

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 June 2013

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

SAME SEX MARRIAGE BILL

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (10:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for same sex marriages in this state; to recognise same sex marriages under corresponding laws; and to make related amendments to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996 and the Wills Act 1936. Read a first time.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The American philosopher William James wrote in 1891 that, 'the highest ethical life—however few may be called to bear its burdens—consists at all times in the breaking of rules which have grown too narrow for the actual case.' But we in this place enjoy a particular fortune. Rather than breaking the too narrow rules, we are in a position to change them.

The rules of traditional marriage are now too narrow and the time has more than come, in 2013, to address this particular injustice where sexuality is a barrier to being able to legally marry one's partner. The same-sex marriage legislation arising in jurisdictions around the globe tells us that the time for change is now well and truly upon us.

Our nation and especially our state can boast long records as beacons of equality and fairness. We have prided ourselves on our forward thinking, but, on this particular matter of equality, it looks as if the world may soon leave us behind, and I do not take any pride in that.

William James goes on to say there is but one unconditional commandment, which is, he says, 'to vote and to act as to bring about the very largest total universe of good which we can see'. I know that many of you will agree with me in heart and in conscience that legislating for same-sex marriage in this jurisdiction would contribute in a profound and meaningful way to the universe of good that we in this place strive to achieve and expand.

For a particular group of people, proportionally a minority but in real terms a very significant number of South Australians, this law would make a universe of difference to them and to their lives. The passage of this law would show that large group of people that we in this place do not believe sexuality to be a basis of exclusion from the simple and fundamental act of choosing to marry.

The compassionate human value of that decision cannot be understated in its magnitude, because there are a great many people who, by virtue of the discriminatory nature of our current laws, are being made to feel lesser. They are being made to feel that their relationships are neither as valuable nor as legitimate as heterosexual relationships. This discrimination affects not only these individuals but their families and in particular their children. Young South Australians growing up with parents in same-sex relationships, young people who happen to have been born to homosexual parents, are being given the message every day by the laws of our society that their families are worth less, that they are worth less.

Crucially, impressionable young South Australians, school-age children and teenagers who are just coming to realise that they are same-sex attracted, are receiving the same message: you are lesser. At a stage of their life where their self-esteem tends to be already fragile, our laws give them a very clear reason to think of themselves as less valuable. All of this is unacceptable to me. So I am guided by my own conviction that enacting legislation that would enable the state to recognise same-sex marriage is not only the decent thing to do, not only a good thing, expanding our total universe of good, but that there is an overwhelming moral imperative for us as lawmakers to try to address the injustice. If there is any possibility that we may accomplish this, then we must try.

This is a conviction that I hold deeply and dearly, and for reasons that not only derive from my moral conscience but from my personal experience. I have mentioned before in this place that I have a brother called Stephen, who is 11 years my junior. As it happens, today is Stephen's birthday. He celebrates his birthday today with his partner, a wonderful man who has been embraced by all our family and friends and in whose love my brother finds a great deal of joy. It is a

jarring injustice to me that, despite our long list of similarities, one of the differences between Stephen and me that feels so minor to me means that I am able to marry the person I love, but Stephen is not.

I do not believe that I deserve to have access to any civil institution to which Stephen does not have access. I know that there is no difference between the love that I feel in my heart and the love that Stephen feels in his heart, so it is difficult for me to understand how it can be justified that the state regards us differently. That is one of the personal reasons I so strongly support what this bill attempts to do, which is provide for people seeking to enter same-sex marriages as the commonwealth has provided for people seeking to enter heterosexual marriages.

Let me now address the matter of concerns around the constitutionality or the validity of this piece of legislation. As with any legislation passed in any Australian parliament, its validity must be a concern of the parliament as well as a concern of the courts. As we all know, Australia has a federal system and under our constitutional arrangements some matters are given to the commonwealth and others remain the authority of the states. The Australian constitution grants to the commonwealth the power of marriage in section 51(21).

The full constitutional meaning of that single word and the ultimate scope of the commonwealth powers over the subject matter remain unknown. What we do know is that marriage is a concurrent power under our system. It is a power shared by states and commonwealth parliaments. We know this because there are many people in this house whose parents were married under the state law prior to 1961, when the commonwealth Marriage Act came into operation. A South Australian marriage act was first passed by the parliament more than 50 years prior to federation in 1842. As late as 1957, this parliament was reforming the act to raise the age of marriage for boys to 18, and for girls to 16.

Of the two jurisdictions, the commonwealth is the latecomer in the regulation of marriage. So there are no grounds for concern regarding the capacity of this parliament to pass the legislation. As I have said, it is a concurrent power, not the exclusive power of the commonwealth. However, it is the case that the commonwealth amended the federal Marriage Act in 2004 in an attempt to define marriage under the commonwealth act as being between a man and a woman.

So certainly there are grounds on which the validity of this legislation may be challenged, but that challenge will not be on the basis that this parliament lacks the capacity to pass the legislation. Rather, if there is any challenge, it will be on the basis that the two laws contradict, or are inconsistent with, each other. As we know, section 109 of the Australian Constitution deals with issues of inconsistency. The section provides:

When a law of a State is inconsistent with the law of the Commonwealth, the latter shall prevail, and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid.

However, that does not make the state law unconstitutional. Rather, in the words of the section, the state law is invalid, and it is a special kind of invalidity. As Chief Justice Latham pointed out in the Egg and Egg Pulp Marketing Board case in 1942, the word 'invalid' in section 109 cannot mean that a state law affected by section 109 becomes ultra vires, in whole or in part. The word must be regarded as meaning inoperative. His Honour added, 'If the commonwealth law were repealed, the state law would again become operative.'

But the forensic examination of the operation of the commonwealth law and this proposed law is not a matter for any of us in this place to decide conclusively. If challenged, it would ultimately be a question for the High Court of Australia.

It is for the High Court to determine whether the two pieces of legislation, the federal Marriage Act and this proposed act, can coexist together, or whether the federal legislation covers the field and exclusively provides a narrow and specific definition of marriage in Australia as being between a man and a woman. There are respectable arguments to both conclusions. The commonwealth has legislated for heterosexual marriage; that much is clear. But has the commonwealth succeeded in legislating for all marriage? That is the question the High Court will have the opportunity to answer if this parliament passes this piece of legislation.

Whether the commonwealth government did, in fact, achieve that narrow end has never been tested. We are not acting in the face of known High Court jurisprudence. If South Australia were the first state to pass legislation such as that which is before us now, then that opportunity would arise for the first time.

For me, there is no question that the amended federal Marriage Act is discriminatory in its exclusive provision of heterosexual marriage. For those of us who believe that the rules of marriage in this country are too narrow, they should embrace this opportunity to test the scope of the existing law, not to shy away from it. Whatever the answer to the question of the coexistence or otherwise of the commonwealth and state acts, I am not so presumptuous to believe that I can provide a definitive answer.

For those who believe that all people should be treated under our laws as equals and that none should be left behind, or excluded, they should embrace William James' one unconditional commandment: that we should vote and act as to take another step in expanding our universe of good to make room enough for all South Australians, not just most South Australians, to reside within it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

FOOD (LABELLING OF FREE-RANGE EGGS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 June 2012.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:44): In rising to speak to this bill that was introduced by the member for Finniss on 29 March 2012, being the Food (Labelling of Free-range Eggs) Amendment Bill 2012, I am pleased that the government seems to have come around to the fact that 1,500 hens per hectare is the appropriate amount for labelling, as far as labelling eggs from these hens as free-range eggs is concerned.

I note that, at the time this bill was introduced, the member for Finniss formed a rather unholy alliance with the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place. I note that she moved it in terms of animal welfare, and I know that my friend the member for Finniss introduced this as a truth-in-labelling bill.

It has certainly been an interesting time over the last 15 months since this bill was introduced. There has been much lobbying from most players in the field, including the growers, whether they be biodynamic, whether they are true free-range or whether they are growers who want to get on the free-range egg bandwagon, to make sure that they benefit from having those eggs labelled how they want to get the maximum economic benefit for the eggs they produce.

On a personal level, I am quite happy to eat caged eggs. I have witnessed caged-egg production, and I think it is done very well. I have witnessed barn-laid egg production and I have witnessed free-range egg production. Just diverting a bit from the free-range debate, caged hens involved in caged-egg production have the lowest mortality rate in the production of eggs. So, that is just an interesting thing to note. Their nutrition and fluids are managed exceptionally, but that is not to say that it is not managed in the free-range environment; I just wanted to make that point.

There are various views on what should be called 'free range'. There has been a voluntary code of conduct in the past, with 1,500 hens per hectare being the sum amount in regard to what you can call free-range egg production, but we have recently seen a push where producers want to have 20,000 hens per hectare. To me, 20,000 hens per hectare sounds like barn laid, where they get access to an area outside if the hens feel like it, and that does not seem to me to be strictly like free-range egg production.

I have witnessed an example of this, up at Two Wells. I also note that there are other differing views; Coles, which seems to be on the animal welfare bandwagon, indicated that its arrangement was for 10,000 hens per hectare. We have different ranges of producers, as I indicated. We have producers which have 750 hens per hectare, and we have others which grow them at 125 hens per hectare.

Last November, when I was the shadow agriculture spokesman for the Liberal Party, I went with the member for Finniss and met with a few growers on Kangaroo Island who are doing a great job in their free-range egg production. They are in an interesting part of South Australia because obviously they do not have to worry about foxes, so they do not need to have any fencing. So, it is a very appropriate place to be involved in free-range egg production.

The property of Graham and Kathy Barrett at Katham Springs was one of the properties I visited. They grow biodynamic free-range eggs, and I believe that they run their hens at about 125 hens per hectare. Then there is Tom and Fiona Fryar, who have been running 50,000 hens over their property. These people have done a great job in their family operations. I note that Tom

Fryar comes from a shearing background, so he has had to work hard to get where he has got; I was a shearer in the past, and I know what it is like. He and his wife and family have done a great job in getting to where they are, and they are a real success story not just for Kangaroo Island but for South Australia. I want to read part of the submission that Tom Fryar put to us at an egg forum on 27 June 2012, as follows:

Kangaroo Island Free Range Eggs was started 20 years ago with 400 laying hens and these were stocked on 40 hectares. We now have 50,000 hens stocked on 1,600 hectares. We have invested approximately \$6 million on land and infrastructure to farm hens at stocking density rates of less than 1,500 per hectare, while abiding by the *Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals—Domestic Poultry 4th Edition*.

The South Australian government must help us keep stocking density at no more than 1,500 chickens per hectare because we can't change to 20,000 with our system and can't compete with intensive so-called free range. It would be detrimental to our business which then flows on as being detrimental to the families of our 18 employees.

The 20,000 hens per hectare is not sustainable. In the video that the Australian Egg Corporation Ltd has shown to try and convince consumers that 20,000 per hectare is okay, you can clearly see that not many hens are ranging. Where are the other 19,500 hens? How can the eggs laid from these hens be labelled free range when most of the hens aren't venturing outside? They should be labelled barnyard. There are not enough pop holes. There are no shade trees. There is no feed and water outside to encourage the hens outside.

To help everyone understand that it is not a sustainable situation, please consider the following information. Hens will eat a minimum of 30 grams of pasture per day, times 20,000 hens equals 600 kilograms per day which equals 200 tonnes per year. Productive land can grow only around seven tonnes per hectare per year. If 20,000 hens were ranging on one hectare of land it would be a dust bowl in a week. 20,000 hens will produce 3,200 kilograms of manure per day, that is over 1,000 tonnes per year. If half of this is deposited in the shed and half on the range, that is over 500 tonnes on one hectare of land 100 metres by 100 metres. Fifteen semi-trailer loads of manure on one hectare per year is not sustainable and presents significant issues for the Environment Protection Authority.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I am reading from Tom Fryar's submission. It continues:

There is less than half a hectare range area between sheds and they are running approximately 13,000 hens per shed. Consumers would be horrified if they paid a premium for these so-called free range eggs. We believe consumers are being misled and confused with the term 'free range'.

The government should help us enforce 1,500 hens per hectare as I believe this will open up huge export opportunities for South Australian free range egg producers. We have had buyers from Dubai wanting us to sign contracts to supply eggs by the container load. We have had a Chinese consortium visit our farm and they want us to supply two container loads per week of free range eggs into Hong Kong. That is double what we produce now. Upon asking why the interest in our Kangaroo Island free range eggs the answer is always, 'We want the best quality product, true to label and farmed naturally and environmentally sustainably.' We exported into Hong Kong in small quantities some years ago. There are currently no South Australian egg producers exporting out of this country.

We believe a very simply solution to all of this is to leave free range egg production at a maximum of 1,500 hens per hectare and anything over this can be labelled barnyard because they live in a barn without a small yard.

In my closing comments, the Australian Egg Corporation lobbied us heavily to get that number lifted to 20,000. We, on this side of the house, have got no problem with people running hens at 20,000 per hectare, but we do not want them being labelled as free range eggs, so that our true free range egg growers can be supported and produce this great quality product not just for our consumers here in South Australia, but interstate, and also the potential to grow their business into overseas markets and do this great work. I believe that everyone can get on in this space. Everyone just needs to see the reality that labelling is the key.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:54): As a veterinary surgeon, obviously animal welfare is one of the areas that I am extremely interested in. It has been an area in which I have been able to introduce legislation in this place to improve the lot of dogs, and certainly I have enjoyed participating in the changes and modernisation of the Veterinary Surgeons Act and the Animal Welfare Act. The bill that the member for Finnis has put before the house is a very sensible bill. It does talk about food labelling, and that is the main issue that most people are concerned about. People want to know that what they are seeing is what they are getting, and the labelling of a product that really is not being produced in the way that it is purported to be I think is something that we should take very seriously, whether for free-range eggs, as in this case, or a 'Made in Australia' label, for example.

The issue behind this, obviously, is that people want to buy free-range eggs because they want those chooks to be living in as natural a condition as possible. I have eight chooks at home

and they have 400 acres to wander around on. Unfortunately, they do not do that. They all come back and they lay their eggs in the roost at night, and we keep that lovely and clean. The chooks can go out and eat the chook food that we buy for them, plus they do forage. With all the eggs we have given away to friends, we always get compliments on the quality of those eggs. That is probably the ultimate in free range, when you have 400 acres for eight chooks.

The issue here though is: do we accept that 20,000 chickens per hectare is acceptable, 1,500 chickens per hectare or eight chooks per 400 acres? To be practical about this, what we are talking about is not the misrepresentation of a product as being free range, natural, environmentally friendly and sustainable where you have 20,000 chickens per hectare. Remember, a hectare is 10,000 square metres or 100 metres by 100 metres, so it is not a huge area.

Having 20,000 chickens in that area, as we have heard from other members, is a lot of manure and a lot of foraging, and it is completely unsustainable. It is an artificial situation we are putting those chickens into. People will argue that 1,500 chickens per hectare is artificial, but it is a far more tolerable situation for both the chickens and the producers, and I think it is an arguable case that the area that the chickens have to range around in, fossick in, forage in, scratch in and peck in is much less of a pressure cooker area than if there are 20,000 chickens per hectare.

The need for chickens to be able to lay eggs in a clean and hygienic environment is something that I am very aware of, because all eggshells, if you look at them closely, have millions of little pores and it is not just a solid wall of calcium. Eggs have a porous surface and a newly-laid egg has a layer of mucous over it. Until that mucous dries, there is the ability for bacteria and viruses to penetrate into those eggs, so you do need to have a hygienic situation or location for chickens to lay their eggs. Whether your eggs are free range, cage laid or, as in our case at home with domestic chooks, you have to make sure that those newly-laid eggs are given the opportunity to dry out without being in a contaminated area so that there is no chance of contamination of the eggs.

We should remember that one way that we develop vaccines is that eggs are injected with viruses and bacteria. Eggs are a terrific medium for the growing of bacteria and viruses, but we do not want that to happen in the eggs that we are going to consume every day. We need to make sure that those eggs are laid in as hygienic a situation as possible where they can dry out and be the product that we want them to be.

The issue behind free-range eggs fits in with all the other animal welfare issues. We see that there is sow stall-free pork, and the live export of sheep and cattle is being questioned. Animal welfare, unfortunately, is one of those areas where people become very anthropomorphic about their views. In other words, they give animals the same emotions, feelings and thoughts that we have as human beings.

I can tell you, having worked with everything from canaries to elephants and snakes—you name it: dogs, cats, horses, cattle, pigs, goats—I have been around a lot of animals, and some of them are far more intelligent than others, and there is a range within the species. There are some pretty dumb dogs and there are some very smart dogs, just as there are some very fast horses and some very slow racehorses, and the only race they would win is against a greyhound. The need to make sure that animals are able to be in a stress-free environment, though, is different from giving them the attributes, emotions, thoughts and intelligence that we have as human beings.

I strongly encourage everybody who is interested in animal welfare—and that should be all of us in this place—to have a look at how animals in the wild behave. Cats, for example, are the ultimate creature. I think cats and cockroaches would survive the Holocaust. They sleep for anything up to 20 hours a day, and they spend the rest of the time hunting and gathering and doing whatever they need to do to survive so that they can breed; and that is what it is all about. It is not about having a pleasant, happy life; it is about eating, surviving, breeding, and making sure the species continues.

We need to look at what we are doing to animals, putting them in artificial situations, whether it is in sow stalls, cattle feed lots, or in this case, free-range chicken production. We must be very careful about what we wish for, because if our views of animal behaviour, intelligence and attitudes do not genuinely reflect their roots, origins and basic purpose in life, then we can inadvertently kill off a whole industry in some cases. We could have products that are going to be far more inferior to those being produced anywhere else in the world, so we could be putting our manufacturers and producers at a distinct disadvantage.

Do not think that because we aim for the highest standards of animal welfare in Australia, which we should all be doing, that it is always going to be to our advantage. We cannot stop, unfortunately, the terrible conditions that we have seen on our televisions that we know go on in other countries that are less developed than ours. We can do all we can to help overcome those situations. The Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation certainly should have been doing a lot better than it has been, in my opinion. We need to make sure that we, in Australia, do not price ourselves out of the market so that we end up drinking milk from New Zealand and eating eggs from China and pork from Canada.

We need to make sure that we have a home-grown domestic economy. However, if that home-grown product—in this case free-range eggs—is going to be extremely expensive to produce and prohibitive for the average consumers to buy, then that is a concern. We need to have a balance in this place. So, 20,000 chickens per hectare certainly is not free range, and you cannot describe it as being free range. I think a good balance is 1,500 hens per hectare.

Consumers who want to buy eggs from chickens that are kept in a more exclusive situation than that, or a completely open situation—as you would see with a lot of domestic chooks that are being kept—pay about \$5 or \$6 a dozen, and most consumers cannot afford that. They can afford the price at the moment for the true free-range eggs, but they cannot afford to buy these expensive eggs, and so they are missing out on a very good nutritional product. Who wants to deny our kids a boiled egg or a bit of scrambled egg when they want it?

We in Australia underestimate the lucky country we live in. Our standards of animal welfare are very high, but there are some concerns. Certainly I will be doing all I can as a vet to make sure that the Veterinary Association, members in this place, my constituents, and other people in South Australia continue to advance the cause of animal welfare so that we have a product that is not only going to be palatable, consumable and of the best quality, but one that will be produced from animals that are not under stress, not under pressure, and, in this case, truly free-range.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (11:04): I rise to support this motion by the member for Finniss on the labelling of free-range eggs. The member for Finniss organised a meeting for us to consult with several egg producers, and it certainly came to my attention the skulduggery that goes on in the industry concerning free-range eggs. I never bother buying free-range eggs because I have no faith whatsoever in the labelling of those eggs. If you look at the position where there are 20,000 chooks per hectare, that is basically two chooks to every square metre, and there is no way known that that is free range.

I certainly support the changes that are proposed where it would be 1,500 chooks per hectare. I am also a great believer that consumers should have faith that the labels that are on the products that they buy are actually indicative of what they are actually purchasing. When they go to a shop to buy free-range eggs, they should actually be free-range eggs and not being run under the conditions that the chooks are presently.

I think the other important issue to consider is that we must ensure that, when eggs are brought into this state from other states, they are also subject to the same rules. If an egg producer in South Australia is producing free-range eggs at 1,500 chooks to the hectare or less, the same has to apply to those eggs that are imported into this state. Without any further ado, I indicate that I will be supporting this bill.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:06): I also rise to support the bill. My thoughts on this differ a little from some of my colleagues. I do not see this as an animal welfare issue, although there may be animal welfare issues within the egg-producing industry, and I accept that. However, this particular issue raised by the member for Finniss is all about consumers being able to reliably expect to get what they are buying, to be able to reliably expect that when they see a label, the image that is portrayed in their mind by that label is in fact what occurs in the production of the product that they are purchasing.

I think that is what this is about and I think the member for Mount Gambier put it quite succinctly when he said that he just does not trust the labelling on free-range eggs. Unfortunately, I suspect that there are a huge number of consumers out there who are fooled by the free-range label on egg cartons in our supermarkets, and that is the injustice that the member for Finniss is endeavouring to correct in this matter that we are discussing today.

The member for Morphett pointed out that a hectare is merely 10,000 square metres. If you have 20,000 chickens on 10,000 square metres, that is two to the square metre. If you have 1,500, it is one chicken per 6.666 recurring square metres. The member for Hammond said that a

chicken will consume 30 grams of grass a day. I take him at his word on that; I have no idea. I have some understanding of the carrying capacity of the landscape for carrying sheep or cattle. I have little or no idea of the carrying capacity for chickens, but I can guarantee that you would not carry two chickens on a square metre of land. I do know that.

Mr Pegler: How many dry chooks to the acre?

Mr WILLIAMS: How many dry chooks to the acre, as the member for Mount Gambier points out? I do not know.

An honourable member: What's the dry sheep equivalent?

Mr WILLIAMS: A dry sheep equivalent is a 45-kilogram sheep, dry, maintained in condition. I do know that. I can probably tell you in the Lower South-East how much dry matter you will produce per acre in each month of the year as well, but that has nothing to do with this. Actually, it has got a lot to do with this, to be quite honest, but I do not know the relevant figures with regard to chickens.

What I do know is that, when a consumer goes into a supermarket and they see free-range eggs, they have an assumption in their mind that the eggs are produced by chickens that are foraging in a free-range environment, are actually obtaining their food from the area that they are allowed to forage on and are producing the eggs in what we would describe as a natural sort of way.

That is certainly not the case. I suspect that that is probably not the case even at the number of 1,500, but I think the compromise that the member for Finnis seeks to have us adopt at 1,500 is probably a fair compromise and it probably would indeed meet the expectations of those consumers. It is because of that that I support what the member has brought to the house.

I think there is a huge number of labelling issues which we should be addressing as a nation. Most of them, I suspect, need to be addressed by our federal parliament on a national basis rather than by this parliament but, as a food producer and having been a food producer for most of my life, I am aware—very much aware—that we have huge problems with labelling in this country. It is not just about Australian-made or the quantity of Australian production or even product that goes into things that are labelled Australian-made, but it is about the way in which foodstuffs are produced. There is a whole range of issues which I think should be addressed in the food labelling area which just are not addressed and, as I said, they should be addressed by our federal parliament.

I think this is an important step in the right direction by the member for Finnis. It comes to mind also that we have just seen in the egg industry that apparently an interstate producer is selling eggs whose labelling gives the image to consumers that they are produced in the Barossa Valley when they are not produced in South Australia at all. That is another issue that I think should be addressed forthwith. I certainly commend the member for Finnis for bringing this matter to the attention of the house.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (11:11): I also rise to support the bill introduced by the member for Finnis and congratulate him for doing this. As the member for Mount Gambier has indicated, I also have concerns about the true labelling of not only eggs but all of the produce in Australia. When you buy something, you want to know that what you are paying for is what you are getting.

The member for Finnis is to be congratulated. I remember at the start of his journey on this proposed bill that he arranged for some meetings in Parliament House, and I went to those meetings and it was a bit surprising to hear the difference in the attitude and the information that we got from the various organisations.

I have one fairly large free-range operation in my electorate, and that is Rohdes at Tarlee. They have what I consider are true free-range birds. They do not overstock their grazing facility. They have got about 5,000 hens there. I must say that chickens do not lay the eggs, as the member for Fisher indicated before: it is the hens that lay the eggs. We need to be very clear about that. If you are going to run 20,000 hens, or fowls, per hectare that is not humane, in my opinion. You will deplete the natural food in the area and they will not get any true indication of relaxation or exercise. The figure suggested by the member for Finnis of 1,500 hens per hectare is a good compromise. I certainly will be supporting this bill, and I again congratulate the member for Finnis for bringing it to our attention.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:13): I am sure I say it every Thursday morning, but I love Thursday mornings. It is amazing what you can learn when you sit in this chamber and listen to the contributions from others. I commend the member for Hammond for the information he was able to provide to us about the capacity of land to absorb, in this case, hens (chickens) and the member for MacKillop—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: And their waste.

Mr GRIFFITHS: And their waste, indeed, and how that impacts. It comes back to the reason the member for Finniss put this bill before us, and it all comes back to truth in labelling. From my point of view, I only have the low-level chicken experience of having a chance as a child to collect eggs on my grandparents' farm and my wife's family farm. We would take the little kids out to do that. When Donna and I built a home in Orroroo, we put a chook pen in the back and had eight chickens which my father-in-law described as 'designer chooks', because they were different colours. I do not know why he called them designer chooks, but it is all part of the experience of life.

This comes back to an absolutely critical issue of when a consumer—the people that we are here to represent—purchases a product and the knowledge and confidence they can have about the labelling on that product about whether it actually means what it says. So, when the member for Mount Gambier says that he has no confidence in it and he does not buy it—as in free-range eggs—I can understand that.

The criticism I have of this is not levelled in any way towards those who engage in intensive animal keeping. In the electorate of Goyder, there are a vast number of chicken sheds that engage in intensive animal keeping, but it is for the meat purpose not the egg opportunity that it represents. That has been a vitally important growth opportunity for the electorate. It has had some great needs, but when it has done well it has provided some good employment opportunities for people.

When you listen to the argument, I think it is fairly easy to make the decision quite quickly. When the member for Finniss proposed the bill to the Liberal party room, it was on the sound basis of ensuring that the consumer had the opportunity to be confident in what they were buying, so there is no risk of marketing opportunity which reflects on what the consumer is prepared to pay.

As now only a retail consumer of the product, on a recent trip to a supermarket I bought what was defined as being 'caged eggs'. I am pretty sure it was about \$3 per dozen—certainly the free-range option is far more expensive than that—but it represents a different purchasing opportunity for people. So, it is important that the parliament actually ensures that it does what it can to make sure that, when people take the money out of their pocket, they are actually getting what they pay for.

I support the bill. The member for Finniss has not done this is lightly. He has consulted widely, not just with people in his own community but across the electorate and with the industry and in other states. He has brought it here in all seriousness to ensure that we put in place a bill that reflects the need to preserve the consumer's confidence and, importantly, to give the growers, who are investing a significant amount of money in marketing a product based on a style of production, some confidence that they are going to be competitive because they are competing equally.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:16): I rise to speak on the free-range egg legislation introduced by the member for Finniss and commend him for this initiative. I am reminded of the occasion when, after nine male speakers, Margaret Thatcher once, addressing an after-dinner speaker's engagement, said, 'The cock might crow but it's the hen that lays the eggs.' May I firstly disclose that I do not currently own any poultry. My brother currently has two, who are regular layers. My son has had two, but members would probably accept that they were not fated for egg production as much as the pot, given that their names were Tasty and Delicious.

The guideline option presented by the government—that is, to have a code of practice—which was suggested earlier this week by the Attorney-General as being the more effective means to manage the disclosure and transparency under the labelling for the benefit of consumers, is utterly rejected. It is puzzling that the Attorney would present this as an argument to defeat this bill, given that he has been hell-bent in other areas of legislation on insisting upon having legislative protection and not relying on voluntary codes of practice.

The most important aspect of this bill, in my mind, is that either the Attorney-General has failed to understand the significance of the economic implication of his proposal or he has not addressed it at all; that is, to impose the guidelines he has in mind will, in fact, put current operators out of business. Again, it is just illustrative of the government's ignorance of the significance of what is actually going on in the real world.

There are current producers of free-range eggs, who are the basis upon which the member for Finnis has introduced this legislation, as they put representations to him of the importance of protecting the brand and the opportunity to provide a genuine product to the consumers, who increasingly demand some transparency in getting what they buy. One of those was Tom and Fiona Fryar, who have a very good business on Kangaroo Island. Tommy Fryar was in my class at Parndana Area School, before it became the Parndana campus of the Kangaroo Island schools. I will not go there—because, of course, it is had an utter demise under this government.

Nevertheless, Tommy was in my class. He came from a family down at the western end of Kangaroo Island. They did not have much by way of any financial support—probably close to nothing. In fact, their neighbours, the Ordways, also married into the Fryar family. They went into the chicken business and Tommy went into the egg business. Both have been enormously successful in taking on a risk, taking on a challenge, with little or no support or financial buffer to get them going—good on them! They have carved out a highly respected area of interest, bringing new markets and industry to Kangaroo Island. As has been said by other speakers, Kangaroo Island is blessed in not having any rabbits or foxes, the natural predator of chooks, so has some significant benefit in being able to operate free range without having to have the impediment of secure fences and the like.

There has been some continuing predation on the hens and chicks on Kangaroo Island, namely by eagles and other predatory birds. I understand that the most novel way to deal with this on Kangaroo Island is to allow dogs to run free range in the paddocks. They live, operate and earn their keep by running around in the chook paddocks and they help keep away the eagles and other predators.

It is a very happy, harmonious, well-planned, well-serviced industry, which has been embryonic by people like Tom and Fiona Fryar and which has developed into a secure employer for the people of Kangaroo Island. We obviously have other investment from Kangaroo island, which has developed the industry, and for the government to simply say, 'Well, we're going to only look at the tangent of animal welfare, and we're going to introduce a guideline process,' and not understand that there is a significant economic disadvantage in what they are doing, obviously indicates the limitation of their peripheral vision on these types of matters.

The most important aspect is that the guidelines will allow for 20,000 chickens, hens or birds per hectare to flourish and the operation can still be described as free range, inconsistent with what the industry currently accepts, that is 1,500 birds per hectare. For other members who have significant intensive chicken industries in their electorates, usually for meat, for poultry breeding, they of course have very high intensification in their industry.

Those who have been in these sheds will understand that the little yellow chicks are brought in on day one, and that they have a fenced off area within a shed usually. As the chickens grow and become white and develop in size, the ropes are extended down the shed and they take up the full area. I think after about 60 days they are loaded back up in the truck, having never seen daylight, and they are taken off to become the meat produce that we see in chicken shops today.

It is unlike the old days, when of course chicken was a luxury that you had once a year at Christmas, but from which you enjoyed the eggs all year round. I commend the member for Finnis for bringing this important piece of legislation to the attention of the parliament. It clearly has across-the-board support, except from the government, which, as usual, has been churlish and narrow in its vision in not accepting what is a very sensible idea, all because it wants to take the credit.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (11:23): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (23)

Bedford, F.E.

Bettison, Z.L.

Bignell, L.W.K.

AYES (23)

Breuer, L.R.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Conlon, P.F.	Fox, C.C.	Geraghty, R.K. (teller)
Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.	Key, S.W.
O'Brien, M.F.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Portolesi, G.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Sibbons, A.J.
Snelling, J.J.	Thompson, M.G.	Vlahos, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wright, M.J.	

NOES (19)

Brock, G.G.	Chapman, V.A.	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Pegler, D.W.	Pengilly, M. (teller)	Pisoni, D.G.
Redmond, I.M.	Sanderson, R.	Such, R.B.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Venning, I.H.	Whetstone, T.J.
Williams, M.R.		

PAIRS (4)

Koutsantonis, A.	Marshall, S.S.
Piccolo, A.	Treloar, P.A.

Majority of 4 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

SPORTING AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:31):** I move:

That this house recognises the significant positive contribution that sporting and recreational facilities make to communities over and above the direct benefits of participating in the sporting and recreational activities.

It is, of course, very well known to all present the benefits of participating in sporting and recreational pursuits, and I am thinking here of physically active ones. But that is not what this is actually about; this is about trying to ensure that the house is very well aware of and supports the benefits to communities that come from the investment in sporting and recreational facilities in those communities.

This motion is very much about our entire state; it is not just about regional South Australia, as many of my motions are. This motion is deliberately about the entire state—city, country, the outback, everything from rowing courses all the way through to outback horseracing tracks or bronco branding yards.

Sport was probably just about the most important thing to me for about the first half of my life. I was a bit taken aback last night, when I was thinking about these things, that, at the age of 48, I look back and realise that I was probably at my sporting peak at 24—so a long, long time ago. That was the last year I played in the National Basketball League. I did manage to play on a premiership-winning state basketball league team, with the mighty West Adelaide Bearcats, which was a great privilege and lots and lots of fun. I played with them for a few years after the NBL. But it is not about me, it is not about participation. It is about the commercial, economic, social and community benefits that these facilities bring.

It is not just about my own thoughts, either. I have had the great fortune to have Ms Alexandra Grigg from Adelaide University do a study into these matters for me. I asked her to look into the benefits in rural areas (that is what this particular study was on) of health facilities, transport facilities, recreation and sport facilities and education facilities over and above their primary purposes.

She did a lot of very good work and presented a fantastic report as part of her internship program, which was run by Clem Macintyre, with the universities and the South Australian

Parliament. Alexandra Grigg is an economics student primarily because that is what I wanted. I wanted some hard data. I did not want some wishy-washy thoughts or inclinations or ideas or concepts of how it could be; I wanted something very significant to support this. I will take a couple of quotes out of Ms Grigg's report, and I will start with section 4.2—Sporting Facilities. It states:

Investment in regional sporting facilities in South Australia results in an increase of real median weekly household income for that district by \$33.61, holding all else constant. This may be due to the multiplier effects of increased population, facilitating increases in local demand and therefore services, as a result of the community spirit generated in these sporting facilities.

A bit further on:

As per the effects of health facilities on regional communities' social welfare, the regressions in section 3.1 illustrate that sporting facilities have a positive influence on volunteer rates (as a percentage of town population), population and age spread in rural townships.

Sporting facilities in a community provide a diverse range of external benefits beyond their primary purpose. These facilities allow for the involvement and participation of residents of all ages in a community. Through this ongoing facilitation of civic engagement, town members feel directly connected to those around them, generating a greater sense of community spirit. Not only do sporting facilities directly influence the town's social welfare, these factors indirectly influence community strength through their ability to attract families to the district. Through the facilities' capacity to provide health benefits, engage the community and foster civic engagement through volunteerism, local sporting infrastructure attracts families, further generating a sense of community spirit.

This development of community spirit promotes the cultivation of diverse support networks, in turn, growing loyalty and trust, further improving on community strength. Like the indirect effects of health facilities in regional communities, sporting facilities' influences on social welfare are interrelated. The greater the development of these interrelations between the benefits provided by local sporting clubs, the larger the multiplier effect of investment in these facilities.

A lot of work has gone into this to actually show that this is econometrically defensible work, but these things that I have just been reading out which apply to rural communities are equally true of suburban metropolitan Adelaide, and that is why I wanted to bring this matter to the house. The benefits just grow and grow and grow. The more sporting facilities and recreational facilities we have, like bike paths and all sorts of non-team sports, is very important. I am not just focusing on the stock standards, like cricket, football etc. The non-structured, non-team, individual recreational pursuits are just as valid in this area.

I encourage the government and I encourage all future governments to think about this very hard. Mr Deputy Speaker, as a former minister for recreation and sport, I am sure that you know a lot about this and I hope you share my views on this very important topic. I am disappointed, of course, that the government has recently cut \$3½ million out of the recreation and sport grants that are available to communities. I think that is a great shame because as the work of Ms Grigg shows, there are extraordinary multiplier effects. That \$3½ million to South Australia has a very large multiplier effect that goes a long way towards enhancing the strength of communities.

I am also not shying away from raising Adelaide Oval in this issue as well. All sporting facilities, from the largest like Adelaide Oval all the way through to the smallest, that might be, as I said, a bronco branding yard at Marree, or another outback town, provide these benefits. I am firmly on the record here in this house and other places saying that the problem with the Adelaide Oval expansion is we actually just cannot afford it. So I am not suggesting for a second that these types of benefits do not accrue.

But the reality is with the budget situation—which we are all now very well aware of with nearly \$14 billion of debt—spending over half a billion dollars on the upgrade of the Adelaide Oval, which will only get us an additional 12,000 seats over the 38,000 that already exist in the former Adelaide Oval, is an expenditure that unfortunately we cannot justify. However, I do not shy away from the fact that exactly the same benefits that I am talking about will accrue from that investment. I wish we could afford it.

I would also like to put on record my thanks and appreciation for the good work that is done by Sport SA—a very important South Australian organisation that promotes and advocates for sport in general. They do that in many ways, such as getting involved in supporting the Olympics, all the way through to small, tiny clubs, organisations and individual participants. They are very busy with clubs and leagues alike. In fact, they do some quite innovative work in this area, in terms of trying to expand and maximise the benefits that come from sport, like training sports administrators. They do that in-house. They train sports administrators so that they can contribute to the sport. These are people who may never take the court or the field, or whatever it happens to

be, but they can contribute to and benefit from, and share in and expand, for the good of the whole community, the benefits that come from sport.

I will wrap up by saying that, just like there are far more benefits than just educational outcomes in investing in schools, just like there are far more benefits than the health outcomes to communities by investing in hospitals and other health facilities, and just like there are far more benefits than just the ability to transport that comes from investing in transport facilities, so it is with sporting and recreational facilities. Well beyond the benefits of participation, our communities throughout South Australia benefit enormously, both socially and economically, from both the state and commonwealth governments'—and also community and volunteer—investment in our sporting facilities.

That investment can be summarised in two ways: there is a very clear economic multiplier effect, which brings increased economic opportunities, additional local expenditure and increased local demand; and there is a very clear social welfare multiplier effect, which brings increased volunteer participation, increased local trust, increased local diversity and increased social interaction. I urge the house to support this motion and I urge this government and all future governments to take these issues into very serious consideration when they are weighing up their investment decisions.

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (11:42): I rise to respond to the motion moved by the member for Stuart on behalf of the government. Naturally, the government supports this motion. Local sporting clubs not only provide a significant possible contribution to their members and the wider community but they also deliver programs for people of all ages and circumstances, which in turn benefits the health and wellbeing of those taking part.

Without doubt, sport makes an enormous contribution to our society beyond the boundaries of participation. Being active is an integral part of our culture and involves a broad range of organisations working together to support community needs. The state government knows that sport and recreation facilities provide places to play and participate, places to meet and share common interests, and places to support the development of community values. Sporting clubs have an important role to play in providing safe communities and healthy neighbourhoods, as well as providing leadership development opportunities for athletes, coaches and volunteers.

Through the Office for Recreation and Sport we have funded in excess of \$59,600,000 of community sporting infrastructure developments since 2002. This funding does not even include major state sport infrastructure projects, such as the magnificent state Aquatic & Leisure Centre in my own electorate of Mitchell or the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval. The state government will continue to support the planning and delivery of facilities for sport and active recreation at fiscally responsible levels.

Over the past 12 years, the Mitchell electorate has benefited from this support to the tune of \$1,055,445, \$493,840 of which has been contributed through Active Club Program grants and \$561,605 of which has been granted through the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program. Since I was elected in 2010, no fewer than 24 different clubs and organisations based in Mitchell have been the recipients of grants under these programs. I have had the pleasure of handing cheques over to them, the privilege of being present for the opening of new facilities, and the launch of new programs made possible by these grants.

The Glenelg Rebel Softball Club, the Sheidow Park Cricket Club, the South Adelaide Basketball Club, the South Australian Over 60s Cricket Association, Riding for the Disabled Association, Scouts SA, Reynella Smallbore and Air Rifle Club, Diving South Australia, the Fleurieu Swimming Club, Marion Bowling Club, Marion Croquet Club, Marion Swimming Club, South City Chiefs, American Football Club, Reynella Bowling Club (through the City of Onkaparinga), the Henley Water Polo Club, the Marion Cricket Club, the Masters Swimming SA, Southern Field Archers, Sturt Marion Women's Soccer Club, Sturt Pistol and Shooting Club, the Hub Netball Club, Reynella Cricket Club, Sturt Marion Thunder Soccer Club, and the Trott Park Fencing Club have all benefited from this support.

Some clubs have purchased basic sporting equipment, others have put on 'come and try' programs, while others have installed floodlights or upgraded playing facilities and services, and others have had coaches accredited or volunteers trained. Whether they have received a few thousand or \$100,000, the money has been gratefully received and well spent.

Since I became member for Mitchell, I have made a point of writing to every sport and recreation club that I am aware of in my electorate to notify them about grants offered by the state

government. This has definitely broadened awareness and generated an increase in funding. I am very proud that nearly half a million has been secured for sport and community clubs in Mitchell since 2010. It is important to note that, if an electorate does not apply for grant funding of its allocation each year, those funds are allocated elsewhere. This is why I always try to remind clubs to get in their applications.

Mitchell is not the only electorate to be home to clubs which have benefited from the state government's important investment in sporting and recreation facilities. For example, the electorate of Stuart, from which the mover of this motion comes, has received \$2,940,237 for its sporting and recreation facilities over the past 12 years. One of my neighbours in the east, the electorate of Davenport (represented by the opposition spokesman for recreation and sport, Mr Evans) has received \$1,117,668 for sporting and recreation clubs across the same period.

What this is all about is the state government's commitment to investment in sport and the benefits that flow from having an active, healthy community. Sport fosters a positive, productive and principled culture. Additionally, all team sports come with innate lessons in cooperation, discipline, focus, fitness and teamwork, as well as leadership.

Sport played a big part of my life growing up. It was big in my house—well, softball and speedway were, anyway. My sister, who was 11 years older than me, played softball for Seacombe and South Australia as a pitcher, and my father was a softball umpire and a mad speedway fan. We spent many hours at the softball fields at West Beach, and as a young fellow it was a great environment. Everyone knew each other, and I had so many surrogate aunts and uncles.

I guess it would not be too hard to work out what sport I took up. It was school baseball for Tonsley Park Primary School, and then on to Goodwood to the Goodwood Indians, and I also played cricket whilst I was at school. Sport kept me focused when my parents separated, and being in a team environment was so helpful for me.

Fast forward a couple of decades and, with three kids all actively involved in various sports, it continues to play a huge role in my life. As an adult, I have coached cricket, T-ball and soccer I have to say that soccer was a sport that was certainly totally foreign to me. However, it started new learning for me. At one school meeting where the kids had a team all ready to go but they did not have a coach, guess who put his hand up? I guess everyone in this chamber has been there and done that.

From those modest beginnings, I eventually became the secretary and webmaster of Southern Districts Junior Soccer Association and was honoured in 2010 to be awarded life membership. I love to watch almost every sport, and my wife can certainly vouch for that. I played indoor cricket for the same team for 20 years, until late 2010, when ill health intervened and I was diagnosed with an inner ear infection that brought on vertigo. If anybody knows a cure, let me know.

Ms Bedford: My big toe stops me playing sport!

Mr SIBBONS: The trouble is, I fall flat on my face if I start running. Speaking about sport in this place is a privilege. It is something I am so passionate about. It is not difficult to list the things that sporting clubs could back to our communities. Just let me run through a few things that spring to mind.

There are health benefits for us and our children. More than ever our health system faces the multiple challenges of an ageing population, ageing infrastructure and the increasing burden of chronic disease. Prevention is more important than ever before. As a nation we are becoming less active, often due to the work we do, and we have to look at ways of combating our sedentary lifestyles. Sport and recreation facilities help to reverse this trend by engaging groups of all ages, all fitness levels and all backgrounds.

In my view, every dollar invested in local sport and recreation is literally one less that will be required in health one day. There are also enormous social benefits that derive from having vibrant sport and recreation clubs at the heart of our community. That is why I am proud to be part of a state government that stands shoulder to shoulder with its sporting clubs and associations in supporting their commitment with its own.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (11:52): I certainly support this motion. I do not think any of us appreciate how important our sporting clubs are, particularly in the regions. I will just use my local Kongorong sports club as an example. Every Saturday during the winter—or every second

Saturday at home, of course—they play football and netball at all grades right through from the juniors to the seniors.

It is a great opportunity for families in a district to come together and, of course, those from the districts that we are playing against, so that people get to mix with each other and get to know each other. I think there are benefits, particularly when things are tough sometimes. The dairy industry in the last 12 to 18 months has been going through very dire times, yet those families can come along to the football and netball of a Saturday, forget all their woes, watch the game or play in the game, have a beer or two and a steak and just have a good yarn with each other and support each other.

It is not only the benefits of the sports itself, but the benefits to the community that far outweigh anything else that happens within our community, I feel. These clubs are also very much the hub of the community. Whenever there is a local disaster or somebody runs into trouble—losing a loved one or whatever—it is always those sporting clubs that come together to assist in those disasters or assist those families who have run into trouble. That is great thing.

The benefits for our young people in playing their sports is tremendous. They get together every Tuesday and Thursday night to train and then, of course, play on Saturdays. Many of our clubs have introduced programs on responsible alcohol drinking and responsible eating, etc., which has been a great benefit for our communities, so I certainly congratulate them on that.

I do not think that we will ever appreciate the help that it gives to people, particularly, with mental health problems. They can be feeling down all week, they go along on Saturday to the footy or the netball and get to have a yarn with a few of their mates and that alleviates a lot of their problems.

Sporting clubs also have a great benefit for new families that move into an area because they get to meet the locals and become part of the community very quickly, and they are certainly always welcome within those clubs. Those clubs bring many benefits to our communities.

I would also like to congratulate our governments and councils for the grants that they have made to these clubs over many years. I know within my own electorate just about every sports club has been the recipient of grants and, without those grants, they would never have had the facilities they have. You look at their clubrooms and their change rooms, which are magnificent. Their booths and food facilities are second to none and, of course, the ovals nowadays, with irrigation and responsible usage of water, are tremendous. I certainly congratulate our governments and councils on the facilities that they have made available for our people. I certainly commend this motion, particularly for the benefits it has to our communities.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:56): Sport definitely builds communities and relationships and keeps us healthy. We learn life skills through organising competitions and working as part of a team, sporting clubs have links with local communities and community groups and, most importantly, they provide a social outlet for people who might otherwise be lonely or isolated.

There are obvious environmental benefits, too, to looking after sport and recreational clubs and their facilities. The protection of green space in our communities that sporting clubs provide is increasingly and extremely important. In our own case in Modbury, we have a great sporting complex, the heart of which is the Waterworld swimming centre. Then they have the Modbury Sporting Club and, standing on that oval on a Saturday afternoon, you could be at any oval in Australia in the regional areas. It is surrounded by gum trees, with a great view of the hills. Many hundreds of families spend their time there. We also have a lawn bowling hub very close to that as well.

Another very important positive derived from sporting clubs is their impact on community safety. I believe there is absolutely no doubt that sport and recreation plays a role in reducing youth crime and property damage. When young people stay involved in sport through their teens, the disciplined team work and positive life skills learnt reduce their vulnerability to negative life choices such as drug, alcohol and antisocial or criminal behaviour.

So, with all these positive benefits, what are we doing to ensure we continue to see vibrant and functioning local sporting clubs across our communities here in South Australia? The state government has a strong commitment to sports and supports active recreation in clubs and sports programs that assist in improving our health and wellbeing. These funding mechanisms help to get more people involved in physical activity.

In Florey, for instance, we are home to many sports, and I actually like the obscure sports. Not only are we looking at things like cricket and AFL but we have also tennis and table tennis, all forms of football (rugby league, rugby union and grid iron). We have—

An honourable member: Lacrosse?

Ms BEDFORD: No lacrosse that I know of. We have hockey (a great hockey club), all forms of bowls and baseball. We have scouting groups involved in sport. We have a pitch and putt association. I would like to put on record the importance of women's participation in sports, at all sorts of levels. As the state and national patron of calisthenics, I stand here very proud of the work that the state government has done in supporting calisthenics. We have dozens of clubs all over the state and I urge all members to go and watch some calisthenics if they have not seen it. It is a really vibrant and interesting sport. We have great women's clubs for netball, of course—we cannot go past the local netball—and, of course, in premier league netball our girls are doing extremely well.

There are obviously though some challenges facing local sports and recreation clubs. Some of this is about financial resources and I am sure a large part of it is about finding enough volunteers to help share the load of running the clubs or the associations. From coaches to umpires, to scorers, first aid or canteen staff, along with people who look after the finances and the webpages, of course, or the playing surfaces and the clubrooms, keeping a sporting club going takes a lot of work and commitment.

I know that, in Florey, some of our grants have gone to that sort of administration around sport, and I want to encourage clubs to look at that aspect of the club grants. In Florey, I have only been able to make sure the clubs have got half a million dollars, according to this spreadsheet. It seems like a lot more work when we do it, but we can obviously be doing a lot more because, as the member for Mitchell said, if you do not apply for that money, it goes to other areas, so it is about us making sure we make these opportunities available for the clubs.

I know I have had several days where we have explained how to fill in the form, because the form is the most daunting part of the whole thing, but several clubs have made sure they have been able to achieve a grant many, many times, according to this spreadsheet, over the last 10 years. So, despite the challenges they face, I believe that, by working collaboratively and working smarter and utilising all the levels of government support—local, state and federal—sport and recreation clubs have a very bright future here in this state.

I would also like to point out that one of the things I tried to get off the ground in Florey recently, or have over the years, was a 'come and try sports' passport where you get your clubs to allot, say, half a day over the school holidays, get help through local community groups and make sure that there is something there for the kids to do at the school ovals, morning and afternoon, every day of the school holidays. It was a really exciting initiative. It is going to take a bit of organisation, but we are going to have a go at doing that over the school holidays in the not too distant future.

I urge all members to have a think about that because, if we can get something off the ground in our electorates, it actually provides an opportunity for kids to come and try some of the obscure sports like lacrosse, that we were talking about, and the Olympic sports like hockey. You could not help but be excited by Olympic hockey. You have got to start somewhere and getting fit by running up and down that sporting pitch is the way to do it. I commend the government for its work in this area and also commend the member for bringing this motion to the house.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:01): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, a former minister for sport too, as am I. I congratulate the member for Stuart for bringing this motion about the importance of sport and recreation before the house. I just want to make some comments in regards to sport and recreation. I, like other members, think the importance of both competitive sport and active recreation is one of the foundation stones of our society, but I just want to take the opportunity to correct a few misconceptions from other speakers.

The member for Mitchell gets up and says, in effect, 'Isn't the government good? We have spent about \$53 million over 11 years on recreation and sport.' What he fails to say, of course, is that, of that, they are required by legislation to spend around \$40 million to \$41 million because, under the Gaming Machines Act, there is \$3.5 million a year put aside into the Sport and Recreation Fund, specifically for that purpose.

That is not a government decision, actually: that was a decision of the parliament about 15 years ago under previous regimes—it has been amended since. I remember Kevin Foley, the then treasurer, getting ambushed by the upper house on this particular issue and caving in under the pressure. The reality is the government has not been generous. What they have done is what the legislation has asked them to do.

We remember, of course, that, when this government first came into power, the first thing they did was cut the sport and recreation funding. Dorothy Kotz, as I recall, was the opposition spokesman at the time. There was a cut to sport and recreation funding under this particular government.

I remember that there was a figure of around \$6 million or \$7 million put into the forward estimates in regards to recreational trails for horseriders, for walkers and for bike riders. Of course, that money has now run out, and guess what? There is no money set aside for that style of trail in the Office for Recreation and Sport. They have a Trails Coordinating Committee without a budget. They have abandoned recreation in that sense.

So, the reality is, yes, the government has spent \$40 million or \$50 million. The reality is they cut the budget when they first came to power and they have simply maintained what has been required—the vast majority of it—by legislation. The member for Mitchell comments on my electorate. It is nice of him to raise that we have about \$1 million into the humble seat of Davenport. What he forgets to mention, of course, is that a lot of that money has gone to the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, which is great—I support those clubs there—but that is a state facility. Because the government will not fund that facility out of the state facilities fund—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Well, it has been full of rubbish. The reality is, that is a state facility and rather than that money being paid out of the state facilities fund, the individual clubs have to apply through the Active Club Grant and other mechanisms. In other words, the money has been diverted to a state facility via club grants. I support the concept of those clubs getting their facilities upgraded; I contest whether it should be out of the normal grant pool or out of the state facilities fund.

The reality is that the government will spend more on interest on Adelaide Oval than it will on all the recreation and sport put together. That is the fundamental basis of it. If you want to really understand the government's priority on recreation and sport, then go to the other fund, called the recreation and sport fund. The recreation and sport fund has been the subject of a dispute between the Treasury and the Office of Recreation and Sport for about six years. This gets money out of the old soccer pools. It increases its revenue every year by a few hundred thousand dollars.

I think my memory is right—I have a reasonable memory—that on the last evidence to the Economics and Finance Committee, the amount of money that had built up was about \$1.6 million. So because the Office of Recreation and Sport cannot resolve a dispute with Treasury, there is \$1.6 million sitting there in accounts which should be going to recreation and sport clubs, but the two groups are having a dispute—the two groups are having a dispute.

All the members opposite who have been or are on the Economics and Finance Committee know that is true. They were as surprised as the opposition was when this suddenly came out in evidence at the Economics and Finance Committee, I think three or four years ago. Three or four years down the track, the dispute is still going on, so I congratulate the member for Stuart for his motion about recreation and sport and its importance, but please, please until the government can sort out these really basic issues about how this money can sit there when recreation and sport clubs are desperate for it—how they can sit there and not solve this dispute—I find it hard to believe that the government is committed to recreation and sport other than what it is legislatively required to do.

This is a government which ran round telling everyone that its priorities were not going to be stadiums. When the Hindmarsh Stadium dispute occurred, and the then opposition played a lot of politics with it, they ran around saying their priority would not be stadiums. Their priority would not be stadiums. We all know their history since then. The members opposite are simply getting up and really what they are saying is, 'Although we got into government and cut funding, we've simply spent what is legislatively required of us, and aren't we big fellows?' Well, I have a different view.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:08): I support this motion and commend the member for Stuart for bringing it to the house. One of the important things about sporting and recreational

clubs and associated facilities is the contribution they make in terms of providing not just young people, but particularly young people, with some structure, discipline and commitment in their lives. I think it is fair to say, as a generalisation, that young people who are involved in sporting activities are less likely to engage in antisocial and, indeed, even criminal activity. I have interacted with coaches who have been involved for 40 or more years who attest to that claim.

It is not just for the benefit of the people who are in the clubs, in these organisations, there is a wider community benefit. That is why it is legitimate for governments, at all levels, to support sporting and recreational activities because there is a spin-off in a whole range of benefits, not just in terms of decreased and antisocial behaviour, but improvements in health and so on.

I think it is one of the key elements in our society that people can get rid of some of their energy or even some of their aggression by playing sport. If you take the game of cricket, it is more than just a game: there is a whole culture about cricket and doing the right thing and walking if you know you are out. We do not see everyone upholding that at the moment or, necessarily, in recent times. There is a culture with various sports and it is something that we should encourage and governments should actively support.

One of my concerns—and just taking this motion a little bit further—is what I see as a decline in organised sport and physical activity in schools. There are some schools that are still committed to it, but sadly, compared to a few years ago, there is less commitment to organised sport and physical activity in schools.

My first professional job was as a teacher. In those days, we used to change into a tracksuit (or the equivalent) and it was integrated into the curriculum so that there was physical activity throughout the day—and these were primary school children, year 7s and so on—and that was better for the students. It had a positive impact on their learning and it also helped with some of the children who had particular frustrations.

One lad I had, Freddie (I won't use his surname), had some learning issues, and every now and again he steamed up in the classroom, so I used to get him to run around the oval and he calmed down and he was fine. After a while, the deputy principal said, 'No, he can't do that, he has to stay in the classroom.' Within a few weeks, he was expelled from the school and then expelled from other schools as well.

The point is, I think what we need to have is a reinvigoration of sporting activities—physical activity—in schools. As I say, it is best if it is integrated into the timetable, the daily program, not as something that you would only do on a weekend, but something that you do each and every day. I think that is where you get the best outcome, and I would like to see an attempt to restore physical activity and organised sport to a high level in all schools, not just in some.

Within my electorate I have some fantastic sporting clubs, but I will not name them. I appreciate the work of the people who organise these clubs and the work they do. Matches do not happen easily—someone has to organise them. One of the down sides is that increasingly, for junior sport, there are significant costs involved. No-one expects a free lunch, but I think some of the costs which are now borne by parents of young children playing sport are quite significant.

The other thing which is very sad is that because some men, in particular, have done the wrong thing, what we are seeing is a reluctance by some men to be involved in junior sport. They do not want to be suspected of doing the wrong thing with children. I think that has been a very unfortunate consequence of the unacceptable behaviour, the evil behaviour, of a very small number of people. I think if men are honest, they will say they are very cautious now about being involved in any activities—sporting, or otherwise—with children, because they might be falsely accused or might get in a situation where there is some suggestion of acting improperly. I think that is sad and ultimately works against the interests of the children, as well as the adults.

I believe this motion is a worthy one, and I once again thank the member for Stuart for putting it to the house.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:14): I have listened to the contributions made by others, and especially when it comes to the member for Mitchell, I listened very intently when he talked with great pride about not just the sporting groups that exist within his area and those that he has been involved with, but indeed, the level of funding that has come through from the state government. I was rather frustrated, though, because I did not hear from him a word about the local commitment to fundraising and the improvement of facilities. I recognise very strongly that government support is a key to an improvement opportunity, even though, frustratingly, it is in a small amount of dollars.

But the stimulus for it comes from people who live in those communities and the effort they go to, often over generations, to develop those facilities, through a lot of voluntary work and hard work, fundraising and local debentures that are taken out. They do aspire to receive government grants, and it is important that they are available and come through. For me, that is a key thing. Unlike the member for Stuart, I have only ever been a bit of a hack sportsperson—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: A hack, but I have appreciated—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: I don't believe it.

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: A previous life. But I have appreciated the way in which it has enabled me to develop as a person. It is that involvement in a sport, either in a team or as an individual, that allows you to become the person you do become. You are involved with others, they rely upon you and you rely upon them, and you learn a level of responsibility that impacts your personal and professional lives. So, it is very important.

I am particularly pleased that, whenever there is an opportunity for a community group to apply for a grant, they approach me or other members of parliament to support that. I do so on several bases. One is to get the money but, secondly, out of recognition, as I think the member for Mount Gambier reflected upon, of the opportunity it provides for not just the local people who live there and who might have grown up in that community but new people who come in to be involved in a sport and to be welcomed into a town, where they suddenly develop the friendships, which are really a key to our social feeling and how we get along in a town. I do that continually, for a lot of different reasons, and I hope that it continues to be available.

I also recognise the great pressure on all community groups to continue to maintain their sporting facilities. There is no doubt that locals do an enormous amount of fundraising; local government is required to contribute towards that. Luckily, a lot of councils these days have a grant funding program (sometimes equal to 1 per cent of their rate revenue), which is devoted to community projects. It gives those local clubs a great opportunity to get some money to assist in upgrades and maintenance works, and it is important that it is there.

Like every member here, I have one small community in my electorate (a community of only about 150 people), but they have built in the last three years a turf cricket pitch, for example. I cannot even begin to imagine how much work goes into the development of a turf cricket pitch, and it is for juniors—no adult cricket is played there. So, that is a commitment—

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, they don't run sheep on it—and a tremendous effort. They have upgraded their basketball and netball facilities because they compete in a wider regional competition, basketball in particular, and they have done exceptionally well. They have built great clubrooms there. They got some money from the federal government and I think some dollars from the state government also. It is about how it is driven by people, and it is not just the current leadership group but, indeed, it is generational. That is the thing that has really shone through for me, that is, that it is a generational commitment to provide an opportunity for their community to grow, and for them it has always been the sporting opportunities, and I commend them on that. It comes back to the spirit they as individuals hold for themselves and for their community.

I am humbled when I go around the electorate and look at some of the old photos and I talk to the older people who were involved about the original development of a lot of our facilities, no matter what it is—it can be the popular sports or the ones that are not utilised by as many people. You see in photos, in particular, a vast change from what is currently there to what was originally there, and you have to try to consider the amount of work that has gone into that.

I remember that, as a young bloke growing up in Yorketown, I was told by the older chaps about the 1950s when the oval was levelled, where all of these trucks worked for a week to bring in soil to put in a new surface, and the rocks were taken away, and that is what a country sporting fields were about—rocks initially. There are also the bowling clubs and the golf clubs where they have improved facilities. They started off with just these tiny tin sheds, and now they have facilities there that they are exceptionally proud of. It shows the generational commitment that is there to sporting facilities.

To me, though, it is really important, no matter whether it is regional or metropolitan, that the sporting commitment exists because it allows young people to aspire to be either a good sportsman or a contributor to a sport. The member for Stuart talked about those who might not be players but who are involved in the administration of a sport, and that is equally important. But we cannot have the elite level of sport unless we have the grassroots level.

The fact that this is a motion that is based around community driven sporting facilities which provide that grassroots opportunity for young people to work their way through—to be mentored and, indeed, if they have got it in them through either skill or capacity for hard work and a commitment level to aspire for greatness—is what we should all be proud of, because Australian history is littered with it. It used to be, I am told, that every street corner had a tennis court, and that is when we had Ken Rosewall and John Newcombe. All those generations before and after were given that opportunity to be outstanding sports people because their local community provided that facility for them, so that is an absolute credit.

I am equally frustrated, indeed, that there has been a reduction in the recreation and sport funding, and I know there has been some media on this. It is going to impact across a wide variety of our community and it is just going to make it that much harder to actually get the dollars that all these towns and suburban areas need and I would like to see if there is an opportunity for that to be reviewed because it is such an important one.

For those of us who have been involved in coaching of young people—and I have found it to be one of the absolute pleasures of my life—it is a great chance to be involved in mentoring; to help grow a young person. I know when I did some junior cricket coaching for a couple of years there was one young fellow in my team who was not an outstanding player, but I knew as a coach that I could count on him to perform as a player. We lost the grand final in the second year of my coaching and then I had to do other things in life, but his parents came up to me and said, 'It is the fact that you believed in him that has made a difference to him.'

That story is replicated millions of times across Australia, not just now, but across all generations and it has given all these young people a chance to aspire to great things because someone has believed in them. If the facility was not there and the organisations were not there and the people prepared to be involved were not there, maybe that would not have happened for that young bloke, and maybe it would not have happened for a lot of young people across Australia, so it shows the importance of this motion. I am pleased indeed that the government has indicated its support for it. It is not a political one, it is just an opportunity for us to believe in our future.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:21): I, too, rise to support the member for Stuart's motion, and I think sport is the heart and soul of the fabric of our community, both in regional South Australia and, just as importantly, in metro South Australia. I have had the good fortune to live in both country South Australia and down here in Adelaide, and sport is probably something that has the fondest memories for me; the opportunities that were given to myself as a young sportsperson.

Now I watch my children given the opportunities and I watch their friends and how they actually play together. It gives them values—not just on how to play sport, but on how to be a team, how to share and also how to achieve. Also, when you do achieve or when you have actually participated in a game or a competition, just what rewards you can get, whether it is about winning or whether it is about participation, whether it is about achieving a personal best or whether it is just about having fun.

For me, I have had the opportunity to do all of that. Obviously when I was a lad in Adelaide I was given the opportunity as a young fellow to play a variety of sports, and I think that that was really something that was a bit of a luxury, because in many cases a lot of the young, once upon a time, were given a sport to play in winter and a sport to play in summer. For me, I loved my football and hence I played down at Paringa Park and Somerton with great pride in my school colours. In doing that, I was given the opportunity to play down at Glenelg Football Club in the mini-league competition.

Members interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: They certainly did have mini-league. I can tell you that when I played down at Glenelg I played with the Kernahan family, and most of us can remember the Kernahan brothers—Gary, Stephen and David—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Gary lives in Port Augusta now.

Mr WHETSTONE: He does, indeed—and obviously their very proud father, Harry, used to follow them around with a football over and over, day in and day out, but there were many others who also achieved. Sadly, a knee injury put an end to my promising career in football, but along the way I got myself better—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Would have won a Brownlow otherwise!

Mr WHETSTONE: A potential Brownlow—and I moved into soccer. Again, that was another dynamic of sport and it gave me opportunities to move around the state, competing with country versus city. That was another way of meeting friends and experiencing a lifestyle that I had not been able to have with either living in the city and enjoying a country lifestyle or living in the country and enjoying a city lifestyle.

Over the years, sport has given me great pleasure, and I was lucky enough to be a Findon skid kid. One of the accolades there was that I was able to jump the wall of fire. I do not have any burns to prove it, but it really was another experience and another accolade. As I have said to some of my colleagues in this place, waterski racing was then a passion of mine. I was able to compete at all sorts of levels.

Over 25 years I was given the opportunity to participate and compete at both a state and national level, and I was lucky enough to be chosen in several Australian teams at an international level. That really did give me another dimension on competitive sport. At that level, it is about winning. In essence, it is not about competing; it is about having fun and enjoying what you do, but it is about winning. That is something that I am very proud of over my many years involved in that.

Coming into fatherhood, I put my aspirations of sport on hold and I chased my kids' sporting careers. Obviously, as many here have done, I filled in the void and took up coaching and mentoring roles. Whether you are an expert coach, a mentor for your kids or an expert orange cutter for your daughter's netball team, they are all the gaps that need to be filled along the way.

You might have a four-wheel drive car, and in most cases you have a four-wheel drive car so that you can fit the netball team or the soccer team in. We will not say that cars have been overloaded, but they are the sorts of things that you do to support sport. You might do a working bee at the motocross club to make sure that the track is ready for the next competition, or you might do a working bee at the footy oval or the tennis court. They are the sorts of things that can never be underestimated.

I will touch a little on some of the statistics in the region of Chaffey. Some of the stats show that in the Murray and Mallee 69 per cent compete or participate in sport, which is about 38,000 adults participating, and I think that is outstanding. Here in South Australia, more than 200,000 South Australians have been involved in coaching roles, umpiring or administrating, and the vast majority of these have been in a voluntary capacity.

This motion that the member for Stuart has put forward is also an opportunity for those volunteers—parents, friends and people who have given their time and dedication to supporting those sporting clubs—to be recognised. Also, their efforts in fundraising, essentially, are the heart and soul of our sporting clubs because, as the member for Goyder has said, sadly in this year's budget we have seen about \$3.6 million removed from the sport and recreation budget, and it is a sad indictment on any government to be taking away something that is the fabric of a community, metropolitan or country.

It is the foundation of young participants in sport getting a grip on exactly what they are good at, what they can do to prevent boredom, for social behaviour. Sport is one of the best medications for mental health, sport is one of the best medications for social behaviour, and sport is a great experience for family unity, for friendship building. I think this is a good motion. We need to look deeper than just the facilities, we need to look at what competing is all about. It is about what it provides as a flow-on effect.

I will touch quickly on the Riverland and the Mallee and some of the sporting prowess and achievements of some of our higher achievers. We have a very rich and proud motorsport history. We have had participants (as I did) compete in the world famous Bridge to Bridge Water Ski Race in New South Wales. We brought home the trophy in 2000. Over 350 teams competed from right around the world, so we are very, very proud of that achievement. Last year, one of my constituents brought home the outright Finke Desert Race trophy, and that is another great achievement. Go-karting, speedway, boat racing and dinghy racing are some of the other motorsport events.

We have AFL greats—Tony Modra, Neil Kerley, Russell Ebert, Mark Ricciuto, just to name a few. We have great Olympians—Hayden Stoeckel and Sophie Edington—and we have great cricketers—the Darlings. We have a great dynamic of families and individuals who have represented not only the region, but also our state and nation. I think that we as a sporting state should be proud of what has been achieved. I commend the member for Stuart's motion.

Time expired.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:32): I also rise to speak in support of this motion, and I commend the member for Stuart for bringing the motion to the house. It is such an important issue. I do not think you could overestimate the importance of providing sporting and recreational facilities throughout South Australia.

My childhood was spent in Melbourne until the age of 14, and that was probably when I did the most sport ever. One of the differences that I noticed as a teenager was that within a 10-minute drive of my home in Victoria I could have swimming competitions on a Saturday morning in a 50-metre outdoor pool in Greensborough, I could have squad training at Briar Hill, and I could go to other training at Eltham, straight down the road from me; you could have private lessons. There were at least five swimming pools within a 10-minute drive of my home, so to be engaged in sport was far easier, given that there were so many facilities.

When I moved to Adelaide I swam for North Adelaide and I trained at the Aquatic Centre when it was an outdoor pool, which was quite cold, and then it was closed for a while and then when it reopened again. However, other than the Aquatic Centre there were not really any other pools nearby. When I went to university I used to search for swimming pools that I could train at, because if you wanted to train after working hours at the Aquatic Centre you would be faced with 10 people per lane, and it was just crazy busy and quite impossible to train properly. Certainly compared to Victoria, where I grew up, South Australia is quite lacking, particularly in swimming centres.

The other sport that I played a lot in Victoria was basketball. Again, there were several stadiums. I think there were two or three indoor basketball stadiums within probably a 10 to 15 minute drive of my home. In Adelaide, as a teenager I wandered the streets with my basketball trying to find a hoop or somewhere to play around the key, and I struggled to find anywhere. In fact, the Walkerville YMCA was the only indoor basketball facility that I could find that was open to the public, and that is where our university used to train.

In fact, the University of South Australia did not—and they still do not—even have their own basketball facilities, so we used to use the Adelaide university's basketball courts in North Adelaide, which have now been demolished, so none of the city universities actually have any basketball facilities. I do think there is actually a need to invest in more sporting facilities.

I think it is extremely important. Not only does it keep children active and motivated, but from working in the modelling industry where, for 18 years, I actually trained and taught many thousands of teenagers, it was quite obvious to me which teenagers had an interest outside of school. Whether that was acting or modelling or whether that was music or sport or calisthenics or dancing, it made a very big difference to the lives of those children.

You could see that they had goals, they had other outlets for making friends. They had other interests, so if they were not engaged at school, they could perhaps have that engagement with their sport or music or other activity, where they could perhaps find people to talk to or understand them. I have also noticed that most teenagers go through a difficult patch. In fact, I have recommended many of them to take up martial arts as a way of harnessing their aggression through their teenage years and having an outlet for putting that into a productive source.

I actually did participate in judo for several years at the Prospect Tiger Judo Club and represented South Australia at the nationals. I found that it was a particularly useful sport and a really good outlet for your teenage years to learn something important, Whether it is breathing, stretching or team bonding, there are many other benefits to doing sport.

One of the things that also used to happen in Victoria when I was in primary school was that every morning we would do two laps of the primary school and there would be 10 exercise stations, so we would be doing our sit-ups, chin-ups, push-ups and balance beams and all kinds of things.

It is great to see that in some of our Parklands there are some exercise stations now being set up, but I do not think we could overestimate at all the value and importance of children getting

involved in sport from a young age. In fact, I think it really sets your body up for later on, in terms of not putting on weight as easily and enjoying sport and the coordination and interaction that it brings.

In my electorate of Adelaide there are actually over 250 local sporting and recreational groups and there are also many clubs from around the metropolitan area, including schools and university clubs, that use the Parklands that surround the area. Whilst the government is spending over \$600 million on Adelaide Oval, which includes the \$40 million footbridge, it is disappointing that they have taken away \$3.5 million in funding for community groups.

I have had the great pleasure over the last three years of handing out some of the grant cheques to different community groups and finding out about some sports that I did not know existed in my electorate. I recently took a cheque to the Swords Club which includes fencing and sabre and I think there is another type of sword that they compete with. It was really good to see them at work and training and to see them all kitted out with their gear.

I have handed out cheques to walking groups, softball clubs, soccer clubs and football clubs and turned on lights at the Walkerville Oval, so there has been lots and lots of activity which is terrific, but it is disappointing that that will be reduced in the future because it is just so vitally important.

There have been many studies done over the years of the other benefits of participating in sport and these include increased social interaction and support, positive self-esteem and confidence, challenge and competition, a feeling of achievement and leadership, improved individual physical and mental health, and skills development. It can lead to employment in the industry and in associated industries. There are also economic benefits of sport and recreation in tourism and other special events that come to the state.

It also provides a safer community through reduced antisocial and criminal behaviour. The teenagers who are most likely to be graffitiing or setting fire to bins or binge drinking are usually not the ones who have to be up at seven in the morning to squad train with their team or be at the rowing club at six in the morning. If they were, they certainly would not be able to be out so late at night and participating in negative and criminal behaviours.

There is also a link to increased community pride and improved societal health and wellbeing, as well as a reduction in health care costs. If you keep people fit and healthy, sure, there are a few injuries here and there involved in sport but, in general, people are fitter and healthier and less likely to end up in hospital or have weight issues or diabetes, because they have a really good sporting ethic.

The member for Chaffey mentioned statistics so I would like to brag, really, about the statistics in my electorate. In eastern Adelaide, which includes Adelaide, Prospect and Walkerville, as well as other council areas, there is an 81 per cent participation rate compared to 78 per cent in South Australia as a whole. In fact, it is the highest rate in the state across all the regions.

The rate of participation in my electorate for males between the ages of 16 to 24 is 94 per cent. To contrast with that, 90 per cent of females between the ages of 35 and 54 are involved in sport. So, females get more involved in sport when they are older and males when they are a bit younger. Almost half of the adults, or 78,100, in my region participated in some organised sport or active recreation. It is terrific to see.

The sports that are most popular in my area are aerobics and fitness, cycling, running, swimming, tennis, and walking, at 74.5 per cent, so that is very popular. I think the Linear Park around the river is a terrific walking trail and there is a need for some more walking trails. Weight training is the other one. I commend the member for Stuart for bringing forward this important issue and I commend the motion to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:42): I commend the member for Stuart for bringing this motion. As people have said before, it is not just about participation: it is about all the support that is put in around teams and sporting activities in our electorates. In regard to football, I played a little bit of football in my time. I went through the junior colts ranks right through to the senior ranks at Border Downs football club at Coonalpyn. It is a few years ago now, but—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: A couple of hips ago.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, and a couple of injuries ago, too, I must say. It was a very exciting period. Playing in the River Murray Football League, we were always the underdogs out there in

the Mallee. It always has horrified me the amount of money that has had to come into local sport. I know it is par for the course now and part of the action that happens so that teams can be competitive, but I have been dismayed that over the decades we have had to have paid players, especially in the football arena, to keep local clubs going.

In saying that, if that gives the ability to a local town to have a club so that we can keep functioning, perhaps that is the plus of it, but it is probably one of those evil necessities we need to keep our regional sports going. I am aware that paid players go down to Mount Gambier and, in our league, they go to Murrayville to play football.

I know a few people have related a few personal stories. I was very much a reserves ruckman and, on many weekends, we got used to seeing 20 or 25 goals being kicked over our heads but we still turned up every week and, when we had a win, it was celebrated, I can assure members.

Just on another personal note, one day, I was at footy training, it was near the end of my career, and the coach said, 'We've got you listed in the A grade.' I said, 'Come on; that's never happened before.' I think I was 29 years old. Someone came up to me and said, 'You are listed in the B grade as well.' I said, 'Thanks for that.' So, I played three quarters of reserves, went on the bench for a quarter, then went on the bench for a quarter of A grade and then played almost the full three quarters of A grade.

The Hon. R.B. Such: Collapsed.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, I was dragged off because I was injured. I had been taken out by the other ruckman because I was beating him.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: That's your story.

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely, and I am going to stick to it every day.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: And you call that a career?

Mr PEDERICK: That's alright, as I said. I know what happened on the day.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Even I could come up with a better story than that.

Mr PEDERICK: That's good, but I don't even have to make it up. What I am saying is it is about participation and getting out there. My boys are playing at Peake in the Mallee league and they are having a great run. Young Angus is only nine years old, and his mother was keen for him to wear a helmet. He has always been a fairly aggressive player, and he said, 'That will let me go in harder.' I do not know if that curbed Sally's anxiety about possible head injuries.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, I will get onto that. Young Mackenzie, who is an onballer, is 12. He is in the under 13s and plays in the same team as Angus. He can play ruck-rover, up the field or centre. He is having a good run and he has some good little teammates around him.

The member for Chaffey has egged me on to talk about some of the genes in the family, and I will reflect on that. We were at the football the other day at Peake and someone said, 'Who's that young No. 16?' The person they were talking to said, 'That's Bruce Abernethy's nephew'—not Adrian Pederick's son, Bruce Abernethy's nephew. I thought, 'One thing about my boys: if they get the Abernethy skills and my build, they will go alright, but if it is the other way around, it might be a bit ordinary.' But they are going alright and it is good to see the kids around them having a good day out.

We talked about travelling to football. We have to go interstate to the MCG—the Murrayville Cricket Ground—to play. We always get the extra seats motivated in the car and take a mate and his son. It is quite a good day out to go over there and play footy with our Victorian friends.

It is about what the communities do around sport. I know, with the Peake sporting club there that we are involved in, it is about the netball, it is about the football and it is about that community interaction that happens on weekends. People have busier and busier lives and they perhaps do not get the opportunity to meet up with people at other times, but they do at these sporting events. A lot of business gets done during the afternoon and a lot of people find out what is going on and follow up afterwards. They sort out whatever business or other activities they are

organising with friends and neighbours who they only get the opportunity to have a decent conversation with at the football.

This also relates to being at the cricket, the basketball or the hockey. There are so many sporting activities that people can take up. As many in this house know, I am a fairly keen lawn bowler. There are a lot of lawn bowlers in the community. Someone said it is the most dangerous game played in the world because there are more deaths on the field than in any other activity, but that might have something to do with the age of the participants at times. There are plenty of young bowlers playing bowls. It is a great sport and is great for social interaction.

Night bowls at Geranium got me into it. I know there a lot of night bowlers out there and a lot of clubs. We played at Melbourne earlier this year with the parliamentary bowling team and they have the barefoot bowls, so it gets a whole lot of other people involved in a sport that they otherwise may not have been involved in.

I just want to reflect on a few of the sporting stars who have come out of the Hammond electorate. We have got Marty Mattner, who was at the local footy last week. He recently retired from a successful career at the Sydney Swans. I did say, 'Is he going to play for Peake?' and they said, 'No, he can't be cleared this year because he is still contracted, even though he has retired.' His hips are no good. We have young Chad Wingard playing for the mighty Port Power. He is having a stellar season and he will have a stellar career. His father, Trevor, plays for Peake occasionally, and you can see where the football genes come through there.

We have people like young James McRae, an Australian rower who has won many awards—bronze at the recent Olympics. Rowing is one of those sports that a lot of people do not have a direct relationship with. One of my mates, Wally Seidel, his daughter Georgia recently went to Sydney in the nationals. It was interesting, evidently. I was not there, of course, but she was in the women's double sculls, and she and another girl won. The fascinating thing is, all the other rowers there had their individual coaches, and there was Georgie with her father, Wally. There is a story: if you are good at a sport, you can get there with ability and a bit of training. I know she is doing a bit of work now down at West Lakes as well as training at Murray Bridge. I commend her for what she is doing there.

Sport does bring communities together and I know we can never let that pass. There were a lot of challenges to get sport happening with the lack of water for facilities in the last few years preceding the breaking of the drought. A lot of bowling clubs put in artificial turf to get around that, but a lot of effort was made and a lot of fundraising done by other clubs to make sure that they could water their ovals and their playing grounds, just so that they could keep those sporting facilities going to keep the fabric of the community alive. In closing, I commend the member for Stuart for this motion. I cannot think of a better way to keep communities together than sporting activities.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:51): I will be fairly brief on this motion, but it is the perfect opportunity for me to acknowledge a group in my local area that deserves particular commendation to the house, and that is the Campbelltown City Soccer Club, which this year is celebrating its 50th anniversary. It is the perfect example of what the motion brought to us by the member for Stuart says: that sporting facilities do make a significant contribution to the community over and above the direct benefits of participating in sporting activities. Over 50 years, the Campbelltown soccer club has given so much to the community around Morialta, as those members who have had reason to come into contact with it would know.

The club is doing some spectacular things this year. Apart from anything else, the first team has turned around a few years of mid-table activity and is currently second in the Super League, which is terrific and a credit to the new coach, Joe Mullen. Last weekend I was very pleased to see he was able to help the club come to a nil-all draw against his old team, Adelaide United. Along with the assistant coach, Joe Lagana, and the captain, Vasilis Parhas, he is leading a great team this year. It is a really strong effort and I have every faith that they are going to have a year to be genuinely proud of.

I want to place on the record my thanks to the committee led by Don Leombruno, who is having a terrific year. He is a fairly new chairman of the club and he is doing a marvellous job. Julie Ciccocioppo has been the secretary for six years and Tony Centofanti has been the treasurer for 10 years, along with the support of the patron Aldo Perilli. The committee is going really well and organising a fantastic year for the club.

The 50th anniversary is particularly being helped by the chairmanship of Arturo DiFede, who is organising a group of events, including a family fun day that a number of members were able to come to earlier in the year. I was pleased to have the opportunity to speak there. There is a reunion of past players and a gala dinner coming up, which should raise a bit of money and also some profile.

This club has hundreds of players and probably 1,000 people directly involved with the club, including family members. The juniors go from under eights to under-16s. The sort of facilities involved are important. It is a real combination of all levels of government. I know that when John Howard was the prime minister, Christopher Pyne as the local federal member was instrumental in getting \$1 million grant so that the junior clubrooms at the Campbelltown soccer club could be built.

Those clubrooms are really well utilised today. Over 20 teams use them, but also every Friday night it is one of the best places to get pizza anywhere in the Morialta electorate. For those of you who have had some pizza at the Campbelltown soccer club, or anywhere else in the Morialta electorate, I think you will agree.

The council supports it through the ownership, of course, of the land and the main building. It is also a facility that provides for the East Adelaide Table Tennis Club and the Athelstone Kindergym, which is all greatly appreciated. But I want to commend the Campbelltown soccer club for the great work that they do, continue to do, and have done for 50 years.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:55): I rise to make a contribution to the motion by the member for Stuart. It is a good motion, and it is very worthy of debate in this house and members putting across their points of view. In essence, sport is particularly rural and regional South Australia. If you did not have sport on weekends—at this time of year, football and netball, particularly—quite frankly, a lot of those rural communities just would not continue to exist.

These days, in many respects—and I know the minister just looked at me—the reality is that on a Saturday, netball, in many areas now, is far bigger than football and the football really follows the netball around. It is a day out for the community and if these sporting clubs are run particularly well (which most of them are) they are a training ground for young people. They give young people the opportunity to learn some discipline in and around club rooms; the way clubs operate; and they learn discipline on the field, mostly. That is a really important part of this.

There are many good examples of that in my electorate. One, in particular, is Brendon Lade who used to play for Port Power. He comes from my home club, the Wisanger Football Club, on Kangaroo Island—Wisanger Sports Club, where briefly, a couple of years ago, the minister and the Speaker attended on the centenary. They couldn't find me, but I heard they were there. However, no greater advocate for sport has been Brendon's father and mother, Don and Marie; they have been fantastic and they have given many young people a good grounding in the basics of life through their involvement in both football and netball.

I know it is a broader spectrum; there is hockey played, and then you get into the summer sports—the list goes on and on. I am always keen to encourage sporting clubs to apply for grants and I know that the member for Stuart is incorporating the metropolitan area, but as rural members we are particularly reliant on that.

Tonight, I have the annual sponsors dinner for the Encounter Bay Football Club. There will probably be 150 to 200 people at that. Their A grade is having a stellar year; they have Scott Welsh and Ian Perry playing down there this year. It has been an enormous boost for them, and the club is going particularly well. It is a very, very well-managed club and they provide good facilities. In fact, they had a trial AFL game there last year between Fremantle and Port. I am a Crows supporter, but Fremantle got done over that day.

It is a terrific thing for the community to have great sports grounds. Only just then I was outside meeting briefly with the general manager and the development manager of Bowls SA, and I am tabling a petition from them later on this afternoon. Bowls is enormous in my electorate. It is enormous in other parts of the state and across Australia. We have hundreds of bowlers down in my electorate that play every day of the week, it seems to be—you're not a bowler, Don! They play every day of the week, and then they go north during the winter to play up in the warmer climes. So the list of sports is endless. Darts is considered a sport—I have active darts clubs; I have active all sorts of clubs.

The other thing that is rather important is that there is a great big push for an aquatic facility down on the south coast to encourage organised swimming, but also to encourage hydrotherapy

pool activity for people who need it. There has been an announcement this week on that, but I do not think I will go near that. The reality is that if and when it does occur, it will also be of great benefit to the people of the south coast. So, it is with great pleasure that I support the member for Stuart's motion, and with those few words I will sit down.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member for Stuart speaks, he closes the debate.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:59): Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate the contribution from all members here, including the government members. I also appreciated the member for Davenport being able to correct a few financial issues as well.

All communities benefit: whether it is Wilmington (where I live) or Port Augusta, or the Kilburn Football Club, where I recently met community members on a totally different topic and was very impressed with their young club president, Dale, whose last name I cannot actually remember. However, sporting facilities create healthier communities, more prosperous communities, more cohesive communities, more successful communities, regardless of where they are in the state, and I appreciate this house's support of the motion.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00]

LAWN BOWLS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition signed by 5,267 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to amend the Equal Opportunity Act to ensure that the future of lawn bowls in South Australia is sound and members can compete in both single and open gender competitions according to the demographics of the particular area, and to amend section 48 of the Equal Opportunity Act to remove references relating to strength, stamina or physique of the competitor.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

DESALINATION PLANT

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (13 November 2012).

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The Minister for Water and the River Murray has been advised:

As at 30 June 2012 water produced by the Adelaide Desalination Plant was approximately 4 billion litres.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (13 November 2012).

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The Minister for Water and the River Murray has been advised:

The total cost of legal advice for the preparation and negotiation of the Deed of Settlement was approximately \$0.31 million of which approximately \$0.24 million was outside legal advice and approximately \$0.07 million for Crown Solicitor services.

SA WATER

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (13 November 2012).

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The Minister for Water and the River Murray has received this advice:

As at 4 December 2012 premises leased by SA Water on which rent was paid is as follows:

Item	Site Name	Lease Expiry
1	111 Gawler Place, level 6	8/12/2012*
2	63 Pirie Street, Level 1	31/01/2014*
3	100 Pirie Street, Level 3 and 6	Level 6 31/01/2013* Level 3 31/03/2013*
4	Ashwin Parade, Torrensville	31/01/2014
5	28 Vaughan Terrace, Berri (RMO)	30/04/2014
6	11 Waymouth Street	Level 12 31/10/2022

Those premises marked with * have been/will be vacated on lease expiry.

SA Water also owns regional hubs in Port Lincoln, Crystal Brook, Mount Barker and Mount Gambier and there are depots around the State.

SOCIAL INCLUSION UNIT

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (6 March 2013).

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I am advised:

Dr McFetridge's question suggests he may be confusing the Social Inclusion Expenses budget with the Net Cost of Services budget.

In the 2012-13 Budget Papers, the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion reported that Sub-program 5.4: Social Inclusion had a 2012-13 Expenses budget of \$4.918m, an Income budget of \$0.384m and a Net Cost of Services budget of \$4.534m.

It is evident from these figures that there has been no blow out in the costs of the Social Inclusion Unit.

Last year's (2012-13) budget papers did not identify expenditure on the social inclusion program at \$4.534m. The \$4.534m amount is actually the net cost of the service when the income budget of \$0.384m is deducted from the expenditure budget of \$4.918m.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Ombudsman SA—A report on the implementation of the Ombudsman's recommendations by agencies for the period 1 July 2009 to 31 March 2013 [Ordered to be printed.]

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Remuneration Tribunal Determination—No. 2 of 2013—Travelling and Accommodation Allowances—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Third Party Premiums Committee—Statement of Reasons—Determination—March 2012

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Maralinga Lands Unnamed Conservation Board—Annual Report 2011-12

Response by Government—

70th Report—Environment, Resources and Development Committee Report—Waste to Resources

77th Report—Natural Resources Committee Report—Foxes—Hunting for the Right Solution

QUESTION TIME

AGRICULTURE SECTOR

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. Why are jobs in the South Australian agriculture sector at their lowest level in the 29-year history of ABS records, given that premium food and wine is one of the four pillars of the government's economic strategy?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:05): We have seen some fairly dramatic changes in the way in which rural economies have worked over a considerable period of time, where there has been the stripping out, if you like, of employment opportunities in rural and primary industries as people move to more intensive mechanisation.

It has been the history of the development of our primary industries in this nation over an extended period of time. Of course, there are particular conditions that would be bearing on the circumstances that exist within the primary industries at the moment, particularly seasonal conditions that bear on employment, and also the particularly high Australian dollar, which has been a feature of the conditions which exist at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Heysen and the member for Bragg to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That does not mean that the particular priority that we have ascribed to premium food and wine grown in a clean environment is not an appropriate decision to take; indeed, it is the very reason we chose to make that one of our key priorities for South Australia. We know that we live in a region in the world which sits close to the great growing middle classes of world history in China and India.

Their demand for premium food products (in particular, food products that have high integrity) is something that we have identified as an opportunity. It is equally true to say that we are a high-cost jurisdiction. The reason we are a high-cost jurisdiction is because we have higher standards. We pay good wages, we have good environmental protections, we insist on standards—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and that does add cost to our production. But it is the very same reason why people can choose our products with great confidence. It is the reason why the largest-selling beer in China, Tsingtao beer—and I had the great pleasure to visit their factory in Qingdao recently—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Bragg for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —actually use South Australian barley: because it is of the highest quality and has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Heysen for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —South Australian barley. It is no mistake that they choose that, because it is of the highest quality and is of the highest integrity; they can rely upon its quality and its safety. That is where we need to take our primary production and our food production: up the value chain; not seeking to compete on the basis of cost, but on the basis of value. So, there are challenges. We did not choose those priorities because they were easy; we chose them because they are important and because there were real challenges facing South Australia.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:08): My question is also to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on the new investments the government is making to build infrastructure in South Australia and how this investment is supporting South Australian jobs?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:08): Partly for the reasons that are promoted by the Leader of the Opposition in what I anticipate to be a series of questions where he talks about those sectors of the economy which are doing it hardest, we need to make sure that we maintain our public investments in other areas of the economy to sustain job growth. That is what a responsible government does: it responds by making sensible public investments, and that is what we have been doing, such as the duplication of the Southern Expressway—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Morialta to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —a toll-free \$407 million investment putting behind us the embarrassing one-way expressway which was bequeathed to us by the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Waite to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: From the onset of the global financial crisis the government has maintained a strong commitment to infrastructure investment. We worked hard to protect jobs and growth during the largest economic downturn since the Great Depression. It seems to be forgotten by many people, but that is what we were facing, and that required a response. The investment in key infrastructure has and will continue to deliver significantly improved hospitals, schools, roads, water, entertainment, tourism and leisure facilities for this state. These investments will benefit South Australians for generations.

Crucially, these investments have also supported up to 12,000 jobs each year in the economy and have contributed up to 3 per cent of gross state product. The state government will invest \$10.1 billion over the next four years for important infrastructure programs. These projects will support 8,700 jobs in 2013-14 alone. Our \$10.1 billion investment over the next four years includes works underway but also new projects built in partnership with the commonwealth, like:

- the \$896 million upgrade to South Road between the Torrens Road intersection and the River Torrens, which includes the sinking of a \$1.4 kilometre road below the surface, as well as the construction of two new grade-separated interchanges and a passenger rail line overpass;
- the construction of an electrical substation and the electrification of the Gawler line to Dry Creek at a cost of \$152 million, as the first step to restart the electrification of the Gawler line;
- \$63 million for the duplication of part of the Tonsley rail line to provide for increased services, including the rebuilding of Clovelly Park and Tonsley railway stations, which will include new—

The Hon. C.C. Fox interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Minister for Transport Services to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —park-and-ride facilities and a bus exchange;

- \$56.1 million over the forward estimates towards a \$106 million upgrade of the road into the APY lands;
- \$3.2 million for something that I know those opposite have been calling for for some time: the reconfiguration of the Britannia roundabout—no need to thank us too quickly.

This year, funding allocation will enable work to be concluded on other projects, like the South Road Superway, the new overtaking lanes—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Adelaide to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —rest areas and other safety works on the Dukes Highway, and the Noarlunga to Seaford rail extension that will open later this year. We are also providing stimulus to the housing construction sector, because we want to sustain jobs in this sector.

Mr Marshall: They love you!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They do, actually. Our Affordable Housing Stimulus Package: \$38.7 million to extend the Housing Construction Grant, \$30 million in social housing investment and \$20 million as a capital grant program for community housing investment. In total, all of these initiatives will mean construction will start on more than 930 homes in the next 18 months—a total of \$220 million investment and supporting 2,400 jobs. To ensure that South Australia achieves the economic benefit from our investments, we are also ensuring that we fund the Industry Participation Advocate to make sure that South Australians get their fair share of these contracts.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: apart from repetition, it is also out of time.

The SPEAKER: On this occasion the deputy leader is absolutely correct. The leader.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): The Premier said that he was spending \$10 billion to create 8,700 jobs. Can he perhaps tell the parliament how much the state will be paying to create each of those jobs?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:13): I am more than happy to do that. It is set out in the budget, and I will repeat: \$896 million upgrade of South Road between the Torrens Road intersection and the River Torrens, the construction of the electrical substation at Dry Creek, getting back on the Gawler line. I know the member—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: the Premier is not addressing the substance of the question. The question was about the cost of creating those jobs.

The SPEAKER: I think the better point would be repetition. The leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There is more?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, Mr Speaker. I am just simply seeking to answer a question that I was asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

Mr Marshall: \$1.2 million—that's how much.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He knows the answer to the question, apparently, but he happens to be wrong. The public investments we have made—\$10.1 billion of public investment that we have made—will generate not only the jobs that have been created here but economic returns and activity for generations in this state, just like the state building measures that were taken by Sir Thomas Playford when he raised debt to finance the important state building projects which have built the state—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —the hospitals; the schools: the public infrastructure that continues to deliver returns to South Australians now, just like any public investment. Consider this, Mr Speaker: the so-called allegation against the government of false economy when we make significant public investments which generate benefits for generations. There would not be a public investment made in this state or this nation if it was not for sensible governments making long-term investments funded by debt. Are you seriously suggesting that out of our recurrent expenditure we should fund the state building projects that allow this state to grow and prosper? That is economic lunacy. To be advanced by those opposite simply demonstrates they have no—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order from the member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Premier is entering into debate. When he says, 'Do you seriously think this' or 'Do you seriously think that,' he is entering into debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, the conjecture was around the cost per job. I think it is within the legitimate answer for the Premier to canvass the merits per job.

Mr Gardner: You've gone soft.

The SPEAKER: No; well, actually, I haven't. Excuse me, Premier. The member for Morialta—and I imagine he did this a lot in school—drew my attention to the Minister for Transport Services defying my ruling by continuing to interject. In accordance with the information supplied to me by the member for Morialta, I warn the Minister for Transport Services for the first time. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I conclude by saying that ensuring that the state has a moderate level of debt so that it can fund important public infrastructure projects, so that it can continue to deliver surpluses for people in the future and also jobs—

Mr Venning: Moderate level of debt; I'd hate to see a high one.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Schubert to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —for people now, is at the heart of our economic strategy. We accept that there is a difference of opinion—

Mr Venning: That's disgraceful!

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Schubert.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —between us on this question of how the economy should be run in the interests of the ordinary working people of this state. We accept that there is a difference between us and we are content for the community of South Australia to make their choice.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Why are South Australian mining jobs at the lowest levels in two years, with 3,500 jobs lost in the last three months since the government made 'realising the benefits of the mining boom for all' one of its four economic pillars?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:18): The growth in mining jobs over the course of this government has been huge.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: They went from four mines to four mines.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right.

The SPEAKER: I call the minister for mining to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This has been one of the significant growth areas of the South Australian economy and continues to be—

Honourable members: It was.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No; it continues to be a very strong growth area for the South Australian economy. They simply misread the data. They misread the data in relation to mining employment in South Australia. There has been very substantial growth in mining employment in South Australia, beyond the obvious—the growth from four to 20 mines. Beyond the fact that there have been dramatic expansions in a number of our existing mines, there continues to be, not only in the direct mining jobs, an explosion of growth in jobs in the mining services sector. This is—sadly for those opposite, because they love to seize on bad news—actually a good news story for the South Australian economy. We are not—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, simply, I don't accept your analysis. We are also seeking to learn the lessons that exist from other mining jurisdictions. We know that mining employment in itself is a small part of the equation of the opportunities that exist in the mining sector. One of the reasons that we have chosen to make that a key priority—ensuring that we realise the benefits of the increase in mining activity for all South Australians—is because we want to ensure that the benefits are shared more equally across this state. The way to do that is to

ensure that we have a strong mining services industry in South Australia. That is one of the reasons why in the budget we invested in partnership with BHP and Santos—

Mr Venning interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We invested with BHP and Santos in a mining services centre of excellence so that we can grow the technologies that will allow us to exploit the natural resources that we have in our state. Just recently, we have seen some incredibly exciting projects being announced in South Australia, such as the partnership between Beach and Chevron, a \$350 million investment in the Cooper Basin, to unlock the huge opportunities associated with the shale gas resource that exists in the north of our state. We have seen BP make arrangements for a \$600 million drilling rig to be brought into the Great Australian Bight in South Australian territory to allow them to explore the natural resources that exist in that area. These are decisions made—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir. I ask you to bring the Premier back to the substance of the question and ask him to explain how all this relates to the job losses which have actually taken place.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart, if the leader asks a question about job losses, I interpret jobs as being the substance of the question and germane, and one cannot, under standing orders, prevent the Premier from talking about jobs that have been created. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In the last 12 months between May 2012 and May 2013, in relation to mining employment, jobs actually grew, so contrary to—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is on thin ice.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I do not know where the honourable member gets his briefing but, after question time, I invite him to come back into the house and clarify for the house that he has in fact misled the house in relation to these matters. In fact, mining employment grew—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mrs REDMOND: The Premier just accused the leader of misleading the house, and to do so, he has to do so by substantive motion, surely.

The SPEAKER: Premier, did you impute that the leader had misled the house?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, I did, sir.

The SPEAKER: You should withdraw that.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I withdraw that and say that the honourable member gave information to the house which is inaccurate, because in fact between May 2012 and May 2013, mining employment grew. The change of growth was in fact 13.9 per cent, so instead of it falling, mining employment actually grew over the last year. He comes into this place, consistently seeking to mislead the community—and I would go out and get a briefing as well, if I were you.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order! Again the Premier has accused the Leader of the Opposition of misleading the house. After withdrawing it, now he has done it again, in complete defiance.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the word 'mislead'. Am I mistaken?

Ms CHAPMAN: 'Again coming into the house to mislead the house,' or words to that effect.

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: 'Mislead' was clearly in there, and he knows that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The rule is against misleading the house; it is not against misleading the public or the community or some other body, but I would caution the Premier not to impute that any member of the house misled, and I would ask him to refrain from that imputation.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, the word 'misleading' seems to offend so I will—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Maybe if we could take you back to the numbers: between May 2012 and May 2013, mining employment actually grew by 13.9 per cent. The premise of the question is, 'Why have we been presiding over a reduction in mining employment?' when actually mining employment was growing over the relevant 12-month period.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired. The member for Torrens.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister tell the house about the South Australian government's investment in the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:24): The South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute was established in December 2009. The establishment of SAHMRI is a unique collaboration between the three South Australian universities and the South Australian government, made possible with the support of the commonwealth government. The South Australian government is committed to making SAHMRI the leading medical health and research institute in this state, as well as ensuring that the institute is recognised nationally and internationally as a centre of excellence.

The dividends for South Australians, both economic and in research return for the state government, are significant. According to an Access Economics report, every dollar invested in health and medical research returns on average \$2.17 in health benefits. The Strategic Review of Health and Medical Research in Australia also recognised that health and medical research has great potential to improve health outcomes and the cost effectiveness of the health system. These are benefits not only to SAHMRI but also to South Australia and, indeed, the nation.

In 2009, the government was successful in receiving \$200 million from the federal government to construct the SAHMRI building. This is being built alongside the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site and will accommodate up to 675 researchers. As part of the 2013-14 budget, the government committed \$41.3 million in funding to support SAHMRI in attracting world-class specialty medical research groups. Transferring of research teams to SAHMRI helps the institute in growing its research capacity and to contribute to its becoming a leader in health and medical research. Some of these research groups include:

- the Flinders Research Clinical Group, which conducts trials in the area of cardiology;
- the Lysosomal Diseases Research Unit, which is the only group researching lysosomal storage diseases nationally and is the largest multidisciplinary group researching this topic worldwide; and
- the Melissa White laboratory, which focuses on the research undertaken to understand the biology of chronic myeloid leukaemia, to develop better diagnostic and monitoring tests, and to further improve therapy and outcomes for this disease.

SAHMRI will have access to funding of approximately \$17 million to research projects through the health and medical research fund. Combined with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute forms the hub of the exciting new development that is happening in the West End of Adelaide, highlighted by the announcement last weekend of \$40 million for a new University of South Australia cancer research building and \$60 million for the University of Adelaide medical and nursing school. These developments will mean that South Australians have access to the largest health and biomedical precinct in the Southern Hemisphere.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:26): Supplementary?

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Can the minister advise how many jobs moving into SAHMRI are already existing positions in South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:27): A number of them are, because a feature of the project always was that it was going to be—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I don't see that that is an issue. It was always the case that SAHMRI was going to include the transfer of existing medical research jobs from other areas. Of course, we have seen of late the recruitment of some amazing, particularly talented medical researchers from right around the world to head up the various research areas within SAHMRI. This is a great thing for our state. I am amazed that the opposition should be attempting to talk it down.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the government's own job growth projections do not forecast the creation of 100,000 jobs between 2010 and 2016?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:28): It depends what forecasts the member for Davenport is talking about. There have been a range of different forecasts from a range of agencies.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, that wasn't what the question said. A range of different agencies have a range of forecasts. We have an ambitious target to create 100,000 jobs by 2016 and we are not prepared to sacrifice that target just because it gets tough and is hard to achieve, because that sits at the core of our project, which is actually to drive the creation of jobs in this state. One of the ways in which we are seeking to do that in this budget is to bring forward the training effort in relation to our commitment to train 100,000 people by 2016, and we will achieve that well before 2016.

Of course, the target of achieving 100,000 jobs by 2016 will be a difficult target to achieve. We fully acknowledge that, and we fully acknowledge that there are conservative estimates that are made about jobs growth in the budget. There are stronger forecasts of growth in other documents, such as those published by our training authorities who seek to anticipate the growth in demand for employment over a period of time and to meet the demands associated with that for training purposes. So there are different estimates, and different agencies make their own forecasts, but it is true that in the budget papers there are conservative estimates of jobs growth, and we hope to exceed those.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Davenport.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:29): But, following the Premier's answer that different agencies have different forecasts, can the Premier advise which state government agency has a growth projection forecast that predicts the creation of 100,000 jobs between 2010 and 2016?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:29): That remains the objective of the economic agencies of government. That is our target—to achieve 100,000 jobs by 2016—and we are not going to sacrifice it just because the opposition says that it's a hard target to reach. It will remain our purpose because it's at the heart of the Labor project. It's the thing that drives our budget strategy to invest \$10.1 billion—

Mr Pisoni: How is that working?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in capital projects to ensure—

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Unley to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that we sustain employment in this economy. It's the reason why we have not slashed deeply into services and jobs in the South Australian public sector, because we know—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Davenport to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that to do that at this time would devastate employment and would further deepen—

Mr Gardner: You're making it up.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —the uncertainty that exists—

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Morialta for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in the economic circumstances that are presented to us. This is at the heart of the strategy that is set down in the budget, the strategy which is about jobs growth. We fully accept that it is a challenging task to achieve 100,000 jobs growth, but we will not abandon that objective.

FOOD LABELLING

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:31): My question is to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as the Minister for Business Services and Consumers. What is being done to ensure products sold in South Australia are being labelled truthfully and accurately?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for this very important question. This issue is important to many South Australians because misleading and deceptive food labelling can impact on consumers and businesses alike. This is particularly true when the misrepresentation involves the exploitation of our iconic regions or products. Recently, a Victorian-based company attempted to indicate its product was produced in our Barossa Valley.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: What?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. Adding insult to injury, there had been reports that this product was also being sold even in the Barossa Valley. I am outraged by this. Packaging of interstate produce that may deceive South Australians into believing that—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can you start the timer again, please?

The SPEAKER: No, certainly not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Anyway, listen. Packaging of interstate produce that may deceive South Australians into believing a particular product is locally produced when it is not is completely unacceptable. I'm passionate about this issue. We must coddle our premium food and wine—our globally recognised brands. This is an 'eggsistential' issue for South Australia. Australian Consumer Law prohibits misleading and deceptive conduct, with penalties of up to \$1.1 million for an offence.

The example I am referring to, of course, is Farm Pride Foods—a Melbourne-based business, formerly the Victorian Marketing Board, which was selling eggs under the name of Barossa Ridge Farms. There were concerns that these eggs may not in fact even originate in the Barossa Valley, which, of course, is known for its premium food and wine.

I referred this matter to Consumer and Business Services as a regulator, and they investigated this matter. As a result of that investigation, Farm Pride Foods immediately desisted from using the Barossa Ridge Farms brand, withdrew from sale all eggs under that brand and whisked away all of the packaging. Businesses intending to mislead or deceive through food labelling, including false claims of produce origins, are on notice. South Australia will not stand for it.

Further to this example, CBS have launched Operation Benedict to identify other instances. CBS have subsequently conducted intelligence-based field activities to identify misleading and deceiving labels on products sold in South Australia. CBS will continue to be vigilant on this issue to ensure consumers are protected and our local businesses are protected, as, of course, must be our premium wine and food brands. Truth in food labelling and the integrity of brands must be protected by the Australian Consumer Law. Along with the announcement of an industry code for free-range eggs in South Australia, this has been the biggest week for eggs since Easter.

An honourable member: Since Easter?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. I strongly encourage any potentially misleading or deceptive food labelling to be reported to Consumer and Business Services.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:35): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have had enough of the minister's anger. My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's comments that losing the AAA credit rating was about jobs, why does the government now forecast the creation of 8,000 fewer jobs between 2012 and 2016 than were forecast in last year's budget, before the loss of the AAA credit rating?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:35): I do not think the two things follow from one another. If we were to have withdrawn from our public investments during the period that the honourable member describes, we would have crated the South Australian economy. We have been through an extraordinarily difficult 2011-12, but what we have seen in the last 10 months is 10 months of continuous job growth.

In fact, in the year to May, South Australia grew stronger in employment growth than any other state in the nation except New South Wales—including Queensland and Western Australia. We grew faster in employment growth over the last 12 months than any other state. The reason we are able to stay here and claim the capacity to do that is that we maintained our public investments at a time when the economy needed them. We are beginning to see, thankfully, the pickup in the private sector.

We are beginning to see an increase in private housing construction activity. We are beginning to see the benefits of our public investments, having now leveraged other private investments. We are seeing it in the Riverbank: two \$200 million buildings leveraged off our \$2.1 billion investment in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and a further \$300 million or so investment in the new casino development off the back of our Riverbank investments. This is the nature of private investment.

In circumstances where the economy is in uncertain times, there is an important role for government to sustain the level of investment in the economy. The fact that we are even talking about 10 continuous months of employment growth and the fact that we have had, in the last 12 months to May, faster growth than the rest of the nation except New South Wales is testimony to the very policies this government decided to put in place.

IMMIGRATION

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. Can the minister update the house on the progress of Immigration SA's 90-day project?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:37): Happily, I am able to provide some information. I am pleased to be able to inform the house on the progress of Immigration SA's 90-day project, which began on 12 May and will run until 2 August. Members may be aware that a series of 90-day projects is being run across government to focus efforts on particular policy areas. In the case of Immigration SA's 90-day project, this is to improve migration outcomes for South Australia by increasing the number of skilled and business migrant nominations and encouraging greater South Australian employer nominations.

What we know is that in some cases our state criteria have been more stringent than federal requirements. Part of this project will be to bring us into line with the commonwealth. The Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy and the Department of

Premier and Cabinet are working collaboratively with local industry to review current migration criteria with the intention of increasing eligibility for potential migrants.

The key changes for the migration programs include extending the validity dates for English language and skills assessments to align with DIAC. This will assist in reducing refusals due to expired documentation. Requirements for work experience in English language have been reviewed and, where appropriate, reduced to ensure a greater pool of potential applicants. We are looking at adding new occupations to the state-nominated occupation list and at making substantial modifications to lower the thresholds for investment export and employment requirements to ensure South Australia is seen as a competitive state for state nomination purposes.

The new Significant Investor visa has been modified to provide more flexible options to the existing state criteria. Of the complying investment, \$A3 million must be invested directly into private South Australian companies not listed on the Australian stock exchange, for a minimum of two years, with no restrictions on how the remaining funds can be invested. Other ways to improve skilled and migrant outcomes for South Australia are also being investigated during this 90-day period. However, those that cannot be implemented in 90 days will be presented in the form of a potential forward work plan.

One of the first achievements has been to launch the new Immigration SA website to provide South Australians, migrants and anyone interested in moving to the state a better and more informative online experience. The revamped site will provide easier navigation, improved transparency of processing times and greater identity through the new state brand. You can access the website at www.migration.sa.gov.au.

I am also pleased that this government recently committed \$600,000 over the next two years to promote South Australia to potential skilled and business migrants. The 90-day immigration project is just one of this government's long-term strategies for more effective participation in national programs for attracting permanent skilled and business migrants. I would like to thank the staff at DMITRE and DPC for their efforts in approving these processes and promoting South Australia as an attractive and competitive destination for migrants to work and live.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:40): My question is for the Minister for Police. Can the minister confirm that the number of sworn police full-time equivalents at 30 June is estimated to be 39 fewer than 12 months ago, according to documents provided to the opposition under FOI?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:40): I can't confirm that figure, but I can confirm the fluidity in patterns with people going on long service leave and the like.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes; that is largely responsible for any discrepancy. The overall trend is upwards—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, they are—

An honourable member: Eight hundred more than what is in the document.

Mr Pisoni: What is the difference then?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: That figure can be misleading, and I quizzed it myself. The explanation as I gave it is that people go on long service leave; they are still sworn officers, but it has an impact on the number of individuals who are in place to do the required job. The overall trend is upward and, if you look, say, six months later, you will find that there has been a reversal in that particular figure.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:42): A supplementary: given the minister's answer, can he confirm that SAPOL has not put a cap on recruitment which is 35 fewer than the number of sworn officers 12 months ago?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:42): I can't, because we are going through the budget process at the moment, and the budget process allows for an increase in the number of police officers. So if there was a cap, the cap would no longer be in place because we have made allowance in the budget for additional recruitment.

POLICE FUNDING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:43): My question is again for the Minister for Police. Can the minister confirm that, since making the election promise in 2010 of 300 new sworn police officers by 2014, the government has funding for only 99 new sworn police officers during that period?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:43): I think that is actually a question that ought to be asked in estimates. All of that detail is contained within the budget papers—

Mr Gardner: It's question time—

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: —and has been explained at some length.

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

POLICE PORTABLE DATA TERMINALS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:43): Again, my question is for the Minister for Police. Can the minister advise if all of the 100 hand-held computers promised by the government at the last election are currently operational?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:44): If we are talking about portable data terminals, they are currently in a trial phase in the Adelaide LSA.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Do you want us to go and purchase stuff without trialling it to find out whether it is compatible?

Mr Pisoni: Why did you promise it then?

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

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Nine devices have been purchased at this particular point in time. The decision on which model to purchase and how to best deploy the technology will be made on the completion of the trial period. In addition to this, an evaluation on network security and software development requirements of the new portable data terminals is due to be completed in the next 12 weeks.

POLICE PORTABLE DATA TERMINALS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:44): I have a supplementary question. Given that the minister has told us about the trial that is underway, does he stand by that election commitment: will they all be installed by the next election?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:45): My understanding is that they will, that they have been budgeted for. The member asked a question of me yesterday on portable fingerprint scanners, and we are going through a similar process with the portable scanners.

Most importantly, the trial will determine whether the devices we are trialling with the portable fingerprint scanners, which we have on loan from New South Wales Police, are ultimately able to interface with a national automated fingerprint identification system via the SAPOL data network. Both the portable data terminals and the portable fingerprint scanners are quite technologically advanced and link not only with the local SAPOL system but then back into the national system.

We have to get it right, and I think that the member for Stuart would concur that we do have to get it right. We do not want to commit substantial amounts of taxpayers' money in technology that will not interface nationally. It has been budgeted for, and my expectation is that we will deliver on our election promises.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for MacKillop to order. The member for Stuart.

NUMBERPLATE RECOGNITION CAMERAS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:46): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is again for the police minister. Can the minister advise whether all of the 20 additional mobile automatic numberplate recognition cameras promised by the government at the last election are currently operational?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:46): I will have to come back to the house with a response to that; I don't have a briefing on it.

STARCHASE PURSUIT MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:46): Again, my question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister explain why the government has abandoned the 20 StarChase pursuit management systems promised by the government at the last election?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:47): My understanding, and I will confirm, is that we had concerns about the reliability of the technology.

Mr Pisoni: Well, why did you promise it?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Again, in terms of its ability to interface with the existing SAPOL software and, I suppose, ultimately to be able to link into the national system. The member for Unley says, 'Well, why?' Well, that is why we did not proceed, because we did not want to purchase—

Mr Pisoni: Why did you promise it? That's what I said.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: We didn't want to purchase technology—

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time. Is the minister finished?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart.

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:48): Again, my question is for the Minister for Police. Can the minister advise whether the government has broken its promise to reduce red tape to keep officers on the beat, given that the police commissioner stated on 5 March this year:

We've still got detectives standing around photocopiers. There's a whole range of inefficiencies that need to be put in.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:48): I think that the Premier yesterday outlined one of the projects that we are running through this public sector reform program, the 90-day projects that we are running. SAPOL has selected the first of many. They may not all be under this program, but this will be the commencement of a fairly widespread, vigorous and targeted attack, if you like, on red tape. The first of those was done

at Holden Hill and was targeted at the old-fashioned delivery of summonses, whereby two police officers were committed to knocking on a door, hoping that somebody was home to hand them a piece of paper.

What we have been able to do at Holden Hill is SMS the individual and get a reply from them as to whether they will be appearing in court, and that process has reduced the amount of red tape, if you like, or waste of police resources. That will be rolled off across the state. We are having discussions in terms of transmitting evidence to the courts, which is currently being done by photocopying and which involves literally thousands if not tens of thousands of pages.

We are having discussions with the courts authority at this particular point in time to determine whether we can actually use electronic transfer of data. That will be an enormous saving of police resources, and that was one of the issues specifically referred to by the police commissioner. The use of photocopiers is the use of a technology that is probably past its use-by date by at least a decade to two decades. There are other projects that are currently under consideration that—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Get rid of them at the ministerial office and see how you cope.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes—will further reduce the time that the police have got to use sworn officers to do fairly mundane and tedious administrative processes.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:50): My question is again for the Minister for Police. With over 80 per cent of the time already gone between the 2010 and 2014 elections, can the minister point to even one of the government's last election promises for police that has been implemented?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:51): I can say to the house, and specifically to—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: —the member for Stuart, that there are more police on the frontline in South Australia than at any time in the state's history.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: My question was quite specific: can the minister point to even one—

The SPEAKER: Yes, and the minister is doing that, and you are called to order. Minister for Police.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: For six years in a row, we have more frontline police per head of capita than in any other state in Australia; a new Police Academy (\$54.3 million); new police headquarters (\$41 million); new police stations across the state—most recently, the new one in Murray Bridge at a cost of \$12.6 million, which will service the Murray-Mallee Local Service Area. More importantly, there has been a 40 per cent reduction in crime in the last 10 years—a direct reflection of the effort and resource that we have placed at SAPOL's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is warned for the second time.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: There is no clearer indication of the level of resource that this government has placed at SAPOL's discretion and use than the fact that we have reduced crime in this state by 40 per cent over the last 10 years.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:52): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to see if it is a supplementary.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Given that the minister said that there are more police officers on the street now than at the election of 2010, can he please advise the house how many?

An honourable member: Numbers.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The number—how many more are on the street?

The SPEAKER: No, I don't think that arises from the minister's answer. The member for Lee.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Thank you for the call, sir—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A point of order from the member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I just wonder, for the clarity of the house, whether you could explain that ruling. Given that the minister said in his answer that there were more police on the frontline now than at the 2010 election and then the member for Stuart, as the shadow minister for police, asked for the numbers, how is that not a supplementary to the answer provided by the Minister for Police?

The SPEAKER: It is not supplementary to the question the member for Stuart asked—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee.

MURRAY RIVER FERRIES

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (14:53): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister inform the house of recent developments with the River Murray ferry operations and, in particular, the replacement of two of the timber hull ferries?

The Hon. I.F. Evans: He gave this answer two weeks ago!

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is one utterance away from leaving the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:54): This government is proud of its investments in infrastructure. The state government is responsible for operating a 24/7 ferry service at 11 locations along our great river. With 12 ferries currently in operation, with two located at the busiest crossing at Mannum, in total we have a fleet of 14 River Murray ferries, consisting of nine steel hull ferries and five timber hull ferries.

Seven of these crossings are on arterial road networks, which are the responsibility of this government, and four crossings are part of the local road network, which is the responsibility of local government. These ferry services are currently provided by the state government free of charge to the public. To ensure the continued operation of the ferry service, the state government has committed \$6.1 million over three years to replace two of the five timber-hulled ferries at the highest-priority crossings.

This commitment builds on the government's significant investment in the river ferry service. Since 2004-05, this government has invested a total of \$73.3 million operating, maintaining and upgrading River Murray ferries. Three new ferries have been built and commissioned in that time. Five-year contracts for the operation of the River Murray ferries at all locations were awarded and commenced on 1 July 2012.

Despite this recent funding, this government will not stop in assisting the communities of the River Murray. Negotiations will continue with local government on funding options for modernising the rest of the service in the future. I encourage members opposite to inform their constituents of these developments and the continued investment this government has provided in these areas so the communities of the River Murray can go about their day-to-day lives.

MURRAY RIVER FERRIES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:56): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary from the member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK: I ask the Minister for Transport if he can indicate which two ferries will be replaced?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:56): What the government is doing is consulting with the local council areas, and I will be consulting with the local members of parliament also about that. Obviously we will be taking a risk-based approach to make sure that the ones that are in the highest need of repair are done. Obviously we can move ferries around, but I want to make sure that the local communities are happy with where we put these ferries and make sure that the ones that get the highest amount of use and give the most benefit to the local communities are where they are done.

Mr Whetstone: Both of them in Chaffey then.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Chaffey?

Mr Whetstone: Highest use.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Highest use. I am glad the member for Chaffey has stuck his head up. I have received a lot of correspondence about these ferries from members opposite, some who are quite passionate about getting these new steel-hulled ferries, and the government delivered them in the budget. There is one river community MP who has never written to me about this or raised it with me ever—the member for Chaffey.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Police. What police operations targeting property-related offences are there in the southern suburbs?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:57): I thank the member for Kaurna for the question. As the house may remember, earlier this year South Australia Police reported that there had been an increase in property-related crime within the South Coast Local Service Area, particularly break-ins to residences. After identifying a trend in the figures for the area, SAPOL undertook a number of operations involving the deployment of both uniformed and plain-clothed officers within identified regions of the South Coast LSA.

This deployment was intelligence based and used the combined resources of local operational staff and the State Tactical Response Group, neighbourhood policing teams, the Dog Operations Unit and the STAR Group. In particular, Operation Ageless and Operation Falcon have been successful in cracking down on the incidence of property-related offending in the area. The result of these operations has led to 60 arrests, 21 reports, 16 cautions, 53 traffic and general expiation notices, and 22 cannabis expiation notices.

A key finding of the intelligence gathered from these operations and subsequent arrests has identified a pattern of drug dealing in exchange for stolen property. This has provided valuable information to allow our police to crack down on property-related crime in the southern suburbs, as well as other issues of criminality which relate.

The government remains committed to addressing the link between property crime and drug use in our community. It has been the increase in police numbers delivered by this government that has allowed the creation of new teams like the State Tactical Response Group and others that give SAPOL the flexibility to deal with hot spots of crime.

The house may be interested that the introduction of the Second-hand Goods Bill is another example of where we have attempted to deliver extra resources and powers to police to break the cycle of crime. As I explained, what we found in the southern suburbs was that those increases in break-ins were related to drug purchases and drug-related crime. While it is disappointing that not everyone in this parliament shares that view, I take the Leader of the Opposition at his word when he says he wants to work with police to make South Australia a safer place. It has been a shaky start, particularly in relation to that piece of legislation, but we will see how he comes up next time when tested.

The SPEAKER: The minister should not anticipate debate on a matter before the house.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes. Mr Speaker, I am advised by SAPOL that, as a result of these operations in the southern suburbs, there has been a noticeable reduction in overall property-related offending within the South Coast LSA, particularly within the areas which have been identified and targeted. I am sure that these results will be welcome news for those living within the southern suburbs. I note the interest of the members for Reynell, Kaurana and Mawson in relation to this issue. I once again congratulate SAPOL on their effective and timely response to this issue and for their continued efforts to support safer communities in South Australia.

ROYAL DISTRICT NURSING SERVICE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why has the government reduced the number of referrals to the RDNS (the Royal District Nursing Service) for home-based health care this year, and what has been the extent of the reduction?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:01): The government has not made a decision to reduce the number of referrals. Individual clinicians in our hospitals have made the decision on a case-by-case basis to not refer as many people as they were. My advice is that partly that is because other service providers are being used and partly just because of the numbers of times when it is appropriate for such a referral to be made; but there is certainly no change in government policy. These are decisions which are made at the coalface by the clinicians.

COUNTRY SPORTS CARNIVALS

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport about a subject which, by looking at me, you can tell I am very passionate about. Can the minister inform the house about the country sport carnivals that took place over the Queen's birthday long weekend?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:02): I thank the member for Giles for her question and her support for people in her area in the sporting clubs and Whyalla, who do such a great job in harnessing the talents of local people and getting them out about, being fit and healthy. The June long weekend is very important on the country calendar for a number of sports, for their sports carnivals. I was very pleased to go to netball headquarters at Mile End over the long weekend to open the Country Championships.

There were teams from right across the state—almost 1,000 netballers from all the different country areas. It is a terrific competition that has been going 71 years now. When I worked at the ABC as a journalist we always made sure that we went out to cover it to send those images back to all the people throughout South Australia from their home towns. The best part was between 1994 and 1996, when the Mid South-East won the championship three years in a row. The member for MacKillop would concur that the women from Mount Burr and Glencoe combined beautifully for some great titles. Unfortunately, it has been a bit of a drought lately for the Mid South-East, and they did not feature among the winners this year.

However, I would like to inform the house of those teams who did win. In the A grade Barossa, Light and Gawler defeated River Murray. Whyalla, you would be pleased to know member for Giles, won the B grade grand final up against Barossa, Light and Gawler. Great Southern beat Western Border in the under 17s grand final, division I; and Port Augusta beat Port Pirie in division 2 of the under 17s. In the 15s and under, Port Pirie, the member for Frome would be pleased to hear, defeated Western Border 27 to 25; so bad luck there for the member for Mount Gambier and the member for MacKillop.

In the division 2 under-15 grand final Great Flinders 24 defeated Southern Hills 23. In division 2 it was Mid West 15 over Mid Hills. In the under-13s Riverland won (and the member for Chaffey would be pleased with that) by beating Mid Hills, and Hills beat Northern Areas in division 2 of the under-13s. In division 3 of the under-15s River Murray were big winners over Whyalla 27 goals to 14.

The A-grade top 10 players for the championships: Fiona Bussenchutt from the Yorke Peninsula; Penny Chappell from Barossa, Light and Gawler; Keston Green, Mid South East; Katie Liebelt from Northern Eastern; Tamara Lodge, Yorke Peninsula; Amy Loechel from River Murray; Tracy Loechel, from River Murray; Keeley Mason, Mid South East; Olivia Scholz, River Murray; and Jess Wilson, Barossa, Light and Gawler.

While I am on the subject of netball, I think we should all congratulate the Adelaide Thunderbirds for taking out the title of minor premiers in the trans-Tasman cup for the first time. We wish them all the best for this weekend in the final minor round match and, of course, for the finals, as well. Go the T'birds.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

POLICE RESOURCES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:05): We have seen over the last three years and three months great disappointment with regard to this government fulfilling its election promises. And we have seen, today in question time, evidence with regard to the police portfolio of exactly what a woeful situation we have with regard to the government fulfilling its promises. Seven government election promises were made leading to the 2010 election and, with over 80 per cent of the time expired from 2010 to the 2014 election, not one of those promises has been fulfilled yet.

The Hon. L.R. BREUER: Point of order, Mr Speaker!

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. L.R. BREUER: Mr Speaker, I cannot hear the member.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles, I presume the point of order is that no-one can hear the member for Stuart.

The Hon. L.R. BREUER: Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, member for Giles; I appreciate that. Here we are with over 80 per cent of the time gone and seven of these election promises made. None of them have been fulfilled. Many of them have not even been started, and it is no wonder that the Police Association, the police in general, the public in general and members in this place are terribly concerned about the extraordinary and very unlikely possibility that any of these promises will be fulfilled in the last nine months.

Let me just step through these promises: recruit 300 police officers by 2014. It certainly has not happened. The government has put that commitment back to 2016-17 and, as we have heard today in question time, in fact, we will finish this financial year with 39 fewer police officers than we started with.

Promise No. 2: Star Chase pursuit management system installed in 10 patrol cars. SAPOL has identified that, in the current South Australian policing environment, they are not safe. You would think you would know that before you make the promise. Promise No. 3: 20 new mobile automatic numberplate recognition systems. Here we are: eight of them are being trialled at this point in time and it looks highly unlikely, even if that trial is successful, that all 20 will be implemented.

Promise No. 4: 150 portable fingerprint scanners. None out of 150 have been installed. In fact, there is actually concern about whether they are even legal, so here we are again. It is the sort of thing you think you would go through and investigate before you even make the promise, if you have any desire to actually fulfil it.

Promise No. 5: 100 hand-held computers. We have heard from the Minister for Police today that there is a trial and that they are trying to get them implemented, but they are finding it very difficult. Some of the problems they are having with regard to the fingerprint devices are actually applicable to the portable data terminals as well. Right now, I believe there are nine out of 100 actually active, so it is very unlikely that the other 91 are going to be put in place in the next three months.

Reducing red tape to keep our officers on the beat: I certainly support that 1,000 per cent. That was a very good area to be working on. The difficulty is that it is just not happening. We hear time and time again—at the Budget and Finance Committee, at the select committee into emergency services and on the media very regularly—the police commissioner very openly and very honestly (and I have to commend him on that) saying that things are not improving.

They are not getting more officers on the beat. In fact, if anything, things are getting worse. We heard the Minister for Police tell us today that they are using technology which he himself

believes is one or two decades out of date, so they are clearly not making any progress there whatsoever.

Promise No. 7: amend legislation that will allow photographs or videos in lieu of line-ups. Members present all know that that is another broken promise. That legislation failed to pass parliament. The promise was not, 'We will introduce it into parliament and we will see how we go.' The promise was, 'We will get it done.' Again, you would think you would do your homework before you start. That is seven broken promises.

The police minister tells us today that there are certain things under trial, and there are certain difficulties they are facing that they are not accountable for. The reality is that these promises will not be fulfilled. One hundred per cent of the promises this government made to the public of South Australia and to the serving police officers of our state will not be fulfilled. Not one of them will be fulfilled.

I asked the police minister today if he could point to one promise made in regard to the police portfolio at the last election which he believes will be implemented by the next election, as promised, and he could not identify one. He avoided the question and moved on to other issues and other figures. When pulled up by a point of order and asked, 'Please, just tell us one. Is there one that you can tell us that you believe your government will do?', he could not answer that. In fact, the Premier could not help him with that and none of his fellow ministers—not one of the former police ministers—could help him, either.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Reducing crime in South Australia. That's what we did.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education may be correct but I call her to order for interjecting. The member for Giles.

OUTBACK COMMUNITIES AUTHORITY

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (15:10): Today I want to comment on some appointments that were announced today by the Minister for State/Local Government Relations to the Outback Communities Authority. The Outback Communities Authority is a very important part of my electorate, certainly. It has jurisdiction over almost two thirds of the state. It serves about 4,000 people in numerous small communities throughout the state, and service locations and pastoral and farming properties in the outback.

It does very important work in managing the provision and improvement of public services and facilities for outback communities as well as helping to communicate the views, interests and aspirations of those who live there to our city politicians and our city-based departments. It is a really important role and, for a long time, I have admired the work they do, and I certainly have had feedback from my various communities about the good and the bad, but mostly good, work that the Outback Communities Authority does out there.

Today, it was announced that there are some new appointments to the board which will take place from July 2013, in particular, the announcement of incoming chair Cecilia Woolford, whom I will talk about a little bit later. This is because Bill McIntosh is the outgoing chair, and I want to speak today particularly about Bill McIntosh, a great man of the outback for whom I have had great admiration for many years.

William Raymond McIntosh was born on 28 January 1948. He lives at Gum Creek Station near Blinman—which is not part of my electorate but is in the electorate of the member for Stuart, but I am sure he also knows Bill very well. He was chair of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust from 1 April 1996, but he was actually a member of that trust (which is the predecessor, of course, of the Outback Communities Authority) since 1988.

In fact, I understand that it is 25 years today exactly since he joined. So he has given 25 years of service to that authority. I believe he served under members like Lowitja O'Donoghue, who was the chair at one stage, and Gavin Kenneally. Currently, he is also a member of the State Bushfire Coordination Committee and a member of the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council, and he has been a JP since 1989.

Bill is an amazing man. He is seen at numerous outback functions, organisations, etc., around the place. He has served on many committees and organisations connected with the outback—for example, the Arid Lands NRM board, the Soil Conservation Council and the Rangelands Integrated Natural Resource Management Group. He is a member of the Regional Communities Consultative Council, the Outback SA Community Board and the Outback

Community Alliance. Some of these have disappeared into time, but the amount of work he has done is unbelievable.

He also served on the Northern Regional Development Board, the South Australian Natural Resources Management Council and also the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation. He was a very active and strong member and chair of the Southern Rangelands Rural Plan Task Force for a couple of years. He has been involved in the Farmers Federation, National Parks and Wildlife and the Progress Association of Blinman. I could go for hours and talk about this, but what I really want to say is this is indicative of the wonderful work that Bill McIntosh has done out there. He goes along to all sorts of functions. I have seen him at all sorts of conferences and different functions that have been held in the Outback areas. Bill is always available and always gives his time.

He is a very charming gentleman, a wonderful man, and I wish him well. I want to thank him on behalf of the parliament for the wonderful work he has done over the years with the Outback Communities Authority. He holds an Australia Medal for his service to Outback communities. He also won, I think, at some stage a Centenary Medal and was an Australia Day Citizen. This is all indicative of the esteem in which people hold him. I wish him and his wife Jane well in their future and thank him again for the wonderful work that he has done. I know it is very much appreciated by everyone throughout the Outback.

The new chair, Cecilia Woolford, comes in with an incredible CV, which makes you feel quite humble when you look at it. She has done all sorts of work, so I know that she will be great for the Outback Communities Authority and I look forward to working with her.

Time expired.

HODGMAN, HON. MICHAEL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:15): It is with some sincere regret that I bring to the attention of the parliament and the house the passing of the Hon. Michael Hodgman AM QC after a long battle with emphysema. I had the great pleasure of meeting Michael on a number of occasions, and he impressed me in the short time that we had the opportunity to converse and also interact in meetings. He was a loud, proud character who had the respect of many, many people, during, after, between and before his time in politics.

He was born on 16 December 1938 in Hobart. His father William was involved in both houses of the Tasmanian parliament. His brother Peter was a member of the Tasmanian House of Assembly and, as members would be aware, his son Will is currently the Leader of the Opposition in the Tasmanian state parliament.

Michael Hodgman entered politics in 1966 in the Legislative Council in Tasmania. In 1975, he was elected to the House of Representatives, representing the constituents of the seat of Denison. In 1980, he was appointed a minister in the Fraser government. He was the minister for the capital territory and assistant minister for industry and commerce. He was instrumental in the introduction of the Australian Institute of Sport. He was also a shadow minister under Andrew Peacock—his opposition leader and someone he was very close to indeed.

In 1987, Michael Hodgman was defeated by Duncan Kerr after a redistribution of electorate boundaries and returned to the bar. He returned to state politics in 1992 in the House of Assembly, this time for the state seat of Denison, and he held that seat for another 17 years. Michael Hodgman became a Queen's Counsel in 1984. He was well respected in the legal profession. Michael Kirby was one who described always enjoying Michael Hodgman's court appearances—someone from maybe slightly different politics but certainly with a respect for the legal mind.

I also note that the member for Stuart, of course, was a professional basketballer with the Hobart Devils. Michael Hodgman was a very active patron of the Hobart Devils National Basketball League team, in which the member for Stuart played from 1985 to 1988. I know that he was very active in that team, as he was in all of the community organisations in which he played a role. The member for Stuart has told me of the value that the players put on their patron. Duncan Kerr, who I mentioned before, described Michael as 'blunt, outspoken, fair, funny, and, despite our two fiercely fought campaigns, my friend.' He went on to say, 'He will be deeply mourned by Tasmanians of every political persuasion.'

The current incumbent member for Denison, Andrew Wilkie—the Independent MP—has said that Michael is still fondly remembered by his constituents. Wilkie said, and I quote: 'It seems he knew every voter, all by name, all their children and which football team they supported.' That is backed up by former Liberal premier Robin Gray, who said, and I quote: 'You could go to the races

with Michael and he would be able to introduce you to nearly everyone on the racecourse and of course they were all his dearest friends.'

He was a monarchist. He strongly believed Australia should not become a republic. I remember that, in federal Liberal Party conferences, whenever he introduced himself to speak on a motion, he would always stand up proudly and say, 'The Hon. Michael Hodgman QC, Her Majesty's loyal shadow attorney-general for the state of Tasmania.' Whenever I hear the Speaker refer to Her Majesty's loyal opposition in this place or any other, I always think of Michael Hodgman and I will do so more so in the future, in fond memory. He served the Tasmanian people at a state and a federal level over a career that spanned over four decades and he was one of Australia's most durable politicians. He never forgot a name or a face. He met the Queen six times, which he was extremely proud of, but he was just as comfortable mixing with Tasmanians down at the pub.

On a personal note again, the first encounter I had with him was when he lent his voice, his passion and his persuasion to an environmental policy motion that I was moving at the federal Liberal Party councillors as a fairly young Liberal president about 12 or 13 years ago. It was a fairly sceptical room. I am not sure that I was going to get anywhere close to a majority in the room. Then Michael Hodgman stood up, Her Majesty's loyal shadow attorney-general for the great state of Tasmania, and I thought he was going to shoot me down completely. He supported the motion. He had a strong environmental passion and he turned the room. I give all credit to him for that.

He took time to support young Liberals, and young people in politics. He earned respect from all sides of the political spectrum, which is a sign of the significant contribution that he has made. He fought for what he believed in. As Malcolm Fraser said, he had the courage, but more than anything he had conviction. Michael Hodgman was a colourful character. He brought life to politics. We are all the richer for the contribution he has made in his career over four decades. My condolences, as are those of the house I am sure, are with his family, his friends, his loved ones and the people of Tasmania.

The SPEAKER: I, too, offer my condolences to the Hodgman family on the death of Michael, the Mouth from the South.

SKYLINK ADELAIDE

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua) (15:21): Good segue, Mr Speaker. I stand today to do something I have done very rarely in this place, and that is to name somebody. It is a privilege that we have as members of parliament and one that should be used most cautiously, and I do so very cautiously on this occasion. I am raising a matter brought to my attention by my constituent Mr Robin Freeman. Mr Freeman tells me that between January 2012 and August 2012 he worked as a bus driver for his now former employer, Mr Ron Payne, trading as Skylink Adelaide.

Skylink runs a shuttle bus service between Adelaide Airport and the hotels in the city. Mr Freeman was not paid according to the relevant award for his work and after his employer ignored his repeated requests for the correct wages, Mr Freeman took the matter to Fair Work Australia. I am told that Fair Work found in favour of Mr Freeman; however, the total money owed to Mr Freeman was never forthcoming.

On the advice of Fair Work Australia, Mr Freeman then sought redress through the South Australian Industrial Relations Court, where industrial magistrate Lieschke ordered in his favour. Magistrate Lieschke, in summarising the matter, said:

I order Mr Payne to pay Mr Freeman within 21 days the total following amounts in full and without any deduction, being \$5,794.54 for underpayment of wages, \$1,238.64 for superannuation, \$2,000 for the pecuniary penalty and \$400 interest, being a total of \$9,433.18.

This was back in November 2012. In making this judgement, the magistrate took into account the failure of Mr Payne to rectify the underpayments despite repeated requests and the absence of any filed defence or explanation from Mr Payne. These amounts appear to be duly owed to Mr Freeman. However, sadly, Mr Freeman has been unable to enforce this judgement despite his very best efforts.

To better explain the injustice, Mr Freeman tells me that he was being paid \$15.40 an hour, regardless of whether he worked weekends or public holidays. To put this in perspective, I believe Mr Freeman should have been paid just over \$41 an hour for public holidays, not the \$15.40. Additionally, there was a three-week period during July 2012 when Mr Freeman was not paid at all. For a worker to be treated this way is completely unacceptable and in total disregard of the law.

The unpaid money has caused considerable financial hardship to my constituent, who is being harassed by debt collectors.

My constituent, Mr Freeman, believes that Mr Payne is still operating Skylink. I contacted Mr Payne directly, via letter dated 22 February 2013, to give him (that is, Mr Payne) the opportunity to resolve this matter. To date, I have not received a response to my letter. I believe I have given him adequate time to be fair. I have been told by my constituent that an arrest warrant has been issued now for Mr Payne and I encourage our law enforcement officers to do their very best to see this warrant is actioned, so that Mr Payne can be accountable.

I draw this matter very clearly to the attention of the airport and the hotels which use this service. They should know the kind of person they are dealing with when they have their customers sent around the city between the hotels and the airport.

In the remaining two minutes that I have, I wish to draw the attention of the house to a parliamentary research library paper which was placed in every member's pigeonhole today, and sent to them electronically as well. It is a paper called: 'Smoking Cessation: A Review of Recent Strategies and Proposals' prepared by Dr John Weste, the manager of research services, on my request.

I have a motion before the house, which I will not get into, but I hope this paper will provide good background reading for those who might want to participate in that debate. What I have asked Dr Weste to do is to look at the concept of endgame in smoking cessation. We are now getting to the point where relatively few people are smoking and the rate of people taking up smoking is declining.

A number of jurisdictions around the world have started talking about endgame strategies. This paper looks at those strategies and proposes some measures which might be taken by communities to make sure that the amount of smoking in the community is reduced and even get to the point where there is no smoking. That is something I think is worth considering and worth debating. I really commend Dr Weste on his paper. He really brings together all of the issues in a very coherent and sensible way, and I draw it to the attention of members of this place.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:26): Today I rise to speak about something that is dear to my heart and very important to the people of Chaffey and that is the Murray-Darling Basin Plan; the intergovernmental agreement that South Australia has yet to sign up to.

When the previous premier was knifed and the current Premier came into power as the leader of the Labor Party, he came to my electorate and said that irrigators would not give up one more drop of water. He said that we would achieve 4,000 gigalitres and that was his promise. Along the way we have seen his promises slowly slip and slide away, from 4,000 back to 3,200.

We see the desal plant, that would reduce Adelaide's reliance on the Murray, now being mothballed. We see that he secretly agreed to giving up another 83 gigalitres of basin water, insisting that South Australia would not give up more water. He signed up to an additional 450 gigalitres of environmental water without seeing any of the detail and who would be giving up that water.

The Premier and the new water minister have got a lot to answer for to the people of South Australia. Victoria has signed up to the agreement, as has the ACT—they are receiving extra funding. The Premier and the water minister continue to say to my constituents and to the people of South Australia that we are days away from signing that agreement. Now it has been weeks since they have said it will be days. Again, South Australia is being left out in the dry. The Premier is spin-drying the people of South Australia. More importantly, he is spin-drying the people of Chaffey.

The water minister of South Australia is saying that the Coalition is the biggest risk to South Australia and yet I have an article here to say that Mr Joyce and the Coalition represented the biggest risk to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, which they signed on to, but South Australia has still not signed on to the intergovernmental agreement. What sort of hypocrisy is that, Mr Speaker?

Again, South Australia now needs to achieve 83 gigalitres of water, and for the Premier not to sign up to this intergovernmental agreement again puts the Water Industry Alliance initiative at risk—\$240 million that is coming into the river communities of South Australia to achieve 40 gigalitres of water through infrastructure improvements. Those infrastructure improvements are for water. Again, that is more water that South Australia will give up, remembering that the Premier

said that irrigators would not have to give up any more water under his watch. Again, that is a broken promise.

The government has committed another 20 gigalitres as part of that 83 gigalitres, but guess where that 20 gigalitres has come from? Yes, it came from the suffering irrigators during the drought. They had to sell their water, under sufferance; they were not willing sellers. They were sellers due to bank pressure, due to the drought, due to watching their trees die. They had to sell that water to the government. Again, we look at the water minister and the Premier here in South Australia not living up to a promise. That is another broken promise. We continually hear the Premier and the water minister, who he goes to for advice, saying to my constituents, 'We're days away.'

I have the banks ringing me and saying, 'What is the Premier doing about signing this intergovernmental agreement?' We have finance contracts that we need to get into play so that people can improve their efficiencies and make the necessary management changes on their properties. Yet we have a Premier and a minister who are giving us more and more spin, just drying out the river communities of South Australia.

We see the Australian Conservation Foundation saying that the Coalition's capping the buyback is not the answer, that it is putting the basin at risk. I say to them that we have to have the balance: we have to have buyback, but we also have to have the infrastructure upgrades so that we can have people growing our food, so that we can have communities who live on a sustainable river. To have our Premier, our water minister and the Conservation Foundation saying that the Coalition is the problem is absolutely outrageous.

The South Australian Liberal Party has said from day one that the 2,750 is achievable and that we need a balance in this plan, yet we have the Premier telling us that we are the biggest problem. We have the minister now saying that the federal Coalition is the biggest problem.

Time expired.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:31): I want to speak today about an issue which has been close to my heart and which has occupied much of my thinking and actions since I moved to Modbury Heights in 1976, the year I moved into the house where my children lived almost all their life. Born in 1980 and 1982 respectively, my son and daughter have, thank goodness, needed to attend the Modbury Hospital only a few times, mostly for the usual breaks but, on occasion, for other more serious events, and I have needed emergency treatment there on two occasions. So, my family has the experience and interest to comment on Modbury Hospital, apart from my obvious passion and interest on and behalf of all in the north-eastern suburbs that we continue to enjoy the services of a health facility best equipped to look to our community's needs.

Many years ago, in conjunction with other concerned local residents, I became part of the Modbury Hospital Local Action Group, formed as a result of the then Liberal government's move to privatise Modbury Hospital and its services. Why would a government do such a thing? Clearly, it was looking to allow profit from illness and hospital services, underpinning a two-tier health system, something that continues to dog Australians despite that great Labor initiative way back called Medibank.

At the time that the Modbury Hospital Local Action Group was formed, there were many questions about how service delivery would be made and how the whole of the state system would work. The private company involved did not stay and, in one of my proudest moments, Modbury Hospital returned to the state health system, under a Labor government.

Almost since its beginning, I have been involved in making sure that Modbury Hospital retained its reputation and place in the health system. I have been involved in protests to keep it and to enhance it and now to maintain confidence in it. Those who have lately come into the discussions have come perilously close to seeing Modbury Hospital off by undermining its capacity to retain the confidence of the community.

From what some of them say, you would be forgiven for thinking that anyone left the Modbury Hospital alive. We all know that that is just not true. Hundreds of people have had their life saved and their wellbeing maintained, all due to the Modbury Hospital and the wonderful care they received, and I acknowledge, on behalf of all those hundreds of people, the hundreds of health professionals who have worked there and who have delivered such great care.

Unfortunately, some people do experience adverse outcomes. I am very sorry whenever I hear of those occasions, and I urge people to come forward to have those cases reported and investigated so that systemic changes can be made. That said, it is important that people understand how the health system operates and how the government is always evaluating and reviewing health service delivery.

That is why Friday's announcement of a public consultation into services at Modbury Hospital, partially around the consolidation of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network's paediatric services, should not be surprising or cause hysteria, especially if you have any knowledge of the history of the involvement of health services in the north-east. When I heard of the announcement, I immediately sought information and suggested a public forum for discussion, something I have often done for issues at the hospital, most notably around obstetric services and parking.

I am pleased to say that the minister's office has informed me that Northern Adelaide Local Health Network will be holding two forums. The hospital management will be presenting the proposal and running both forums, which will be held at the Tea Tree Gully council building on Monday 26 June, from 7pm to 9pm, and on Wednesday 28 June, from 10am until noon. They are not being run by the council, but rather are being held at the council chambers, which is centrally located.

I hope everyone with concerns will attend or contact my office (the Florey electorate office), by phone, fax, email, or even our after-hours mail chute. Florey electorate staff are well versed in local knowledge and local problems, and are very interested in understanding how people's lives are going to be affected. That is why consultation is such a powerful tool.

Whatever the outcome, this government will ensure the best possible services, in consultation with health professionals and consumers. I need to hear all the facts to know how best to represent the committee, and I will be at the forums, working to make sure there is a good outcome. Irrespective of any future decision, children will still be seen at the Modbury Hospital. Unless parents sense some otherwise endangerment, help should always be sought there.

As demands on health services increase, it is vital to understand the needs of the public: babies and nursing mothers; adolescents and young families; and the older community members whose needs are ever-growing. Accordingly, we need to have a strong, integrated, sustainable health system; that is what we all want and need.

If we are all to understand that prevention strategies are important in this plan, and that people need to know first aid themselves and only use hospital services when it is absolutely essential, then that will mean those who need those services will be able to access them in their time of need. Again, I urge everyone to get involved in this consultation process. I have only had one call to the office so far.

MAGISTRATES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2013

The Legislative Council gave leave to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. G.E. Gago) and the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 June 2013.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:38): The opposition's understanding of this particular measure is that it amends the First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000, it extends the eligible transaction date for the \$8,500 Housing Construction Grant from 1 July 2013 to 1 January 2014, and extends the completion dates for new homes from 31 December 2014 to 30 June 2015. The Liberal Party supports this particular measure and will not be opposing the bill.

If the minister cares to explain, in his response to the second reading contribution, how many grants have been issued in the past 12 months, or the number of grants that are expected to

be issued in the 12 months of the provision, that would assist the opposition and would save us going into committee.

The other points on which we would seek clarification are whether this is simply for new homes, and whether it is statewide. We would also seek an explanation as to why it has only been extended for six months (to 1 January), given the government's claim that the scheme has been so successful. With those few comments, we support the bill.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:39): I thank the member for Davenport for his extensive probing and well-informed contribution. In answer to the question he asked in relation to the expected uptake of the numbers, I have not been able to do the calculation, but the amount that is contained in the budget is \$38.6 million and the value per grant is \$8,500.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: I was asking for the last 12 months.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: My advisers do not have that information. By simple math we can determine what we expect the uptake to be over the next 12 months, but I will not do that. It is basically \$38.6 million divided by \$8,500. I think it would be fair to assume, member for Davenport, that that would be based in large part on the uptake over the previous 12 months, so it will be double that figure, but I will come back to you, if you are happy with that explanation.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: I would like you to come back to me, yes. Is it statewide?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, it is. It applies to all newly-built homes.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HEAVY VEHICLE NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 May 2013.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:42): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicle National Law) Bill 2013 and the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Bill 2013, to which I will speak only once, you will be pleasantly surprised to hear. I will address the issues in both bills in my contribution. The opposition will be supporting these bills. That is not without a heavy heart at the anticipated but unfortunately inevitable outcome of unresolved issues leading into this debate.

I will refer to them in detail but, in short, this legislation had received significant and I think near universal support amongst stakeholders. However, there were some remaining issues that were unresolved and about which certain promises had been made that they would be resolved, and that there would be consultation with the industry and stakeholders to facilitate that. That offer was made, I do not doubt, in good faith; however, it has come to my attention that those promises have, sadly, been undermined. By whom, we are not certain, but we on this side of the house are certainly concerned. Having spoken to some other members in the parliament, they too share concerns about, really, an offer to resolve outstanding issues that has fallen flat on its face.

It is of no comfort to the opposition that, when offers are made by government to ensure that effective implementation of new laws is going to be in consultation with industry, we find that it is not forthcoming. I am here in this parliament every day we sit, I think, talking about bills where we have absolutely no idea about what is going to be put in the regulations. Sadly, although we are given indications about how matters will be resolved in regulation, time and again we find that we are let down by those who then subsequently introduce a regime of regulation which is not only inconsistent with what has been offered but more often than not adds another swag of obligation that had not been disclosed during the debate.

After 11 years, I have to say, I am certainly a little weary of the government promises and ministers' indications of what they propose to do or what they expect of their colleagues—and I say

that in the secondary area in an example such as this, when we are looking to a national regulation—and all of the promises really fall flat on their face. Or, some are implemented but they are significantly marred in their benefit, stained by the failure either of the minister to follow them through or to ensure that their colleagues in other states do.

So, let's have a look at this legislation: the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Bill, laid on the table 2 May. The principal bill was developed from a COAG agreement to establish a national system for heavy vehicle regulation to be governed by one national law. This follows, as members would be aware, legislative reform for rail and marine vessels to the same extent; that is, to introduce a national regime. This area of transport (namely, heavy vehicles) has had a very long gestation period. I think it probably started its legislative life before the other two, but the other two have since passed and been largely implemented for the benefit of those industries.

Marine vessels has now had legislation passed and, if not established, the headquarters in Canberra are in the process of being established. The national rail scheme has been passed, and although there have been a few glitches I think it is fair to say that that area, South Australia being the headquarters of the national regulator for rail, is up and running. I did meet recently with a very significant provider of train services in South Australia—and I was pleased have a look at some new technology that they have been implementing—and they identified some areas of diminished performance; but I think it is fair to say that, if they are representative of the industry, they are not unhappy with the effectiveness of the new national regulation in the rail world.

Obviously there are always disappointments at the delay and the expectation of agencies to be up and running, but I have certainly learned after 11 years that that is never a fast process. It is just that some of these things seem to move at a glacial pace, but overall I think it is fair to say that the hopes there for the efficiencies and increased productivity in the rail world—we are yet to see it in the marine world—are still an aspiration that is on the table that has not yet been severely blemished.

The history is that there have been a couple of years of debate around Australia at ministers' COAG meetings and ultimately legislation was introduced in the Queensland parliament before the last state election up there under the Bligh government. That lapsed as a result of the intervention of the election. After considerable further discussions, in August last year, the national law was passed by Queensland. The format of this national program is that there will be a host state and Queensland is the host state in respect of this legislation.

The board has been appointed and I am advised that the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator Board is chaired by the Hon. Bruce Baird AM, and Peter Garske, Robin Stewart-Crompton, Coral Taylor and Vincent Tremaine are members of the federal board. Members here would be aware that Mr Vincent Tremaine is the chief executive officer of Flinders Ports here in South Australia and has had other representative roles as a former president of Business SA. Obviously, there is South Australian contribution there and that is certainly worth noting. Mr Richard Hancock has been appointed national regulator and he has commenced business on 21 January this year.

The full operation of the national law is unable to commence until the states have passed their laws. To date, New South Wales, Victoria and I think South Australia expected at least to have the legislation passed to commence in July of this year. That is only a matter of days away. That has not been the case. The government has obviously not advanced this legislation in this parliament with sufficient priority to be able to ensure that that occurs.

However, it seems that at least one or both of the other states have not yet completed their debates, either. I may be wrong about that. It may be that that situation has improved in the last week or so, but my understanding is that there has been a delay in the other states, and the expectation now is that this whole new regime is not likely to take effect until either September or 1 January next year. Of course, that may depend on advances in the other states.

The Northern Territory and the ACT had already indicated that they needed more time to follow through, but that they would not be falling into line entirely with the model system here. In particular, the Northern Territory was not prepared to accept the fatigue management model law. Members may be aware that, in essence, in about 2007 there was a national regime established to look at fatigue management. This largely concerns, of course, the drivers of heavy vehicles, to look at how best to secure a high standard of safety for all those on the road—not just the drivers, but of course other users of the road. At that stage, some of the jurisdictions did not participate. South Australia was one that did, and it adopted the national model law. The fatigue management for the

Northern Territory is not something that they accept. That does not mean they do not have it: it means that they operate under their own scheme.

Western Australia is not a signatory to this agreement. That is nothing new. They usually don't. History is littered with examples of where Western Australia does not come into any national scheme. They have taken the view, frequently, over the lifetime of the federation that, more often than not, it seems, they think their way is better than the national way, so they have remained fiercely independent. I have not assessed at all, or considered, what model the Western Australian jurisdiction will maintain for those subject to its jurisdiction so I do not make any comment on whether it is, in this instance, better or worse but, nevertheless, they have remained independent.

The Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Bill, which is the principal bill, establishes the national system. The secondary bill just provides some modifications to existing South Australian laws and also provides some additional powers and offences.

It is fair to say that the expectation of this type of reform in establishing a national scheme has the usual lofty aspirations. Essentially, the minister has, in introducing this legislation, identified the aims to create a more productive and safer heavy vehicle industry—in short, to have uniformity and some harmonious consistency, which will somehow provide us with a simpler, cheaper, fairer system that will mean that there will be increased service, presumably at a reduced, or at least not more expensive, price, and that all will be happy in the truck world.

Predictably, given the demonstrable failure of that lofty ideal on other occasions in the last 11 years that I have witnessed, I do not have any high expectation of that, but I do respect the fact that those who are in the industry are still keen to give it a go and make sure that, as best as possible, that would be achieved.

I will refer to a number of the stakeholder groups, that is, the representative bodies, who have contacted, met or written to me about this legislation, and there have been many. One is the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association of SA Inc., and I have met with Mr Brian McArdle and Mr David Smith, the President and immediate past president respectively, and other representatives of the organisation. I have read their correspondence, and I will say that it is one organisation that has remained consistent in its support for a nationally consistent regulatory regime. Obviously, they have an expectation that this will be good because it will recognise that South Australia's economy is heavily reliant upon interstate and international trade.

The logistics of securing that, the importance of the transport industry to it and the long period of advocacy by organisations, including their own, to achieve this have been, they say, critical to eliminating remaining inconsistencies and ending the periodic creation of new inconsistencies. They tell me that they have been fighting for this issue for the last 25 years, so they are keen to have it come to fruition.

Secondly, they consider that this will provide a structure that will give increased expertise and effectiveness to the government's regulation of the industry, which will be able to assemble a unique blend of skills in leadership, consultation, occupational safety, road safety, legal, economic, engineering and technical domains, and that establishing a single, national specialist regulator is the most effective way to bring together those skills and be able to better serve the industry.

I hope they are right. I am not overly confident, given some issues that have come to my attention, but, nevertheless, they remain staunchly supportive. They have lobbied for a long time, they have represented their industry well and they will be pleased if these bills are advanced and passed.

I will say that this was a group that was also very concerned at the time of the state government's decision to change the rules in respect of registration of heavy vehicles in this state, and I will come back to that shortly. Certainly, the Livestock & Rural Transporters Association have to meet with their membership which, of course, has, I think it is fair to say, an extra responsibility when it comes to providing live product. I think most members would appreciate the importance of protecting and ensuring the health, wellbeing, and not least the profitability, of the stock they might be carrying; but, purely on the grounds of the importance of protecting livestock in transit, the operators of livestock transport have an extra responsibility.

It has brought a number of other challenges, including the tension between trying to meet the safety needs of drivers in the fatigue management guidelines, rules, codes of practice and, ultimately, legal obligations in respect of fatigue management, together with the need to ensure that livestock are dealt with as humanely as possible in transit. Nobody wishes to see stock overly

stressed or unreasonably held in conditions of transit, alienated from food and water and the opportunity to rest, etc. It is important that, when governments do start drawing up the rules, or throwing away the old rule book and starting to draw up a new one, they actually understand that there are a number of factors to take into account.

It is fair to say that, in the livestock industry particularly, they were also very concerned about the obligations of those in the trucking industry towards the safety and wellbeing of their stock, independent of and sometimes in addition to the owner or the agent of the stock or, indeed, the ultimate purchaser. Chain of responsibility issues have also been very significant and high on their agenda, but overall they have stayed strong, and they wish to have the legislation passed.

The other issues, though, that this legislation has thrown up include the questions relating to heavy vehicle charging and investment. There is some reform going on at the national level in respect of how the heavy vehicle industry should make its contribution. We all know that they pay fuel tax. There are some diesel rebates available. That is under review at present. The industry is talking across the country with the powers that be in Canberra about what model that should develop to, to be as fair a system as possible. Suffice to say there are always challenges between the big operators and the small operators who might only work within a local district and not across state boundaries. Often their expectation and benefit from legislation is vastly different, and so there can be tensions even within the industries. Nevertheless, that is under review.

In South Australia as recently as last year, minister Conlon determined that there would be a massive increase in the registration fees of some classes of heavy vehicle. Some classes of truck were to have a very big increase in their registration fees, which would have the effect that large vehicles like road trains and other multiple linked vehicles would have a much higher registration. I am told for basically a truck and two additional trailers, it costs about \$30,000 a year to register that vehicle. Suffice to say, when you look at the capital investment of that vehicle, it is hardly surprising that whether you are a small operator or a big operator, you want to have that capital returning some investment. It needs to be on the road as much as possible. The productivity out of these large pieces of investment is critical to the industry.

I make this point because one of the things that became very evident is that in a state like South Australia, where road trains are used particularly in the remoter and regional parts, this decision by Mr Conlon to massively increase the registration for them had a direct impact on people, for example, who lived on the West Coast. Every loaf of bread they bought, every newspaper (apart from the fact that apparently the printing costs are high and they are going to have to pay more now anyway), every can of beer, every product that has to be transported in a large truck, of course, would have the impost transferred to it.

I just despair when I hear of ministers who say, 'Well, this is something that the truck industry can absorb,' or that there will be some absorption of this. It is a bit like when they say, 'Oh well, we will make infrastructure the responsibility of the developers of land,' as though they are just going to suddenly absorb it into their back pocket and it is not going to have some implication for a young couple who might be wanting to go and buy a block of land in a development.

This mentality is very concerning, because having announced that there would be a massive increase in registration fees for particular classes of vehicle, they then said, 'Well, look, we are going to be giving a corresponding decrease in that instance to trailers and small trucks.' So the little trucks that run up and down between Stonyfell and along Greenhill Road every day in my electorate—they pick up rock out of the quarries at Stonyfell—would receive a reduction in their registration costs. So there would be some winners and losers. A claim of the government over that 12 months or so of discussion about it, leading into last year's budget, was that, 'It is really only going to be revenue neutral and we're really just changing the rules for some; some will win and some will lose.'

This is not a revenue-raising exercise, and we deny that this is any process that is designed to raise revenue for the government. This is to be a fairer system. I do not think the industry accepted that. I spoke to a number of industry groups and, whilst they firstly went to the table a few times to try and get some sense out of the information that was being provided to justify this revenue-neutral approach, the reality is that there were clearly concerns. There was a level of distrust—some information was produced and other information was withheld—and this policy to cross-subsidise classes of heavy transport in the registration fees was not something that was universally embraced, that is for sure.

The government ultimately agreed to the implementation, but they would review it and I think the review is due in June 2014—conveniently after the next election. They will then be able to presumably demonstrate that this has really just been an exercise in providing equitable relief amongst all of those who are paying for heavy vehicle registration on trucks and that it is not something that should be adversely affecting the industry in total.

The other aspect of this is that it indicates the utter stupidity of governments making decisions that actually have an adverse effect for taxpayers and the industry. Let me give you an example. Firstly, it should not be beyond the wit of a person of the most average intellect to understand that if you massively increase the registration fees for a particular product (a vehicle in this case) and there is an opportunity in a neighbouring jurisdiction to attract a payment obligation at a much lower level, of course they are going to walk. They are going to take their registration revenue interstate. This is something that blind Freddy could see, and yet the government seems to be completely either blindly ignorant about it or just living in hope that it is not going to happen.

We had a number of meetings with both representative people and also members of the industry who said, when it went from this sort of category, 'Actually we have got trucks, Vickie, that are in the A trailer category so we are actually happy; we are not going to complain about this. We will come back if there is another review and we are going to have them increased.' Obviously, not surprisingly, they are happy. They have, of course, got a reduced revenue to start with on the current rate.

Then there were the ones who were higher—some were just a bit higher and/or they had only operations within the state and they were not sufficiently large; they might have had two, three, four or five trucks. They were relatively small operators and they had always registered their vehicles with the department here. They did not really have any intention to expand into other states. If anything, they were close to retirement and they were saying, 'Well, look Vickie; you know we are not going to hassle about it. We are going to have to pay a bit more, but we will just stick with what we have got.' Then, of course, there is this other group.

Recently, I went around the state and met with people who own trucks. I thank many in the trucking industry for giving me some pretty comprehensive education on everything with more than four wheels, especially the member for Chaffey, who welcomed me into his electorate to understand the issues that happened at the interstate border level. For those on the West Coast and in the South-East and the like, there are different aspects that are pressing to the industry, depending on where they are in which region of the state.

What was absolutely clear was that, where there were larger vehicles which now attract a massively increased registration fee, and where there was multiple truck ownership and where there was travel interstate, particularly to Western Australia or to Victoria, guess what? They said, 'Well this is what we pay, Vickie. This is our usual registration fee; it is \$165,000 a year or it is \$280,000 a year, and guess what? As of this year, we are registering in Perth or we are registering in Victoria.'

For the benefit of any of those in the department who are hoping to get some of this money back, from my information, there are more over in Melbourne that are getting our money than there are in Perth, but that is probably reflective of the fact that there is probably a much higher level of traffic to Victoria than there is to Western Australia. This is not my area of expertise, so I do not know how much of that transport work is there, but I am just assuming, given the produce we send out of the state to the east and to the north-east rather than to the west.

We have this situation of two things now, one being the loss of revenue to South Australia. We do not yet have the figures provided, and we will be looking with interest as to what the government produces to try to sustain this argument of having a policy of cross-subsidising classes using the registration instrument, blunt as it is. But I can tell you that, anecdotally, we are talking about truck operators that have seriously moved with the chequebook, and the beneficiaries are, of course, are neighbouring state coffers.

The second, of course, is that there is a clear resultant inequity that has developed between the small operators and the larger operators. So, if you are a big interstate operator (and it is really academic as to where you might electronically send your registration fees) and you operate across the country and you have the personnel in the office to be able to monitor this (that is, the best place to be able to register, the best place to set up your business, the best place to pay your WorkCover, etc.), you can do well in employing people to get the best outcome in the sense of regulatory cost that is imposed by governments.

But the little operator, the person who might operate just within a region and a state—go back and forth to Adelaide with a particular product to a particular port or train station to develop a particular piece of produce from a regional area or to deliver to local towns within a certain region—these people have no chance. They actually end up carrying the heavy burden of the higher registration costs in South Australia. So, it is a double-edged sword: less overall money for the state and a system that is no longer fair, if it ever was, and the inequity that it produces. We will see what happens with this whole question of contribution by the heavy vehicle industry.

I have not gone into buses and the like in this regard, but I will make the point that all users of roads, whether they are motorists, cyclists, pedestrians or people going along on their mobility scooters, right across to heavy vehicles, in different ways, in taxation and registration fees, we expect there to be contributions, and very significant registration fees are paid by the heavy vehicle industry.

They are, of course, also high consumers of fuel, I think still usually diesel. I am only assuming that, but I am sure the member for Chaffey will tell me if I am wrong, but I assuming diesel is still the biggest energy provider for heavy vehicles in this state. I have not seen too many hybrid trucks, anyway; in fact, it is fair to say that I have not see any. In any event, clearly they are big consumers of fuel and pay the fuel tax and excises at the national level, commensurate with some diesel rebate opportunities for truck operators and primary producers, etc.

Everyone contributes in some way to roads. Obviously, as taxpayers, we make contributions to infrastructure projects through the general revenue and the like, and it seems that we have come to a new dawn of opportunity for government to get access to money by this year's budget. For the first time in my time in the parliament, we now have the government taking money out of the Motor Accident Commission—\$100 million in this year's budget—to finance projects for roads, ostensibly under the guise of road safety. Anyway, we will deal with that in another debate.

This is a big issue, and one that is not remedied or enhanced by this legislation. If anything, the frustration of the industry here could be exacerbated if they do not have timely processing of their regulatory obligations by having to go through the national scheme. There is an expectation that it will cost less, or cost no more, and be more streamlined, and therefore more productive. As I said, I am not filled with hope in that regard, but some in the industry are still hanging on by a thread.

The other aspect is occupational health and safety, and this comes under heavy scrutiny in this legislation. There is a proposal in this tranche of legislation that we will add to some of the obligations by virtue of offences and powers to the enforcement that sits around this. Obviously, we know of the aspect of fatigue management, but there is also the broader safety aspect of other road users. I think it is important to put into perspective that, according to the research in the *Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety* in 2011 on heavy vehicle safety:

In Australia, deaths from heavy vehicle crashes represent 16% of the national road toll, with an estimated cost to society of \$2 billion per year. During the 12 months to the end of September 2010, 250 people died from 209 crashes involving heavy trucks or buses. The majority of those crashes (60%) involved articulated trucks, followed by heavy rigid trucks (32%) and buses (8%).

Recently, I was pleased to read that there had actually been a reduction in road deaths in which a heavy truck had been involved. That is encouraging, but there are two things that we do not always take into account. One is that there are other significant injuries and/or property damage that can occur as a result of motor vehicle accidents, outside of fatalities, which of course are very sad. Obviously there can be other significant adverse outcomes from heavy vehicle accidents. The other thing is that other road users, including motor vehicle operators, are also involved in and are, in a number of cases, responsible for fatalities on the road. In South Australia, we have some 100 people a year who, sadly, lose their lives, and hundreds more who suffer some injury.

What is concerning to me and I am sure to other members in the parliament is, firstly, that we need to always keep in perspective the relativity of what damage is actually happening in the sense of personal injury and death on roads. We should not lose perspective of what is the heavy killer. I do not think it is helpful to be making large comparisons about whether cars are more dangerous than trucks, because the reality is that they both use the roads, but I do not think it can be overlooked that, sadly, speed, inattentiveness and other aspects in relation to motor vehicle use is also a large killer of those who operate vehicles on the roads.

What is concerning to me is that, in all the data, the reality is that there is an ever-increasing, very significant and sharp increase in heavy vehicle road freight distribution. If we

continue to have the number of heavy vehicles on the roads and highways at the trajectory that we are heading towards then we have to look seriously at this, because logistics is an important business, obviously. I read somewhere not that long ago that, for a loaf of bread now, a very significant percentage—somewhere near half—of the cost of a loaf of bread is attributed to the logistical transport and delivery of it, a much smaller portion goes to the person who has produced the wheat and other products for it, and then of course there is the baker who has put it all together.

The slice for logistics and transport distribution is very high. It seems that, largely, that is because there are fewer and fewer outlets and there are major intermodal transport operations now for products, say within Australia. One of the large supermarkets—I cannot remember now whether it is Coles or Woolworths—has two major intermodal transport exchanges of its product for all of its supermarkets in Australia, one in Queensland and one in South Australia. All the product is brought to one spot and then it is redistributed out, usually by road, to other outlets, so it is a massive exercise.

I was looking on the website today to see all the little black ants going around the Britannia roundabout to show me how I will have to actually deal with it at the end of the year. We will get two roundabouts that I will have to go around twice a day. In any event, I was looking at that and thinking to myself, 'It must be massive to see the amount of heavy transport at an Australia-wide level of what is actually out there.' The reason this was heightened for me is not because I get shown all these statistics about the huge trajectory of demand and the use of freight delivery by road but because out in the field—and it was with one of the operators with the member for Chaffey, I recall—I was looking at a screen, and on that screen was a display of all of the trucking company's vehicles, either stationary or en route, across Australia.

They were like little dots. I cannot remember now whether they were green or red dots, but the technology now for being able to identify where a truck is, and even what the truck driver is doing, is quite extraordinary. I was told that they could identify exactly where one of their trucks was at any one time. They could probably make a safe prediction as to whether the truck driver, if stopped, had stopped for a toilet break, to have a cigarette or have lunch, and be able to make an assessment of not only—

Mr Whetstone: How fast.

Ms CHAPMAN: How fast they were going and, of course, assuming they are going on the right route, that they were actually undertaking their contractual load obligation. All of these things are important, not just for safety—to make sure that the drivers are not speeding. The employer has an obligation to make sure that they are not breaking the rules, that they are taking the mandatory breaks on their driving stints and that they are not speeding, etc. These are all important tools in being able to heighten heavy vehicle safety outcomes. However, it is extraordinary to think that when I look at a screen like that and see what I would describe as a small to medium business in a South Australian country area, with a picture of all these little dots of their own vehicles, and if you were to overlap Scott transport—I think Scott's is still the biggest—and all of the other smaller South Australian companies that have all of their heavy vehicles out there, it would look like an ant's nest, with all of the people going in and out of ports and major intermodal centres and, of course, to train stations and the like.

Fascinating as all that is, I make the point that the demand is ever-increasing. We have very few new roads. We have a major backlog of maintenance for the current roads in South Australia, which is concerning, but the demand is there and it will get higher. Clearly, we need to address those issues; to me they are very important. It is one thing to transfer all of the rules and regulations, not only as masses to be carried, and the like, by vehicles and the rules to apply to driver behaviour, to a national regulator, but these are really big issues that still have to be dealt with, and really have not been, I think, properly considered for the future.

In fact, what we have created is not a remedy for some of these big issues, but we have created an obligation to people in the trucking industry, and not just employers. Employers always get trotted out as the people who are responsible for the extra regulation, red tape and green tape—we hear about that quite often—but it should not be overlooked that it is also the obligation of a very significant number of employees in the heavy vehicle world. That is not just drivers, of course, but anyone who might be loading trucks, unloading trucks, pumping up the tyres, attending to the mechanical maintenance of vehicles, buying and selling, fitting and retrofitting of particular equipment—it might be a seatbelt or anything else.

All of these people in the heavy vehicle world, in addition to some corporate group, or a family partner, husband-and-wife, who might be employing the people involved in these ventures, have to go through a heavy burden of training. Why? Because we have loads and loads of rules about what they need to be proficient in. They need to certify, perhaps by a declaration process, that they have complied with and have continuing education and training to keep up with their obligations. Transferring these obligations, together with some special ones that we have in South Australia, to some group in Queensland does not make it any easier; it does not resolve the bigger issue.

Just to give myself some education in this area in the region of the member for Chaffey's electorate, I met with a company that operates in a number of states. They are headquartered in New South Wales, and they operate in the Riverland and have an outlet there. They provide transport for what I describe as dead things. They do not have livestock, but they have boxes, cartons and containers, and so on. I said to them, 'Just give me an idea of what the obligation is. Apart from training to get your special licence to be a driver and the like, what are all the other things that they have to do to comply with their training to start working with you to the level which you, as a responsible employer, are required to induct them?'

I was staggered. I had taken up with me a copy of the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Bill 2013 which is about 2½ centimetres thick and I was staggered when they handed over a bundle of material that was about 3½ centimetres thick. I said, 'Could you send me a copy of that electronically? I would like to have a look through it and see what is really involved in getting your employees up to speed and what the things are that they have to do.'

It was interesting to read through, but the manual I had received that was necessary for induction—even of somebody who was not driving a truck—was absolutely extraordinary. There are the usual topics of drug and alcohol rules, fatigue knowledge and awareness, fitness for duty, heavy equipment undergoing maintenance, incident reporting and investigation, information technology and media, mobile phones, occupational health and safety, opportunities for improvement, organisational structure, performance management, privacy and confidentiality—the list goes on.

I was staggered at all of the company policies that the companies were required to prepare and publish and induct every employee into before they came on site, essentially, to do their work. When it came to either driving and manoeuvring of heavy vehicles and/or loading, which is just a whole new world in itself—I mean I have read mass specifications and things like that over the years for different reasons, such as court cases and so on, but I was blown away by the actual level of obligation.

This week I received a regulation from the minister and the parliament of all the new fees that apply to all these things, which just make me sick, actually, but nevertheless I was provided with this huge volume of all the things that they needed to be trained in and that they had to read and sign that they had read and sign that they understood. These people needed a university degree just to be able to get their foot in the door and to be able to have the job legally.

By the time they got to the last form that was sent me, which was the social club membership, they would be so exhausted that they would not have time to be able to be a member. In any event, it certainly was an eye-opener to me of the layer upon layer of regulatory obligation that is now there, not just for the employer but for the people who work in that long chain of responsibility group in the industry.

I know that we can sit here in blissful ignorance of what is happening in the real world some days and think that we are overloaded with material but, just remember, in this parliament we are making new laws, and if we make one law, there is a massive amount of regulation being churned out and imposed on the general populace.

I have spent 30 years either applying the law or making it and nobody disputes the importance in civilised society of having a regime of legal structure. I support it: I support the rule of law and the separation of powers. I support democracy. However, I just ask those who are responsible for the implementation of the extraordinary amount of administrative obligation that comes with these laws that we make, to understand how difficult it is for the person out there to actually comply with them.

The other aspect of this legislation is that, whilst it is supposed to be providing some uniformity and some consistency, the reality is that if you operate in South Australia—whether or

not you are based somewhere else and operate here in South Australia—you get anything but uniformity with the rest of Australia.

This piece of legislation is proposing to take with it a signing up to the national scheme but with a whole lot of extras. The general principle of the extras under consideration is that it is underpinned by the fact that these are already procedures or powers or offences which apply in South Australia and, presumably, our Minister for Transport, or his predecessor, has argued to the powers that be in the COAG meetings that these are better laws than somewhere else and it is important that we keep them and that is part of the deal. So, in the sign-up to the uniform, harmonious arrangement, we are going to have a whole lot of extras. Principally, the variations are:

- first, to make four additional heavy vehicle national law offences expiable, and the government here proposes that they will be in regulatory form;
- secondly, to allow the issue of an improvement notice where a breach of the heavy vehicle national law is likely to occur as well as is occurring or has occurred;
- thirdly, removing the requirement to have a reasonable belief that evidence will be destroyed in order to enter a place without a warrant for investigation purposes;
- fourthly, excluding the reasonable steps defence from the offence of tampering with a speed limiter; and
- fifthly, placing the onus of proving reasonable excuse in a number of offences on the defendant.

These, apparently—again, I am not an expert in this area but I am told and I have no reason to doubt it—are in our current South Australian laws. I will say that, during the course of the consultation with the general industry, there was no strong outcry against these continuing. I will come to an aspect that was of concern but, in principle, people did not have any objection.

To give an example, people did not have any objection to it being an offence to tamper with a speed limiter. They understood the importance of that kind of conduct being unacceptable and that it should be an offence. I do not think any of them that I spoke to had a clue what the reasonable steps defence meant. It was not a big topic of conversation in the consultations I was doing with the industry, but most of them did not have a clue what that actually meant. But, generally, they were saying, 'Really, we understand these things are there for good reason.'

Perhaps they were just generally good, law-abiding business people, but they did not have an issue with that. This is something that always happens with offences. Until somebody actually gets caught by it or is alleged to have offended and breached prohibited conduct laws and they are suddenly facing huge penalties, they do not really give it a lot of attention. That can happen, too, but I make the point that at this stage there has not been any strong objection to it.

The extended powers and offences in this bill which, again, currently apply, largely relate to our police powers being extended in this regime, and they include: the offence of possessing a device designed to enable tampering with a speed limiter; the offence of selling or otherwise disposing of a vehicle which is subject to a defect notice; the power to inspect and defect a vehicle kept at a place for hire or sale; the power to direct a heavy vehicle to move if it is obstructing a vehicle from entering or leaving land adjacent to a road or obstructing a lawful event; the power, including for local government enforcement officers, to move an unattended or broken-down heavy vehicle that is on a bridge, culvert or freeway, is obstructing any lawful event, is obstructing a vehicle from entering or leaving land adjacent to a road, is causing harm or risk of harm to public safety, the environment or road infrastructure, or is obstructing traffic.

Interestingly, to me anyway, when I was travelling back from Port Augusta recently—sadly from the service for the late Joy Baluch—I happened to stop at a service station and I picked up a magazine. I cannot even remember the name of it now, but it was trucking news. I have to confess I have never actually read one of these magazines.

Mr Whetstone: *Big Rigs.*

Ms CHAPMAN: *Big Rigs*—that's it. I thought, considering my new portfolio, I would actually read it. It is very interesting to find out where you can go to have truck stops and so on. There were letters to the editor, and one chap had decided that he was going to have a call to arms of drivers. He was proposing that there be a rally to object to what he saw as unrealistic expectation in the delivery of the fatigue management rules, in particular that there had to be a

certain amount of time that you were able to drive or operate your vehicle and then you had to have certain rest stops. His complaint was that that is all very well, but where do you stop a huge, loaded vehicle on a main road where there is no place to stop?

He was really suggesting that there is an inadequate number of places to safely stop a vehicle, park and have your compulsory or mandatory rest time in the journeys that they are doing. Remember, a lot of these people are travelling interstate. They are driving for very long periods of time in total, but we have these rules that say they have to stop. Everybody accepts that you have got to have special rules, obviously, otherwise people get tired, they cause accidents, hurt themselves, kill other people, etc.; but he was outraged that there should be an obligation in relation to this with no flexibility, according to him, in what was being proposed there.

Of course, a typical regulator, somebody back here in Adelaide—like we all are—sitting in offices, can say, 'They should work around this. If it is an eight-hour period that is the limit, or after the fourth hour they have to stop and rest for half an hour—whatever the rule might be—and they have not had a spot there that is available, then they have to stop after 3½ hours, find a spot before and pull their rig in, have a cup of coffee and have a break.' But that is just not the real world. Sometimes these people are out in the middle of nowhere. They are not all going along main highways. Their three-hour or four-hour limit, or half an hour either side, might still be miles away from anywhere.

Mr Whetstone: In the hot sun.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the stinking heat or in the freezing cold. It is just not realistic. The inflexibility of this is of concern, not because the driver was saying in this article that he disagreed with the concept of having fatigue management, but he said the inflexibility is a problem because the penalties with this are massive. The consequences of a breach of these affect not just he or she who is driving the truck and who might be in breach, but their employer or someone else who is responsible for the management of the truck or in the chain of responsibility rules is also responsible.

It is not just the fine or the potential to lose in some pecuniary way, but the suspension or disqualification of a licence or the confiscation of a truck are all very serious impositions that come with breaches of offences in this range. They are there. We stand here in this parliament and we make these laws in the expectation that we are doing this in the interests of safety and protecting people on the road. It all sounds good, but I defy any of the members to go out and actually talk to the people in the trucking industry and understand what is happening in the real world. In the real world they are trying to get the loaves of bread, the bottles of milk, the cans of beer, whatever it is, distributed around the country to be delivered to people so that they can eat and have building materials for their shed or house, and clothes for their children to go to the local school—all the things that are necessary and are provided by the logistics and transport industry.

Yet we are being asked to make laws that impose not just a handbrake, but an anvil thrown on the heads of these people. I commend the magazine to anybody. It is quite an interesting read. They have lots of little jokes. I do not understand most of them but, nevertheless, they are very interesting to read. Before we come in to make legislation on these things, we ought to have a look at them.

The other aspect of this is the question of the defect procedures. In our compliance and enforcement in respect of the heavy vehicle world, I understand we have a number of people in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (whatever it is called these days) who go out to inspect, to see that loads are the right mass and the right weight, and so on. We have weighing stations, we have checking of how different loads have been packed. I think we even have some special rules in South Australia that do not apply in other states about bales of hay—all these sorts of things; the weight and mass of vehicles. Obviously, in South Australia this is an important role of the enforcement officers within the department.

Then we have a second group. I think there are 20-odd people in the police department in South Australia who have a specific role in detecting and prosecuting offences which involve the industry. That is not just in breach of truck rules, but obviously in breach of the road rules and behaviour such as drink-driving and the like.

The use and/or abuse of the defect process is of concern. It was made clear to me that there was a use by some of the defect notice process to access other powers and for other purposes. This was presented to me by some people in the industry as being, 'Look, we know sometimes our trucks get picked up. They are defected for a minor matter with a view to being able

to utilise the powers under the laws which allow for the inspection or confiscation of a vehicle and/or to be able to access it to search for drugs and the like.'

I did not come down in the last shower. It does not surprise me that there is a vigilant effort on the part of our authorities, particularly the police department, to keep an eye on the transport, particularly of illicit drugs, in this state. As South Australia is known, and still remains I think, the bastion at the top level of marijuana growing in Australia—it is not a badge of honour, I might say, but it is one which we understand and we do not challenge—it is reasonable for the enforcement agencies to try to keep a lid on that.

Consequently, checking whether it is a boat or a plane or a road vehicle at the borders is reasonable—or outside of an area at which there is suspected trading and transporting of drugs. Again, you do not have to be Einstein to realise that trucks are pretty big vehicles. They are loaded up and strapped up—and they do not even put ropes on them anymore, they have all of these clever gadgets which manoeuvre the load into place and strap it down. I am sure the minister has done this many times—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I always wanted to.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is done to protect the cargo. It is a skilful occupation for the people who do all of this, but it would be obvious to everybody that it would not be difficult for there to be the transporting of illicit drugs in small quantities in these large operations. I, for one, accept that it is important to be able to arrest the trade in this regard as much as one can, so I am not going to challenge the need for the government to allow police officers to have a role in this regard and to be able to have these powers.

For me, where there was an identified deficiency was with the group in the department which is responsible for defecting. I have to say—before I leave the police—that it is not as though there were no complaints in the information from some drivers and/or operators. There were several who had indicated to me that they thought that sometimes the police action in pulling up a truck and defecting it for the most minor thing was overzealous on the part of the police officer, but the real criticism actually came from the defecting at the departmental level.

I will not name any particular people involved in this, but I make the point that it is pretty clear that two things are happening. One is that sometimes defects are put on a vehicle, and they are assessed to be defective by persons who are not qualified in mechanics or engineering, which is necessary in making that assessment. That is the first thing I say, and I will give you an example in a moment.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. T Kenyon]

Ms CHAPMAN: The second aspect is the process by which truck operators or drivers can get the defect removed. So there is the question of the qualifications of those who are doing the defecting and there is also the question of accessibility to go through the process of inspection and release from the defect. In essence, as I understand it, what happens is that, a defect notice is issued (that is, a vehicle is inspected; it might be at a weighing station, it might be picked up on the side of the road, it might be in the station, in its usual depot, for example; in any event, there are certain powers of access to inspect these vehicles).

If a defect notice is issued, then, except in a limited capacity, the vehicle is taken off the road, and the vehicle has to be inspected by an authorised officer in South Australia, who will then identify if there has been a remedying of the defect, such as changing the mud flap, or whatever the issue is that is defective. The problem is that the inspection depot for heavy vehicles is in Adelaide and, from there, periodically some of the officers at the depots go out to regional areas—to the Riverland, I think to Peterborough—

Mr Whetstone: Coober Pedy.

Ms CHAPMAN: —Coober Pedy, Mount Gambier; obviously to various regional centres around the state. At those places there are usually some facilities, which are either shared, leased or owned perhaps by the department, where people can bring their trucks. They can make a booking, they take their vehicle in and then they can have it checked off.

The problem is this: first, if you live in regional South Australia, where a lot of these trucking operations are based, they either have to take their trucks down to Adelaide or wait until somebody

comes out to them. Then they have to be able to book the space, and then hope that they can get in. That does not happen the next day; that might happen once a month.

What I am told is that the bigger operators—again, those that have somebody there to manage all of this—block book an afternoon or a day or a week or whatever it takes to have their vehicles that have been defected attended to. Obviously, as efficiently as that can be done, they then whiz them through to try to be relieved of that, have it certified that the defect has been remedied, and they can get back on the road.

But the weeks of loss of productivity of a vehicle, which is worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, not to mention the about \$30,000 a year just to register it and to keep it on the road, and the loss of income maybe for the driver, who would otherwise be out there earning a living, if they are paid at that rate, or the loss to the employer if they have to pay them anyway and they are not on some arrangements where they are paid according to the shifts they work. There are losses all around.

So, when I read a piece of *Hansard* which tells me, 'This is an important initiative, this national scheme, because it is going to be increasing productivity for an industry,' and I know that we are transferring what we have in law to a national regulator but we are still going to be implementing back here in the same way, it does not fill me with joy. I despair at the fact that there does not seem to be any remedying of what is actually happening out there.

So, what can be done? Obviously, we have to have some inspectorate, some sort of authorised officer, to undertake it. If you have a rule that says that something has to be done, you usually have to have somebody to follow it through, unlike marine parks, where you can set up all of the rules and then not have anybody to enforce them. Anyway, the basic principle of having a legal structure, for all the reasons that are meritorious in terms of safety and the like, you actually have to have someone to enforce it; we accept that.

But isn't it about time that the government understood that the imposition of the process here is cumbersome, expensive and unnecessary. The reason for that is that even our neighbours next door (and I had some briefing on this from the Victorian situation) do not require their trucks to necessarily have to go to these designated points. They actually authorise people who are in the field, who are experienced and who are qualified to be able to identify whether there has been a defect and what is necessary to remedy it, in enterprises and businesses which are scattered all around Victoria.

So, instead of insisting that they go to Regency Park or the main truck station, or waiting weeks and weeks to actually have an appointment at one of the regional offices spread out around South Australia, in Victoria they actually let you go down to the local authorised representative, who might be in private business, where they tick it off; the truck gets back on the road, and everyone is happy. It really does disturb me that we are perpetuating a system which is not efficient, and which hopefully will not take hold in other states, because it seems that they are way head of us in this regard.

I do not want you to take my word for it. During the course of a number of consultations, I met with South Australian Road Transport Association (SARTA) representatives and other stakeholders and discussed what they mean by 'unreasonable defects'. For some reason, I do not have the defect notice that I wanted to refer to with me, but I have the letter that was sent by an operator to SARTA about what happens out there in the real world.

The letter is dated 25 February 2013, and was in response to a defect notice that had been issued by an employee of the department's enforcement group. I was provided with a copy of the certificate of roadworthiness and the defect notice (which I seemed to have misplaced) but I think you will get the gist of what the complaint is when I read this letter. He writes: 'Attention Steve Shearer', who is the chief executive officer of SARTA, and states:

Dear Steve,

Hope this day finds all well.

I have a problem I hope you can help me with, or point me in the right direction of someone who can.

Last Wednesday, 20th of February, we had a truck booked in to be inspected at Renmark inspection station for a roadworthy certificate and B Double rating.

The truck, a Freightliner Argosy having done 350,000km, is in excellent condition mechanically as I am meticulous with my fleet.

To get to the point, I am disgusted with the inspector, who failed this vehicle, and I feel something must be done to stop this crap with this inspector.

Item 1 A speed limiter report was done at William Adams in Mildura. He said he wanted a South Australian limiter report. What is the reason for this?

Item 2 The seatbelt was not frayed to the extent of having to be replaced and even in cars you sometimes have to jerk once or twice to retract.

Item 3 Odometer does work correctly, he has no idea of the workings of this computer and dash system in these Freightliners and to say the odometer is not visible is absolute rubbish.

Item 4 The centre drive mudflaps are original to the truck and have passed the test before from new and other inspectors. Bob tail these flaps were 210mm from the ground, whereas the rear was replaced and 150mm from the ground.

Item 5 On the engine mounts the way the rubber is moulded they have a seam in the middle which makes them look torn but they are not.

Item 6 One loose bolt on the cross bars between the fuel tanks, what crap!!

None of the things listed are relevant to the vehicle roadworthiness and through your group I want to take this matter further and get some reality when doing these inspections, not by amateurs with a 'I will cos I can' attitude.

I went into the inspection centre to ask why and was greeted by inspector 131 who, when I asked if he was a mechanic or what qualifications he had, replied 'I have been through the automotive industry', what that means I don't know.

In closing, I could go on forever—

Something has to be done with this sort of thing to get proper inspectors who know what its all about and not this 'shit' that is going on.

The vehicle has 350,000km on the clock and is not a threat on the road, especially with this sort of rubbish by this inspector!

We have since had the vehicle roadworthied elsewhere without any problems and it is now registered in another state.

By the way, I asked why the mudflaps had to be 200mm and was given the DTEI Spray Suppression Manual, which originates in London UK! Yeah England! And it was brought out in May 2007, bit old!!

Regards

X

I think that is a pretty frank assessment of obviously how he felt about the inspection and the lack of qualification, and I have a copy of the certificate of roadworthiness that ultimately flowed in respect of this vehicle. I cannot make any assessment myself as to whether that was a reasonable complaint, because I do not know the vehicle, I did not inspect it and I am not qualified to identify whether it was reasonable or not, but this is symptomatic of the sort of complaint that I was getting across South Australia from people who were frustrated by a process which seemed to be, as the cumulative examples came to me, more and more concerning.

The statement in this instance is from someone in what I would describe as a medium-sized business—again, hardly as big as the South-East ventures or Lindsay Fox's operation, but it was a medium-sized business. This is someone who is purported to have been in the industry for a long time and presented to me as having some pride in the level of safety with which he operated his trucks and claimed that he had not been in any level of suspension or disqualification from operating his business. In other words, he is an all-round decent, experienced operator.

They get to this level of frustration to write to their representative body to try to get some relief. It is no comfort to me to think that all of this process is still going to go on without us relieving it and fixing it up when we are looking at a national scheme. I do not know what the immediate answer is to this. I have canvassed it with other colleagues in the parliament and, clearly, those who represent country areas and have had experience in heavy vehicle transport operations have also expressed concern.

Again, it is not to the extent of saying, 'Look, we have to try to arrest this bill. We have to try to stop it now before it gets translated into the federal arena, and it might even get worse.' It seems to me that there has been a failure to recognise that there are consequences to real businesses, real families, real jobs and real livelihoods out there as a result of what appears to be overzealous enforcement and a regime of relief from that enforcement by the release on defect notices in an overprescriptive and limited access to people who are expert to do it.

I am told that just recently there was a review done by a private mechanical business of one of the trucks of one of the operators that I spoke to who actually had their certificate prepared by somebody in Victoria. They presented it back to the South Australian police officer and it was accepted at the local level as having remedied the defect sufficiently to allow it to operate. What a sensible, pragmatic way of resolving the matter. Perhaps it just took a sensible police officer in a country town to take the administrative position to remedy it and deal with something. Otherwise, the consequence for a particular operator was to take the vehicle to Adelaide, as I say, line up to get the booking—

Mr Whetstone: Book it in.

Ms CHAPMAN: That's right; book it in first, and go down there and go through all that process. Thank goodness for people out there who seem to be acting in a pragmatic way. Quite possibly, he did not comply with all of the processes of obligation that are prescribed for how these issues are dealt with, but it sounded like plain common sense to me and something that the government should get a bit active in ensuring that they allow for.

If we are going to go into a federal system, for goodness' sake, apart from just hanging on to the powers and offences that we protect as perfect and beneficial to our own, at least learn a bit from what is happening interstate when you go into this regime to give us a chance of picking up some beneficial outcomes from this whole exercise.

One of the things that I would ask the government to look at is material that is published by the Victorian Department of Transport under a trading name of some description (I call it VicRoads). It has its own manager, but I assume it is under the jurisdiction of the equivalent transport department in Victoria. They publish an excellent manual of helpful information for truck operators.

I have not seen anything similar to it in South Australia, but it is a helpful document to take. Not everybody can sit there on their iPad in their truck to check up certain rules or obligations, or mass limits for a B-double, or whatever issue they need to check on or, indeed, in the middle of the night they have to check back at the office headquarters if they are closed to get advice on a particular regulatory obligation.

I think the material that is published by VicRoads could be helpful for us to learn from and it would be worthwhile following through. The reason I particularly mention this is because, separate from compliance and enforcement problems that I have highlighted, especially around the defect process, another matter that has come to my attention is the failure to resolve the first mile-last mile process.

For those who are not familiar with what I am referring to, essentially there are rules that say that vehicles of a certain size, weight or mass are not able to travel on certain roads without a permit. My understanding is that this is necessary to ensure that you have got safe access on the roads, that the vehicle is not too heavy for a bridge, for example, that there is room on the road for other vehicles to use it and that it is not dangerous.

Big vehicles, especially loaded up, may cause some damage to the road, public property, trees, or branches along the side of a road unless this process is in place. In essence, as I understand what happens, usually this is an issue in country South Australia when vehicles try to go down a road to access a property, which might be a primary producer.

In the first mile of that journey going into the premises, it may be that the truck needs to go off a main road which might be sealed and very safe and suitable for heavy transport. It might need to go down a dirt track or over a little bridge or a crossing and then go onto a property and pick up its load of sheep, wheat or grapes and the like. The local council says, 'We're responsible for that road and we don't think it's appropriate that the truck goes down that road, so we're not going to give approval.'

The second area, which is often called 'the last mile issue', is where the truck driver needs to go into the town to go to the silo at the port, for example, and unload their wheat and they need to go down a certain route to get to the depot or the silo. Often in towns or regions where there is regular produce with a seasonal supply, there is a sealed road and that is a fairly high standard road. There is a dedicated road and the local council who might be responsible for the roads in the town advises the truck operators, who may be transport operators or owner/operators.

A lot of farmers now have their own vehicles, so they might be very small-scale transporters but they transport their own product and they have a seasonal fleet that they use. The

council has worked out where it is safest to traverse the town and what route they should go down so that they cause minimal disturbance to retailers or patients in a hospital or children in a school or a childcare centre or somebody reading something in the library—we still have libraries in the country; that is fortunate.

They work out where there is minimum inconvenience or disturbance to other activity in the town and where there is a safe place to travel and presumably make some assessment about whether the vehicle is going to cause any damage to the road surface or other improvements that it might traverse. If the council does not provide consent for a vehicle to go over a particular road, then the process, as I understand it, has been that the department is asked to try to negotiate some kind of outcome to let them do it or impose some conditions to reduce the size of the load or whatever to be able to traverse a certain area.

Over the time I have covered transport matters, I have had some helpful advice from senior people in the Department of Transport as to how they do that and they try—I think, quite fairly, and I can only accept that that is what occurs—not to override a decision of the council but work with the council as to how you can have a win-win. Obviously a lot of the country towns' councils have mixed obligations. They might have a very noisy group of parents at the school who say, 'We don't want the truck coming down this road,' and they try to work with them to make sure that there is a win-win outcome for the town and the producer and so on.

If there is no resolution at that stage, what happens? Let me tell you what happens out in the real world. What happens is that they go down these roads anyway. That is the truth of it. It is absolutely absurd to think that we have this whole process which is now being formalised in this legislation to try to remedy this issue. They are going to formalise the process so that where there is a refusal and the attempt to negotiate falls apart, there is to be a process of review and then the minister can have a look at it. There has to be approval from the new regulator to be able to go through this process, so we are going to formalise what has been an informal arrangement.

It seems, though, that we are not going to add to it or fix it up when there is no resolution. It just seems that there is going to be an autocratic decision at the end where the minister either agrees or disagrees and he or she will have the final say. There is no appeal to the District Court or any process through which you can get relief. You are just at the behest of the minister. You do wonder sometimes why we go through all this process to fix an ill, to cure an ill. I am not certain that it is going to be any better.

Time and again, I would speak to people who operate the trucks, sometimes their own local truck. They would be loading up with a whole lot of wheat, barley, or something, to move and they need to go from certain paddocks to another and they might traverse a local council-controlled road and, because the local council says, 'You can't use that road,' they might have to go thousands of acres around, kilometres more, to go onto another road to be able to traverse paddocks and load up and do the whole exercise again. I can tell the parliament that the information that has come to me is they do not do that. They just open cocky's gate, move the truck through, shut the gate, go and get what they have to and leave.

Here is the danger with doing that. First, they can be caught and prosecuted. Secondly, there could be a very good reason why it might create some danger, namely, the vehicle might take up a whole lot of space on a small road, there may be an accident with another vehicle that comes along the road that hits it and we have got all sorts of questions about liability. All around, it is not acceptable that we have a situation where, I would suggest, there is not over-vigilant enforcement of this because nobody wants to do anything about it. The attempt to do it in this bill I think is clumsy at best and is more onerous to the people who might be aggrieved by decisions that are made at local council level or, of course, if the authority that determines access to the road or whatever conditions are set is a state body, then the state rejects access to a road.

These things may seem to be small to many of us standing here who do not appreciate that, all day, these truck drivers are having to traverse, pick up loads, take them, empty them, go to another property and pick up their load and move on, and the like, but there is no real assistance or relief under this proposal and it is more cumbersome and, I would suggest, will be more costly, and I think it is still very concerning.

The other aspect is the regulation of heavy transport that will be dealt with under the model law according to the Road Traffic Act to be amended to only cover light vehicles. However, the drink and drug driving, careless and dangerous driving, excessive speed and Australian road rule

requirements will continue to apply to heavy vehicles as well as light vehicles under the Road Traffic Act.

I would just like to raise another aspect of the enforcement and the defect process. I have had the interesting role of covering transport on behalf of the opposition and one of the things that occurred to me is that, whilst there is a vigilant regime of regulation for heavy transport to be safe on our roads (obviously, so we do not cause carnage and damage to others and property), some of the basis for the defects that we refer to as being the subject of complaint in the over-zealous enforcement might be something as small as a mark on a mudguard.

Obviously, there could be bolts missing or rigs that can move around or aspects of a chassis that could come loose or loads could dismantle and cause a major problem—they are the obvious ones—but I just ask the government, and particularly the minister, to take into account what his government is doing with their heavy transport and what standards they set themselves.

To the best of my knowledge, the government do not own big fleets of heavy vehicles anymore because they do not actually do building maintenance and various things anymore, but they do have lots of buses. The Minister for Transport shares transport services responsibility with a second minister, but the government have a fleet of buses that they used to own, many of which they still do, that they lease now to private operators to put on the road.

Members will be familiar with the grandstanding contributions by the Premier on an almost daily basis about how proud he is of the infrastructure build of his government, for all of the reasons he claims as meritorious. In any event, as a result of, for example, the electrification of trains to the south, there are a number of other buses that are now being used by the government to provide the transport services to people who live in the south.

As I understand it, under the Minister for Transport Services, in the public arena, those that they have had in reserve or that might have been a bit old have sort of been brought back into service to fill the need while the trains are out of action.

Of all the buses that we see on the roads, I would just ask members to have a good look next time they are out on North Terrace or King William Street at the rows of buses that are lined up and just have a little look at those and the condition that they are in, and then observe them take off and have a good look at how they are operating, and, if they have got time, have a word to some of the passengers who are expected to travel on these buses, particularly those used as replacement services.

There is a list of things that I alone have observed. I am not someone who usually watches buses, but this is a list that I have made. There is body damage to the paintwork and to the body of the bus which has not been fixed—usually called a 'dent'—there are faded numberplates and there are, of course, the smoky buses.

I am talking about buses that have got exhaust facilities at the top of them that steam out grey dust of some description. I do not know what it is. It is some sort of smoke or dust. I am told it is oil burning because there is oil leaking in these things. These things are so prolific in the amount of dust coming out or smoke or whatever it is, they should be used for a climate change ad or something—they are so bad. Do not stand behind it when you are actually trying to see this.

There are rear and front lights that are not working. Any number of these would just take a truck off the road, but not in our buses. There was gaffer tape on the rear end of one bus, which was to hold a piece of something to the rear end of the body. There were buses that were not running on all cylinders and were sitting crooked. There were air bags failing. There were doors not shutting, or opening, and forcing passengers to get out of one or other of the exit doors.

But wait for it: I got one letter of complaint—I did not actually observe this myself—from somebody who was furious that, in inclement weather, in which they took their umbrella to the local bus station to catch the bus, when they got on the bus, they had to use their umbrella again. Why? Because the bus was leaking. I ask you, why is it that we place such an onerous level of responsibility on heavy transport truck operations and their drivers and employees—reading all these teams of manuals, doing all these things are expected of them, high levels of training, every piece of their vehicle has to be in absolute top condition—and yet here in Adelaide I can see hundreds of buses travelling around South Australia in a disgusting state, not to mention the fact that they are filthy, or I have complaints that they are not on time, and all those other things. This is the very state of buses that are actually driving around with people in them. I am not talking about

boxes or cartons or cattle or a driver, I am talking about other members of the public, who are sitting in these vehicles which are clearly below standard.

I just think the government needs to take a good look at itself, particularly the Minister for Transport Services or the Premier, and get this thing sorted out and work out who is going to be in charge of these issues, because we have not only had a year of all the issues relating to bus contracts, but now we have public transport vehicles—heavy transport vehicles—owned by the government, which is supposed to be the regulator and the safety barons for the protection of the public, that are substandard vehicles driving around in our very streets, full of people. I think it is disgraceful and that the government needs to understand that it can make all rules in the world for the rest of the world, but it needs to stand by its own standards.

The final thing I wish to address is the fact that Mr Steve Shearer, and others representing several of the stakeholders, including the South Australian Road Transport Association, and the national body, the Australian Trucking Association (ATA), together with some other entities, have pointed out, crystal clear, what the problem is.

The problem is this: it became evident during the debate up to the December parliamentary sessions in Queensland for the national law that a couple of issues were unresolved. One of them was this first mile, last mile issue, and how they could actually come to some landing about how it could work.

Another area was described to me as the 'five-star concept' and the absolute concern that this would introduce a new level of bureaucracy if it were introduced. I do not know what is required under the five-star system, but as I understand it, at least, it is a new form of accreditation, an extra layer of accreditation—I am presuming for the actual vehicles rather than the drivers, but I am not familiar with the detail of it.

What the government has hastened to do around the Australian Trucking Association as the peak national body, to try to keep them happy about their concerns about the introduction of this new accreditation program, is say, 'Look, what we are going to do is this. We realise that there are some concerns. We realise that we have not properly dealt with this, so we are going to set up a committee and we're going to work through this with industry and we are going to have some dialogue about this. So don't worry. Put the legislation through. Everything will be fine and we can nut these minor matters out.'

As time went on, we found that it did not quite work that way; there had not really been some resolution. Apparently even the representation of South Australia on this committee to try and work through these minor matters was suddenly disenfranchised in some way. I do not have all of the detail in front of me, but I am concerned that the tenure and tone of what had been an embracing of a new regulatory reform by SARTA and ATA were melting into disrepair as we spoke over the last couple of months. That level of goodwill or expectation that minor matters could be nipped out and dealt with in the regulations—that type of talk—had soured into a very unhappy situation.

I received some fairly scathing commentary about what happened and with it was a concern raised that it seemed that Queensland was taking control and that, far from being a national scheme where there would be general recognition and representation, it was starting to be a bit of a takeover. There were secret meetings going on between different parties in the Eastern States, and basically the situation was, 'We don't give a toss about what's happening in South Australia.' That is certainly what was being presented to me.

This is not the way it is supposed to work. The way it is supposed to work when you have a national regulator is that you have accountability to each of the ministers under this model around the country, because there are different regimes. The enforcement is supposed to be at a local level, and we are supposed to have some kind of dialogue, or the machinery upon which the dialogue can occur to deal with issues as they come about.

There had been a plea by SARTA for weeks, apparently, to the minister's office to even have a meeting to try and nut this out. I don't know whether in the last week they have had a meeting, but I can tell you the tenure of what was presented to me was scathing about the refusal to even deal with these issues. It is bit like saying: 'Well listen, we have given you what you want. You have got a national regime, so don't come whingeing to us about the detail of it. We will deal with that. Don't come to us with these pesky little issues that you have suddenly identified are a problem, because we are going to give you what you want—go away.'

That is just not acceptable. I think that it is important that, in the time that the government will have, clearly, as we debate this—and now, as other jurisdictions have not pushed it through in a hurry, we have got some time to deal with it—it is incumbent on the government, and in particular the minister, to sit down with industry, if he is genuine about saying—as I have heard him say at conferences for truck drivers and operators—that he is keen to listen, that he is keen to talk about these issues and make sure that we have something that works, it is a win-win for everybody including the viability of the enterprises that are at risk and are under regulation for this.

I do not get what are actually scathing statements. I am not going to read them today although I am tempted to, but I give the minister the opportunity, in the course of the adjournment of this debate, to sit down and genuinely try and sort these issues out. Joint industry means joint industry, not every other state or every other Eastern State and do not give a toss about South Australia. I do not even know whether Tasmania gets a look in here, to be honest; it probably does not. We do not care what it does, because it probably does not have too many trucking industries that traverse the country, but I daresay it has heavy vehicles that go back and forth on shipping vessels to Tasmania, but I am not here to bat for Tasmania.

I make the point that our ministers here are supposed to be for us, and it is not good enough to simply go off to these COAG meetings, sign up thinking, 'This is a great idea, beaut; yeah, we'll do all this and we'll do this national thing and everything will be happy, harmonious, cheaper, simpler', blah, blah, blah—the usual. That is not good enough. These issues have to be sorted out. It is bad enough that we do not get other regulations in detail before we have legislation, but it is simply not acceptable that some of these key issues are not resolved and given some consideration.

There will always be compromise; there will be some issues where South Australia does not get its way, and I accept that. But to exclude people from the process of even having the opportunity to contribute to a regime under which they are going to be culpable, liable and responsible is unacceptable—if they are to be excluded from the tent. I am sure that there will be other magnificent contributions made on this debate, and I will listen with interest and continue my learning on this most important industry in this state.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:45): I rise to speak on the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Bill and to echo the comments of the deputy leader, the member for Bragg. Obviously, this bill is an attempt to create a national scheme for regulation of heavy vehicles. On our national roads, it seeks to provide clarity to owners, operators and drivers of heavy vehicles, and it seeks to enhance efficiency and productivity through having similar provisions operating across all state borders.

One thing that has concerned me is that, after speaking to many heavy vehicle operators, businesses, owners, drivers, the people who are loading the heavy vehicles, they all think that by harmonising national legislation, everything will be fixed; everything will be alright. Many of them have isolated issues. Many of the operators feel that South Australia is almost becoming, to some extent, a backwater with regard to compliance, whether it be registration, inspection, roadworthiness or defect notices—I guess what you would call the similarity between one inspector and another. It is about getting permits to travel across borders.

But it is not just about travelling across borders; it is about the permits that have to be issued. I have manufacturing businesses up in my electorate of Chaffey that are large stainless steel tank makers. Not only do those tank makers have to get permits for crossing borders and permits for certain heights but they have to get permits for the individual electricity suppliers. So, every time they go through the jurisdiction of one power supplier, they have to get a permit for that power supplier. Then when they go into the next jurisdiction of a power supplier, they have to get another permit. It is just myriads of complexities and complications; it is just barriers to doing business, and it is added costs.

There is so much frustration that I am hearing out there in the transport world. Many people are saying, 'Just sign the agreement. Get it over and done with, and we'll be happy to get on with life.' But it is not that simple. Listening to some of their concerns and looking at the bill, it is not just that we are going to fall into place with all of the other states and everything will be fine.

As the member for Chaffey, I welcome any attempt to simplify the regulatory burdens placed on owners and drivers of heavy vehicles. One needs to drive only a couple of hours out of the city to understand and appreciate the importance of what the heavy vehicle sector means to South Australia and its production capabilities.

For instance, the Sturt Highway, which takes you right through the middle of my electorate, carries 10,000 vehicles a day, and 33 per cent of those vehicles are trucks. Those trucks are primarily on their way from Adelaide to Sydney or from Sydney to Adelaide. Mildura is one of the main stopover points when it comes to that journey. It seems that we are going to have to fall in with national compliance or a national law; it is about the ever-increasing numbers of trucks we see on the roads.

I live on the Sturt Highway, the federal highway from Adelaide to Sydney, and I see the ever-increasing number of trucks, I see the ever-increasing regularity of those trucks going past. It shows me that the heavy vehicle industry is going to be front and centre for logistically moving goods, whether it is moving harvest products, dry freight, or livestock. I have it all come past my gate and I see it on a regular basis.

Again, I have a lot of those transport and logistics companies in my electorate, and I also have a lot of friends that have large operations, in all states—Western Australia, here in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales—and we regularly talk about the barriers to doing business, the issues with compliance, and the issues with dealing with their workforce.

The chain of responsibility is something that is of real concern: when a driver is pulled over for speeding, drugs, or any particular reason, the owner of that truck and business is not notified. The owner of that truck and business is only notified if that driver reoffends—if the owner of that truck or business happens to go up and want to have a look in his logbook. So, that is one of the issues with the chain of responsibility.

Through the course of my contribution, I will touch on a few of the issues that again raise their ugly heads to the owners of these heavy vehicles and to the owners of the businesses. More importantly, it is about them getting their truck to the destination on time. As the member for Bragg has said, we have come a long way, particularly in the last five years, with that chain of responsibility, with the business owners having to monitor where their trucks are every step of the way.

I think it is a great network that they are falling into line with now. Most of the larger owners have a screen, a computer, and all the readouts that come onto their phones or into their offices, and they know whether the truck driver is in transit; they know what speed he is doing; they know what revs he is doing; and in some cases they even know what tyre pressures the trucks have. So, technology is a wonderful thing, but it has to be used in a way that can be for the benefit of the industry.

I think what we are seeing at the moment is that we are moving for the betterment of the industry. It is essentially cleaning up what was regarded for a long time as a cowboy industry. It was regarded as hell on wheels in a lot of instances. I remember, as a younger fellow—I am still young, but I was younger—trucks would whiz past you on the highway. You would have fellows who jumped out of a truck in a pair of thongs and a pair of Stubbies and that was it, and they would drive for days on end. Who knows how they were doing it, but it was to the detriment of the safety of people on the road.

I think, as the industry is becoming more—I would not say 'regulated', but is being held responsible for its actions, it has come of age. The organisations that use national carriers are now asking for more compliance and responsibility with every load that is a part of their chain of responsibility. That responsibility comes with the technology and comes with compliance.

We have to have this industry as clean as a whistle so that that chain of responsibility is not carried on down the line. These big multinationals cannot have any slurs against their name. They cannot have any mud sticking on their name because it is a bad look; it is bad for advertising, it is bad for the consumer, and these days it is all about the image with any business that operates.

Obviously heavy vehicles are important in South Australia with all the food and wine-producing regions, as well as for livestock and grain. We have a very limited amount of rail in this state and the rail infrastructure is getting old. If the trucking industry moved as slow as what some of the rail industry does, with the compliance of the rail lines and the infrastructure in place, the trucking industry would be put off the tracks.

We have rail networks in my electorate, but we have speed restrictions. We are not allowed to use the rail line over 32 degrees. We are not allowed to go over 30 kilometres an hour in certain sections of the rail. How is that efficient? How is that compliant with today's rules and regulations?

If we look at what we are trying to achieve in the national heavy vehicle bill, I think it is chalk and cheese.

There are some lines that are presentable, and the member for Bragg and myself did visit one of the more prominent rail network organisations last week. They showed us the way that they are doing business, the way that they are training their drivers and the way that they are dealing with safety and compliance, and it is first class, but the infrastructure is what really bothers me. I know the infrastructure is not the train, like the truck is to the road, but there needs to be a reflection and, if we are looking at heavy vehicles, perhaps we need to look at trains as a heavy vehicle.

Trucks bring their produce to the market, the warehouse or the terminal—whether it is at the port, the silos or a holding pen—and it really does mean that we have to have the reliability, the compliance and the safety within the industry. We are looking at industries that are worth billions of dollars that are now relying on heavy vehicles on our highways. In my electorate, we transport nearly \$700 million worth of fresh fruit and vegetables a year, and there is \$7 billion worth of grain in this state per annum, let alone the livestock.

The cost of livestock is huge these days. I am sure everyone here has been to the butchers and their jaw drops when they look at the price of lamb or any of the livestock products. It is now an industry that is looking for that transport or truck to be compliant and squeaky clean, and to pick up the produce on time and be at the market, the next warehouse or the next port of call on time. That is why I think the national law must very much be a national regime. There cannot be a little bit of, 'It's okay in this state and it will work okay.' I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

POLICE (GST EXEMPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Wednesday 3 July 2013 at 11:00.