? Also, what is the status of the CEO? Is it still a temporary basis, or has there been a permanent appointment?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:16): I can inform the honourable member that I am advised that Bernard Singer was elected Deputy Chair of the APY Executive Board, and in relation to the General Manager, Mr Richard King was appointed—and I will get the exact dates—one and a half months ago on a three-month interim contract while a

fuller recruitment process was undertaken. I don't think there has been a permanent appointment, but I understand that process is underway.

WOMEN IN POLICING

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:17): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Status of Women a question about South Australian women in the police force.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Women now comprise 27 per cent of SAPOL's sworn staff, up from 22 per cent a decade ago. This represents 1,264 women working across all areas of policing, including four of the six assistant commissioners. My question is: can the minister update the chamber on 100 years of women in policing in South Australia?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. South Australia does, indeed, have a very proud history of women in policing beginning with Ms Kate Cocks and Ms Annie Ross who set up the first women's police branch in December 1915—the first of its kind in the British Empire, I understand.

Since their inception, South Australia women police have had the same powers of apprehension as male officers. For many years, the work of women police was referred to as 'preventative policing' and was particularly found in social welfare fields where they performed fairly restricted duties dealing with matters mainly relating to women and children.

They performed their duties in plain clothes, I am told, and had responsibilities including protecting young women and children from violence or from being drawn into crime or prostitution, patrolling the night-time streets, which apparently included dance halls for those underage, and also handling female offenders.

According to the State Library of South Australia, Ms Kate Cocks became well known for her nightly patrols of the Parklands around Adelaide on the lookout for young people engaged in what was called amorous behaviour. Her catchphrase became: 'Three feet apart, three feet apart!', which is incredible.

Ms Louise Forster, who joined as the fourth member of the South Australian women police in 1917, was sent to Mount Gambier for the summer months between 1922 and 1923. Over her career she travelled back to Adelaide for periods of up to nine months at a time to assist with key issues impacting women and children particularly.

In 1945, women officers were provided with formal training, which was provided through one-on-one instructions in law, fingerprinting and jujitsu, I am told, which is quite astounding as well. For the first time in 1950 they were given driving instructions at the Thebarton barracks.

By the early 1970s, uniformed police women were employed, and the very first women to work as uniformed police started at the Thebarton barracks in October 1973 and were required to complete the same studies, physical education and driver training as their male counterparts.

Although trained to use firearms, women on mixed patrols were not issued with guns or firearms until 1977, and at that time they were instructed not to carry them in their handbags. Apparently handbags were the issue at the time as they presented a security risk.

In 1979, women were first allowed to join SAPOL as police cadets from 17 years of age and serve in general uniform police roles. Also in 1979, Chief Inspector Fay Leditschke became the first woman commissioned officer in SAPOL as an inspector. The chief inspector had to design her own uniform as no female uniform template existed at her rank. So I guess that went with the job. South Australia was also the first Australian policing jurisdiction to appoint a woman police officer, Senior Sergeant Jane Kluzek, to a tactical response group (the STAR group) in 1999.

On 1 July 2015, of course, Ms Linda Williams will become South Australia's first woman deputy police commissioner, and once again I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Linda on this very important appointment and this first for South Australia. Throughout 2015, various

events will be held to celebrate 100 years of women policing, which is marked by the first women's police office being opened in Victoria Square on 1 December 1915.

More than 30 years later, initiatives such as maternity leave, measures to combat workplace discrimination and harassment, and a broad range of career opportunities have all contributed to an increase in the number of female officers serving in the South Australian community. I congratulate the South Australian police force on 100 years of women in policing, and look forward to hearing about the celebratory events.

Matters of Interest

FOODBANK SA

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:23): Recently I visited Foodbank South Australia to see and discuss its operations. Founded 15 years ago, Foodbank is the largest food relief agency in Australia and is found all over South Australia. Its goal is to source all the food needed for food relief in South Australia and give it away. Using its logistics and procurement expertise, Foodbank acts as an intermediary between the food industry's surplus supply and the welfare sector's needs. Foodbank sources food from the food industry and supplies it to welfare agencies. It also purchases food from financial donations and food drives. In 2013-14, the estimated volume of food distributed was 1.7 million kilograms at an estimated retail value of \$12 million, or about 3.5 million meals. In 2014-15 this is expected to rise to 4 million meals with a retail value of about \$14 million.

Foodbank's work also provides a large social return on investment. Last year over \$550 million of social value was created, and this included improving the physical health and performance of students at schools through its school breakfast program. Outside of directly helping food relief recipients, Foodbank has saved 19.7 million kilograms from landfill and avoided 24.7 million kilograms of greenhouse gas emissions.

Around 10 per cent of Australia's population relies on food relief, half of that children. In Australia the issue of hunger is generally a hidden social problem, and many people suffer in silence. It is an issue that is seen to mostly affect the unemployed, yet there is actually a greater prevalence in low-income families seeking food relief than there is for the unemployed. Recipients of various disadvantaged groups also seek food relief.

Each month over 60,000 South Australians rely on food relief services, and unfortunately one in three of those are children. However, there is insufficient food to meet the needs of those who rely on food relief, with 14 per cent of those relying on food services unable to be assisted and 40 per cent of children unable to be assisted. Moreover, 59 per cent of charities in South Australia do not have enough food to meet demand. Unfortunately, these figures are not improving and Foodbank SA has experienced a 6 per cent increase in the number of people seeking food relief.

Whilst it is hoped that food insecurity will decrease over time, the 2013 End of Hunger report shows the opposite to be true. Foodbank's aim is to distribute 3.5 million kilograms of food, as this is the estimated need of South Australia.

Foodbank believes that food insecurity can be tackled head on. It notes that this is not a production issue as we produce twice the quantity of food that we eat, nor is it that there is a lack of organisations, given Foodbank and the hundreds of welfare groups. Foodbank believes tackling food insecurity is a whole-of-community endeavour that requires a long-term campaign, and its success will depend on the combined efforts of all involved, including the support of the welfare sector, government departments working in these areas, corporate Australia and the public.

A recent \$100,000 grant from the South Australian government has ensured that Foodbank SA distributes fresh fruit and vegetables—650,000 kilograms, in fact, in 2015—at no extra charge. A further grant from DCSI of \$250,000 per year over the next four years has been awarded to establish more food hubs that are helping more South Australians. Foodbank's latest new food hub at Elizabeth is a joint venture with Anglicare South Australia, and is due to open shortly.

Every six to eight weeks the Foodbank team host mobile Foodbank events and take their trucks and vans, full of food and fresh fruit and vegetables, to a predetermined location working with

local welfare groups, and invites their case-managed clients to attend a pop-up Foodbank morning where Foodbank gives away food. I applaud Foodbank and its goal to end food insecurity.

DUTCH COMMUNITY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:29): It is my pleasure to rise today to speak about two important events that were proudly organised by the Dutch community of South Australia. The first event I would like to highlight is the Dutch Festival, which was held on 27 April 2015. It was proudly organised by the Adelaide Dutch Club based at Greenfields, and I place on the record my sincere thanks to the hard-working president, Mr Maurice McLeod, his family, committee members and volunteers for inviting me to make the opening speech and launch the Dutch Festival this year.

They had a successful festival in 2013, which I also attended. The Dutch Festival is a biannual festival where the Dutch Club opens its doors to the Australian community and encourages everyone to embrace all things orange and Dutch. The Dutch Festival is held in celebration of King Willem-Alexander's birthday in the Netherlands and known as Koningsdag.

Orange is the Dutch national colour and is worn at major festivals and sporting events. Yes, if you must know, I wore a bright orange hat and matching scarf for the happy occasion. There was orange everywhere—balloons, T-shirts, hats, costumes; very bright, proud and beautiful. It was a great day for the community. There was entertainment, arts and crafts, traditional Dutch meals, live music, kids entertainment—you name it, they had it.

The second event I would like to highlight today is the 70th liberation and remembrance day ceremony of the fallen of World War II. It was held on Saturday 9 May. The moving remembrance service and wreath-laying ceremony was organised by the Netherlands Ex-Servicemen and Women's Association in Australia (SA Branch). The national patron of the association is the delightful Ambassador for the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Mrs Annemieke Ruigrok, and the SA Branch patron is Honorary Consul Mr Willem Ouwens, who is a wonderful community leader. It was great to see both of them at the ceremony.

Other distinguished guests on the day included the Governor of South Australia, His Excellency Hieu Van Le and Mrs Le. The Liberal Party was well represented. I was joined by my wonderful colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink—as many of you may know, she has a proud Dutch heritage—and also the shadow minister for veterans' affairs Dr Duncan McFetridge. Other VIP guests included Colonel Harold Jacobs, Defence Attaché, Embassy of the Netherlands, Mr Odenwalder represented the government, and Deputy Mayor Brad Vermeer represented the City of Salisbury.

It is my great honour to acknowledge the great work of the president, Mr Eddy van Reeuyk, secretary and treasurer, Mr John van Dulken, Mrs Joanna Kegel, their families, committee members, veterans and volunteers of the Netherlands Ex-Servicemen and Women's Association for their hard work and dedication in organising the meaningful commemoration service. The committee has been working hard to keep the association relevant in South Australia so that their children and grandchildren will know that the Dutch veterans are survivors from World War II. I recall some of the words spoken by Joanna Kegel on the day. She said:

It isn't just Americans that won the war, Dutch soldiers did as well...Unless NESWA flies the flag, Australia and Australians will forget that Holland was and still is, a valuable part of the UN and NATO...Our children and grandchildren will only find out if those of us that are still alive and still remember, make our presence known, by flying the flag and our banner on days like ANZAC Day. Our members march and ride in a jeep on the ANZAC Day March. I am a very proud Australian, but Holland has still a large part of my heart.

Her emotional message resonated with veterans and members of the Dutch community present that day. The Dutch-born population is one of the oldest culturally and linguistically diverse population groups in Australia. According to 2011 Australian Census, 27,375 South Australians are reported to have Dutch ancestry. As the shadow parliamentary secretary for multicultural affairs it was a great honour for me to be a part of the Dutch Festival and the 70th liberation and remembrance service. I want to convey my heartfelt congratulations and say thank you to the Dutch community for the wonderful events that they organise and also for making a great contribution to South Australia.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:34): There have been many developments in the debate surrounding the Abbott government decision to stop building the 12 promised submarines in South Australia. Since I last spoke on this important issue we have learnt more about how well advanced discussions have been with Japan about giving them the submarine contract. I quote directly from an article in *The Australian* from 22 March 2015, which states:

For several months last year, the federal government single mindedly pursued a plan, driven largely from Tony Abbott's office, to buy the navy's new submarines from Japan.

This wheeling and dealing behind closed doors by Mr Abbott was done in full knowledge that he was disobeying his promise to South Australians that 12 new submarines would be built here. The Abbott government even had media releases prepared until their plans were scuttled by the Australian community's reaction.

The defence industry, MPs and senators from South Australia, the media, and the government of South Australia (especially the Premier, Jay Weatherill, and the Minister for Defence Industries, the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith) must all be congratulated for their relentless campaign in holding the Abbott government to its promise. The campaign seems to be working, as we have since been told that the government is no longer awarding the project directly to Japan but is now undertaking a 'competitive evaluation process', whatever that means. Only three countries—Germany, France and Japan—have been selected.

I and many Australians are confused and surprised that the Swedes were excluded from this process. I would certainly like to see the Swedes, through Saab, be given the opportunity to participate in this 'competitive evaluation process'. The Swedes have proven that they can build submarines. They have indicated that they would be happy to build the submarines here in South Australia and purchase ASC if needs be.

Having another contender in the race would put pressure on Germany, France and Japan to provide Australia with the best outcome not just on price but also on maintaining jobs for South Australians and Australians. At the very least, whichever country this project is eventually given to, I implore the Prime Minister to consider the total value of the contract to Australia's defence industry, its workers and the broader Australian community by ensuring that as much sustenance and maintenance work as possible is kept within Australia. This work will be the majority generator of economic activities for Australia for the life of the project, which is estimated to be at least 30 years.

Germany through Thyssenkrupp, France with DCNS, and Japan with Kawasaki and Mitsubishi are all reputable defence companies that I have no doubt would do a good job in building the submarines. However, the Abbott government needs to put on the competitive evaluation process two very important conditions for potential bidders:

1. They must demonstrate how they can partner with ASC to build the submarines in Australia; and
2. The sustenance and maintenance work for the life cycle of these submarines must be done here in Australia.

These two conditions must be at the forefront of any negotiations. We have not heard any further announcements about the next generation of submarines from Mr Abbott. It has been 18 months since he was elected PM and his government has handed down two budgets. There are talks that the government may even call for an early election. These delays are causing much concern and anxiety not only within the industry but for the thousands of workers and their families. It is time that Abbott and his government stop worrying about their own jobs and make the right decision for the people of Australia.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:38): Last night, a most important report for our state was launched before an audience of over 150 people at The Joinery in Adelaide. The Joinery is the new home of the Conservation Council of South Australia and a number of other environmental groups,

and it is based in the old country and interstate bus terminal in Franklin Street, just across the road from the new terminal.

The report is entitled, '100% renewable electricity for South Australia', and it was researched and written for the Conservation Council by Dr Mark Diesendorf, Associate Professor and Deputy Director of the Institute of Environmental Studies at the University of New South Wales in Sydney. Dr Diesendorf's report is also a background paper to assist the current nuclear royal commission.

Its main conclusion is that South Australia is already the leading Australian state in terms of the proportion of renewable energy supplying the state's annual electricity consumption. With its excellent wind and solar resources, and its already high penetrations of wind energy into the grid and solar photovoltaics onto its residential roof tops, South Australia has a realistic opportunity to become the first Australian state to reach 100 per cent renewable electricity.

The study examines two scenarios where the future electricity mix for our state is either predominantly or entirely based on renewable energy by 2030. The study considers renewable energy resources, benefits, reliability, costs and risks. It also canvasses the policies needed from the South Australian government to drive the transition to a renewable electricity future.

The report also refutes 11 common myths about renewable energy, which just happen to be the most common myths that I hear from fellow MPs, whether it is in the chamber, the corridors or over a coffee. For example, there is the myth that renewable energy is too variable or intermittent to reliably make the major contribution to electricity supply, or the related myth that base load power stations are necessary and renewable energy cannot provide them.

These myths are comprehensively busted, using hourly computer simulations, spanning up to 32 years of data on electricity supply and demand, as well as wind, weather and sunlight records. The report shows that 80 to 100 per cent renewable energy can supply electricity just as reliably as conventional power stations. I will make sure that every MP gets a copy of this report, and I think it should be essential reading.

Of course, the timing of the report is both fortunate and sad in that it comes in the week that we learn about the pending closure of South Australia's only coal mine and coal-fired power stations. The fact that these closures have been predicted for some time does not detract from the fear and uncertainty faced by over 400 workers, whose families and livelihoods depend directly on the power stations and mine, or those many others who indirectly rely on these facilities.

I acknowledge the quick response of the government, in particular ministers Maher and Brock, in putting in place services to deal with the human impacts of the closure announcement. The challenge for our state is not to stop change but to plan for it, to manage it as well as we can and to offer support to those affected to re-establish themselves in other industries. That is why transitioning our energy system to renewables as quickly as possible is not just good for the environment but for the economy as well.

That is also why the Greens have renewed our call this week for state and federal governments to get behind the proposed solar thermal plant at Port Augusta. The timing is right, the local community wants it and it will offer opportunities to hundreds of soon to be displaced workers at Port Augusta and Leigh Creek. It is not a radical concept for the state to invest or co-invest in energy infrastructure: it is how we built our electricity system in the first place.

A key feature of this report is the reliability of the electricity supply system. Practical experience from jurisdictions with high penetrations of variable types of renewable energy, such as wind and solar, including South Australia, gives confidence that the electricity supply system can be operated reliably, with penetrations of at least 40 per cent annual average generation from variable renewable sources and, with appropriate transmission connections to neighbouring states, penetrations of 100 per cent.

South Australia itself has already demonstrated that it can operate reliably and stably for hours when the contribution of variable renewable energy reaches two-thirds of demand. To get to 80 to 100 per cent renewable electricity in South Australia, reliability will be achieved by a mix of

variable and flexible dispatchable renewable energy, and that will include concentrated solar thermal with thermal storage, biofuelled gas turbines and others.

Somewhat surprisingly, the models do not depend on vast amounts of electricity storage, even though we know that technology is quite advanced. I refer members to the operations of Zen Energy Systems, whose power bank is being made here right in Adelaide at Tonsley. In South Australia, if we design our electricity system properly, there is no need for so-called base load power stations such as coal or nuclear. In fact, compared with renewable energy, nuclear is too expensive, too inflexible, too dangerous, too CO₂ intensive and too slow a technology to introduce into South Australia.

NORTHERN SOUND SYSTEM

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:44): I recently had the great pleasure of touring an innovative and unique organisation located in Elizabeth, an award winning initiative of the Playford City Council, the Northern Sound System, which is a youth and community focused music centre. Opened in January 2007, this facility truly is a state-of-the-art focal point for the music industry. Incorporating schools, government, local businesses and variety community programs, the NSS provides specifically designed and equipped rehearsal and recording spaces, tools, software applications and training programs in specialised areas of the industry. These include song writing, lighting, sound engineering and digital music production, just to name a few.

Their school of music provides a career pathway for young people who have struggled with the more regimented structure of mainstream education. The NSS offers a space for mentoring, skills development, project and personal support. It is a meeting place and hub for young people who have an interest and desire to learn and immerse themselves in the creative music industry. Additionally, NSS offers council-supported music programs, connecting experienced musicians with enthusiastic students eager to learn.

The NSS is comprised of three work spaces: the studio, a purpose-built recording studio; the floor, a 300-person venue for live music, recording and training; and the workshop, a training space for up to 30 people. Notably, the Northern Sound System was visited by the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge on their brief visit to Adelaide. While there, they met with staff and students, chatted with graffiti artists, joined a rap session and watched skateboarders in action. As keen enthusiasts of youth development, the duke and duchess pinpointed the NSS as a flourishing venture.

The NSS has mentored numerous artists who have gone on to find notable success in the music industry, with hip hop artist Tkay Maidza their most visible success story to date. Tkay competed in the NSS 2012 Battle of the Bands, participated at hip hop hangout 'Check 1 2' and then successfully applied for N1 Records. Tkay's music attracted unprecedented responses from major labels and a host of serious Australian music industry players. She now tours nationally, appearing at every popular festival in Australia from late 2013 to the present day. Tkay's international career is rapidly expanding, with regular visits to the US and Europe for touring and production opportunities.

The NSS facility is funded by the City of Playford council in conjunction with the federal government's sustainable regions program, while all NSS resources, staff and the majority of activities are council funded. Arts SA has been key to providing funds for programming expenses and currently funds the N1 Records program at NSS and associated activities. NSS currently offers 40 programs engaging approximately 600 participants. The centre caters for around 250 rehearsals each year, hundreds of main and home studio use hours, and anywhere up to 25 events. Annually, the Northern Sound System hosts more than 50,000 visitors—quite an impressive figure.

The NSS centre affords an opportunity for creative learning in a supportive environment, providing links to valuable networks and generating education and career opportunities which would not otherwise have been available to youth in this area. Their programs have been studied by many other communities both nationally and internationally and are considered a new framework for music industry education. Their award winning initiative, The Remedy Project, was a winner in the Governor's Multicultural Awards for 2014 and has produced some outstanding collaborations with artists, performers and producers available for viewing on YouTube.

One of the Northern Sound System's unique strengths is its track record for re-engaging disenchanted young people in the northern suburbs. Participants are given an outlet to safely and productively express their creativity, build on self-esteem and feel a renewed connection with society. The benefits of this venture are far reaching and not always visible to the outsider. Instead of feeling left behind, the opportunities presented at NSS can potentially pave the way for a different life path for many young people in the northern suburbs left directionless with the closure of the Holden factory. City of Playford Mayor Glenn Docherty sums it up with, and I quote:

It's really about how we continue to engage the local community and transition from a general 1950s manufacturing base and into the modern, global economy.

My sincere congratulations and thanks goes out to the Northern Sound System team, including project officer Nick O'Connor and City of Playford service coordinator Lisa Baker for their intense commitment to rejuvenating local youth, art, culture and music. I will certainly be keeping an eye out for their upcoming projects and commend their organisation to the chamber. I hope that the three levels of government continue their funding support.

TRINITY SOUTH COAST

The Hon. R.L. BROKESHIRE (15:49): In my matter of interest I want to put on the public record my appreciation and my hope for much success into the future when it comes to a new church that started in my area on Easter Sunday this year, which I had the opportunity of being invited and attending—that was Trinity South Coast.

It is actually a good opportunity to offer different chances for people to attend and share time together when it comes to church on a Sunday because it is not in your traditional church environment but actually at the Investigator College. I regularly now see right across the state, and particularly in the metropolitan area, quite a lot of public schools and private schools that are making their facilities available for church services and youth development services and opportunities. Of course, down on the Fleurieu Peninsula, we have a very diverse community, and we also have a lot of younger people who sometimes are looking to be involved in a different type of church to the traditional denominations that we have been used to.

The Trinity South Coast is a new church on the south coast. As I said, it meets at the Investigator College in the performing arts and sports centre on the college's Victor Harbor campus. The Investigator College needs to be congratulated on the great work it is doing down in Victor Harbor and right through the Fleurieu Peninsula when it comes to educating our young people. It is doing very well with its numbers because of the quality, all-round education that it is providing. That college has warmly welcomed the Trinity South Coast Church, which is a non-denominational church, but it is part of a wider network of churches, namely the Trinity Network of churches.

The church originally started through a small group of people attending Bible study, meeting in the Middleton Pioneer Hall at Middleton. From that, it was clear to those attending and the leaders of the group that formed that a new church for the south coast would provide an opportunity for more people to attend, worship and develop their Christian and community spirit.

Whilst they had tried out the Investigator College a couple of weekends before, on Easter Sunday, they had the public launch. It was a very well-attended service. I was particularly impressed by the leadership group, and a diverse group it is at that. It is also a very young group that is headed up by Senior Pastor Duncan Andrews, and his wife is also extremely supportive. I wish them every success because anywhere we can spread the word and give people the opportunity to come together and build a strong community spirit, I would suggest, the better it is for the South Australian community.

Whilst on that, I want to congratulate Mr Bruce Hicks. He has been a candidate of our party on numerous occasions and a tireless worker. He is also the principal of a Christian school at Murray Bridge. He is a fellow Anglican with myself and has been a leader in our own Anglican church in our hometown at Mount Compass.

He is actually about to be ordained in the Diocese of The Murray with, I think, four other locals. Some of them are farmers, he is a principal of a school and others are from different diverse backgrounds, but that augurs well for the support work that is needed in our diocese. Given that

Mr Hicks has had an incredible career both as an educator and as a genuinely committed community person, I am pleased and proud and wish him every success on his ordination in July.

STAMP DUTY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:53): There has been some suggestion in recent days that one of the potential announcements in the budget will be an announcement in relation to the removal of stamp duty on non-realty property transfers and non-quoted marketable securities. If that is to be the case, and I do not know whether it is—we will find out tomorrow—I want to put on the record the history of those particular stamp duty provisions.

When the intergovernmental agreement in relation to the GST was negotiated between the federal government and state governments in and around about 2001, for the introduction of the GST, all state and territory governments agreed in that intergovernmental agreement to remove various state taxes and charges over a period of time. A phase-in period was allowed for state and territory jurisdictions.

All of the state taxes and charges that were part of that intergovernmental agreement have been removed in South Australia with the exception of stamp duty on non-realty property transfers and on non-quoted marketable securities. The history of that is that if one goes back through it, in the 2005-06 budget the Labor government announced that the rates on those two areas would be halved from 1 July 2009 and completely abolished from 1 July 2010. If you then follow it through, in the 2008-09 Mid-Year Budget Review, post the GST, the government delayed the completion of that particular policy commitment when it said that stamp duty on the transfer of non-quotable marketable securities and non-real property transfers would be abolished from 1 July 2012. So, it was delayed by two years.

When we came to 1 July 2012, the government issued a statement 'Information Circular No:44' from Revenue SA which said that the government had previously announced that it would abolish stamp duty on non-quoted marketable securities from 1 July 2012 and on non-real property transfers from 1 July 2013, but that as part of the 2012-13 budget, '...the Government today announced that the abolition of stamp duty on'—both those areas—'will both be deferred until budget circumstances allow'. That was announced in 2012.

My understanding is that there has been some considerable pressure from the federal government to the state government indicating that this commitment had been made almost 15 years ago now on the condition that if the state government was to get the GST revenue, it had committed to removing, over a reasonable period of time, various state taxes and charges including these two particular examples of stamp duty.

If, ultimately, the state government announces this change tomorrow, it will be only as a result of pressure from the federal government to comply with an intergovernmental agreement which had been signed almost 15 years ago and which has been promised for much of the past 10 years in terms of having to be implemented. So, at some stage, the state government will have to implement those particular commitments.

The second quick point I make today is in relation to TVSP policy. As I indicated yesterday, Treasury has just issued a directive which says that, as from 1 July, agencies will have to pay for their own TVSPs for the future. This has caused considerable concern in some agencies, because considerable extra costs will now be incurred by individual agencies. As an example, within the Department of Premier and Cabinet I am told there has been an urgent call for TVSPs to be processed before 30 June. I am also told that 100 people are so fed up with what is going on in DPC at the moment that they have applied for the TVSP.

The TVSP policy requires that an individual must be given at least three weeks to consider a TVSP—it is a big issue. I am told that that particular requirement is not being implemented within DPC, and in some way DPC is going to have to look at getting around that particular requirement, because officers have been told they will have less than three weeks before 30 June to decide whether or not they want to accept a targeted separation package.

*Motions***MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION**

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:59): I move:

That the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, as an urgent priority, investigate and examine—

1. The proposal for privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission including, but not limited to, the alternative to privatisation as put forward to the state government by the MAC board;
2. The PricewaterhouseCoopers' economic predictions and the report by Finity Consulting on the MAC board proposal;
3. Treasury involvement in the decision to privatise the MAC;
4. Other states that have privatised and the impact that has had on CTP costs and injury compensation; and
5. Whether the authority and its operations provide the most effective, efficient and economical means for achieving the purposes set out within the act including, but not limited to, whether purposes of the fund noted in section 25 of the Motor Accident Commission Act regarding the Compulsory Third Party Fund are being appropriately administered in accordance with the act.

As colleagues would be aware, yesterday I gave notice of the motion that I am about to speak to, and that motion is to move that the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, as an urgent priority, investigate and examine five key matters with regard to the government's proposal for privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission.

Just to advise colleagues, I did have a discussion with some of my colleagues and after due consideration I strongly believe that the SARC would be the best avenue in which to proceed with this inquiry, because to set up another select committee would take a lot longer and the government are going as fast as they possibly can to effectively dismantle the Motor Accident Commission. I do not believe that we actually have time to go through the processes of a select committee. Also, to be fair to my colleagues, we are all very busy with select committees on top of our standing committees at the moment, and I believe that the SARC would be the competent and correct standing committee to do this investigation.

I have already been criticised by some in government who have said, 'Why would you, someone who is a conservative in business and pro business, not support what the government is wanting to put forward when it comes to the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission?' I want to put on the public record now for the benefit of colleagues (and I will also email colleagues) as they consider voting on this motion that I would hope to put this motion up for a vote on the next Wednesday of sitting because it is an urgent motion. Colleagues will see even more tomorrow when the budget comes out the reasons why I would like to put it to a vote on the next Wednesday of sitting. If any colleagues would like to come and have a look at my freedom of information documents and discuss the matter with me, I would welcome that opportunity.

The reality is, first and foremost, that you do not actually privatise everything simply because it is allegedly good for the private sector. There are some things that governments should not be in and there are some things that the government needs to be in. If you look at the history of compulsory third party, it used to be in the hands of the private sector and it was because of the unworkable situation of looking after people injured in motor accidents and on our roads and because of the situation with premiums and the like that the parliament in its wisdom at that time decided that compulsory third party would be through, back then, SGIC. It was sold off, but the compulsory third-party sector was kept and became the Motor Accident Commission.

I had someone come and speak to me some time ago saying, 'Robert, I think you should have a look at what the government is proposing with the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission, because I think it is a slippery slope to what has already occurred in New South Wales, Queensland and Canberra.' You are duty bound as a member of parliament that, when people in the community advise you of their concerns, you need to do some investigation.

I actually thought first and foremost that the government said they would not privatise and, in fact, they made a commitment to the community of South Australia prior to the March 2014 election that there would be no privatisation under a Weatherill government. I took them at their word,

because we can recall the former premier, the Hon. Mike Rann, when he put a pledge card up saying that there would be no privatisation under any government that he was premier of with respect to any assets of South Australia. It was clear when people went to the election last time that there would be no privatisation.

I did my FOI research, and it was interesting. It was not necessarily easy to get the documentation, but it was very interesting when I did get it to discover that, prior to the last election when the Premier was also the treasurer of South Australia he, through Treasury, had secretly instructed the Treasury to start to scope the benefits or otherwise of the privatisation of the MAC. It is disappointing that we went to the last election with that work being done behind the scenes, but no public debate on the matter. In fact, the first time the public and the parliament knew about it was when last year's budget, the 2014-15 budget, was introduced to the parliament.

I always understood that this government had promised transparency. I also understood, and strongly believe, that if you are going to privatise assets you do not have a mandate to privatise those simply because you are in government; you have a mandate to privatise them only if, preferably, you have been totally open and honest with the people of South Australia and there is an urgent reason why something needs to be privatised. Then you at least take it through parliament.

It appears—although the advice to me is not totally clear—that the government may technically be able to do the first part of this privatisation without coming through the parliament. However, I understand that even yesterday the Treasurer, in another place, advised parliamentarians in the House of Assembly that at some point in the future there would have to be legislation changes, because after the capping period that the government has promised to put on the CTP until after the next election—so that motorists do not see any further increases until after the next election, to falsely protect the government—they would have to bring a regulator in. When the regulator comes in they would have to have legislation changes.

That immediately says to me, 'That's interesting,' because tomorrow we are going to find out whether we are going to get absolute confirmation of \$1.2 billion, which will be the largest asset receipt to the government since the privatisation of ETSA. It is a very large and significant amount of money. I am advised it could be higher; in fact, some indicators suggest that it may be as high as \$2 billion tomorrow, but we will have a look at that when the budget papers are available. However, the point is that this is a serious amount of money.

When you look at it, some of that money has already been paid. At the end of the day, whichever way the Treasurer wants to talk about this—he can say it is going into the road fund and is not going into general revenue—the reality is that that money is being taken. It is not even actually taxpayers money per se; it is actually money specifically paid by motorists and businesses with vehicles, by farmers with their tractors, trucks and utes. It is their money, and it is the money of the Motor Accident Commission because of the excellent investment work it has done. It is not even general taxpayers' money, yet this government is going to take it and put it into recurrent funding. It is not even going to go off the core debt.

At this point in time it cannot go through the parliament because they can sneakily do this without going through the parliament—that is what I am told, and that is what I trust that SARC will be able to investigate. It is also not going to go off core debt but is simply going to help add to what will be a false or artificial surplus that I expect will be shown into the forward years prior to the next election, come tomorrow's budget.

I did some research on this and, for members' interest, if you look at the many prior years (not just the last one or two) the average return from investments for the Motor Accident Commission has been 6.25 per cent. What starts to worry me is that not only do I find that the then treasurer was asking for scoping before the last election, but when you look at the freedom of information documents you actually discover that there were confidential agreements that Treasury forced senior officials in the Motor Accident Commission to sign. Whilst I do not see the names of those in the documents, I certainly have a copy of the template for that, and I am told that Treasury has basically taken over control of the Motor Accident Commission. Even worse, I am told that because of these commercial contracts between executive members of the Motor Accident Commission—non-board members, that is—and Treasury, work was being done without the knowledge of the board. We need

to establish whether that is true because that is a very serious matter if indeed work was being done and control taken by Treasury.

I am told that what we are going to see tomorrow is a \$30 hit to motorists in South Australia. I just want to put on the public record \$30. It will show a \$7 increase, I am advised. The fact is that, had the government not announced the privatisation, then just as last year when the Motor Accident Commission had a reduction in CTP to motorists, the board was expecting—because of their very strong asset base which is way above what any actuarial has ever indicated they needed to meet their obligations and their unfunded and potential liabilities—a \$23 reduction in premiums again this year.

The reality is that it is just not a \$7 increase to the motorist, it is actually a \$30 hit to every motorist in this state simply because this state government wants to take money from an entity that I do not believe it has a right to. In fact, just on that, I want to put on the public record what a highly respected lawyer, Mr Tony Kerin, said on the Leon Byner program this week. He said that he did not believe you could use that money for road infrastructure. That is another thing that I am asking SARC to have a look at because we need to understand whether or not they are legally allowed to do that.

The bottom line is that motorists will be hit with \$30 extra because the government has decided to privatise and put this into general revenue. I understand that, when the MAC board discovered that the Treasurer and the government were intending to privatise the CTP for South Australia and basically make defunct MAC as we know it today, they were horrified. They thought that this was not in the interest of South Australia. This is almost like Gillman all over again when you think about it, because the board of Renewal SA said, 'We need to go out with expressions of interest for Gillman.' The allegations at the moment with Gillman are that the government has undersold it by possibly hundreds of millions of dollars. They ignored the board.

Now we have another situation where a board has said, 'This is wrong.' Not only did they say it was wrong, they said, 'We will give you an alternative that is better than what you are going to do with the privatisation.' That is what the board said to the government. In fact I understand that the board said that they could probably pay up to \$1 billion and then give an annual return into the future of up to \$150 million. If that is true, we need to urgently and seriously investigate this because short-term political gain is going to cause very long-term pain to 1.5 million South Australians.

Where the modelling has been adopted in places like New South Wales, they have seen an increase in their CTP of 70 per cent in just five years. I have an interesting article in front of me about how the Treasurer of New South Wales was under incredible pressure because the private providers for CTP in that state went to her and said, 'We need another 15 per cent increase.' MPs over there were getting very nervous about all of these increases. There had already been a 70 per cent increase over five years.

But guess what? I understand that the Treasurer approved the 15 per cent increase because the private provider said, 'If we can't get that, then we are going to walk. We don't want the business because we are not going to make a loss on it.' I also advise the house that I am advised that government has a benefit in running a CTP as against the private sector because the government does not have to have all of the offsets and the reporting processes that the private sector does in relation to the underwriting. So, there is an absolute advantage for a start on the government owning this.

If you buy the Premier's argument yesterday, when the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier and myself were on radio debating this, where he said that there was a pretty strong chance that CTP would come down as a result of privatisation, if he is so sure about all that, why does he not adopt the same thing with WorkCover? They will not do it with WorkCover, but with MAC they are prepared to do it. We know the reasons why, but we need the investigation.

I want to put a couple of other things on the public record. I understand that PricewaterhouseCoopers were commissioned by an insurance company (and I will not name the insurance company) to have a look at possible opportunities if there was privatisation. My advice is that this was prior to the announcement that they would be privatising. Somewhere between 6 and 12 months before the budget came out last year, I understand that a national insurance company

engaged PricewaterhouseCoopers to actually have a look at what the benefits would be of getting involved in the private market opportunity of privatisation of MAC.

I also want to put on the public record that I am advised that, when the Motor Accident Board put the alternative proposal to the government of being able to provide what is effectively a cash payment of up to \$1 billion, a one-off whack of a massive amount of money, and then up to \$100 to \$150 million a year, they actually got a company called Finity to have a look at the whole thing. They actually got an independent company called Finity and they had a look at it all. I am told that Finity is a company that does all the actuarials and assessments and is regularly used by governments, including the state government.

When MAC put this proposal, rather than the government and Treasury having a look at what they were always in the past happy to look at with what Finity say—and I understand Finity say that the proposal that the MAC Board put forward was actually conservative—guess what? Treasury decided that they would get the same company that the national insurance company got to scope this (PricewaterhouseCoopers) to have a look at what the board had put forward after it had been signed off allegedly by Finity, and then they dismissed it and said it was not possible and was too optimistic.

I think we really need to have a close look at it all. If the government were to come out and actually table all of those documents, the parliament may have a different opinion to what I am putting forward, because I hope that the parliament will support my proposal, but the government are refusing to make those documents available. We cannot get the documentation that MAC provided the Treasurer as the alternative. We cannot even get the PricewaterhouseCoopers document that went to Treasury with respect to the assessment they did on the proposal from the MAC Board.

At the end of the day, this might be good for this government because it will give a false surplus. It adds to the opportunity for a false surplus, just like the \$10 million additional hit on the ESL for the Sampson Flat fires has done. This was unprecedented: instead of pulling that money out of contingency money, they have hit everybody that owns property—

The Hon. J.A. Darley: What about \$2.7 billion from SA Water?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: And, of course, the \$2.7 billion that my colleague, the Hon. John Darley, talks about, which they took from their core debt to give it across to SA Water Corporation so that they had to manage that, and guess what: every South Australian is now paying more for their water.

The point is that, long-term, I am very concerned that this is going to lead to a significant increase in CTP. Given that we already are the highest-taxed state in Australia, given that we have the highest unemployment in Australia, given that we have very significant core debt and we do not have a structure to have genuine, sustainable surpluses, why would you actually sell off the last piece of crystal in the cabinet chest when it can deliver sustainable returns ongoing into the future?

I apologise that that overview has taken a little while, but I wanted to put it all on the public record. I have to act in good faith with what has been put to me from my informants, and I also have to act with the material I have available to me through freedom of information and other material that is available, but I believe that this is such a serious issue, with no mandate from the government to be able to do this, trying to bypass the parliament and leaving our future with increases in CTP that will be out of control, because at the end of the day the shareholders of those insurance companies will demand dividends.

We have a model here that is a tremendous model. The people who have done the investment for the MAC should be congratulated: they should be put in charge of Treasury and not Treasury taking over control of what they are doing, because their returns have been superb. It is diverse, it is in cash, it is in property and it is in shares. It is safe because of the quality of those people. I will leave members with these last remarks.

I am told that the Hon. Mr Jeff Kennett, back in about 2000, had a look at privatising their equivalent of MAC. It is fair to say that the Hon. Jeff Kennett was probably a pro-privatisation premier, but when appropriate. Jeff Kennett had a look at their equivalent of MAC (their MAC is called TAC) and said that in no way would they privatise it. If you look at the budget papers through those years

since Jeff Kennett made that decision to stick to a model the same as we have here now, there has been, I am told, several billion dollars returned to the coffers of Victoria.

We already have the second highest CTP charges in Australia, and the only state that has higher charges than us happens to be New South Wales, and that is effectively the model that this government is adopting. By interest, the Western Australian CTP is about 50 per cent of what we pay here in South Australia.

So, this is an important and urgent matter. I thank my colleagues for listening to this debate, and I strongly encourage them to support my motion. I trust that it will be up and approved for the next Wednesday of sitting, and I wish SARC well with its deliberations, because it will be interesting to see what it can factually obtain and report to the parliament.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT INJURY SCHEMES

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:23): I move:

That the Social Development Committee inquire into and report on the impact of the Lifetime Care and Support Scheme and the Compulsory Third Party Insurance Scheme on persons injured in motor vehicle accidents and any other relevant matters including, but not limited to, consideration of other schemes in operation around the country.

In 2013 this government introduced the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Bill. The bill represented a major shift in the way we deal with the rights of persons injured in motor vehicle accidents. It sought to establish a no-fault lifetime support scheme for those people catastrophically injured in motor vehicle accidents, irrespective of who was at fault. To counter the costs associated with such a scheme, the bill also sought to overhaul the existing fault-based CTP insurance scheme, including significant changes to tort law for awards of damages under that scheme.

At the time of the debate I made it clear that, whilst I supported a call for a no-fault lifetime support scheme for persons who sustained catastrophic injuries, I did not support such a measure being implemented at the expense and the diminution of a person's ability to seek appropriate compensation for at-fault accidents.

My colleague the Hon. Kelly Vincent also counselled the government against blanket use of injury tables and the catastrophic impact that failing to take an injured person's age, personal situation or employment into account would have. The honourable member was very clear in her criticism of and opposition to the government's proposal, and I am extremely grateful that she has joined me in calling for this motion.

A number of amendments were moved to try to soften the blow of the government's bill. Some of those amendments were adopted, but not nearly enough to make up for the major shortcomings of the legislation. The government did agree to a provision proposed by the Hon. Tammy Franks for a comprehensive review into the operation of the scheme after the three-year mark. That was a very welcome amendment.

The Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act commenced operation last year. Since then, the government has announced its plan to sell off and privatise the Motor Accident Commission, a decision I think most of us find absolutely astonishing. The problem is that, if the government presses ahead with this ridiculous plan, any review into the effectiveness of the changes to the act and the scheme will be rendered absolutely useless. If we wait three years for the review it is highly unlikely that the review will be effective, if the government has sold the fund and stipulated that there will be no change to the legislation, which any purchasing insurer is likely to require.

The impact of the scheme on injured persons has been tremendous, and the ability to claim damages for many injuries has either diminished or been abolished altogether. I have received some comparisons of actual case studies which I will place on the record. The first example relates to the loss of vision of one eye. For a motor vehicle accident claim under the new scheme, such an injury would have a range of 26 to 30 ISV points.

Under the old motor accident scheme, if it attracted 30 points, the non-economic loss lump sum would be \$91,830. For a WorkCover claim, the injury would equate to approximately 50 per cent whole person impairment. For an injury occurring in 2013, this would result in a non-economic loss assessment of \$237,599. Under the new scheme, an entitlement has been reduced by approximately 75 per cent and a person injured in a motor vehicle accident gets a mere 10 per cent of what a person injured in a work accident gets.

The second example relates to a cyclist who is knocked off his bike. The injured person has an ISV of between eight and nine points and is likely to require surgery to repair ligaments. Even with such injuries, a 9 per cent ISV does not attract an assessment for non-economic loss. If it was a WorkCover claim, assuming an 8 per cent whole person impairment for a 2013 injury, the injured person would be entitled to \$18,394. Under the old motor vehicle scheme, a not unreasonable assessment for this injury would be five points, which would give a lump sum payment of \$7,650.

The third example also relates to a cyclist being knocked off a bike. The cyclist has fractures to her wrist, thumb and rib, and her pre-existing osteoarthritis has been aggravated. She is assessed at ISV 11 points. Her entitlement to non-economic loss for a 2013 injury is \$3,000. If she had sustained the same injuries during work, the whole person impairment would be around 10 per cent and she would be entitled to \$20,243. Under the old scheme, the injured person would have an assessment of between 10 and 15 points, which would equate to a lump sum of around \$21,430.

How these examples could be considered fair is anyone's guess. I am sure a person injured in a motor vehicle accident would be amazed to know that, if they are male and they happen to lose a testicle in a motor vehicle accident, that injury would not satisfy the threshold for non-economic loss, that is, for pain and suffering.

The legal profession, including law firms, the Law Society's CTP group, the SA Bar Association and the Australian Lawyers Alliance, are telling us that the scheme is so harsh and so draconian that the majority of victims involved in motor accidents are precluded from receiving compensation for pain and suffering. Contrary to what the government is telling us, we are not talking about minor injuries. We are talking about significant injuries with long-term effects.

It is not just entitlements to claims for pain and suffering that have been lost. We are being advised that potential clients with injuries are being turned away in droves because they simply do not meet any of the thresholds in the new legislation. The bottom line is, if we do not have a review now and you or anyone you know are unlucky enough to be involved in a motor vehicle accident, then you had better hope and pray that it occurs within the course of your employment so that you have any hope of being more appropriately compensated for all your injuries.

The changes to the CTP scheme are relatively new, and it is difficult to know the full extent of the impact they have on injured persons. That is why it is so important that we inquire into this issue now and assess the information that we have available before the government proceeds with its plans to privatise the MAC, especially because we are all completely in the dark when it comes to the detail around what the government is proposing.

We have not even received a clear answer as to whether the plans require either legislation or changes to regulation but, if the government is intent on pressing ahead with that proposal and we wait for another two or three years before any sort of review takes place, it will simply be too late. With that, I commend the motion to the council, and I look forward to hearing from other honourable members on this very important issue.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

O-BAHN TUNNEL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.A. Darley:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the state government's O-Bahn access project, with reference to—
 - (a) any alternative transport routes and/or proposals prepared by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, in respect of the O-Bahn extension proposal;

- (b) any alternative transport routes and/or proposals in respect of the O-Bahn extension proposal, including any considered by the state government;
 - (c) any alternative proposals to save time for commuters, that do not include major road works, including pre-validation of fares;
 - (d) any investigations, undertaken by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, into road traffic movement in Grenfell Street;
 - (e) any cost-benefit analyses related to the O-Bahn extension proposal;
 - (f) the community impacts of the O-Bahn city access project proposal, including any adverse effects on local residents, local traders and businesses and, community events;
 - (g) the impacts of any likely disruption during the construction phase of the O-Bahn city access project proposal;
 - (h) any likely adverse impacts on Rymill Park after construction of the proposed busway tunnel and highway connection to Grenfell Street;
 - (i) any potential impacts of the O-Bahn city access project proposal on the current Royal Adelaide Hospital site, the Adelaide Zoo and other surrounding sites;
 - (j) how the O-Bahn extension proposal fits in with the state government's Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan;
 - (k) the cost benefit of extending the O-Bahn to suburbs including Golden Grove and/or surrounding suburbs; and
 - (l) any other relevant matters.
2. That standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the Chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.
 3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.
 4. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

(Continued from 3 June 2015.)

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (16:33): I rise to outline the government's position on this motion. The O-Bahn city access project has undergone a substantial community consultation phase with feedback sought from commuters, stakeholders, businesses, residents and local councils, including the Adelaide City Council. On Wednesday 10 June, after the tabling of this motion, changes to the proposed plan were announced in response to the community feedback.

The revised scheme includes the retention of Rundle Road, addressing car parking in the East End of the city, reduced impact on Rymill Park, maintaining an increase in parkland, consideration for a future tram corridor, no net loss of trees, and better access for local residents on East Terrace and Grenfell Street. The Adelaide City Council, the lead stakeholder in regard to the Parklands, has supported the revised plan following its announcement.

The O-Bahn city access project is the result of an election commitment made by the government at the last state election. The government believes that it is important to deliver bus commuters to Grenfell Street faster and more reliably. We believe this will bring more people into the city via the O-Bahn. The state government is committed to ensuring this objective is achieved.

The project announced in February outlined many additional benefits the government has identified to revitalise the East End of the city, including the return of 3,000 square metres of road reserve to parklands and improved events space in Rundle Park and calmer traffic in Rundle Street itself.

Over the past few months, the O-Bahn project team has been gathering public feedback on that plan and consulting with key stakeholders, businesses and residents. The minister has stated that, wherever possible, the project team would seek to revise the project in response to community concerns. The changes focus on addressing the key concerns raised while achieving the improvements necessary to our public transport network:

- addressing car parking in the East End of the city, with over 50 more car parks than currently exist along Rundle Road and East Terrace;
- reduced impact on Rymill Park with a 140 metre longer tunnel (now 650 metres with only 40 metres at grade, and 120 metres of ramp), and the retention of Rundle Road in its existing location;
- maintaining an increased parkland with a smaller road footprint, with Rundle Road reduced to one lane in each direction;
- consideration for a future tram corridor along North Terrace, East Terrace, and Rundle Road;
- a separated bikeway along Rundle Road; and
- it endeavours to have no net loss of trees with a reduction of eight affected trees (including three significant) from the previous plan.

The revisions announced on 10 June address many of the issues raised in the motion by the Hon. John Darley and have received the support of the Adelaide City Council and positive comments from the Rymill Park alliance who have led the protest against the original proposal. All the relevant information will be presented to the Public Works Committee as per the normal parliamentary process. For these reasons, the government does not support the Hon. John Darley's motion.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (16:37): I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak to the motion of the Hon. John Darley that a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the state government's O-Bahn access project with reference to a range of particular terms of reference. I will not go through them today because the members will have them all on the *Notice Paper*.

The opposition will be supporting the Hon. John Darley's motion for a select committee. I think the first time we heard about upgrades to the O-Bahn was when minister Patrick Conlon was a minister for transport and I think he and his good friend Anthony Albanese, the federal minister, flew around Adelaide in a helicopter and looked down and they made a decision that maybe that would be something that they could be involved in and could fund. Of course, we did not see that project go ahead and now we have had a number of other potential solutions to save a few minutes of travel time each time into the city with changes to the access to the city with the O-Bahn.

I remind members that the O-Bahn was, of course, an initiative of the Tonkin government in 1979-82—so, some 30 years ago it was an initiative of a Liberal government. I think it is testament to their foresight that that is still an extremely well used bit of public infrastructure and has served the north-eastern suburbs extremely well.

It always concerned me—particularly in the proposal which now has been changed—but the initial proposal, I thought, lacked a lot of community engagement. Some of the restaurants in the East End in Rundle Street, and one in particular which I will not name, told me that if car parking was removed from Rundle Road, they would shut up shop and move somewhere else. It would have such an impact on their business they did not believe they could sustain their business with the impact on car parking.

There is a revised plan, but I still think it is an opportunity for the select committee to actually sit down and talk to those people who actually go out and borrow money, put their house on the line to grow a small business, work seven days a week and long hours, and have a number of staff who contribute to the population and jobs growth in South Australia to ensure that any new bit of infrastructure does not impact on those businesses. In a time when we are seeing jobs being shed all over the state, any business that is actually employing people should be regarded with absolute importance and we should make sure that no bit of new infrastructure has a negative impact on any business at all.

I am interested, in particular, in term (k) which is the cost benefit of extending the O-Bahn into some further suburbs, including Golden Grove and other surrounding suburbs. We are going to

spend \$140 million or \$150 million, but every project this government puts its hands on goes over budget, so I think it will be somewhere between \$150 million and \$200 million we will spend.

I wonder what the benefit is if you actually spend \$150 million or \$200 million at the other end of the line to give more people some opportunities. I accept that you are not going to get those time savings at this end of the journey, but you may actually give an increased number of South Australians an opportunity to access that public transport as well.

I noticed yesterday that *The Advertiser* had an online poll where certainly there was not unanimous community support for the saving of time at the end of the journey. There was a whole range of other options posed. I think this select committee gives an opportunity to have an in-depth look at the proposal. The Hon. Gerry Kandelaars has said it will go to the Public Works Committee. Of course, that is the Public Works Committee that is dominated by the government and the government has the numbers. This gives us an opportunity under, I assume, the chairmanship of the Hon. John Darley to have a close look at this particular piece of proposed public infrastructure.

I reiterate that no bit of public infrastructure in this sort of jobs crisis environment that we have now should have a negative impact on any particular job or business. We have a whole range of very good businesses in the East End and I think we need to hear from them to make sure that anything that is done in the future supports and enhances their businesses and grows them, not has a negative impact on them. With those few words, I indicate the opposition would be delighted to support the Hon. John Darley's motion.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:42): The Greens too will be supporting the creation of this select committee, and we congratulate the Hon. John Darley for the initiative to bring it before us. The fact that we are supporting the select committee does not mean that the Greens are opposed to public transport infrastructure projects. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth.

At a personal level, I was a founding member and public officer of the group, People for Public Transport SA Inc., and I am also a member of the Adelaide Park Lands Preservation Association. I am a firm believer in the principle that you can walk and chew gum at the same time. We can have a better public transport system and we can protect our Parklands from inappropriate intrusions, and that is where I see this select committee having a valuable role in exploring all of the different options and hopefully coming up with some consensus recommendations that give taxpayers value for money and, most importantly, improve our public transport service and protect the Parklands.

A number of people have said that they do not support this particular public transport project on the basis of how little time it saves. I will remind members that back when what is now called the Southern Expressway was first being mooted—the third arterial road was the sexy title it had back then—that was going to save seven minutes, exactly the same time saving that has been foreshadowed for this one. I do not think that that is the be all and end all of it, because when it comes to public transport, if we are to encourage people to use more public transport, then it does need to be competitive with private car travel and therefore we do need to take options that make public transport travel faster.

So the Greens strongly support public transport and we want to see a much improved public transport network and system in Adelaide. However, there were elements of the government's O-Bahn City Access Project that did cause some concern, and at the top of that list was the impact—what we say was the unnecessary impact—that it would have on Rymill Park; in particular, the construction of a new multi-lane road through some of the most important parts of Rymill Park, very close to the recreational lake and one of the most popular picnic precincts in that park. We thought the government could do better, and I am very pleased to say that the government has come back with some different plans which, whilst we have not examined every aspect of them, do appear to be better.

That does not mean we should abandon this select committee. In fact, I think the parliament should be taking more opportunities, not less, to look at public infrastructure projects. I accept, as the Hon. David Ridgway said, that the Public Works Committee is a poor substitute for genuine multi-party scrutiny of major projects; we just do not do enough of that in this chamber. I do not think the changes to the plan removes the need or the desirability of having a select committee and I have

offered, to the Hon. John Darley, to serve on that committee if it is established. This is a complex project and is deserving of scrutiny.

One other aspect I will touch on briefly is the latest plan, which involves leaving Rundle Road as it is, thereby retaining it as a throughway and retaining the on-street car parks there. One thing I would like this select committee to have a look at is to perhaps look at what the government was originally proposing in terms of Rundle Road, because it strikes me that there were some other options that could have returned some or all of that land to parklands yet still provide good access and a good East End business and visitor experience.

One thing we were quite interested in exploring was this notion that Rundle Street, if Rundle Road were closed, would effectively become an isolated length of street that served little purpose as a through road. If that were, in fact, to occur, then traffic-calming Rundle Street, perhaps turning it into a one-way road, widening the footpath, increasing the footpath dining areas—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Perhaps, as the Hon. Rob Brokenshire says, closing it to cars and making it a pedestrian/restaurant precinct. There is a range of options which I think are well deserving of exploration, and I would like to think that this select committee could have a look at some of these options that might flow from an O-Bahn City Access Project.

I think this select committee is a good initiative. I think it does serve a need. The community is certainly asking lots of questions, including whether the money might be better spent on another part of the public transport network, such as extending the O-Bahn further from the city. The Greens have an open mind about whether that would be a better project; maybe it would be an additional project. Certainly our position has long been that, given the billions upon billions of dollars that have been spent expanding the road network in Adelaide and South Australia, spending on public transport has not been sufficient, and we think the government could be doing much better.

Our support for this select committee should in no way be interpreted as somehow being critical of public transport. As I have reminded members on probably about 25 occasions, I have written only two short books in my life, and one of them was *Greening Adelaide with Public Transport*, now sadly out of print. However, I do recall that then transport minister Diana Laidlaw bought 10 copies of my book at \$7 each, so no doubt there are copies in the transport department library.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins): Order!

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: With those brief remarks, the Greens will be supporting this select committee.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:49): Dignity for Disability, of course, joins other members in supporting the establishment of this select committee and in welcoming this initiative because, as with almost any project of this size, there are many options available as to how it might look—but previous speakers have described what those options might be, so I will not go into detail. With a project of this size and with as many options available for how it might roll out, I think it is only right and proper that alternatives are examined and the process is examined and those options are weighed up.

The minister put the government's case for the O-Bahn extension to me in a briefing that my office had with him as a way of 'stopping buses taking up space from cars'. South Australia purports to be getting with the times, and certainly I think in some ways we are. One example is our uptake of alternative energy as being something that has drawn positive feedback, but private vehicle use certainly in general has to decline if we are to meet our environmental obligations into the future. As policymakers we cannot just keep saying that we need to make room for cars.

Adelaideans—and I will confine my comments to the capital here because public transport outside of this city is woefully inadequate and, in some ways, another matter altogether—by and large, seem to have been slow in comparison to residents from other cities in Australia and the world to take up public transport. I believe that we are now seeing an increase in patronage, and certainly the use of smart phone technology, I think, has increased commuter confidence from what I can tell

in using the public transport network. Bus journeys, I am told, currently make up 80 per cent of Adelaide's public transport trips and mass transportation is the only way we can look to the future to move large numbers of commuters in and out of our CBD.

I think it is something of a mixed message to be blaming the bus for taking up road space when, in fact, we want to encourage more people to take up public transport options. Dignity for Disability would certainly like to see a study on reducing car usage to create an equal or improved travel time for the O-Bahn. In relation to the proposed extension of the track, perhaps there are some more effective solutions—and for such a short distance the amount of money envisaged seems to be somewhat obscene.

The desecration of our parklands seems unnecessary and the benefits to both O-Bahn passengers and other road users seem to have been exaggerated. We certainly appreciate that there have been some negotiations and improvements to these plans in recent days and we welcome those based on community feedback, but we do think that we also need to take a project of this size very seriously. With those few words, Dignity for Disability commends the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:52): The O-Bahn is the most highly patronised public transport corridor in the metropolitan area, carrying approximately eight million passengers per year. The Infrastructure Australia Audit report has identified:

- Congestion on Adelaide roads will get worse in the next 20 years without investment in vital transport infrastructure.
- If no action is taken the travel times in Adelaide will increase by at least 20 per cent—and some trips could more than double.
- By 2031 delay costs of Lower North East Road/Payneham Road and North East Road transport corridors will reach \$2.74 million (an increase of 74 per cent) and \$2.3 million (an increase of 91 per cent) respectively.
- Bus patronage from Tea Tree Gully would surge 37 per cent by 2031 as well.

As part of the 2014-15 state budget, it was confirmed that \$160 million will be provided by the state government to improve access into the CBD from the O-Bahn track at Gilberton. I am going to outline some of the current congestion on the current ring routes. The current vehicle movements per day at the Botanic Road/Hackney Road intersection is 79,000 per day. This is near capacity; it must be fixed. At Rundle Road/Dequetteville Terrace, 44,900 vehicles per day; Hackney Road, 44,600; Rundle Road, 14,500; and 25 per cent of travel time due to delays at these intersections.

With the O-Bahn buses, there are currently over 31,000 O-Bahn commuters on an average working day and over 1,000 O-Bahn buses per day. Between 7am and 9am, there are 150 buses coming out of the exit point on Hackney Road. That is one bus every 48 seconds—less than one minute. If you are standing there, one bus will come out every minute.

At peak periods, buses can be delayed up to 30 minutes. I know honourable members have mentioned the seven-minute mark, but if you are looking at delays in peak periods, it can get up to 30 minutes. These are the problems that commuters on O-Bahn buses and people who are driving around that area are facing every day. This is not some kind of ALP conspiracy that we dreamt up. These are the facts, and the fact is it will get worse if we do not fix it. In 10 years time, it will multiply.

Rundle Road can certainly cope with 15,000 vehicles per day, so it does not need two lanes. Once completed, by reducing one lane in each direction, the project will actually increase parking space and there will be more parkland. Currently, there are 218 car parks around Rundle Mall, which are made up of 150 on Rundle Road and 68 on East Terrace. In three years' time, hopefully, when the project is complete, there will be at least 50 more car parking spaces, and I believe the minister's office is currently working with the Adelaide City Council on that plan.

Congestion on the ring routes will be reduced by separating O-Bahn buses from the general public. Very often, people have complained that, during the Clipsal period, when they have to drive into the city, the O-Bahn on Hackney Road is holding up and congesting traffic. This project will fix that problem. Buses will go straight underneath, through the tunnel to Grenfell Street.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. T.T. NGO: In peak time. Currently, the 150 buses that come out between 7am and 9am come out into full-on heavy traffic. By the end of this project, those problems hopefully will be alleviated. Rymill Park currently has 145,000 square metres in park space; once the project is completed, I believe that the parkland space will actually increase to 149,121 square metres. Rundle Park currently has 65,696 square metres; this will stay the same. One important point that needs to be pointed out is that this project will create 450 jobs over the construction stage.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: How long will that be?

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Three years. As honourable members would know, we are not doing too well in this state regarding employment. People are screaming out for projects like this to create jobs, and the government is actually doing something about it. This project should be encouraged so that more jobs can be created for the people of South Australia. There should be more of these kinds of projects to unlock economic activity for this state. This project, I am certainly sure, is being welcomed by thousands of people who are looking for work at the moment.

I think as a council honourable members need to really have a good think about whether we need another select committee established to look at another inquiry, which to me is really wasting the council's resources and its staff. Some of the terms of reference that the honourable member moved make it some general inquiry, whereby honourable members can write to the minister or seek a briefing.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Or do nothing.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Or do nothing, yes. So, there are a number of other standing committees that can also investigate these issues raised by the Hon. Mr Darley. For example, the O-Bahn issue is currently being dealt with by the Public Works Committee in terms of the cost-benefit analysis. The Budget and Finance Committee, chaired by the Hon. Mr Lucas, a very good Chair, can certainly call in witnesses and ask these sorts of questions.

The ERD Committee, on which the Hon. Mr Parnell, Michelle Lensink and myself currently sit, deals with planning, land use and transportation. This committee is better equipped to deal with this matter raised by the Hon. Mr Darley. It probably would have more influence than the select committee to be set up under this motion. We do not need to set up another select committee to find answers on the terms of reference as proposed; it is really unnecessary.

I believe the continued establishment of select committees is denigrating the good committee structure that our parliament has at the moment. Our parliament only has so many resources. I must congratulate the Hon. Mr Brokenshire for moving the issue of outsourcing the MAC to the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. I hope he will speak next and be able to convince other honourable members that maybe that is what they should be doing. We are talking about a large project like MAC and he has referred it to another standing committee, which should be the way to go.

I acknowledge the Hon. John Darley's interest in this issue, but prior to the March 2014 state election the Labor government gave the commitment to the people of South Australia that, if it was re-elected, it would build a tunnel to fix the O-Bahn congestion along the ring route. The public and the opposition have been demanding for years that the congestion be fixed. Let me pull up some of the media releases that the opposition has put out. I have one here that has been organised by my staff. It is the media release by Vickie Chapman, MP, Deputy State Liberal Leader, shadow minister for transport and infrastructure, released on 8 May 2014, and it states:

Weatherill must commit to O-Bahn upgrade

Shadow Transport Minister Vickie Chapman has called on Premier Weatherill to recommit to his Labor Government's O-Bahn upgrade before the release of the State Budget in June.

One of the Weatherill Labor Government's election commitments was a \$160 million O-Bahn upgrade from Hackney Road into the CBD.

'Let's not forget that This State Labor Government has spent 12 years making and breaking promises', said Ms Chapman.

'Of course, Mr Weatherill has been a Cabinet Minister for 12 years.

'Mr Weatherill must tell South Australians before the June state budget whether or not his \$160 million O-Bahn upgrade still stands'.

Last month, L-plate Transport Minister, Stephen Mullighan, made an embarrassing gaffe about the completion date of the upgrade—bringing the project forward to 2017 when Labor's final election costings confirmed it would not be completed until at least 2018-19.

A previous proposal to extend the O-Bahn was announced and then scrapped by the Weatherill Labor Government.

'South Australians deserve to know whether or not this O-Bahn upgrade will go ahead in its current form, before the state budget is delivered in June,' said Ms Chapman.

'Why should South Australians trust Premier Weatherill to deliver this project this time?

'South Australians deserve a Government that delivers what it promises'.

I have another press release that was put out:

Talk is cheap and it is time for Mr Koutsantonis to put his money where his mouth is and fund the projects he personally promised South Australia that a Labor government would build...

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Gee, you have been getting Michael to do some work for a change.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: No, mate, I did it. The people of South Australia can trust this Premier, and this 'L-plate minister', if that is what the opposition wants to call him, and this government to deliver on this project. We are a government in the business of keeping our election promises. So I urge honourable members to follow the lead of the Hon. Mr Brokenshire and refer this issue to an existing standing committee so we can deal with it. I urge members not to vote for this motion.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (17:05): I want to put Family First's position on this motion on the public record. We are probably coming from a different angle to some of my colleagues. Whichever way people feel about this, I do not believe we have \$164 million at the moment to spend on this particular project to save three minutes, and I want to highlight why. In particular, we do not have a strategic transport plan. If it had not been for the Abbott government, as an example, funding the Darlington triangle upgrade then, whilst it is great to have a duplication of the Southern Expressway, it would come straight down to a bottleneck. This is the problem with this project: it is going to save 3½ minutes, but I wonder what the true net cost-benefit analysis is.

One of my staff members lives in the north-eastern suburbs but does not have the opportunity of using the O-Bahn, she has to use the other basic bus services. There is an absolute bottleneck in Grenfell Street and the fact is that the government does not have a plan to fix the bottleneck problem. If you are serious about a public transport plan, go to Perth and have a look at what they have there. They have a transport plan where they all come in underground and they go straight through to the CBD.

The key reason we are supporting this is motion is that, if you have a look at \$164 million, the people of the north-eastern suburbs by and large with respect to this O-Bahn extension from *The Advertiser* poll—the absolute majority of them do not support this project. We have a lot of constituents in the north-eastern suburbs and we will always stick up for them, but they want bigger park-and-ride opportunities back out in their own suburbs. Part of the problem at the moment is that they do not have the park-and-ride facilities out there. They want night services. Vouchers for access cabs for people with a disability are short in number and they are continually running out of them.

Consider the horrendous and tragic fatalities in the last few days. I will start with the one at the intersection of the Yorke Highway and the Copper Coast Highway near Port Wakefield. We lost a lovely 14-year-old lad and two beautiful parents; their children are now orphans. That intersection needs an overpass. We are going to have a situation where people will not go on to the Yorke Peninsula as tourists to the extent that they are now because they are fed up with what is happening and the safety issues with the roads there. That intersection needs an overpass. As one of my constituents said to me the other day, you could build an overpass at Port Wakefield for similar money to the overpass that the commonwealth mainly funded at McLaren Vale—probably about

\$20 million or \$25 million. You could then have a proper bypass and integrated infrastructure put in at Port Wakefield to overcome the bottlenecks and the safety issues.

Have a look at the tragedy last night on the Swanport Bridge. If you drive across the Swanport Bridge, it is a single lane each way and it is getting busier and busier with B-doubles. It is actually quite scary. It needs to be two lanes each way on the Swanport Bridge, then maybe the tragedy last night may not have occurred.

What I am trying to say in a nutshell is that, if the government have got a lazy \$164 million at the moment, put the \$164 million into broader public transport improvements like park-and-rides and better bus and access cab opportunities, and start to fix up some of our busted up roads that are causing road trauma and tragedy. I was told that we have gone from around about \$200 million of backlog road maintenance, mainly in the country, to \$1 billion worth of backlog road maintenance now and a lot of urgent infrastructure.

So, from those points of view, we actually think that the priorities at the moment should be to spend the money wisely and better and provide a much broader opportunity for South Australians to be safe when they are travelling on our roads, whether it is public transport or main roads. We therefore commend the Hon. John Darley and, if there is a division, we will be voting with the Hon. John Darley to support a thorough and transparent investigation through the select committee.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (17:10): I just want to make two quick points as a result of the debate. The first one is I would urge members, if the committee is established, to look at the evidence given by former CEO of DPTI Rod Hook about two years ago in relation to one of the earlier versions of the O-Bahn tunnel plan.

His evidence, in summary, was very significantly that you had to cater for, as part of your costing of your project, changes and the impacts on Grenfell Street. He said it made no sense just talking about digging tunnels, building bridges or whatever it happened to be and dumping all of this extra traffic, buses in particular.

He outlined in some detail what needed to be done on Grenfell Street. It had not been finely costed and done, but he certainly outlined the important part of the work that would need to be done. I would urge members, if this committee is established, to look at his evidence. It would probably be sensible to get Rod Hook to come and give evidence to the committee, I would have thought.

The second point I make was just to put on the record my response to the Hon. Mr Parnell's assertion that a fair comparison of the seven-minute saving on the O-Bahn was the same as the claimed seven-minute saving on the original Southern Expressway. I did interject at the time. I just want to place on the record that I suspect, without having had a chance to check, that the seven minutes, if that was indeed the correct claim at the time, might have related to the travel time one way into the city or whatever, whereas the seven minutes which is being discussed here is a two-way calculation of savings both going in and out.

I understand there are different calculations for going in and different calculations for going out. I accept all of that, but I just wanted to place on the public record that I did not want an implied criticism of a fine infrastructure project at the time to stand on the record uncorrected.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:12): I would like to thank the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. David Ridgway, the Hon. Mark Parnell, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Tung Ngo and the Hon. Robert Brokenshire for their contributions, and I look forward to all members' support on this motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. Mark Parnell, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. Terry Stephens, the Hon. David Ridgway and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and to report on 29 July 2015.

Motion carried.

MARRIAGE EQUALITY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:14): I move:

That this council—

1. Supports marriage equality; and
2. Calls on the parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia to amend the Marriage Act 1961 to provide for marriage equality.

We are not so 'dearly beloved' in this chamber today, but we are gathered here to witness the debate in our nation. I truly hope that those who have spoken long and loudly in support of spurious efforts, I believe, to deny a couple the right to wed will then forever have to hold their peace sometime soon. I know in this place that we do have a difference of opinions, and I do look forward to those opinions being put forward in a debate and taking this motion to a vote.

Bring on the marriage equality debates I say, because if this issue has shown one thing, it is that debate changes opinions—and changes opinions in support of marriage equality. It dispels the misconceptions if we have the debate. The misconception that marriage is just a religious matter has long been dispelled. As we know, not all religious leaders oppose marriage equality; some would welcome it in their congregations. In fact, some of those religious leaders in this state marry other couples each and every weekend, yet cannot marry each other. It also dispels the myth that the creation of a family is what marriage is about. Well, we know that not all families see children born in wedlock, and we also know that not all couples who marry want to, or desire to have children.

We know that in the past it has been said that this debate would be changing the institution of marriage. Well, the institution of marriage has long changed to suit the culture and the society in which those marriages are performed. We do not have prohibition on interracial marriages in 2015 in Australia I am proud to say, but not so long ago it would have been not the thing for a black man to marry a white woman, or vice versa. We know that once upon a time, in my mother's time, it would have been unheard of for a Catholic to marry a Protestant—yet that would rarely raise an eyebrow these days.

The other idea that marriage is somehow an immovable institution is most obviously shown to be a false contention by the fact that in 2004, in this country, then prime minister Howard changed our marriage act to specifically deny same-sex couples the right to marry. He did so because same-sex couples were getting married overseas and coming back and seeking to have those marriages—quite rightly, I believe—recognised under Australian law.

Churches have the right to marry who they see fit, and they will continue to do so. Marriage equality will not restrict the right of any church to deny a marriage that is sought by that particular church. It will also empower those churches, such as the Quakers, to marry people that they so choose. Marriage equality will not see the sky fall down; it will see the sun rise tomorrow, and the only thing that will be changed if we allow same-sex couples to marry is that some same-sex couples will get married.

I commend those in the federal parliament who are currently actively putting forward bills on this issue to recognise marriage equality. Most recently, we have seen a Liberal Democrat senator put this issue firmly and squarely back on the agenda and then a Greens bill, and now a Labor bill.

I do not agree with the Prime Minister on many things, but I do agree with his words that it would be great to see a parliament bill: a cross-party bill brought to the federal parliament this year and voted on with a free vote. Yet, the Prime Minister has yet to allow that free vote, and I know that Liberals around the country would urge him to allow that free vote, and I would hope that in this debate here in this council we can show whether or not Liberal members of this council are willing to support a free vote and also marriage equality. I believe some of them will.

I note that it is not so long ago that the Labor Party did not have a free vote on this issue. When former backbencher and now minister, Ian Hunter, and I cosponsored a bill in 2010 for

marriage equality, the honourable member, Ian Hunter, was able to cosponsor that bill, but under former premier Rann was not necessarily able to vote for that bill. Things have changed in the Labor Party and I welcome that. I know that it is something that many in the Liberal Party have spoken out about and certainly members such as Warren Entsch, and in South Australia Senator Simon Birmingham, have been strong and proud advocates for marriage equality.

When those politicians do speak out they should know that they are not alone, that the numbers in the community are growing stronger by the day, and that across Australia thinking, caring people, no matter their sexuality, no matter their religion and no matter their background or age, are increasingly supporting marriage equality. They are questioning the successive Howard, Rudd/Gillard and then Rudd rebooted efforts to quash this debate, and the Abbott government, in continuing to deny a full debate on this issue, will stand on the wrong side of history.

Those Australians number in the majority as 72 per cent of Australians now support marriage equality according to last year's Crosby Textor survey of 1,000 Australians. That is the highest level, and the numbers continue to grow. The survey shows a majority of support in every demographic including people of faith, people in regional and rural areas, and older people. While the Australian government does not recognise same-sex marriages entered into overseas or allow same-sex marriages to be performed within this country, many Australians are saying it is time we said resoundingly 'We do.'

It is a question that has been asked and answered in many other countries. In the Netherlands in 2001 they said yes to marriage equality, Belgium in 2003, Canada provincially in 2003 and then nationally in 2005, and Spain, South Africa, Norway, Sweden, Mexico City, Portugal, Iceland, Argentina, Uruguay, New Zealand, France, Brazil, England, Wales, Scotland, and Luxembourg. We know many other countries continue to consider and are on the verge of also moving towards marriage equality. Many states of the United States of America have accepted this. They have had the debate and yet it is a question we still have yet to answer in the affirmative in this country.

This issue has been on the political agenda and the parliament's agenda since 2004 when John Howard moved to diminish the human rights of same-sex couples who had married overseas. At that time my former boss and someone I am proud to call a friend, Senator Natasha Despoja, with former senator Andrew Bartlett, was the first to move a bill in the federal parliament specifically to legislate against this discrimination. I note that she was then in the minority, not only in the parliament, but in the community.

In fact, in 2010 on ABC radio she was out of step with her own husband, Ian Smith, who at that time opposed marriage equality. He stated it was on the grounds of religion. I am informed by Natasha—and I sure that Ian would be happy to confirm this—that he now strongly advocates for same-sex marriage and marriage equality. Other notable people, such as former Victorian premier Jeff Kennett, have shown that many of our political leaders have had a bit of a 'road to Damascus' on this issue.

When we bring on the debate it changes minds and it will recognise what is in the hearts of those same-sex adult consenting couples who simply wish to get married to the person they love. I know that many in the National Party and Liberal Party can be counted on in support of the ranks of those who support marriage equality. I am calling on the Liberal Party to show support for those members of their parties who wish to have a free vote to have that free vote and to have their opinions noted in this council on whether they support marriage equality or not. I urge all members to support this motion.

It is time for political courage to be shown. It is time for this issue to be taken out of the hands of backroom brokers in all political parties. It is time for these irrational policies of the past to be consigned to the dustbin of history. The Greens have been there; every member, every vote, every time. We will again and again vote for this issue until we win. We know it is the right thing to do, and we look forward to members of parliament on the right of chambers of parliaments across this country joining us in support of marriage equality.

We know the numbers in the community are there; I believe the numbers in the parliaments are there if they are given a free vote. The only thing that will change if we support marriage equality

is that we will have marriage equality. I look forward to that day, when we stand in solidarity and definitely on the right side of history. With that I commend the motion to the council.

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

EUROVISION SONG CONTEST

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:26): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Guy Sebastian on representing Australia and placing fifth at the 60th Eurovision Song Contest in Vienna;
2. Acknowledges the importance of having Australia represented at Eurovision, one of the longest running and most popular television shows in Europe; and
3. Notes that Guy Sebastian is one of Australia's most successful male artists and has been an active member and contributor to the South Australian community.

I rise to speak on this motion today because, as a proud Australian, I was excited to see Australia being recognised on the world stage at the 60th Eurovision Song Contest. The competition, held in Vienna, attracted close to 200 million people. Locally, SBS recorded that 4.2 million Australians watched the semi-finals and grand final of Eurovision this year.

I would like to use this motion to highlight a number of key themes: the impact of pop culture in our society; the impact of pop culture on our economy; the connectivity of Australia with the rest of the world; the showcase of multiculturalism; and the positive influence of a successful migrant ambassador in our community. As honourable members would know, popular culture (or pop culture) comprises ideas, perspectives, attitudes, images and other phenomena that are within the mainstream of a given culture.

The most common pop culture categories are entertainment (such as movies, music and TV), sports, fashion, and sometimes politics. Pop culture is heavily influenced by mass media and across social media. The collection of ideas permeates the everyday lives of a society. Over the last 60 years the Eurovision competition has been broadcast not only throughout Europe also in Canada, Egypt, Hong Kong, India, Jordan, Korea, New Zealand, the United States of America and, of course, Australia. It is no surprise that it is broadcast in Australia, because Australia is a proud country of migrants.

Eurovision is exceptionally popular, and is one of the longest-running European television shows in history. Over the last 60 years over 1,400 songs have been sung, and the contest has launched the careers of some exceptionally well-known artists, including ABBA, Celine Dion and Cliff Richard, as well as dance performances such as Riverdance.

This is the first time in history that Australia has been invited to compete in the contest as a wild card entry. It was a wonderful opportunity for Australia to be recognised on the world stage, with Eurovision audiences numbering close to 200 million. This participation demonstrates the connectivity of Australia to the world.

In early March 2015 Guy Sebastian was selected to represent Australia at Eurovision in Vienna, and was awarded fifth place in the 60th Eurovision Song Contest. SBS recorded the audience over the Eurovision final weekend, and the contest delivered record ratings for the network. More than 4.2 million Australians watched the semi-finals or grand final over that weekend, compared to 2.7 million who tuned in last year. The Australian government has also recognised and congratulated Guy Sebastian on his top five placement in the Eurovision Song Contest. The federal arts minister George Brandis said, 'Sebastian is a "wonderful ambassador" for Australian musical talent on the international stage, where he won the hearts of European audiences.'

Guy Sebastian, an Australian migrant from Malaysia, has taken the music world by storm. I remember when he won the inaugural *Australian Idol* series in 2003. Being an Australian Malaysian, I was very connected to the Malaysian community and I was bombarded by a number of postings on Facebook regarding Guy Sebastian. There was such excitement throughout South Australia with people voting for him.

Guy Sebastian's performance during Eurovision not only advanced his profile and Australia's profile to an international audience, it showcased Australia's highly competitive, talent driven music industry. Australia has a wonderful music and arts industry; however, it is a sector that, unfortunately, gets little recognition. Many honourable members may have attended the Adelaide Cabaret Festival. You would have heard the renowned genius Barry Humphries when he launched the festival. He suggested that the best and wicked way to fund the arts industry is to simply register the theatre as a sport. He also said, 'Please, no more bridges over the Torrens,' as he refers to the \$40 million footbridge—actually we spent more.

The arts industry in South Australia is regularly overlooked and therefore to have an Adelaide educated musician impressing audiences on a global stage is truly remarkable and ought to be recognised. Guy is not only a musical icon but he is an ambassador for multiculturalism. Guy Sebastian was born in Klang, Malaysia, on 26 October 1981. His father Ivan was also born in Malaysia but is of Sri Lankan Tamil descent with distant colonial Portuguese roots, while his mother Nellie is of English and Portuguese descent and was raised in India. Guy Sebastian is the second of four sons. His older brother, Ollie, was born in India and his young brothers, Chris and Jeremy, were born in Australia after the family migrated in 1988.

As a child, Guy Sebastian took violin lessons, and although he had no formal training in other musical instruments, he also plays guitar, drums and piano. Guy Sebastian attended Paradise Community Church, an Assemblies of God church and one of the largest churches in Australia. He actually became one of their main worship singers. After graduating from King's Baptist Grammar School, Guy began studies in medical radiation and radiotherapy at the University of South Australia, but he left to pursue a career in music. He taught vocals at Temple Christian College and other high schools while also working as a recording engineer and studying music technology at the University of Adelaide's Elder School of Music.

Along with these commitments, Guy Sebastian also sang with the Paradise Community Church Youth Conference Planetshakers, performing both lead and backup vocals for their 2002 and 2003 conferences and albums. From all of Sebastian's community work and musical studies, he entered the inaugural *Australian Idol* competition in 2003, which was the platform to his successful musical career. His first solo single *Angels Brought Me Here* debuted at number one and was the fastest selling Australian single in ARIA chart history. He won the ARIA award for the highest selling single, which propelled him to take his career from strength to strength.

Today Guy Sebastian is labelled as the only Australian male artist to have ever achieved six number one singles and two number one albums in chart history. He has one of the best success stories and is a genuine musician who has exceptional talent. Over the course of his career, he has received 22 ARIA award nominations, including Single of the Year, Best Male Artist and Best Pop Artist. He released 11 top 10 singles, three top 15 singles—six of those singles have achieved multi-platinum certification, including the eight times platinum *Battle Scars*. With 42 platinum and three gold certifications and combined album and single sales of over 3 million in Australia, Sebastian has achieved a lot within his musical career.

Through his innovation and vision, he has recorded albums in Los Angeles with many world-leading artists within the music field. He also participated as a judge on Channel 7's *The X Factor*. He mentored a number of upcoming Australian artists and helped them enter the music industry. Guy Sebastian is an outstanding success story who promotes multiculturalism. He has also continuously made great artistic and economic contributions to Australia. He deserves to be recognised and congratulated for his success in just the way that sports people and Olympians are recognised in the sports sector.

With all the accolades he receives in the music industry, in Australia and worldwide, Guy stays humble and remains connected to the community. He and his wife launched the Sebastian Foundation in 2013. The foundation works in conjunction with a range of different benevolent organisations, both nationally and on a global scale, in order to create lasting change in the lives of those less fortunate. The foundation was instigated to encourage the potential in each and every individual, essentially seeking to provide a chance at a better life.

Learning the story behind Guy Sebastian and his success as a migrant is a true example that Australia is the land of opportunity. Sebastian has excelled on the world stage through Eurovision and I wish to congratulate him on his success and his contributions to the Australian music and arts industry, the economy, and in helping disadvantaged people in our community through his foundation. With those remarks, I commend this motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

CHILD PROTECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.G. Wade:

That it be an instruction to the Select Committee on Statutory Child Protection and Care in South Australia that its terms of reference be amended by inserting the following additional term of reference—

- 1A. That the select committee further inquire into and report on—
- (a) the government's responses to the recommendations; and
 - (b) the implementation of the government's responses to recommendations, including policy and legislation in respect of the following reports:
 - (i) the Review of Child Protection in South Australia;
 - (ii) Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry;
 - (iii) Commission of Inquiry (Children on the APY Lands);
 - (iv) Select Committee on Families SA;
 - (v) Report of the Coronial Inquest in the Death of Chloe Lee Valentine;
 - (vi) Child Protection Systems Royal Commission; and
 - (vii) any other relevant report.

(Continued from 3 June 2015.)

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:36): I rise to oppose this motion. When the select committee was established last year, the government did not oppose its creation. The Hon. John Gazzola and I have represented the government as constructive members of the committee and contributed to its work. The committee has met many times and has heard from many witnesses. In fact, we are due to review the first draft of the report next week.

Given that the terms of reference of the committee relate very specifically to the treatment of foster carers by Families SA, as a committee we had resolved that it was only right for the final witness to be the chief executive responsible for the agency, Mr Tony Harrison. You can imagine my surprise, Mr President, when, without consultation or discussion with the rest of the committee, the Hon. Mr Wade has come to this place and put a motion forward to expand the terms of reference of the existing committee, and in no small way.

The Hon. Mr Wade is seeking to take what was a specific and limited terms of reference and make a committee with the power to look into any matter pertaining to child protection in this state. The government has already established a royal commission into the child protection system. It is an independent and an extensive inquiry into the systems in place to protect our most vulnerable children and what can be done to improve their lot. It is, and as it should be, above political point-scoring and grandstanding. It is not a media circus for taking cheap political shots.

The government has, on many occasions, spoken of the need for child protection to be above the cut and thrust of politics. The Premier spoke very strongly in the other place about the fact that, if we are to make progress in this incredibly difficult and vexed area, we must approach the issue with a measure of bipartisanship and calm, measured reasoning. This is why we have a royal commission. When this committee was established with the support of government, the government members in this place implored the committee to go about its work without pandering to political self-interest and posturing.

I am concerned that some of the committee are trying to pre-empt the work of a royal commission, as well as the government's review into adoption in this state. I am also concerned that some of the focus on adoption by the committee needs to be very carefully considered, particularly

when one considers that nearly 30 per cent of those under state care are from Indigenous backgrounds, and the committee has not fully explored the views of the broader Indigenous community on this issue. This is a matter where we need to be very careful, lest we create a stolen generation. The politicisation of the issue of child protection—

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On a point of order, sir, I put to you that the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars' comments about a report that is in preparation by the committee in relation to a current reference has absolutely no relevance to whether the committee should take on another reference.

The PRESIDENT: I think you are right: we should not refer to any part of an issue that is being looked at by another committee.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: It is the same committee, Mr President. The politicisation of the issue of child protection is of great concern to me. One needs to remember that, for a child to come under the attention of Families SA, invariably means that the child's home life is dysfunctional. This means that Families SA staff are working in very trying circumstances, and I know the vast majority of those staff try to do the best they possibly can for the children under their care, as for that matter, do kinship carers—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Kandelaars, I just want to make the point that there is no point of order, so go ahead.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: —foster carers and other agencies who work in a very difficult area of child protection. This is not an issue that should be politicised, but one that should have a multi-partisan approach. I oppose this motion, as its objectives appear to be to create an ongoing circus to give politicised commentary on the manner in which child protection systems operate under the dubious umbrella of a parliamentary committee. Given the Hon. Mr Wade's desire to persist with this motion, I indicate that government members, myself and the Hon. John Gazzola, will be resigning from this committee.

The PRESIDENT: There is a bit of opposition to that point of order. I will get the Clerk to give proper advice on that and I will get back to the honourable member.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (17:43): Very briefly, Dignity for Disability will support this motion moved by the Hon. Mr Wade. We understand that the intent is not to create a circus, is not to create unnecessary workload but to merely track the government's progress on implementing the recommendations of previous reports to do with child protection, and we think that is a meritorious aim and will therefore be supporting this motion. We do not want to see more and more reports done into this area and other areas of importance only to sit on shelves gathering dust. We think that any measure we can take that is reasonable to track government progress in this area should be welcomed, and we welcome the motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:44): The Greens will also support the motion. I concur with the words of the Hon. Kelly Vincent just then that any measures undertaken by this parliament to better track our efforts on child protection and improving the protection for children in this state should be welcomed, and members of parliament are well placed to be doing that work. If the government has a great story to tell, then those tracking mechanisms will reflect that.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:44): I rise very briefly to indicate my support for this motion and to commend the Hon. Stephen Wade for his work in this area. The need for this sort of monitoring of the government's responses to recommendations and reviews involving our most vulnerable and precious members of the community is absolutely warranted and proved to be as such. As much as they may or may not like it, the government has a responsibility to this parliament and to the community as a whole to keep us updated on these very important issues.

Time and time again we have been kept in the dark about the response to recommendations and reviews, not just in this area but in other important areas as well. The Coroner's 49 recommendations into the death of Christopher Wilson spring to mind as a perfect example of the government's ineptitude in this regard. Sometimes we are all left wondering whether it is a case of ineptitude or arrogance when it comes to the government's response, or rather lack thereof. Again, this is an extremely important step, particularly given the gravity of the subject, that I think we need to adopt.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (17:46): In summing up, I would like to thank the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. John Darley for their contributions. In doing so, I would like to correct the record in regard to some of the points that the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars made. In particular, he suggested that I brought this motion before the parliament without any consultation with the committee.

Forgive me for not having my diary with me, but it is my clear recollection that I raised this motion at a previous meeting of the committee. I do recall—and I do not want to name the member because my quote might be wrong—a member of the government saying that the government would need to consider it through their caucus. So it was acknowledged that the motion was noted, but that the government members were not in a position to express a view, and I fully respect that.

I roundly deny the accusation that I made no attempt to consult with the committee. Even if that was the case, earlier this week I distributed the motion and invited any member to discuss the issue with me—that being any member of the council, not necessarily just the committee. Be that as it may, I do have the right to bring matters before the parliament. The fact is that there is no standing order of the parliament that says I have to consult a standing committee, for example, if I want to put a motion before them. Be that as it may, it is a statement of fact that the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars asserted which is wrong.

The second point is that the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars wants to cast this committee as a narrowly focused committee which I am suddenly trying to expand. All I do is invite members to look at the terms of reference. What it says is:

A Select Committee of the Legislative Council of South Australia has been established to inquire into and report on statutory child protection and care in South Australia...

That sounds pretty broad to me. It goes on to say:

...including a review of...foster care...

The point is that Family First went to the last election promising a standing committee on child protection and Families SA. We as a Liberal Party said, 'We are yet to see the case made for a standing committee. We are happy to establish a general select committee with a particular focus on foster care and let's see if the need exists beyond this reference onto other matters.' My recollection—and I could be proven wrong—is that in the debate on the establishment of the committee I specifically foreshadowed that the Liberal Party was open to additional references.

However, even if all we rely on is the terms of reference of the select committee, it is established to inquire into and report on statutory child protection and care in South Australia. So I dispute the re-characterisation of the committee by government members as a narrowly focused committee; they need to learn to read terms of reference. In terms of cheap political points, I am not going to engage in the debate as to what politics are being played because—

The Hon. J.M. Gazzola: Oh, right!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Okay, let me just make the point: if I was engaged in a political game in relation to this committee, perhaps, since the committee was established, I might have done some media on it. I do not recall having spoken to the media once on matters before this committee. I think, before the government starts throwing around comments about cheap political shots, they might get their head out of, if you like, the flurry that the Premier was engaged in in recent weeks and be fair to the way that committees are being conducted. On the point that the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars makes about himself—

The Hon. J.M. Gazzola: You're a bit sensitive.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Well, I would ask Mr Gazzola to show me one example of when I went before the media.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There will be no interjections. Just continue on, the Hon. Mr Wade.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Hon. John Gazzola wants to accuse me of cheap political points. As I said, show me one occasion where I engaged the media on the work of this committee.

The PRESIDENT: No, look, the Hon. Mr Gazzola made no reference to that. All he said was you are a bit sensitive and delicate—that's all. The Hon. Mr Wade, these sorts of debates happen and people put points of view. At the end of the day, you seem to have the numbers. Let's just get on with it.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am sorry, Mr President. I appreciate you regard your role as something of a political commentator as well as the chairman of the council, but that is not what I see your role as.

The PRESIDENT: I make no comment. I am just trying to make sure we get this through.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: All I ask for is the opportunity to make my points. If the government wants to stand up and characterise this committee as a political circus, it deserves to be rebutted. The failure to rebut the crass accusations of government members would leave them endorsed by not being challenged.

The fact of the matter is we have had a positive engagement on foster care. I am disappointed that the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars wants to preview his comments on the draft report days before the committee has a chance to consider them as a group, but that was his choice. I am sorry my point of order that the standards of this house should be maintained was not better expressed, but the fact of the matter is that this is a committee that has worked constructively.

I believe that these particular terms of reference are particularly well suited to the parliament. We are after all a forum dedicated to accountability. I think at times we do bite off more than we can chew in terms of developing recommendations for policy action, but surely the parliament is extremely well suited. I cannot think of a task better suited to a parliament than holding an executive to account for the recommendations of experts in the field—people like Justice Layton, people like Justice Mullighan, people like Coroner Johns.

I believe that this is a very relevant task for the committee to undertake. I am honestly disappointed that the government has not seen this as an opportunity to move forward. This is an opportunity for the government to engage the opposition and crossbenchers in a positive path forward for Families SA. Clearly, this organisation has a big task in front of itself to refocus, to stabilise and to fulfil its statutory and other duties, and it is important for us as a parliament to make our contribution. If the government wants to engage in the sort of political jibes we had from the Hon Gerry Kandelaars today, it will long postpone the recovery of Families SA. I urge the council to support the motion.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE CITY SKATE PARK

Adjourned debated on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

That this council—

1. Notes that skate parks across the world provide for considerable positive youth development opportunities;
2. Notes that the Adelaide City Skate Park has been an outstanding social and recreational space for South Australia since June 2000, and in this time it has also provided a career launch pad for professional skaters and riders;
3. Expresses concern that, as a result of announcements to build new medical facilities on the site of the Adelaide City Skate Park, the state government has terminated its lease with the Adelaide City Council, effective June 2014, yet did not make a corresponding financial commitment for a replacement central city skate space; and
4. Calls upon the state government to urgently commit to funding a permanent central city skate space in the upcoming budget.

(Continued from 13 May 2015.)

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Kandelaars. Try not to be controversial on this motion, Mr Kandelaars.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:54): Thank you, Mr President. I rise to speak on behalf of the government in relation to this motion. The state government recognises the contribution of skate parks in providing positive youth development and youth activity opportunities. This motion, however, is opposed because its central purpose is again calling for a premature commitment.

The state government, through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, has continually been working constructively with skate park users and the Adelaide City Council to achieve both a short-term and long-term solution. As stated previously—and now must be repeated—the cooperation between the state government and the Adelaide City Council in finding an appropriate solution began prior to this motion being moved by the Hon. Tammy Franks. Such cooperation and commitment to finding an appropriate solution continues despite this motion.

To ensure a skate park that not only meets the needs and interests of skaters but is also an effective use of public funds requires more than simply a commitment to fund. It is also proper and necessary to consider and balance other public interests that may be impacted upon a skate park, both in the short and long-term.

Following continued cooperation and commitment, the state government through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure earlier this month received from the Adelaide City Council a design contract that seeks to ensure successful delivery of a temporary skate park. The Adelaide City Council has proposed a design concept which it says will allow parts of any such temporary skate park to be reused in other parts of the city once a permanent location is identified.

I understand the Adelaide City Council proposal follows significant consultation with patrons who provided feedback on the amenity, design and location of a future skate park. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is now considering the Adelaide City Council's recent proposal and will advise the Minister for Planning in due course on any next steps to ensure that the best-possible outcome—both in the short and long-term—is achieved for the skating community.

I understand that the state government through the department will work with the Adelaide City Council towards an outcome as soon as possible. When the plans for the new skate park have been finalised, the government will work with council to consider funding arrangements. For these reasons, the government opposes the motion.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (17:57): Dignity for Disability certainly welcomes this motion which acknowledges the importance of skate parks across the world as part, in particular, of positive youth development and the importance of the Adelaide City Skate Park on North Terrace, which is just down the road from this very parliament. The failure of this state government to find an alternative location for a skate park thus far within the city is very disturbing. I am pleased to hear from the Hon. Mr Kandelaars that there may be some developments in that space, but I will look forward to seeing them—

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: —and not rubber stamp them. Indeed, as the Hon. Ms Franks has pointed out, it sounds like it should be the Adelaide City Council that we thank for that, not the state government. In any event, we will wait and see what happens.

In the meantime, the skate park—whilst not something that I am personally a regular user of despite significant pressure from arts writer, Dane Howard, on Twitter to crack out my helmet—quite frankly, there is not enough foam in the world to make me feel confident that my fall would be caught, so that has not as yet happened. But despite significant pressure, I am not myself a user of the skate park. However, I do not need to be, to know that it is important. It has been heavily patronised and provides a healthy and free activity for people from all walks of life who have used it for skateboarding and BMX riding for many years.

As a young person myself (although perhaps not so young anymore, as I was reminded just a few moments ago in the contribution by the Hon. Ms Lee that Guy Sebastian's performance on Australian Idol was in 2003 and I have to say my life flashed before my eyes as it certainly does not seem that long ago) I certainly am mindful of the challenges that my generation and generations after it face in relation to health, wellbeing, exercise, weight management and social activity. At a time

when access to screens is more prevalent than ever, we must support activities that keep young people moving, active and outside. I am particularly mindful of that as I read these speech notes off the screen of my tablet.

By not prioritising a new home for the City Skate Park, I feel very disappointed in particular for young South Australians. It is clear this government does not prioritise our health and wellbeing as young people and future leaders. With those brief words we are happy to keep the pressure on this government to work constructively to find an alternative home for the City Skate Park and we welcome the motion. We thank the Hon. Ms Franks for putting it forward and we commend it to the chamber.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (18:00): I rise on behalf of the Liberal Party to support the motion of the Hon. Tammy Franks. We have been supportive in the past and I have spoken on this particular issue in the past. I commend the motion to the house. It is an important motion, and the member for Adelaide, Rachel Sanderson, also has been doing quite a bit of agitating on this particular issue. She has had a very keen interest and has really pushed us in the Liberal Party to make sure that we are very supportive. I notice that the member for Adelaide has spoken at a rally at the Skate Park prior to the 2014 election to express her support and to commit to lobbying her colleagues to ensure funding for a new city skate park.

We believe it is shameful that Labor would give away the Skate Park land before finding a safe and permanent site for a new skate park. The member for Adelaide has also met with members of the Skate Park lobby group multiple times to discuss alternative sites, none of which have the same accessibility, particularly to trains, trams and buses, or the safety provided by the high pedestrian traffic and highly visible North Terrace site. Due to the closure of the Skate Park without an alternative site, many Skate Park users are skating along North Terrace and Victoria Square, which leads to safety issues for the greater public.

The Liberal Party notes the importance of recreational facilities such as skate parks, particularly for young people in our city centre. This free facility is one of the only options available to young people that keeps them away from venues that sell alcohol, and this is a point that the member for Adelaide has reiterated to me many times.

Over time the city has had multiple recreational activities available for young people. These include Downtown, Timezone, Academy Cinema centre, Regent Cinema, Dazzleland, and the Hindley Street complex. These activities are no longer available, which makes the retaining of a safe and accessible skate park even more significant. The member for Adelaide has hammered these points home to us in our party time and time again and fully supports this motion.

This government is committed to a vibrant city. They should put their money where their mouth is and commit the funds required to build a skate park. I am pleased that the member for Adelaide, Rachel Sanderson, has pointed this out to me many times and will continue to fight, along with the Hon. Tammy Franks from the Greens, who, again, we commend for putting up this motion. We are pleased to join the Hon. Tammy Franks in what is the good fight.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:03): I rise to thank those speakers who made a contribution to this debate: the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. Terry Stephens, and the Hon. Kelly Vincent. I also note that the Hon. Dennis Hood sent an email of support for this motion and, in particular, he noted, in response to my email alerting all of my parliamentary colleagues both in this council and in the other place that I was bringing this matter to a vote, that it was the almost exact same motion as I put a year ago tomorrow in this place. I also note that the government speech was almost word for word the exact same government response. I wonder if a new speech was sought or whether they simply dragged out last year's *Hansard* and read from that.

In that email I asked government members to define the word 'premature' for the edification of this council, given that a year ago tomorrow the government said it was too premature to make a funding announcement. It was not too premature during the March 2014 state election for the potential Labor member for Adelaide—who was then the Labor candidate for Adelaide, David O'Loughlin—to say that only Labor had money for a relocated skate park. I note that he tweeted that back in March 2014; but he was unsuccessful in his bid to be the member for Adelaide.

I commend the work of the current member for Adelaide, and believe that should the Liberal Party have taken government in 2014 we probably would not be having this debate here and now, because the skate park would have been elevated as a priority and those election commitments kept.

The Hon. T.T. Ngo interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I note that this is an issue where the Premier announced the development of the Biomedical Precinct back in 2013, some three prime ministers ago now. He promised that the skate park would be relocated and that the state government would step up and make that happen. This is the second year in a row I have put this motion and it is the second year in a row that the Labor Party has given users of the skate park a lacklustre response, a response that shows that Jay does not get it when it comes to youth culture and skating culture in this state. Jay does not get that a vibrant city does not just include wine bars, it also includes skate parks.

I have long said that when you do not have a skate park in the city your city becomes the skate park. Have a look at the YouTube footage of the Nitro Circus performer breaking into the construction site we now see over the top of the old Adelaide City Skate Park and using a scooter to jump those construction fences and scoot onto North Terrace. That would not be happening if we had actually relocated the skate park in a timely manner.

I think the Labor Party's version of the word premature is an oxymoron, akin to something in 1984 where it means exactly the opposite of what they claim it to mean. It is overdue, well overdue, that we see an announcement from this government on the skate park, and it is time that the Minister for Planning stopped talking about skaters being able to use Victoria Square. That was clearly an inappropriate response.

Stop prioritising wine bars over skaters in this state. It has been more than two years. You have had enough time, so get your skates on tomorrow, I say to the Premier, and start to actually value the skating community of this state. Then you will truly be able to lay claim to creating a creative and carbon-neutral, vibrant city.

Motion carried.

DEER INDUSTRY FUND

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 23: Hon. Mr Kandelaars to move:

That the regulations under the Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act 1998 concerning the Deer Industry Fund, made on 30 October 2014 and laid on the table of this council on 11 November 2014, be disallowed.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (18:08): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

Parliamentary Committees

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars:

That the annual report of the committee, 2013-14, be noted.

(Continued from 25 February 2014.)

Motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME) BILL

Final Stages

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

At 18:10 the council adjourned until Thursday 18 June 2015 at 14:15.