

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 1 March 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I would like to welcome today students from Encounter Lutheran College to parliament. Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We hope they enjoy their visit to parliament, learn something from us here today and have a look at the grille in Centre Hall before they leave.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: UNCONVENTIONAL GAS (FRACKING) FINAL REPORT**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key:

That the 119<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Unconventional Gas (Fracking) in the South-East of South Australia Final Report, be noted.

(Continued from 30 November 2016.)

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:04):** I am still waiting to speak on the interim report, and I think I am now speaking on the final report.

*The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I doubt whether I will ever get to it. It matters not whether I speak on the interim report or the final report. I welcome the final report. As I have often said in this place, I think some of the best work that the parliament does is done by our committees, and this one has done an excellent job. It was an onerous task to go about and take evidence from a large number of people with a wide variety of views and considerable passion.

The report I think is thoughtful in its findings and recommendations. It did not go quite as far as I thought it might, but that does not surprise me given the nature of the make-up of the committee. I thought the committee may have recommended a moratorium be set in the South-East for a period to allow more public discussion and a greater understanding of what is still, certainly for the people of the South-East, relatively new technology.

I do not mind saying, and I have said this publicly in the South-East, that I have no fears about the fracking technology. Personally, I have no fears. I do not think that particularly the water resources of the South-East or any other parts of the environment in the South-East would be impacted adversely if fracking were undertaken in the region. Notwithstanding that, my community, I believe, feels quite differently. The community that I represent, I think quite strongly has serious reservations. Over a number of years now, I have been going around to meetings and opportunities I have had to meet people in my local electorate. I have expressed my views that I do not think fracking poses any threat or danger to the region; notwithstanding that, the community has come to a different view.

I came to the conclusion, after doing that for a number of years, that it was not my job as the local member to change the mind of my community. That, I believe, is the job of those who would propose to undertake fracking in the South-East; that is, the proponents, if there are any, intending to utilise that technology sometime in the future. It is their job, in my opinion, to prove the case that

the technology would provide no risk particularly to the watertable, which is a very valuable resource of the South-East and of the state as a whole.

The company Beach Petroleum came to the South-East and put down two exploratory wells. I thought it was very provocative of them to put down one of those wells during the election campaign in the run-up to the 2014 election. It was a provocative move. It gave those who would oppose fracking a wonderful opportunity and a great deal of media to sell their case. Beach Petroleum, on the other hand, failed absolutely to make any inroads into selling their case.

I met with Beach Petroleum. They gave me a briefing on what their intent was and what they were wanting to do. Over a period of time, I believe I had several meetings with them and made a few contacts. I had given them some advice about the nature of what I thought they needed to do in the South-East and then, lo and behold, a drilling rig turned up in December or January, only a few months before the last election. Obviously, in the heat of an election campaign, there is opportunity for all sorts of people to get out and make all sorts of statements, and that indeed occurred.

Beach Petroleum I think made several fatal errors in that process. One was, as I said, the provocative—and that is a word I use quite deliberately—drilling campaign at that particular time. The other error is that they failed totally to get around to the community and explain the technology they were thinking about using. Certainly, at that time they were not proposing to undertake fracking: they were investigating to see whether the fracking technology would be beneficial.

Indeed, my understanding is that they learned several things from the work they did, and one was that, yes, at some stage fracking may be beneficial to the extraction of natural gas in the South-East, and the other thing they learned from that process, and it is my understanding, was that there is a significant amount of gas to be harvested in the region utilising conventional gas extraction methods. They found a lot more gas in the sands overlaying the bedrock—the source material, the shales at great depth—which has not been tapped at this stage.

They believe they can tap that gas, and I believe the next investment in gas production in the South-East will be in conventional gas production with no intent to undertake fracking. That would foresee the investment window for many years to come. In supporting the committee's report and its recommendations, I also put on the record that I personally do not have any fears about the technology but that I certainly support my community. They deserve the opportunity to have the people who propose the use of such technology do the work on the ground to convince the community.

I note that the Minister for Energy regularly has a go at the Liberal Party for coming out with the policy that we would impose a 10-year moratorium on fracking in the South-East if we came into government following the election just over 12 months away. I note that the Premier was recently in my electorate and quoted in *The South Eastern Times* as saying that fracking would not be undertaken in the South-East unless the community supported it—and that was in quotation marks. So, even the Premier of this government told that to the people of the South-East.

I do not know whether the Premier is telling the people of the South-East one thing when he is down there and his minister is saying something else to the people in Adelaide. I will leave the community to work that out for themselves. I can tell you that *The South Eastern Times* quoted the Premier as saying, 'Our policy is that there will be no fracking in the South-East unless the community are on side.' I am on the same page as the Premier on this.

The person who is on the wrong page, obviously, is the Minister for Mineral Resources. I can understand why he is on the wrong page—because he is locked into a position where this government for so many years has had an energy policy that has pushed renewables and tried to get rid of the historic methods of generating electricity here in South Australia—principally coal, but also gas.

As I interjected in question time yesterday when we were sitting in here and it was 30-something degrees outside, our consumption of electrical energy in South Australia was just under 1,960 or 1,970 megawatts, 600 of which was coming across the border through the Heywood Interconnector and at one stage another 140 was coming through the Murraylink Interconnector. So, between 700 and 800, which is getting towards half (over 40 per cent) was coming from Victoria, and what were the wind farms doing? What were they doing?

At one stage, when I was looking at the app on my iPad, they were producing a grand total of nine megawatts. The wind must have puffed a couple of windmills at one stage and I saw it get up to 13 megawatts out of almost 2,000. Anybody who seriously thinks that the problem with energy reliability in South Australia has anything to do with anything other than the fact that we have driven out coal-fired generation and we are in the process of driving out gas-fired generation has not really looked at the issue. We are in dire straits. Until this minister gets out of his delusional position, we are not going to move forward. Unfortunately, I have run out of time and I have to conclude my remarks there.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:14):** After two years of work, the Natural Resources Committee concluded its inquiry. I note that we issued a media release on 29 November talking about the inquiry. One of the reasons for putting out the interim report, members will remember, was the huge number of people who made submissions to the inquiry. I think that at that stage of the interim report we had 178 written submissions.

We thought that, because we knew this was going to be a long inquiry, particularly with our committee's commitment to making sure that we visited the South-East, as well as receiving submissions here in Parliament House, it was important to acknowledge the great work done by so many people for our inquiry. I agree with the member for MacKillop that it would have been nice to deal with the interim report and now the final report, which we are talking about, but that is the way it is.

I want to remind members of the recommendations of the report. We said—and I think this is what the Premier was probably referring to, member for MacKillop—that without social licence unconventional gas exploration development should not proceed in the South-East of South Australia. The committee found that the social licence to explore/develop unconventional gas does not exist in the South-East of South Australia. At no time did I even imagine that we would suggest a moratorium. I hope that I made that very clear during the case that I did not think that was the answer.

Having had the opportunity to go to England just after we started the case, the member for Florey and I had the honour of speaking to the members of the Environmental Audit Committee of Westminster, where we were given a briefing on the difficulties the members of those committees, particularly the Environmental Audit Committee, had with the concept of fracking in the south of England. The decision they made at that stage was to hold a moratorium, which I think is now up, so it will be interesting to see what the next stage of that particular development is.

Also, I was aware, as was the committee, of suggestions for a moratorium in different parts of Australia. It was the committee's view (and particularly mine, I might add) that that was not the solution we were looking for, that we really did need to make up our minds about whether or not there was support for fracking in the South-East—and I emphasise the South-East. That does not mean that fracking is not something that we acknowledge elsewhere in South Australia and also Australia.

The other point we made, which I think is important to re-emphasise, is that, while the specific process of hydraulic fracturing or fracking in deep shale, properly managed and regulated, is unlikely to pose significant risk to groundwater, other processes associated with unconventional gas extraction, including mid- to long-term well integrity and surface spills, present risks that may need to be properly considered and managed. Furthermore, groundwater use in any unconventional gas extraction process in the South-East should be considered in relation to the existing Limestone Coast Prescribed Wells Area Water Allocation Plan (WAP) and other relevant regional WAPs.

I commend the other recommendations to the house. In closing, I want to thank all the people who spent time not only making submissions to the committee but also appearing as witnesses. We had at least 66 witnesses to our inquiry. We had a lot of support from members in both this house and the Legislative Council. I would particularly like to acknowledge the contribution of the member for Mount Gambier, Mr Troy Bell MP; the member for Hammond, Mr Adrian Pederick MP; the member for MacKillop, Mr Mitch Williams MP; and the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC. We also had the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC, who attended some of our hearings, supporting us at different stages. The committee does need to be commended. We worked very strongly together, and I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Encounter Lutheran. Unfortunately, their member is not here at the moment, but we all welcome them to parliament today and hope they have a good time looking around the building and learning things. We hope they go home and tell their mums and dads what a wonderful place parliament is.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: WORK RELATED MENTAL DISORDERS AND SUICIDE PREVENTION**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key:

That the 26<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Work Related Mental Disorders and Suicide Prevention, be noted.

(Continued from 16 November 2016.)

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:21):** I rise today to talk to the wonderful report done by one of the hardest working committees in the parliament, a committee I am very happy to continue to be on regardless of any other jobs that land in my lap.

This inquiry lasted quite a long time and saw a huge number of varied witnesses from across unions as well as lots of non-government sector people who came to give evidence to the inquiry into work-related mental disorders and suicide prevention. I propose to go through a couple of the recommendations and flesh them out in small detail to give us a better understanding of why we arrived at the decisions we did.

Recommendation 1 talks about asking the Attorney-General to commission an independent review of the South Australian Guide to Evaluation of Psychiatric Impairment for Clinicians (GEPIC). This is a model used to ascertain psychiatric impairment when defining how mentally impaired an individual is, especially in relation to an injury from a work-related cause.

We took a lot of evidence on the effectiveness of GEPIC, as a model, to put into a numerical form something that is inherently subjective and difficult to measure. I wholeheartedly support the review of the GEPIC measure, because we saw what we perceived to be a lot of inconsistency in the way that GEPIC, as a model, was applied. We saw situations where some people who had a much greater propensity to return to work had higher GEPIC scores than others for reasons unknown to the committee, which we did not quite understand, not being qualified psychologists.

This was based on scenarios put to us—'This is the scenario we put to you, but this is the score they came out with'—that showed there was a level of concern by the committee about how this was being implemented. I understand that regardless of what measure we try to put in place there will always be a level of subjectivity; it is not like a physical injury where, if you break a bone you can show that the bone is broken and you cannot use your arm.

When we are talking about psychological injury, it is much more difficult to measure. Still, I think there is much more work that needs to be done. There can be some greater transparency around how GEPIC scores are given, and hopefully that will give greater comfort to those who go through that process.

Recommendation 2 is probably the one I struggled with the most. Our committee, being a committee that likes to come to a consensus decision, did alter recommendation 2 and toned down the recommendation to call on the Minister for Industrial Relations to investigate the call for presumptive provisions for police and emergency services personnel who suffer prescribed mental disorders.

We have been through presumptive compensation for firefighters and CFS volunteers when they contract cancers. We did that because certain cancers show up potentially 10, 15 or 20 years after somebody has stopped being an active firefighter, and there is a reasonable body of evidence

that shows a level of causation between somebody being a firefighter and contracting one of these cancers. That link was well understood, so presumptive compensation for those cancers makes sense. Instead of going through what would be a difficult process to prove correlation and causation, a presumption is put in.

I felt that there was not the same level of evidence for our committee to come out and say that we need presumptive provisions for prescribed mental disorders when it comes to emergency services personnel. That is not to say in any way that our front-line police, emergency services staff and volunteers do not go out and see things and do things that lead them to suffer from mental disorder—not at all. But to presume that in every instance, as the new legislation says, the significant factor is work, is I think a step too far, and the evidence was not there to support it. I am comfortable with the recommendation as it stands to investigate the call to see if we can actually build a body of evidence that develops that tight causation, and I look forward to the response from the minister.

The other recommendations meld together around looking at ways to improve how people who work in high-risk industries where they are likely to come into contact with violent, dangerous, potentially scarring situations are dealt with. That is the crux of where our inquiry wanted to head and where we saw real issues.

Recommendations 11, 13, 19, 21, 23 and 24 all in some way deal with that, whether it be the Minister for Police commissioning a report into suicidal behaviour of police officers, which is an issue that I have talked to police officers about; commissioning an evaluation of the current psychological health programs; and SafeWork SA looking at promoting help-seeking behaviour in regard to encouraging industries around including mental health awareness in some of their new induction programs. That is probably one of the best recommendations we made because proactively and pre-emptively as part of an induction process is exactly the time to deal with it, so that businesses and workplaces can start to develop a culture of dealing with mental health illness when it arises.

Recommendation 19 was around commissioning an evaluation of the SA Police psychological health program and reporting the findings to us within 12 months. Recommendation 21 was around commissioning a review of the tasks undertaken by police service personnel and to identify those tasks that are likely to expose officers to reasonably foreseeable cumulative psychological harm. That again is at the heart of what we are seeking to determine: what are the actions and incidences that happen that are most likely to cause harm and what can we do to help minimise those effects?

We talked about asking the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to provide details of how workers in regional and rural areas are supported, given that there is an apparent lack of services outside urban areas and also to look into the Victorian Smart app and consider whether that is an effective early intervention tool to assist police officers and managers to deal with mental health concerns. In my new role in the area of police, corrections and emergency services, I have spoken to a number of people who have already looked into this report and said, 'Thank you,' because it highlights concerns they have been raising for a while.

I am fairly sure that the work we have done here is going to spur on further evaluation and analysis, hopefully by the ministers themselves and more broadly in the community. It is something we need to deal with. We ask our police officers to run into situations that we ourselves are running away from. We ask police, along with emergency services personnel, to attend road crashes where horrific scenes may end up scarring their minds.

In fact, an Australia Day award recipient in my local area who is a long-term CFS volunteer detailed, in broad terms, accidents that he had seen over his time as a volunteer firefighter. You could tell that they had left an indelible mark on him. Again, that shows that the people who are running into the things that the rest of us run away from need more help and that we should look after them.

I thank our hardworking committee that just gets on with the job, ably chaired by the member for Ashford. I also thank Sue Sedivy, our research officer, who never fails to seek out information that can help us with our reporting. All in all, it is a good working committee that is helping to move society forward in relation to how we deal with these issues.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:30):** I rise to speak to the 26<sup>th</sup> report of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, entitled 'Work related mental disorders and suicide prevention'. Certainly, since coming into this place I have become well aware of a broad range of issues that can occur due to work-related mental disorders. Before coming into this place, I was well aware of the issues facing our service men and women with post-traumatic stress disorder in the military forces, especially those who in more recent times have served overseas, whether it be in Afghanistan or Iraq.

I have talked about this matter before in this place. My brother was a warrant officer in Iraq during 2005-06 and he had a colleague of the same rank who rotated next to him on their six-month tours. He was, for want of a better word, one of the most bulletproof characters you could ever meet. Sadly, however, getting past the military psychologists, he succumbed to post-traumatic stress disorder and lost his marriage, lost his family and paid a huge price for his service. This former colleague of my brother is not alone. Our service men and women are to be admired for the job they do, not only those who work overseas but also those who work on home soil. I want to make sure that gets onto the *Hansard*.

In relation to other front-line workers on the domestic scene, whether they be police, nurses, firemen or Country Fire Service people, I am a member of the Country Fire Service, as many members are in this place and I have met and talked to people from some of the brigades, especially on the Dukes Highway at Coonalpyn. This is a crash brigade, a highway brigade, and they are involved in dealing with crashes on the Dukes Highway. Anyone who knows about highway crashes knows that they can be pretty terrible, especially when a couple of trucks come together and are burnt out and the only remains of the people inside are, sadly, burnt corpses.

These workers see some terrible things, such as vehicles that have gone under trucks. We also have suicides out there, where people have driven out of Adelaide for a couple of hours and decided to line up a truck that will end their life. It happens far too often. The volunteers in the Country Fire Service are people from the community, and it is also very traumatic for the local ambulance people who have to turn up and pick up the pieces.

I know of at least one person who has said, 'Look, I've got to step back for 12 months because I've seen enough for a while. Hopefully, I can get back and do this volunteer service.' Our paid professionals on the front line—nurses, doctors and police—see some very traumatic incidents, some involving life and death and others involving people having drug episodes, and other episodes they need to deal with, which obviously affect their mental health at the time and into the future.

Mental health and the workplace can go right across the board. I know MATES in Construction do great work in trying to combat suicide in the construction industry, which has one of the highest rates of suicide at an industry level. I have spoken about them in this place before and they do excellent work, they have excellent forums and excellent outreach programs to workers in construction to keep them on the right track. I think the problem may be related to the cyclical nature of construction work, where you have a big building program, then that drops off and all of a sudden there is no pay for a while and you are up against it with payments and so on.

That is just one example, but I believe it has an impact on mental health issues and suicide in the construction sector. My background is in farming and, sadly, it is one of those jobs that has always been linked to rural suicide. Too often, farmers feel isolated and alone, so it is good to see so many different groups operating. I know there is a Men's Shed group that meets regularly on a Friday just outside of Coomandook. There are so many other rural and urban Men's Shed places where people can go to have a chat.

Men's Shed is based around trades, but you do not have to go there and make anything; it is more about making conversation and knowing that there are other people you can talk to and relate to about anything. I think that is important, especially in rural areas. I know only too well from my own background that you can feel isolated at times, but it is only when you catch up with other people that you realise everyone has their issues.

It does not have to be just in a farming sense. It does not matter what occupation you are in, people have their issues. However, it can be accentuated in farming because people spend many, many hours on their own. They get up early, they do not even see the family and get back late. They

do that day in, day out during the busy seasons of seeding and harvest especially, and also when they have busy times, such as shearing and other jobs.

I would like to acknowledge the work of the suicide prevention networks. I am certainly involved at a local level with a network based in Murray Bridge. I think all the groups connected with that network are doing great work. I know Silent Ripples do postvention work helping people who have been bereaved by suicide, but there are also suicide prevention networks that have been set up in Sedan, up in Schubert, and throughout Coorong council areas like Taillem Bend and Meningie. I mentioned MATES in Construction earlier. They held forums in the South-East, but they have not just concentrated on the construction industry. They talked to their local audience, which obviously is mainly a farming community, about mental health issues and suicide prevention.

I know that in the report there is part of a speech by the Hon. John Dawkins, and it would be remiss of me not to mention his work both in this parliament and outside this parliament with regard to mental health and suicide prevention. His work has been exemplary. I know others work in these areas, but I know that John is highly dedicated to this cause and puts in a lot of time and effort, and I truly do commend him for that.

At all levels, we can never do enough and we must keep doing more. Sometimes it comes down to the fact that people need to realise that they are not alone and that they need to find someone and have a chat. It does not have to be directly about their issues, but it helps to just have a chat, settle down, realise that tomorrow is another day and work through them. I am certainly pleased to see that this fulsome report in regard to work-related mental disorders and suicide prevention has gone on, and I commend the report.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:39):** I would like to thank everyone for their contribution to today's debate about our report inquiring into work-related mental disorders and suicide prevention. I think the member for Schubert has covered the recommendations in a fair bit of detail, so I am not going to repeat or highlight those. I would also like to echo what the member for Hammond has said with regard to the Hon. John Dawkins. One of the reasons we started this inquiry all that time ago was to follow up on some of the inquiries John Dawkins had been making into work-related mental disorders and suicide prevention.

He really has made sure that this issue, which he has been campaigning on for such a long time, looks at paid work as well as some of the other areas that have been looked at with regard to suicide prevention and also mental health. As members would know, the prevention of psychological injuries and mental health is in the scope of the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. It places a primary duty of care on a person conducting a business or undertaking (PCBU), as far as reasonably practicable, to ensure that workers are not exposed to risks to their health and safety as a result of their work with the PCBU.

One thing that has come out of the extensive submissions and witness statements the committee received is one of the problems with the collection of data. I make this general point: ReturnToWorkSA no longer produces and publishes annual statistical data about workers compensation and trends, which is obviously of concern to our committee and also to policymakers in general. As much as I have made this plea before, I make it today because I think if we are serious about prevention and about assisting people who have the misfortune of being injured or becoming ill as a result of their work, then we really do need to have a proper profile.

I urge the government, and also ReturnToWork, to exercise its obligations under section 13(1) of the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994, which says that there needs to be a publication of information and statistics to make sure we have this information. Because workers compensation claims data is not the most reliable source for work-related mental injury or suicide, data in our report has been drawn up from a range of sources to assist with the understanding of the breadth and depth of this problem. I would particularly like to commend our executive officer, Ms Sue Sedivy, for the fabulous work she has done in trying to pull this very complicated report together.

What we do know at the moment is that psychological injury claims represent about 4 per cent of all the accepted claims—and I underline the word 'accepted'—but are responsible for five times more in costs and absence from work. Workers in their mid-career, aged 40 to 59, account

for 46 per cent of all psychological injury claims in South Australia. So, we do have some data and it does give us some indicators, but we really do want to go back to having the comprehensive information that policymakers and practitioners in the area can actually work from. I commend the report to the house and thank everybody who has been involved in its production.

Motion carried.

#### **ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO THE LABOUR HIRE INDUSTRY**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 93<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Labour Hire Industry, be noted.

(Continued from 19 October 2016.)

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:44):** I was reminded by the Clerk that I have three minutes left for my remarks, even though they are essentially finished, so I will take the opportunity to bring the house up to date on a couple of things. It is my sincere hope that the recommendations are adopted by the government. They are good recommendations.

I had the good fortune after the last time I spoke to be invited to Victoria by the Hon. Natalie Hutchins, the Minister for Industrial Relations in Victoria, for the launch of the results of their inquiry into the labour hire industry, which grew out of the same impetus as ours. Theirs was conducted by Professor Anthony Forsyth. It was a slightly different type of inquiry. It was not a parliamentary inquiry: it was done by a professor from RMIT. Their findings were essentially the same as ours. They chose to go down the path of implementing almost immediately a state-based scheme.

I am not entirely sure where that is up to, but they were certainly talking about implementing it immediately, or starting that process immediately, so I wish them the best of luck. As I said, I hope that our recommendations are adopted by the government, because they are good recommendations. Ours favour a federal system before a state system but anticipate the introduction of a state system if a federal system is not acceptable to the federal government, which I suspect it may not be.

With those remarks, I will hand over to the member for Schubert, who is champing at the bit. Before that, I want to thank the executive officer, Lisa Baxter, for all her hard work, and Kendall Crowe before her. They brought together what could have been a sprawling, wide-ranging inquiry and focused it and made it very worthwhile. I also want to thank Dr Gordon Elsey, our research officer. With that, I commend the report.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:46):** Unlike our wonderful occupational health and safety committee, unfortunately the Economic and Finance Committee could not come to a unanimous view on this report. First and foremost, in going through my remarks, I want to state that both sides agreed that there was an issue at hand. Both sides agreed that the stories we heard did outline improper and potentially illegal behaviour. We saw that, we heard the stories, and I think everybody was unanimously convinced that there is an issue there that needs to be solved.

I think we differed completely on what the solution is but, having said that, we cannot get away from the fact that there is an issue in the labour hire community. It is not the majority of labour hire providers that are a problem: it is a minority. Someone put the figure at somewhere between 5 and 10 per cent. It is a minority, but a large enough minority to show there is something there that needs to be done.

So, we have identified that there is a problem with potentially illegal behaviour happening. Workers are being exploited and underpaid. Workers are being housed inappropriately by their employers. Workers are not being given all their full entitlements. Labour hire companies are failing to pay WorkCover premiums and failing to pay superannuation and are doing so by essentially removing normal workers' entitlements and conditions. They are trying either to have a fantastic profit margin for themselves or pass on a lower and more competitive rate to the businesses that use their labour hire.

What this report sought to do was reduce this already illegal behaviour. The member for Little Para contends that, by introducing a licensing scheme, we are going to reduce the level of illegal behaviour that happens within the labour hire industry. The linking of those two ideas together



is where I take issue. Simply creating more red tape for those who already operate inside the law is not the answer in my view, because we already have the vast majority of the industry doing the right thing, so they are the ones more likely to get themselves licensed.

These dodgy operators, who most of the time rise and fall like the phoenix trying to keep one step ahead of the authorities who are seeking to prosecute them, are the businesses that are much more likely not to engage in a licensing scheme in the first place. What I think will happen is that we are going to see normal compliant firms have their regulation red-tape burden increased and noncompliant firms continuing to be noncompliant.

I think it would be a perverse outcome if we put the cost burden on those who do the right thing and provide a larger gap or incentive for host employers to use unscrupulous labour hire companies who, not having to bother themselves with licensing, will be able to provide a differentially cheaper rate from those who do the right thing.

We heard from a number of regulating bodies that attempt, in my view with varying levels of success, to have oversight over labour hire companies. They are: ReturnToWorkSA, in relation to the correct payment of premiums; RevenueSA; the Australian Taxation Office, in relation to taxation requirements; SafeWork SA, in relation to compliance with the Work Health and Safety Act; the Fair Work Ombudsman; the Australian Securities and Investments Commission; and the Department of Immigration and Border Protection—all bodies that, as part of their mandate, inquire into workers and ensure that businesses and labour hire companies comply with their obligations.

I want to bring into the debate, and for the benefit of the member for Little Para, an article that was in the *Sunday Mail* on 23 October 2016, entitled Look, No Licence. It stated that more than 1,400 motorists a month were being caught driving without a licence and creating potentially tragic consequences for public safety. What we have for driving is a licensing scheme that is designed in much the same way as the one the member for Little Para proposes for the labour hire industry, a licensing scheme that he believes will reduce criminal behaviour.

When it comes to driver's licences, we have a licensing scheme, but there are still people who engage in illegal behaviour by not having a licence and potentially flouting the law. The reason that we know that there are 1,400 people who have been caught driving without a licence is that the police caught them. That shows that the system works: the police caught the people who were doing the wrong thing. The act of having a licence did not in and of itself reduce illegal behaviour: it was the police enforcing the law as it exists that reduced the criminal behaviour.

I would say that in regard to the labour hire industry this is exactly the same approach we need to take. The act of licensing a labour hire company does not in and of itself change compliance. What changes compliance is the regulatory bodies that are supposed to enforce compliance actually enforcing compliance. That means that we need SafeWork SA, ReturnToWorkSA, ASIC, the Department of Immigration, RevenueSA, and everybody else whose job it is to make sure that illegal behaviour is brought to justice and fixed, to do their job, and they need to be given the resources in order to do their job. That is what will help reduce the illegal behaviour that exists within the labour hire industry, not a licensing scheme.

A licensing scheme is more red tape for the people who already do the right thing. I would be extremely frustrated, especially in relation to recommendation 2, which states that if the federal government does not go ahead with a licensing registration scheme we in South Australia could go it alone. In my view, what would happen in that scenario is that we would have a labour hire company setting up in jurisdictions where there is no licensing requirements, so that all we are doing is creating a burden on South Australian businesses compared with businesses interstate.

Fair enough, recommendation 1 does talk about the fact that the commonwealth should be implementing a licensing scheme for themselves but, as the member for Little Para pointed out, that is highly unlikely, so we are going to see a patchwork of licensing regulations across the country, and those low regulation jurisdictions are going to be the ones where those businesses are set up. If those businesses set up, they have no need in their own jurisdiction to be licensed: they provide labour to employers here in South Australia. It will be South Australian businesses that are punished, and that is not something I want to see happen, and that is why the member for Hartley and the member for Bright agreed with the minority report about the fact that a licensing scheme is wrong.

I think this is a fundamental difference between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party both here in South Australia and nationally: we want to get to the cause of the problem and deal with the problem that exists, rather than creating a whole new bureaucracy to wrap around the problem to make it look like we are doing something. The truth is that, if we were to have a licensing scheme in place, the only way that we would know that it was being enforced was if the regulatory bodies charged with the enforcement did their job, which they can do without a licensing scheme.

I sincerely hope that the government does not take up these recommendations to create increased burdens on the businesses of South Australia. As we all in this chamber know, we need more jobs in South Australia, not fewer, and we need to make it easier for employers to employ people in South Australia. Sure, they need to do the right thing when they employ people, but we should not make it harder for them to employ people.

I implore the government to look closely at the minority report, to see sense, to look at what works, as opposed to trying to look good and look like they are doing something about what works, so that we can all get on and look to a brighter South Australia that has fewer regulations and less red tape and deliver better outcomes for workers through increased compliance and hopefully create a few jobs in South Australia to keep our kids here at home.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.W. Key.

#### **NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: PINERY BUSHFIRES**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key:

That the 116<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Pinery Fire Regional Fact-Finding Trip, be noted.

(Continued from 28 September 2016.)

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:57):** The Pinery fire on 25 November 2015 was an awful day in the life of South Australia and a very awful day for the electorate of Schubert because it is the third time in three years that my electorate has burnt down. I was lucky enough to spend some time with the Natural Resources Committee, which was very good in inviting on the trip the local members whose areas were affected. We spent some time looking at revegetation projects. We spent some time on a farm looking at how they were trying to deal with the fact that their topsoil had essentially burnt off and how they were worried about the latent nutrient levels in their soil. If we fast-forward 12 months, we see that some of the farmers across those affected areas have had the best crop in a long, long time—and a lot of that was due to rainfall—and how quickly the country recovered.

Fair enough, there are a lot of emotional scars and there are still physical scars, but I think that the season that we have just had has done so much to help bring about confidence and positivity to a community that was on its knees and had been punished by the natural environment in a way that it had not seen for generations. To see the country bounce back so quickly I think is exciting. As some farmers said to me, they were looking at 10 years of trying to rebuild their topsoil in order to get back to where they were. Those fears have certainly been allayed.

The Natural Resources Committee has gained another hardworking community, looked after by the member for Ashford. It is out there trying to tackle some of the real issues on the ground and look at practical solutions to help the country recover after such an event. Touch wood, we have been through this season without a major bushfire, which is I think the first year in about four or five years that that has been the case. Hopefully, we can survive the next month. Summer is over today, so hopefully we are okay. Hopefully, we can look forward to learning some lessons out of the Pinery fire, which was a different fire from Sampson Flat, from Eden Valley, from Wirrabara and all the other larger fires we have had over recent years. It was a lot of flat, farming country, and I think the learning we can take out of how the country does recover will be extremely valuable as we move forward to the next fire.

The NRC, in its work in helping to retain some of that institutional knowledge, can hopefully continue that work into the future. With that, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (REGISTERED RELATIONSHIPS) BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 February 2017.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:01):** I rise to indicate that the opposition does not have a party position in respect of this bill. Of course in our party we do not have an obligation on people to maintain our party position; nevertheless, consistent with our previous position on the primary legislation, which is now the Relationships Register Act passed earlier—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.R. Kenyon):** Member for Bragg, are you the lead speaker for this?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** As I was just indicating, the opposition not having a position on this matter, I am neither the lead speaker nor am I going to be presenting a position to the parliament that outlines a party position, as we have determined we will not have one. I simply rise to indicate that, from my perspective, this is essentially a consequential bill to the principal legislation. When the legislation was passed it was to allow for the registration of relationships for couples in a relationship, and therefore demonstrate their status when dealing with other agencies. It was also to allow the recognition of interstate and overseas relationships.

The consequential amendments to a number of other pieces of legislation are outlined in the bill. There was one missing, and that was to deal with the Administration and Probate Act 1919. This matter was brought to the attention of the government by the Law Society. They outlined it had been omitted, obviously illustrating the fact that if it were going to be dealt with when people were alive then at the very least it should transfer after their death and to deal with the treatment of the spouse or domestic partner in the event of an intestacy.

There are a lot of areas—the Wills Act, etc.—that cover this matter, but that smaller group of those who die without a valid will will now be covered, with a foreshadowed amendment by the government to incorporate amendment to the Administration and Probate Act 1919. I have viewed that, and indicate that I will be consenting to the same.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:04):** I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Registered Relationships) Bill 2017. Because it is a conscience vote on our side of the house and to make sure that everyone understands my position I will keep up my consistency. I do not support the bill, but I will not be holding up the house for long.

This bill was introduced by the member for Reynell on 16 February this year. The Relationships Register Act 2016 allows for the registration of relationships for couples in any relationship, thereby demonstrating their status when dealing with other agencies. The act also allows for the recognition of interstate and overseas relationships.

This bill aims to amend current legislative instances where a marriage or domestic partnership is referred to and will amend those references to include a reference to a registered relationship. The bill amends the Family Relationships Act 1975, the Civil Liability Act 1936, the Governors' Pensions Act 1976, the Housing Improvement Act 2016, the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act 1972, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974, the Public Trustee Act 1995, the Southern State Superannuation Act 2009 and the Supreme Court Act 1935.

In her second reading speech on this bill, the member for Reynell talked about the parliament making considerable headway 'in reforming the laws that discriminate against members of our community who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer'. This is the last in a series of bills relating to that group that I am aware of.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Where do I go? It is no surprise that I am conservative and that I represent what I believe is a pretty conservative electorate. There are other opinions in my electorate and they have been voiced to me, which I applaud, because that is what politics is about. If you could please everyone in your community or the state, you would be a miracle person. No-one is going to be able to do that. I appreciate the people who have discussed these bills with me.

I remember having a very robust conversation with a woman who had a transgender child. I appreciated her commentary and at the end of a reasonably lengthy conversation, about half an hour, I said, 'Look, we're just going to have to agree to disagree on some of these matters,' but I was pleased that she made the effort to contact me to put her point of view, as have other people in my electorate, because that is what politics is about. I do worry, though, about this focus on one group of people when there is so much we need to do to make this state a viable place to operate a business and raise young people and to at least be a place where we keep the electricity and the lights on. I am not convinced that we are anywhere close to doing that under the current government.

Quite a bit of angst has been expressed to me at various social functions in regard to this series of legislation and around the Safe Schools program, and concerns have also been raised with me about unisex toilets in schools. I firmly believe that there are likely to be some issues with unisex toilets in schools. I certainly hope there is not but there is a high potential for issues where people claiming to be one gender or the other use it as an excuse to be inside a certain toilet. We will have to wait and see.

One thing we need to do as a society is work with our young people. They can be confused—I think we can all be confused at different stages of our life—but we need to work with young people to make sure that they have a clear path when growing up and do not make rash decisions in their early years that they may regret in the future. I know it is said that this is consequential, but I have not supported the raft of legislation behind this and I do not support it.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:10):** As I said during the debate in relation to the substantive bill and in relation to this consequential amendments bill, I appreciate that when we come to this place we come with a diversity of views. Whilst we are probably in vehement disagreement about a number of these issues, I absolutely appreciate the way this debate has been conducted in this place. I also appreciate—and the member for Hammond spoke about this—that there have been many people who have come to speak with parliamentarians about these particular issues, both in relation to this bill and others. I am very pleased that so many of those community members have had the opportunity to talk fully and deeply with different members of this parliament. I know that is something they appreciate.

Having their input has certainly assisted us to fully explore the personal impact that these particular issues being debated have on members of the South Australian community. I thank everybody who has participated in this debate and I look forward to the progression of this final bill in relation to the relationships register issues that we have contemplated.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

New clause 6A.

**Ms HILDYARD:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Hildyard–1]—

Page 4, after line 19—After Part 2 insert:

Part 2A—Amendment of *Administration and Probate Act 1919*

6A—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

- (1) Section 4, definition of *domestic partner*—delete the definition and substitute:  
*domestic partner*, in relation to a deceased person, means—

- (a) a person declared under the *Family Relationships Act 1975* to have been the domestic partner of the deceased as at the date of the deceased person's death; or
- (b) a person who was in a registered relationship with the deceased as at the date of the deceased person's death;
- (2) Section 4—after the definition of *Public Trustee* insert:  
*registered relationship* means a relationship that is registered under the *Relationships Register Act 2016*, and includes a corresponding law registered relationship under that Act;

For clarification, this amendment is simply to add another act, the Administration and Probate Act 1919, to the list of acts that we need to amend to give effect to the Relationships Register Bill.

Amendment carried; new clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (7 to 21) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:15):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (UNIVERSITIES) BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February 2017.)

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:15):** I rise to speak about the Statutes Amendment (Universities) Bill 2016. You may be surprised, sir, that I actually went to university.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder):** No.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** You are not surprised?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder):** I am not surprised.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It was in 1975 and 1976, I think. I originally went to become a schoolteacher because I was so impressed by the number of schoolteachers I had who had a significant impact on my life since that time, given what I think they instilled into me. There might be some people who are unhappy about those things but, be that as it may, I was very happy to be taught by these teachers.

However, after a short while I started to have a few beers down at what was the Harvey's Henley Hotel, run by Lloyd and Pat Harvey. Of course, on a Friday afternoon I would meet the teachers and have a drink with the teachers who taught me at school. I never lost respect for them, but it seemed to me that a number of them had not really grown up. They had gone from kindergarten, to primary school, to high school, to teachers' college or university and back to school.

I thought, 'Well, if I want to be a schoolteacher, I should go out and actually learn a bit more about the world, become more worldly, and then perhaps go back to that honourable profession,' if that was my decision. As it turned out, that never happened and I joined the fire brigade. I then completed my degree I think in 1985 or thereabouts, for two reasons really: one was to finish what I started; but, secondly, to show my mother and father that the sacrifices they had made for me to be able to go to university were not wasted. I finished my degree, joined the fire brigade and ultimately finished up here, which I am very pleased about. I enjoyed my time at university. I think it was in 1975 or 1976 when the—

**Mr Duluk:** Do you remember your time there?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I do. I think it was either 1975 or 1976 when the university bar and bistro opened. They were alongside each other and that did create a few problems. I remember one Prosh breakfast coming home in the afternoon, after catching the bus home, falling through the front door and mum looking at me and saying, 'Is this why we are sending you to university?' There was some garbled response, but I very much enjoyed my time at university and it was good.

What we do know about our universities in South Australia is that we have world-class institutions. They stand up very well against any of the universities in Australia and, for that matter, around the world. We hear people say that three universities in South Australia are too many, but I do not subscribe to that view. They each have their own specialties and I think we have a population that can accommodate three universities.

We have in South Australia—this is something we sometimes forget—a large enough population to have critical mass, but we are also small enough to do things from an evidence-based process. We show that we can do things differently in South Australia than can be done even on the eastern seaboard. The six degrees of separation that exist are not six degrees of separation in South Australia.

We are seeing great work being undertaken by universities that collaborate not only with our community but between themselves, and I think that sets us apart. We are very privileged to have world-class universities that make a key contribution to our state in South Australia. In making a key contribution to our state, that contribution is being made to our nation and beyond the shores of our country.

The amendments to the universities bill that have come to the house are not necessarily without a degree of controversy in some circles, and that relates mostly to the representation. I will talk about that a little bit later. What we specifically know about this bill is that it is about reducing the size of the university councils and extending the tenure of student representatives on the councils from one to two years. I think that is a good thing. Two years offers a greater period of time for those representatives to learn what the role and function is and, importantly, what their role and function is on the council.

The bill also allows for the tabling of annual reports in parliament by the Minister for Higher Education and Skills instead of the Governor—a common-sense move. As I understand it, the minister already has the role of tabling the annual report of the University of South Australia, but not so for Flinders or Adelaide. This bill also strengthens the statutory liability protections for council members and senior officers, and that, of course, is very important. It includes provision for the establishment of a common investment fund. It also expands the delegation of the powers of the university councils. Whilst that is already detailed, it expands that and, again, that makes a lot of sense.

We know that under the Flinders University of South Australia Act, the university is referred to as the Flinders University of South Australia. The bill is going to make changes so that it will be referred to as Flinders University. I think that anyone who has been connected with the universities in South Australia or not has always referred to it as either Flinders University or just plain Flinders. That is just a small, but I think important, change. This bill will also make associated consequential amendments.

I was saying earlier, Deputy Speaker, that the person who was assuming your chair at that stage might not have realised I went to university. People here might not realise I was also, for a period of time, the further education minister in this state. It was a great privilege, of course, to have that title and involve myself not only with universities but with further education, to see the outstanding work undertaken by our universities and other institutions of further education, the role they play in teaching students, and the role researchers play in researching things that are important to this state and, in fact, important to Australia.

I really enjoyed that job. Part of having that job meant that I attended, on at least one occasion, all the university council meetings. When I say 'all of the university council meetings', I mean I attended at least one for all of the universities that have a council. It was nice to be there, but one thing that struck me was the size of them. There was an enormous amount of people around the table. I always thought to a very great extent that the bigger a council or committee, the more clunky

and cumbersome it is with respect to fulfilling the role of that council, committee or board, depending on the number of people who are representatives.

It seems to make sense to me to reduce the size of a council. I say that on the basis that I think, as has been shown on the eastern seaboard and by the University of South Australia, which actually has a reduced number of people on its council, it augurs well for a better level of operation of that board. That is not to say, of course, that they have not been operating effectively anyway, but I think this will sharpen the focus and sharpen the way by which they will discharge their primary function, and their primary function is, amongst other things, the governance of that particular university in a variety of areas. It does seem to make sense to me.

On the matter of the reduction of representation, if you like, purely in numbers of students and staff, I note that there will still be two representatives from the student body: an undergraduate and a postgraduate. There will still be two on there. This is really a matter for the university. I have a personal view, and it will not necessarily affect the way I vote on this particular bill, but I would alert the house that I have received several emails from people who are upset about the reduction in representation, not only of the student cohort but also of the academic staff.

On my assessment of those reductions, it still appears to me—and I will need to be convinced otherwise—from what I have been able to research and read, that the percentage of representation will not be affected unduly. I say that with a view to not so much trying to comfort those people who have contacted me about these reduction numbers, but just to say that there is still, appropriately so, student and academic staff representation on these councils. From what I have seen of the universities on the eastern seaboard, they have also evolved to a representative council that is similar to that which this bill is trying to put in place here in South Australia that, again, is in line with what successfully worked at what I call the people's university—the University of South Australia.

The reduction in size that will bring the universities of Adelaide and Flinders into line with the University of South Australia, as I said, is meant to be and is being introduced to be consistent with the Universities Australia's Voluntary Code of Best Practice for the Governance of Australian Universities. As I mentioned, too, I think it is important that it will be achieved while broadly—and I say 'broadly'—maintaining the existing proportions of staff, student and appointed independent members on the university councils.

I attended Adelaide University and found it to be a very good institution. I look at the future of universities in South Australia, and I know we are in challenging times when it comes to the funding of universities, how they take their product beyond the walls of the university, how they become more relevant to our communities and, just as importantly, how the work that is being undertaken there actually adds value to our communities in South Australia and beyond.

On any fair assessment, the universities have done a very good job in that regard, but I think there are areas where improvement can take place, and one of those is the research that is being undertaken and how that research can I guess be commercialised to make sure that the university itself benefits from that research. I think we are certainly operating at a different level than what I have seen in Boston, for example, where their focus on the commercialisation of their research is something that is ploughed back into the university and becomes a perpetuating funding stream for that particular university. I think there are improvements in that area that we can make, and I certainly say that is going to be one of the challenges for our universities in South Australia.

I go back to the point I made earlier, too, about the six degrees of separation and how universities here can collaborate at a far different level than they can on the eastern seaboard or even in America. We have critical mass with the people of Adelaide, but we are small enough to make sure that the research we undertake here can be evidenced in a way it might not be able to in other parts of Australia, because we all know each other and we can work differently with each other.

I hate saying, because I hear it in other places, that I was once the minister for this and that, but another portfolio that I really enjoyed was being the minister for science. I only received that portfolio because I am sure the premier of the day said I was just the appropriate person to do it, but the reality is that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is almost impossible to hear the member on his feet. It has been drawn to my attention that there is a lot of background chatter. We do not want to miss the last seven minutes of the member for Colton's contribution.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! That means starting now.

**Mr Duluk:** They don't like his contribution. They don't want to listen to it. I think it is very good, Paul.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** And that means you have to be quiet, member for Davenport.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Is it more that my mumbo jumbo is difficult to understand and that is why people are talking, which I will accept if that is the case? Anyway, taking a couple of steps back, as I said, I do not like saying this, but I was the science minister in this state for a period of time, and that again was a great portfolio. Why was it a great portfolio? Because the work you were doing was so interesting. Not only was it interesting, it also gave you the ability—and I am sure the member for Frome will not like this—to not so much interfere in anyone else's portfolios but, because everything should be underpinned by science, to have an entree into other portfolio responsibilities to a certain extent, to make sure that science was the basis of the decisions being made.

**Mr Gardner:** Like the status of women portfolio.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** There were a few exceptions, but anyway everything is based—and decisions should be based—on science. It was a very good portfolio. I remember receiving a briefing one day and I thought, 'What the hell does that mean?' I read it and got the person who wrote it and said, 'What I want you to do is go away and write this so that not only will I understand it but I will be able to communicate it to the member for Morialta and he will understand it and, when he's standing at the bus stop to come in to work, he will be able to describe that bit of science, how it relates to that person, how it relates to the state and how it is something that is going to be beneficial to the state.' The response was, 'That will be challenging, minister.' I said, 'We like a challenge—go away and do it.'

One of the things that we need to be able to do as well is communicate the research that is being undertaken in universities, and the research that is being undertaken in private companies, to make it relevant to the people who are ultimately going to benefit from that science. So, it is a matter of communicating as well. It is another area, to a certain extent, where some aspects of university life and the research and work being undertaken can be improved, and I will not say 'dumb it down', but allow people to understand it because it is said in simple terms that are meaningful and that people can comprehend—not only comprehend but then communicate to others the importance of the particular research. I have been diverted a little bit, and I apologise for that, but I am just so excited.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, he did. I have not mentioned the functions of university councils. The Flinders University of South Australia (now to be called Flinders University) and the University of Adelaide Act specify the following responsibilities of university councils:

- appointing the vice chancellor—a very big decision;
- approving the mission for strategic direction, budget and business plans of the university;
- overseeing and reviewing the management of the university and its performance;
- establishing policy and procedural principles;
- approving and monitoring systems of control and accountability, as well as the assessment and management of risk;
- overseeing and monitoring the academic activities of the university; and
- approving significant commercial activities.



That is a fairly large number of important responsibilities of the university councils. They are doing a good job, and this reform will assist them in discharging their functions to an even better standard than they do today.

We know that the councils are also primarily comprised of ex-officio members: the chancellor, vice chancellor, presiding member of the academic board or the senate—whatever it is called, depending on the university—the independent appointed members, and staff and student members. Those people will still be represented on the councils after this amendment is put into place, albeit with the numbers I spoke about earlier.

Another thing I want to say about the university councils is that they have been a great breeding ground for people for not only the various occupations they will enter after they have left university but also from a political perspective. I expect there are people in this room who were involved in student politics. There is one sitting to the left of me, figuratively speaking, and I think there are probably one or two opposite.

People who have been involved in university politics have represented all political parties at the highest level—from the late lamented and not so sorely missed Democrats to the Greens and to the two major parties. It has been a very fertile ground for people to move into this chamber and other chambers across Australia. That can only be a good thing for our political system, providing, of course, they actually go out and visit and become part of the real world before they come into this place. That is another thing that we can improve on here.

**Mr Pederick:** They are certainly on your side.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** You've got them on your side. There is a chap over in the other place, the Hon. Mr Lucas, who I assume has gone from university—if he went to university—to becoming the party apparatchik, to coming straight here decades and decades ago. He might barrack for West Adelaide, and that might put him in touch with real people from time to time, but there is not really a great deal of life experience there. We are no different on this side, and I think that is something we can all improve on.

Of course, that has no relevance to the bill before us today. However, it has relevance to how we can best benefit from the opportunities that are provided to those who attend university and do whatever it is they do there and how they can become better at what they do while gathering some world experiences.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** They do study, and they study very hard. During the time of the big dispute about whether or not Union Hall should make way for the building that took its place, I attended a couple of lectures there. I did not know what they were talking about—it was some advanced maths program—but I sat down and talked to students on the way out and asked them what they thought of the place as a lecture room. They said, 'It's ridiculous,' that it was the great big Union Hall. Talking to the students was one of the factors that assisted me in understanding that we need to have good facilities for them to study.

Again, I have digressed, Deputy Speaker. I apologise to you and the house for that. I have had a very good time up here today. I commend the bill to the house and I wish its speedy passage through this place.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am almost tempted to move an extension of time because I was not in the room for the whole contribution.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:36):** I also rise to support this bill. I am following the master, though, and I feel like sitting down again. The government is making a number of amendments to the University of Adelaide Act 1971 and the Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966. As previous speakers have said, these changes are intended to improve the governance arrangements of these universities. They will streamline their operations and hopefully leave the governance bodies freed up to do other work and better serve their communities.

I should say from the outset that I am a firm believer in student representation on university boards. This flows from my support for student unions generally and trade unions in industrial settings. I am obviously a big supporter of those.

**Mr Bell:** And voluntary unions as well.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I will get to that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Do I have to protect the member for Little Para?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Yes, I need protection from the member for—which seat is it?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The book is ruled: I am going to start bringing people to order.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** The member for Davenport and/or Waite.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I was always a member of the student union, and I was briefly a member of a student union council at Salisbury university in the very early nineties. I was not particularly interested in the operations of that body at the time. It was under the family leadership of Phil Harrison, who some people in this place may recall in his various guises. I knew him as the president of the newly formed student representative council of the University of South Australia, Salisbury campus, in the first year of the existence of that campus.

I recall many nights in the bar. Honestly, I do not recall ever going to a council meeting; I am sure I did at some point. Needless to say, I did not take much interest then in the operation of those bodies. As I said, I am a supporter of student representation on these bodies and unions generally.

**Mr Gardner:** Sounds like you were of great value.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta, I am going to call you to order.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I like to think that I guided the campus through those early days in a small way. I hasten to add that this bill does not threaten the principle of student representation. Like the member for Colton, my research leads me to conclude that the proportion of student representation is broadly the same across these bodies, and I am happy about that. Since those early days at Salisbury university, I have become a supporter of student unionism.

I lived and studied through a particularly dire time in New Zealand politics during the early nineties, when I went to university. There was a particularly virulent strain of free-market right-wingery, which included voluntary student unionism. It was more virulent than the strain that took hold here, but I will get to that.

I was at the University of Waikato when a group that called themselves free-market libertarians—and who, I confess, were friends of mine to a certain extent; I think the member for Davenport would have liked them, as would the member for Schubert I think, they would have got along like a house on fire—ran a very sophisticated campaign under this new political regime of voluntary student unionism.

They ran a very sophisticated and, it has to be said, well-resourced campaign for all the union positions, with their sole platform being the complete and immediate abolition of the union and their respective elected positions. They were hugely successful. These people were elected en bloc. Obviously there was no compulsory voting, but I am led to believe there was a pretty high turnout. The very next day they dismantled the entire apparatus of the student union and just walked away from it.

I was in South Australia some of the time this was going on, but I was not at the pointy end of this debate in the South Australian student union movement. Certainly in New Zealand it was pretty devastating. At the University of Waikato the services dried up immediately, and the private sector moved into providing a lot of the services like food and entertainment. It has to be said that it did not move into student services such as counselling or career counselling, or any of those things that student unions traditionally provide.

It also has to be said that the services provided by the private sector—and I have no problem with the private sector—in terms of the food and entertainment it provided on campus were not up to the standard the union provided. Certainly, those extra curricular services that students sometimes need and have come to expect were not provided. It is important to note that, despite the modest changes foreshadowed in this bill, the proportion of staff and student representation on these councils will remain broadly at current levels.

I was interested in the member for Chaffey's comments, in the course of this debate, about international education, particularly the importance of the Chinese market in this regard. As members may know, I have long been an advocate for engagement with China both on an educational level as well as in terms of business engagement. It is, after all, still our largest trading partner and will, for the foreseeable future, be the source of perhaps the biggest threats to and the biggest opportunities for our domestic economy.

I have visited China on several occasions, most recently in the second half of last year. There is a very high and, it has to be said, constantly growing awareness of Australia and South Australia as both a tourism destination and an education market, in particular. As the member for Chaffey pointed out, to his credit, these two are inextricably linked. However, I do not take the same dim view of the current state of our international education market that the member for Chaffey does.

Last year, the state government commissioned Deloitte Access Economics to take a really good look at this market, to look at its current contribution and to look ahead over the next 10 years or so at the threats and opportunities of this market. The first thing I would note about this report is that it continues to see China as claiming the largest share of this market, followed by India, Hong Kong, Malaysia and Vietnam. Interestingly, it does point to smaller—much smaller, in fact—but much faster-growing markets like Oman, Italy, Taiwan, Kenya and Nepal.

The report also goes on to point out some of the particular features which make the South Australian education sector attractive to overseas students, and these are the strengths we should be building on as we attempt to attract a higher and higher share of this market into the future. The first feature that sets South Australia apart, according to Deloitte's report, is price accessibility. This will come as no surprise. The cost of living in Adelaide and South Australia is relatively low compared with other major cities, in particular other major cities in Australia. It is ranked number 71 in the Mercer Cost of Living Survey, which I can only assume is a reputable survey of such things. To put that into perspective, Sydney is ranked at 31 and Melbourne is ranked at 47.

The second feature the report identifies is the accessibility of affordable accommodation—including, we are told, the member for Chaffey's sister. Adelaide has a large amount of purpose-built student accommodation and an average of one bed per 12 students, according to the report. This is the second highest in Australia behind Canberra.

Finally, the report identifies that migration opportunities may be a factor in any decision to study here. In particular, applicants who commit to living and working in South Australia for two years from arrival, with a view to long-term settlement, qualify for five additional points when applying for permanent residency. That is very attractive to people who want to settle here, who want to bring their family members here, and it is good for the South Australian economy generally. The report concludes that South Australia has a lot going for it in the international education market. There are plenty of opportunities to play to its strengths, and we should be emphasising those when we are talking about what needs to be done to attract international students.

It is true that the bill does reduce the size of university councils. It preserves as far as possible the ratio between student/staff representation on those councils, which to me is an important principle. Importantly, it extends the tenure of student representatives on the councils from one to two years, which allows for a bit of personal development for those student representatives. Not only are they proportionally just as well represented but those who are lucky enough to serve on these councils get that experience, which can serve them well later on and give them a lot of personal development. I have no hesitation in supporting this bill and I commend it to the house.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:45):** I am also happy to support this bill. I would like to look at the relationship between universities and business. There was a time when I was the minister for manufacturing and innovation, and one of my tasks was to try to foster and improve the

relationship between universities and businesses. One reason for doing that was to improve the competitiveness of businesses and to focus the talents and energies of those researchers in universities on the needs of business, to make our economy more productive, to provide new products, to improve employment—all those things that our economy needs.

While I was fulfilling my role as a minister in that portfolio, it became very apparent to me that the two groups—universities and business in general—are largely worlds apart. There are some very good instances of collaboration, with universities in fact dealing very well with businesses and businesses going into universities looking to collaborate, but on the whole it is as though they speak two completely separate languages, and they very much struggle to understand one another.

In my view, this is a critical weakness of the Australian economy, and it is also obviously true of South Australia because, if we truly accept that the future of the economy is in commercialising ideas, commercialising research, new products and new manufacturing that come out of the research of universities and other institutions, then we cannot afford that relationship to be as poor as it is currently.

A number of countries around the world do it very well. The US obviously stands out as a country where the universities have a certain business focus and entrepreneurial spirit, and that is very encouraging. It has been a very important part of their wealth and their ability to create wealth in their economy over the years. Germany does it very well. They do it in part through institutions called the Fraunhofer institutes, which marry up researchers and businesses and allow them to interact in a structured way, such that they have very good rates of commercialisation of their research and other things.

South Australia and Australia in general do not have those structures; they do not have institutes like the Fraunhofer institutes. That means that there is a gap in our economy, and it is absolutely critical that we bridge that gap. One way of doing that, in a quick way that forces universities to collaborate with business, is to get hold of research and innovation that comes out of universities and spin it out into a separate company, so that the universities are in fact creating their own companies. By doing that, they become a shareholder in the company and they are necessarily engaged with the business.

There are all sorts of federal government policies that complicate that process—and the controlled entities policy is not the least of them—but universities can still be a significant shareholder in these companies and researchers can be shareholders in these companies, and that necessarily means that they have a very good relationship with the business because they help create it. Hopefully, after applying the appropriate business skills and everything else and building the right team around the innovation, you will end up getting a successful company from this particular research. You will have a product to be hopefully manufactured in South Australia or Australia and then it would go to market. That market, of course, is not just South Australia or Australia, it is the entire world. That is another part of our challenge in this state: to see the entire world as our market.

This critical path to commercialisation, if we rely only on businesses discussing things and relating to universities, is going to be a very slow road. If we get to the point where universities are creating companies and building teams around those companies and having a vested interest in the success of those companies, I think it will be much more successful. I also think that universities will then have a path open to them for another revenue stream.

Universities have student fees, overseas student fees, research grants and federal government grants and those four streams can be supplemented over time. It is a relatively long-term view of the world but say in 20 or 25 years, if they started now and spun out enough companies they could have a revenue stream from dividends and sales and so on that would rival any of those other revenue streams. That would be a good thing because the less reliant universities are on outside sources of funding and are able to create their own sources of funding, then the more independent they will be—and I think that is a good thing.

The reason that is important for this bill is that the size of the board or the size of the university council can often complicate decision-making. My experience is that the larger a decision-making body is the harder it can be to get decisions made and to get things through. Reducing the size of the university councils is a good move and I think it will speed up the decision-making processes

within the universities. Universities themselves are large bureaucracies and anything that improves the decision-making processes within universities is a good thing.

I think it is important to maintain the independence of people on councils. In the ordinary course of events, something like a university could be incorporated under the Corporations Act but there are no clear shareholders for a university: students are part of the university but they are, in effect, a customer; the staff are obviously employees and the federal government funds them but it does not control them in the typical sense of the word; and there are no share structures. Identifying shareholders of a university would be very difficult so it is important that the board or the council is a largely independent body with the best interests of the university at heart. They have been able to do that but I think reducing the size of the councils will speed up their processes and improve things.

However, it is still important to have a wide variety of perspectives. I think it is still important to have student participation and staff participation on the councils because, as much as they are a business and an organisation, universities are also a community in their own right and they are also part of the broader South Australian community, in our instance, and that should be encouraged. That is something that should continue because I think universities have a very large role to play in the future of South Australia.

In fact, in many ways I would like them to be much more engaged in the creation of the future of South Australia. I think spinning out companies and creating start-ups is part of that but they can also play a strategic role in the development of new industries, new directions and new thinking for our state, and that is to be encouraged, especially for South Australia at this time. With those words, I commend the bill to the house and I encourage people to support this as it proceeds through the parliament.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:54):** I also rise to discuss this bill and to mention some issues about our university sector in general in this state. As members would know, this is a very important sector for our economy in South Australia and some of the most important institutions that we have in our state are our three universities.

I agree particularly with the comments made previously by the member for Newland about the importance of using a lot of the world-leading research that is undertaken in our universities and better integrating that with industry and with commercialisation to make sure that we can see the benefits of that research delivering for industry and our economy more generally. There have been a number of very significant steps taken in that regard over the past 10 years, both with initiatives from the state government and with the university sector.

One of the most important initiatives has been the work in the health research sector with the establishment of the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, which has really kick-started our medical research industry. Our medical research industry was obviously strong, but we were seeing other states overtaking us in terms of their research capabilities. By bringing the universities together as part of that institute, we have seen us become much more of a landmark location with not only the fantastic new building on North Terrace but also a lot of research that happens in our universities.

From my perspective, I see that as an important model that could be used across different areas of research. There are some people who think it is best if we combine all the universities. That has never been my view. I think it is important to have some competitive tension amongst our university sector in South Australia and for us to really be known as a university city. I think that coming together through institutions such as SAHMRI is an excellent example of how that can best be delivered.

I am obviously very biased towards Flinders University, not only as a Flinders University graduate but also as a member representing the southern suburbs where Flinders is the largest employer in the south.

**Mr Duluk:** You spent a lot of time at Adelaide University, though, doing student politics.

**Mr PICTON:** I am always very keen to have a good argument with people such as the member for Davenport, who came from Adelaide University and trumpets how good Adelaide University is.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** They are all good.

**Mr PICTON:** They are all very good, but I am a little bit biased, I have to say, member for Colton. They are all good though. I have been particularly pleased in the past few years to see the development of Flinders in a number of ways. The first is in terms of the Tonsley development, which has been a credit to this government's investment. That site could very easily have become a whole bunch of warehouses with no substantial economic development happening on that site at all.

With great investments from Flinders University, TAFE and a large number of companies on that site, there are now more people employed there than on the day that Mitsubishi closed. I think we are going to see more and more developments on that site as time goes on. What you see at the Flinders site at Tonsley is some really innovative work in terms of science, engineering, maths, innovation and commercialisation, as well as start-up work that is happening. That site is designed to be focused on working with industry, which has led to a resurgence of a lot of those courses at Flinders. So, full credit to everybody, including the previous vice chancellor Michael Barber, who was heavily involved in getting that work underway.

In summary, I would like to say a couple of things about undergraduate courses. I have a concern that, since deregulation has happened—and there have been some good things out of deregulation in terms of course numbers—we are seeing numbers of students ballooning in particular professions where the supply of students into the course does not match what the industry demand for those graduates is. I think law is one of those courses where we are seeing huge numbers of lawyers come through. There are a few other examples where the number of graduates does not actually match what the demand is. I think that does need to be reviewed and considered by the federal government.

The other thing I would say in summary is that, while this bill reforms quite significantly the way a number of the councils work, I want to add my thoughts that it is really important for the universities to listen to the views of staff and students in how they operate. I think that is something that benefits the universities as well as the staff and students. I hope they do some more dedicated work on that in the future, because that will serve the interests of our state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Piccolo.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Rules made under the following Acts

Adelaide Park Lands—Park Lands Lease Agreement—Tennis SA Inc

*Parliamentary Committees*

### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:03):** I bring up the 40<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I bring up the 41<sup>st</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time***ELECTRICITY GENERATION**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline to the house what his government is doing to ensure affordable and reliable power for South Australian households and South Australian businesses once the Hazelwood plant closes at the end of this month?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:05):** Mr Speaker—

**Mr Knoll:** Everybody should BYO a generator.

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —the National Electricity Market is run by the Australian Energy Market Operator. They have a responsibility to the Australian states to make sure that available generation is there to service the economy which it serves. They set prices in the market to try to build, of course, a demand within that market. The disorderly exit of the Hazelwood coal-fired generator—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is a disorderly exit.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The coal apologists. You have these disorderly exits of coal-fired generation from Port Augusta's closure of their power station, and of course Hazelwood, and the reason they exit the market is that these generators are not profitable. The reason they are not making money is that, ultimately, the national market is not giving the private sector, which owns almost all the generation in this country, the price signals that they need to reinvest.

What would happen in a mature market where there was clear national policy in place is you would have an orderly investment replacing generation hours and exits. What happens is, as this generation exits, it sends price signals into the market. Those price signals have failed South Australia and they are failing the NEM. They are failing the National Electricity Market in a number of ways, and I will detail exactly how they have failed the market to get that response. The market responses are, as this generation leaves without a national policy framework to incentivise its replacement with gas, for example, which is what we on this side want—we want to replace Victorian coal with South Australian gas—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The question was specifically about the government's response, and the minister has talked about everybody else except the government.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, that is a bogus point of order, and the member for Stuart, who I was about to call to order, is now warned. Minister.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As Hazelwood exits the national market in an unplanned way, because of the failure of the NEM, what you are seeing is a series of events that is leading to, I think, the National Electricity Market showing that it's failed, and that's why we need to intervene into that market. Our intervention needs to look at how we can make sure that our generation, of which there is an oversupply in South Australia, comes on to meet our needs and our services.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The fundamental failure of the NEM, over the interjections of members opposite who have yet to release an energy policy, is that we believe the NEM has failed in the way it dispatches electricity. It does not dispatch electricity in a way that ensures the continuation of supply because of the ownership structure.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yelling at me won't change the fact that the NEM is broken, and our policy initiatives will be put in place to make sure that the NEM serves us—not the other way around. It's exactly the reason—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is exactly the reason that Thomas Playford decided that he would nationalise the electricity operations in this state to make it serve South Australians. Our intervention will return the sovereignty back to the people of this state and we will control our future when it comes to generation. We won't outsource it to the private sector, like members opposite did.

**The SPEAKER:** The opposition may not have liked the answer, but it was relevant to the question.

**Mr Marshall:** It really wasn't. It really, really wasn't, I'm sorry.

**The SPEAKER:** No, the question was framed with the usual schlamperei, and you got the answer that you would expect. I call to order the members for Stuart, Hammond, Morialta, Goyder, Mount Gambier, Davenport, Adelaide, Finniss, and the leader and deputy leader. I warn the members for Hammond, Goyder, Mount Gambier, Finniss, Schubert, Adelaide, Morialta and the deputy leader, and I warn for the second and final time the deputy leader and the members for Stuart, Adelaide, Morialta, Hammond and Finniss.

### ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the comments made by the Minister for Energy and Mineral Resources last year that the closure of the Hazelwood plant at the end of this month will be good for South Australians and, if he does agree, can he explain why it will be good for South Australia?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:11):** We fundamentally believe we support South Australian gas over Victorian coal. We believe—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We believe that we should be doing everything we can to incentivise South Australian generation, not to import a Victorian generation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** And yelling at me is not a substitute for policy. Thumping the table and blowing botox around the place is not a substitute for policy. We support South Australian gas. There is 450 megawatts owned in the state by the same company that owns the megawatts of ENGIE and the Hazelwood power station in Victoria. The question is: would you rather the Hazelwood—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The question is: would you prefer to have the Hazelwood generator on, or Pelican Point on? Do you want South Australian gas fired up or Victorian coal? Members opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Members opposite prefer Victorian coal. We prefer South Australian gas. We support our generators. We want our generators on, not Victorian generators on. By selling our generators, they have put us at the mercy of Victorian and New South Wales generators, and what they want is for us to be more at their mercy. We will stand up for South Australian generation, and I have to say that yelling at me and interjecting is not a substitute for policy. It is not a substitute for an idea. Yelling is not a thought.

*Members interjecting:*

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



*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today the City of Onkaparinga Citizen of the Year, Kellie Matalone.

*Question Time***ELECTRICITY GENERATION**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the parliament and, more importantly, can he inform the people of South Australia, precisely when he will detail his plan for resolving the state's energy crisis?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:13):** When it's ready and when it's—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is called to order. The Premier hasn't uttered a word yet, and the member for Chaffey is interjecting.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Our policy can be described—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Our policy can be described in one simple—

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** For those opposite to understand our policy, it can be described in one simple phrase—

**Mr Gardner:** Have you finished writing it?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —we are taking control of our own—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta will depart for the next hour for flagrant breaches of the standing order. He will depart for an hour under the sessional order.

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Our policy can simply be described in one simple way: self-sufficiency, taking control over our own energy future, standing up for South Australia. These are the principles that will guide our policy formulation. There will be a clear choice. There will be a choice between coal and renewable energy. There will be a choice between clean, affordable and reliable power and the policy chaos of those opposite. There will be a choice between the future and the past.

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

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

**ELECTRICITY GENERATION**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** Supplementary, sir: can the Premier guarantee to this house that this policy, when it's implemented, will ensure there will be no more blackouts in South Australia?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:15):** Any politician who promises the people of this state or any jurisdiction anywhere in the world that there will never be a blackout because they can stop every tree limb from falling on a powerline, that they can stop weather—if the Leader of the Opposition is so adamant that he can stop all blackouts under any circumstances, he should say so. Make it up, make the commitment. Make the commitment right now. If he thinks he can ensure that the lights will never go out in any suburb in any jurisdiction anywhere in South Australia, he should say so.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer will be seated. The Leader of the Opposition won't be saying anything now because it would be contrary to standing orders.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order. Point of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Debate, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I'll listen to what the Treasurer has to say.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As I said to the house yesterday, the majority of blackouts that occur in any jurisdiction—and South Australia is no different—is because of weather. It is an inconvenient truth. Members opposite don't like the answer. They think that when there's a hurricane in Queensland, there are no blackouts. That's not true. They think that when there's a heatwave in New South Wales, there is no load shedding. That's not true. They have load shedding. Of course, Victoria was nearly half out. They think that those things don't occur. What we have here is fake news—fake news.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —and that's the reality and laughing won't change a fact. The truth is that if this was so important to members opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, no other parliament in Australia would put up with that behaviour—no other parliament. The leader is out of control, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is being sorely provoked.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you very much, sir. Quite frankly, any politician promising that they can stop the weather by shouting, by screaming, that they can stop bushfires, can stop floods, they can stop a power outage, is lying.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

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

### ELECTRICITY PRICES

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** Can the Premier guarantee that his plan will lower electricity prices in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:18):** What I can guarantee the people of South Australia is that we will stand up and fight for them. I think there is—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I think this is an extraordinary display by those opposite of an unwillingness to stand up for South Australia and a willingness to join the chorus of people interstate that is simply trying to blackguard and damage South Australia's reputation. It is a disgrace. It is a disgrace, the commentary that is being led by our Prime Minister and joined in by members of the Liberal Party in the national parliament and indeed given aid and comfort by those opposite.

It is a disgrace that our international and national reputation is being traduced in this way by people who have a sworn responsibility to stand up and represent the people of South Australia. So, rather than actually come in this place and add to that chorus of naysayers who are talking South Australia down, why don't you stand up for once in your life for the people of South Australia?

**ELECTRICITY GENERATION**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Supplementary: given that South Australia is currently utilising the full 800-megawatt capacity coming across the border from Victoria, what is the Premier's alternative when Hazelwood closes at the end of this month?

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is on two warnings already.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:19):** First, the interconnector between Victoria and South Australia does not have 800 megawatts, but why let the facts get in the way of the story?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland and the Premier are both called to order. They will not assist the minister in his answer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yelling at us doesn't change the facts—

**Mr Marshall:** Just answer the question.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am answering the question, and if you sit quietly I will give you the answer.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** If Hazelwood closes, the biggest impact will be on the Victorian market. The Victorian market will be the one that is impacted the most.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for the second and final time. I give the leader every scope to be the locomotive for the opposition, but if he utters a sound outside standing orders he will depart.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** When Hazelwood closes and they take their megawatts out of the Victorian system, there are a number of responses that will occur in the market. The first one is that the opposition are claiming there will be no generational response in Victoria; that is, the other gas-fired generation in Victoria will not come on. They are also saying there will be no renewable energy in Victoria either.

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** They are also hoping against hope that the second unit at Pelican Point won't come on because they prefer interstate coal to South Australian gas. When Hazelwood closes, it is going to be a very difficult situation for the Victorian market to face, but we have surplus generation capability in this state.

The idea that every single Victorian generator is operating at capacity 365 days a year, and when Hazelwood comes out there is no spare capacity to be traded across the interconnector, is false. If you had a small amount of literacy in this area you would know that. But we are not hearing that from members of the opposition. They assume—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has not been asked to run a commentary on the opposition. He has been asked about what are the scenarios after a certain power station in Victoria closes.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The idea that Victoria is running all its generation at 100 per cent capacity all the time is wrong, so the idea that when Hazelwood leaves there is no surplus capacity in Victoria is wrong. It is also wrong to say that all 3,000 megawatts of our thermal generation is on all the time: it is not.

Our average demand in this state is 1,200 megawatts, and we have over 2,900 megawatts of installed thermal capacity. We have 1,700 megawatts of wind and about 700 megawatts of sun. So the problem we have in the market is an oversupply of generation and its dispatch order.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Fake laughing won't change that, and not understanding the way the dispatch system works is ridiculous. The idea that somehow when Hazelwood closes the world will stop spinning on its axis is ridiculous.

When Hazelwood closes, the shocks to that system will be in the Victorian system. We have surplus capacity here owned by the same company that owns Hazelwood. If I were a betting man—and I am not—I would have to say that I reckon that second unit is going to come on about the same time they close the Hazelwood generation. It makes complete sense.

**Mr Pederick:** They're going to lose money.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We hear members interjecting that they will lose money. That is because—

**The SPEAKER:** Alas, the minister's time has expired.

#### ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister outline to the house what is the full capacity of the interconnection with Victoria and what the current utilisation of the interconnection is today?

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:24):** The Heywood interconnector is 600 megawatts, and the Murraylink direct current interconnector fluctuates between 80 up to 200.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader, I am warning for the last time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** There is a difference between DC interconnection and AC interconnection.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The direction of the flow of DC connection is done by design. The AC interconnection obeys the laws of physics, so the idea that the Leader of the Opposition is saying somehow that we are always reliant on Victoria for interconnection is wrong. It is wrong. It is not accurate and it fundamentally misunderstands the nature of the interconnection. The AC interconnection between South Australia and Victoria was expanded by this government. We're the ones who argued for it, and it is up to 600 megawatts. That doesn't mean that we are entirely reliant on that 600 megawatts.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We are today, are we? Our demand today is above 3,600 megawatts, is it? No, it's not. Again, it is fundamentally wrong, just like yesterday when he said, 'What was the cost to the state's economy from intermittent energy supply?' Again, it is

misunderstanding the language, not understanding the system, making announcements that he doesn't understand and quite frankly the Leader of the Opposition has no policy position other than fake laughter and removing the renewable energy targets.

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is warned because he continues to debate the question rather than supply the house with information.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I am satiated with information about the Leader of the Opposition, frankly.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I'm glad, sir. I hope it informs you.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, member for Mount Gambier.

**Mr BELL:** The member clearly asked both the capacity, which he has answered, but the second part of the question was how much we are currently using. I would ask you to direct the Treasurer to the amount we are currently using, and if he wants to get on his app he can find out that we are using 743 megawatts.

**The SPEAKER:** Alas, that's very interesting information and the member for Mount Gambier may now depart for the rest of question time for using a point of order to make an impromptu speech which, if permitted, would have us end up like the Australian Union of Students' conferences in the 1970s—God forbid!

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Dry Creek has three units that are not on today, since we are using the app. As we speak, Osborne is running at 165 megawatts; it has further capacity to go as well. There is one unit on at Pelican Point, which is not operating at capacity. I understand there is a second unit that can come on that has more capacity. Of course, Quarantine power station is not on and not all the units at Torrens are on. We have spare capacity in the system.

The market is choosing to use the interconnector. That is different from, 'We are entirely reliant on the interconnector,' which is our point: the market is broken. Checking your NEM app won't change it. Quite frankly, members opposite don't understand that the market is incentivising Victorian coal at the expense of South Australian gas. Members opposite think that's okay. We don't. We want to have South Australian gas on, South Australian generation on at the expense of Victorian coal, not the other way round. I don't know why it's so hard for members opposite to understand this.

#### **ELECTRICITY PRICES**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** Supplementary, sir: will prices go up when Hazelwood closes?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:28):** They certainly will in Victoria and they are going up in New South Wales and they are going up in Queensland. That is entirely the problem. In the absence of a national policy on carbon, you are having the disorderly exit of coal-fired generation. What they are doing is pushing up prices—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Barossa komitadji will be quiet.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** They are pushing up prices with a disorderly exit of generation because there is no signal for reinvestment in the market. If there was a signal for reinvestment in the market, like an energy intensity scheme or a carbon price or emissions trading scheme, you would have an orderly exit of generation replaced by new generation that could benefit from the scheme, but currently the commonwealth government is burying its head in the sand, saying, 'No, no, no, coal is good.'

Coal generation is closing. They know there is no imperative on them to close other generation, so they are making money while they can. They are pushing prices up in New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria, and that's why we need there to be national intervention. That's

why we need there to be a policy in place that gives us the opportunity to use South Australian gas, not Victorian coal.

### ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:30):** My question is for the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Has the minister been advised by Arrium, Nyrstar, BHP or Adelaide Brighton Cement that they intend to purchase on-site electricity generators to protect their operations and employees from further devastating blackouts?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:30):** I have met with all those companies. I meet with them regularly and a number of others that are talking about a whole series of measures they want to put in place to lower prices. A lot of them are very concerned about the continuation of supply, which is why the government will be intervening. They all recognise the failure of the national market and they all recognise the failure of the way the market is operating. They all recognise that it's not giving them what they wanted.

This all comes back to the experiment that we're in here, which isn't about renewable energy, but about the privatisation of an essential service that's been a failure. What we need to do is to come up with mechanisms that retake our sovereignty in this issue so we can actually insert ourselves into this market to protect South Australians.

There is a reason that these companies are going to the spot market. There is a reason that these companies are investing in gas exploration to try to get gas out of the ground to try to link that to generation to hedge for higher power prices. When these companies that the opposition asks me questions about read about policies to ban the exploration of gas in certain areas of South Australia, they are horrified. I don't know how anyone opposite can ask me a question about this without cringing, given what they are doing to our energy policy by trying to ban the exploration of gas in gas-rich regions alongside infrastructure like pipelines. I don't know how anyone can have any credibility asking me questions like that.

I don't blame any of these companies for doing that. Tomago in New South Wales, which is in a jurisdiction that is heavily reliant on coal-fired generation, was let down terribly by coal-fired generation last week when they were forced to close some lines, and when they close those lines that costs production. Coal-fired generation wasn't able to meet demand, but of course, in the absence of a national policy, there is no price signal to reinvest in new generation, so coal-fired generation crowds out the market. It doesn't let anyone new come in because there is no price signal, but when demand is really high we just turn industry off. Their coal just sits there. They continue to make their tidy profits, polluting and making donations to the Liberal Party and it's all okay.

The AI Group, an industry group that is no ally of the Labor Party, put out a report on Monday talking about a 47 per cent increase in prices in New South Wales that's overwhelmingly reliant on coal. Nearly 87 per cent of all of their generation comes from coal. If coal is so good and it's so cheap, why are the people of New South Wales getting a 50 per cent increase in their power prices? I will tell you why—because the market is broken. The market doesn't serve the people: it serves the interests of the owners of the generators, the poles and the wires—the people members opposite did a dirty deal with to sell our generators to and that's why we have to unpick it. This addiction to privatisation, this addition to the market—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Standing order 127: imputing improper motive.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** In the absence of price signals, there are going to be price increases across the NEM, and companies all across the National Electricity Market will be looking at putting in solar panels, batteries and their own generation to try to minimise costs because the real issue here is not availability of supply; it's cost. Cost is what is hurting this nation because coal is failing to give us cheap power.

You have seen the reports, Mr Speaker, that Queensland has had higher price spikes than South Australia since the start of the year—and of course those prices are unacceptable and there needs to be an intervention because the market clearly has failed.

**ELECTRICITY GENERATION**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:34):** Supplementary: given that the minister said in his answer that he had met with all these companies, can he advise the house what this investment in new generators will cost and, also, did any of these companies express their concerns with him about government's policy and the amount of installed wind energy that's unreliable in our state?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:35):** I think a lot of them are very concerned about the heavy subsidies the commonwealth government is giving to renewable energy in South Australia.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** You give all the permissions.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Isn't it amazing? The people who pay the wind generators to operate, they are clean, but the Development Act is guilty. So, paying them to operate when it—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** When Malcolm Turnbull pays wind generators to operate through Renewable Energy Certificates, which they voted for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The interjections will cease. The interjectors are mostly on two warnings already. I don't want a procession out of the chamber. The Treasurer is uncharacteristically not provoking the opposition just at this moment.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will get there, sir, eventually. I think these companies are very concerned about a lack of national policy at a national level and they are very concerned about the vacuum created by the commonwealth government signing the Paris agreement, committing us to decarbonise and putting no mechanism in place to meet that decarbonisation. So, what is the use of signing the Paris agreement? Why commit to it?

At the very least, Tony Abbott was consistent in his ideology: he does not believe climate change is real. He is intellectually consistent. And he doesn't believe there should be a price on carbon. That is consistent. That is an honest argument. But when you sign the Paris agreement and you say that climate change is real and you need to decarbonise and then do nothing about it, you get perverse outcomes in the National Electricity Market.

While the commonwealth government is subsidising renewable energy and that renewable energy is doing what it does best—going to where the conditions are best, which is South Australia because we have very good wind resources and very good sun resources to capture that commonwealth subsidy—they then attack the development assessment process rather than the subsidy.

The real argument here is: what is causing renewable energy to be built in South Australia? Is it the commonwealth subsidy that pays them to operate every single day that they are there or is it a development assessment approval? That is the inconvenient truth for members opposite. Are we to forgo the thousand jobs created in renewable energy? Are we to forgo the billions of dollars invested in South Australia? Are we to forgo all of that?

Where is the criticism of the subsidy paid to renewable energy? At least Abbott is consistent. Members opposite say they support the RET but oppose the Development Act. They support the commonwealth Renewable Energy Target but not the state-based one. They support nuclear power but not a dump.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: standing order 98.

**The SPEAKER:** Debate?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Debate, yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I am afraid I would have to uphold that point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That's disappointing, sir. Ultimately, what these companies all need, what they are all crying out for, what they have all said through their various organisations, whether it's the Business Council of Australia or the AI Group, and even the worker organisations like the ACTU, is national leadership, in a rare bipartisan display of crying out for national leadership.

The Chief Scientist, the Australian Energy Market Commission, the CSIRO and even Malcolm Turnbull all agreed at one stage or another that an energy intensity scheme would help us transition and maintain reliable, affordable electricity, but some members are addicted to coal, and that coal is driving prices up in New South Wales, in Queensland and now in Victoria.

### ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:39):** Supplementary: I would like the minister to explain, if he thinks that the South Australian government policies in the Development Act are innocent in this matter, why his government changed the Development Act specifically to allow the approval for a number of wind farms, including one in my electorate, and then had the Development Act changed back to its former position?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:39):** I think what the member is asking me is: why did we change the Development Act to fit in with the commonwealth policy that was bipartisan at the time? So, otherwise, we would have to actively oppose, or stop, renewable energy being built in the state. I am not sure how the opposition can say they support renewable energy and solar thermal but at the same time say that they are opposed to intermittent energy, opposed to the Development Act and opposed to the subsidy, but support the RET.

Again, it is this confused policy position the opposition have, where they say they support renewable energy only if it has storage. Solar thermal is still intermittent because all you need is a few days without sufficient sunlight to heat that storage—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —and you have intermittent energy. If you take the Leader of the Opposition at his word that he opposes intermittent energy, how can you possibly support solar thermal? How can you?

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** What rubbish.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** 'What rubbish.' On the same day the Leader of the Opposition abandons as a policy position the renewable energy target in this state, I get a letter saying 'build more renewable energy' from the demoted shadow minister.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Perfectly consistent.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** 'Perfectly consistent.' It is as consistent as wanting a nuclear reactor without the dump it requires.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir: could I draw your attention to a breakdown in the timing system?

**The SPEAKER:** The one day I didn't bring the Crvena Zvezda stopwatch.

**Mr Marshall:** I think the time has elapsed, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I suspect the time has elapsed. Deputy leader.

### ELECTRICITY PRICES

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Will the minister ensure that the people of Coober Pedy will pay no more than grid-equivalent energy prices pursuant to the new 20-year power price agreement with Energy Developments Limited?



**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:42):** We can't lock in future governments. Obviously, future governments will decide how they use those tariffs, but we made a commitment at the last election. We made a commitment at the last election that we would do that while we are in office and, of course, we have.

The council has entered into an agreement with ARENA and another company to provide long-term investment and power supply in Coober Pedy. Obviously, we have subsidies that are offered to pay for diesel generation through our rates scheme. That will continue, but ultimately I can't guarantee what future governments will do. We have certainly made a commitment and we will be honouring our commitment.

### ECONOMIC GROWTH

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:42):** My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on recent economic indicators in South Australia and what this means for the economy?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:43):** I am pleased to say that the economic indicators, including new data published today, show that this state is growing robustly, providing a platform for business to thrive and invest in South Australia. These claims of negativity developed by some members of this house aren't being proved by the facts.

Today's national accounts report for the December 2016 quarter, published by the ABS, shows that South Australia's state final demand was 1.8 per cent higher than it was the year before. This growth was ahead of the national domestic final demand of 1.7 per cent over the same period. The ABS said that the growth and final consumption expended by private households and the private sector's gross fixed capital formation grew in seasonally adjusted terms. This result shines a light on the negativity of some in this chamber who deliberately attempt to drag down the confidence—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order: clearly, this is debate, referring to what other members think.

**The SPEAKER:** It is debate. I uphold the point of order. Could we have an answer without reference to the opposition?

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Perhaps the member for Newland thinks the Treasurer is about to denounce dissidence in the government's ranks?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** These figures come despite the continual attacks and criticisms of our state by the commonwealth government. The commonwealth government has ministers like Senator Simon Birmingham, minister Chris Pyne and indeed the Prime Minister himself who made an unprecedented attack on our state. These accounts show that despite that—despite our own Prime Minister attacking our jurisdiction—South Australia is defying global forces.

In terms of jobs, we have added 11,300 total jobs in the past 12 months to January 2017—that is trend employment—and those are 5,300 full-time jobs and 6,000 part-time jobs. Retail turnover increased by 2.3 per cent in South Australia to the year December 2016. Nationally, retail turnover rose by only 1.6 per cent over the year to December 2016. The trend number of dwelling commencements increased by 10 per cent over the year to September 2016, which was the second highest growth across all mainland states after New South Wales. Nationally, dwelling commencements fell by 2.3 per cent over the same period.

On Monday, the ABS reported that mineral and petroleum exploration showed trend exploration expenditure was 14.5 per cent higher in South Australia in the December quarter compared to a year earlier, while nationally the same expenditure fell by 16.3 per cent over the same period. Clearly, this government is getting on with the work of making sure that South Australia is a place where business can invest and grow. Our tax cuts are having an impact. Our Job Accelerator Grant Scheme is having an impact. Our changes to WorkCover—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —when that was changed in a bipartisan way, are having impacts. Laughing at growth in South Australia I think flies in the face of what should be celebrated today. After last quarter's negative growth at a national level, to see the accounts return to positive growth is something all Australians should celebrate, not mock and scoff at.

Given the state is in the position of being in a budget surplus—something some members said we would never achieve, but of course we have and delivered—it will help us invest in our economy and build on what we have done so far. There are more tax cuts on the way in this budget coming up that were forecast in the last budget. We are helping grow the economy despite the negativity of members opposite.

### EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:47):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, what has the response been to the government's recently launched campaign to reduce violence and aggression in hospital emergency departments?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:47):** I thank the member for Elder for her question and her interest. Earlier this month, I launched SA Health's most recent major public awareness campaign, which aims to reduce violence and aggression towards hospital staff in emergency departments. Nurses, doctors and other staff in our hospitals do an outstanding job providing the highest quality care to our community. Sadly, these same staff frequently face situations of violence and aggression from the very people they are there to look after.

The campaign, titled 'Waiting is not an emergency', is running at the moment and will run to June 2017 and is headlined by a 30-second fictitious video showing aggression in an ED through the lens of a security camera. In a busy ED, lives depend on those most in need receiving medical attention first. This can result in people with less critical conditions waiting longer, which can of course be frustrating. However, resorting to the kind of idiotic behaviour that's depicted in the video is totally unacceptable and doesn't help anyone.

We know these public awareness campaigns are effective in getting the message across. Our campaign under the 'Taking care of challenging behaviour' strategy—the award-winning 'Keep your hands off our ambos' campaign—was incredibly successful and so far has resulted in a 13 per cent reduction in such incidents. Similarly, the 'Emergency departments are for emergencies' campaign, which ran over winter in 2015 and 2016, resulted in significantly fewer people presenting to EDs with relatively minor medical complaints.

Since our most recent campaign was launched, there has been an overwhelming response on social media. In the 24 hours following its launch, the video was viewed over 3.5 million times. To date, the video has been viewed more than 6.5 million times with 600,000 of those views by people in South Australia. Over 216,000 people have liked the video, and it has been shared more than 60,000 times.

We are confident that the campaign will be as successful as previous efforts, if not more so, and that people will give greater respect to our hardworking staff. I was disappointed with the opposition spokesperson, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, who was quoted as saying:

I just think the campaign's a really soft approach. I'd love to see, you know, some report that the government's written that says that this is going to be some answer to the problem.

If the honourable member doesn't regret this remark, she doesn't understand the impact that 6½ million views on social media is likely to have. She also couldn't have taken the trouble even to read the media release that was put out when this campaign was launched because, if she did, she would have been aware of SA Health's challenging behaviour strategy. The strategy is available on SA Health's website and describes in some detail how we are working to tackle this problem.

As well as the public awareness campaign, we are trialling measures in the Lyell McEwin Hospital ED to create an environment where people will be less likely to become frustrated to the point that they lash out at staff. For example, a screen has been installed that details in real-time how many people are currently in the ED and the anticipated wait to be treated.

The challenging behaviour strategy has also developed a training course and toolkit to support SA Health staff to identify challenging behaviour, to prevent it and, if necessary, respond when it occurs. Violence and aggression against healthcare workers in any setting is completely unacceptable, and the government is working to protect our staff from this dangerous and destructive behaviour.

#### REGIONAL ENERGY SUPPLY

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. How often did the minister personally meet with representatives of the Coober Pedy council in respect of the Energy Developments Ltd project and/or renewing the Remote Areas Energy Supplies (RAES) scheme?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:51):** Once, at their request, I met with the then chief executive—because they have had a number of chief executives over a period of time—I met with Mr Renshaw, I think it was once. I'm not sure when, but I can get that for the member.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** It was in the paper.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, it was in InDaily, and that was the level of my meetings with the Coober Pedy council.

#### REGIONAL ENERGY SUPPLY

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51):** Supplementary: did the minister inform the Department of State Development—that is, his department—of that meeting? If so, who was advised of that meeting?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:52):** With all my meetings with any stakeholders, the department is always there. They always put my meeting requests in with them. I never meet with anyone, from memory, without having a public servant with me, especially ones who are responsible for the area that people want to speak to me about. So, there would have been public servants there. I can't remember who because it was a long time ago, but I will find out and let you know.

#### REGIONAL ENERGY SUPPLY

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52):** Supplementary: did the minister keep a record of the matters discussed at that meeting, and were they provided to the Department of State Development, or was he relying entirely on the person who was apparently with him?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:52):** I don't understand what the import of the question is. Do I keep notes of my meetings? Yes, I do. Of course, we keep minutes of meetings. I don't know if the department kept their own notes; they may have. I don't know, but I will check and find out.

#### SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:53):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise the house what has been the cost so far of the South Road tram overpass bridgeworks since the now identified design fault saw the permanent closure of the bike path and South Road for four days?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:53):** I thank the member for Unley for his question. I should point out that he said in his question 'the permanent closure of the bike path'. While the bike path remains closed, it is the intention and the commitment of the government that, once the appropriate engineering solution is successfully installed, we will have that bike path back and for

use by the communities on either side of South Road. I think the substance of his question was: what are the costs to date? I haven't got that figure, but I will endeavour to find out for him.

#### **SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:53):** Has the minister been advised of any cost estimate for the repair of the bridge and, if so, can he advise the house of that cost?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:54):** I don't think I have a figure that's been put to me yet. Certainly, because we are still waiting for the second tranche of work, which is being undertaken by the independent firm Auricon, which is to design up a long-term fix for the shared pedestrian/cycling path, once that engineering solution is designed, and once that's reported to the government, then of course we will need to go through a process of getting those works undertaken by contractors. During that process, that's when we are likely to have the cost for that.

#### **SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:54):** Has the minister or his department sought advice from crown law on the government's ability to recover costs from various contractors involved in the design, building or verification of the bridge?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:54):** Certainly the department has, yes.

#### **SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:55):** Did the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure evaluate the bridge design before awarding the contract, and what was the outcome of that evaluation?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:55):** As the member for Unley has been briefed, it's the role of the department and its project managers to coordinate the different work streams which were provided to the government in the course of procuring and installing an infrastructure project such as the South Road tram overpass. It was the requirement of the design and construct contract that was awarded to McConnell Dowell that they would be responsible for both the design and the construction of the tram overpass.

There was also an additional stage, which was the independent certification of the bridge and its design, by another different firm, Walbridge and Gilbert. I think the member for Unley, as he said in some of his media comments, is trying to establish that this was not in fact the result of—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —the member for Finniss is still here—that it's the fault not of these independent contractors who were contracted to—

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order: I believe the minister is debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully. I have upheld points of order about debate before.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the Treasurer is right, I have listened carefully to what the minister has to say.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I was saying, it appears that what the member for Unley was suggesting in his question was consistent with what his comments have been outside, and that's that it's the fault of the department rather than the contractors who were engaged by the government to undertake these works. His previous question very clearly was about whether we have sought crown advice to see what liability lies with those companies that provided these works for the government. Not only have I answered that question and made it—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: I ask that you bring the minister back to the content of the question, which was: did the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure evaluate the bridge design?

**The SPEAKER:** So the question is relevance?

**Mr PISONI:** Exactly, sir, and I am just reminding the minister of what the question was.

**The SPEAKER:** If you were doing that that would be out of order, but it is a point of order and I think your point of order is relevance and, having interpreted your point of order, I now uphold it.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I was explaining while the member was standing on his feet, he is trying to establish that it was not the fault or indeed the resultant liability of those private sector contractors. He is instead trying to establish that it was the fault of the department. His previous question goes to the heart of why his current question is completely wrong.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: improper motives. The minister is in breach of standing orders—

**The SPEAKER:** That's a separate standing order.

**Mr PISONI:** —and he's debating the answer to the question. The question was: did his department evaluate the design before it was awarded?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley will now be seated. I don't think it was a case of imputing improper motives on such a scale that the Chair would have to intervene. The member for Schubert.

#### **TASSONE, MR B.**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Health. With regard to the recent payout given to Mr Bruno Tassone, did the minister sign off on all or part of the payout made to Mr Tassone as part of SA Health's culpability?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:59):** I wouldn't sign off on payouts to employees of SA Health. Those matters would be quite properly the responsibility—

**The SPEAKER:** No, it's a prisoner.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** A prisoner? Okay, I am more than happy to have a look at the matter and see whether I have had any responsibility for it.

#### **TASSONE, MR B.**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:59):** Supplementary: was the minister advised of any proposed settlement before it was made?

**The SPEAKER:** It is a case of a prisoner's treatment for diabetes.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:59):** To my knowledge, SA Health didn't have any responsibility in the matter you refer to. It would have been entirely the responsibility of the department for corrections, so it would not have come to me. I don't know why the member for Schubert is asking me the question. If there was some involvement of SA Health I am happy to report back to the house, but I don't see why SA Health would have had any involvement.

**The SPEAKER:** I have been looking forward to this all question time. The member for Kavel.

#### **MOUNT BARKER DISTRICT SOLDIERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Health. How can the government's trial of an after-hours doctor service at Mount Barker hospital be effective when the community has been given only five days' notice and no information has been provided to them as to what level of emergency care will be available during the trial?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:00):** I am very pleased to see the Leader of the Opposition taking a photograph of the member for Kavel asking his question—there for posterity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** He is the only one we fear. I am very pleased to announce that we will be providing an overnight medical service at the Mount Barker hospital, which has previously not been the case. I have to say that is largely due to the lobbying efforts of the new member for Mayo, who has worked tirelessly on behalf of the Mount Barker community when members of the Liberal Party have taken that community for granted for too long.

The member for Mayo has stood up for her community and has not taken it for granted. Isn't it ironic that the Leader of the Opposition would be taking a photograph, because it is the first time the member for Kavel has asked a question in this place on behalf of his community?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: debate, imputing improper motives and risking his own blood pressure.

**The SPEAKER:** I think we will just uphold it on the basis of debate.

#### **MOUNT BARKER DISTRICT SOLDIERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:02):** A supplementary to the minister: what is the cost of the trial and where is the funding coming from?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:02):** The Strathalbyn GPs, not unreasonably, expressed to Country Health, as part of the negotiations for renewal of their contracts, that the Strathalbyn GPs who provide doctors to the Strathalbyn hospital would not be in a position to continue to offer an overnight cover service, as they have been doing until now. Country Health worked with the Strathalbyn GPs about the best way forward, and all parties agreed that the best way forward would be to have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Isn't it great to see the Liberal Party standing up for the community of Mount Barker, interjecting and expressing clear opposition to the model that has been agreed to between Country Health and the GPs in Strathalbyn? I find the chorus of opposition from members opposite quite enlightening. Nonetheless, I won't be diverted.

It was a model that was agreed to with the Strathalbyn GPs because, not unreasonably, they have said that they are not in a position any longer to continue offering overnight service. Mount Barker hospital is 20 minutes from Strathalbyn, a 20-minute drive from Strathalbyn to Mount Barker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** No, that is normal driving speed. Even my driver, who is not noted for his swiftness when it comes to driving, is able to travel between—

**Ms REDMOND:** Point of order: now that the minister is telling us about the speed at which his driver drives around the place, I think perhaps relevance might be a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I am very tempted to remove the member for Heysen for the remainder of question time for that weak point of order. I will look it up on Whereis.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I was responding to interjections, Mr Speaker, it is true. This is a very good arrangement and, in fact, provides a superior service to the people of Strathalbyn and to the people of Mount Barker because it means that people from Strathalbyn, with the contract we had with the GPs—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The contract with the GPs was that a GP wasn't present at the Strathalbyn hospital overnight. The GP was on call and, under the contract, the GP had to be there

within half an hour. Many people presenting to the Strathalbyn hospital would be waiting up to half an hour to be seen by a doctor.

Under the new arrangement, which we are trialling for three months, there will not be a doctor on call at Mount Barker hospital, but a doctor will be actually present overnight at the Mount Barker hospital. People in Strathalbyn who need to see a doctor will be able to go to Mount Barker hospital, and there will be a doctor there on site to see them. This is, we believe, a far superior service.

Yes, there is an additional cost, and that is being met by the department because we are committed to looking after the people of Mount Barker and because the member for Mayo is particularly interested in the care of her community, working hard for that community to make sure they get the services they need. It is simply a fact: the Mount Barker community and the catchment of the Mount Barker hospital is more than 70,000 and approaching 100,000 people. That is a growing community, and it is interesting that the Liberal Party have given up on it already.

**The SPEAKER:** According to Whereis, the driving time between Mount Barker and Strathalbyn is 19 minutes.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:06):** I rise today to speak about a very important issue in both my community and South Australia in general. We are currently in the midst of a youth unemployment crisis in South Australia. In January this year, South Australia's trend unemployment rate was 6.7 per cent. That is the highest in the country and, as we know, South Australia has been at the bottom of the ladder for more than two years, thanks to this state Labor government. Our statewide youth unemployment rate is more than double that figure. It is at 16.9 per cent, meaning that 16.9 per cent of 15 to 24 year olds are currently unemployed in our state. Youth unemployment gets worse when you look across the regions, with 19.3 per cent of 15 to 24 year olds unemployed in Adelaide's north.

The rate of underemployment in South Australia is 9.8 per cent, the highest on the mainland. Underemployment refers to people aged 15 and over who want and are available for more hours of work than they currently have. They include people who are employed part-time or who want to work more hours and are available to work more hours, or persons employed full-time who work part-time hours for economic reasons, such as insufficient work being available. That is right: the work is not there and South Australians want to work more.

The underutilisation rate is another measure from ABS stats. Again, South Australia is the highest on the mainland, as we were with underemployment. Our underutilisation rate is 16.7 per cent. Underutilisation includes a wider group of people than the unemployed, such as people who are part-time workers who are willing and available to work more hours and people who are willing and available to work but have become discouraged and stopped looking for work. According to those three measures, we have the worst youth unemployment rate in the nation and the highest underutilisation rate and underemployment rate on the mainland. This is really hurtful to all South Australians, and it has had a great impact in my community and right across the state.

Just recently, we saw Coca-Cola lose 190 jobs, and that was another major setback for South Australians. Caroma lost 14, and we now find out that the railway company Pacific National has moved 40 jobs out of South Australia. Forty South Australians have lost their jobs with Pacific National and they have gone interstate. The list of industries and businesses leaving South Australia just keeps getting longer and longer. We know that Holden will close later this year in October, and the fallout from that will come in 2019. The future does not look rosy for South Australia, and all this is after 15 years of a state Labor government in South Australia.

This week, we hear about a solution that the Premier is putting forward, and it is quite an amazing solution. His big plans are to create public sector jobs by getting people in the public sector to give up some of their hours, to actually go part-time and create part-time jobs for people coming in. It is just incongruous.

We support the public sector and the employees, who do a marvellous job and who work hard. We know how beneficial that is for South Australia. But this idea of the Premier is to actually take these people, reduce their hours and then give a handful of hours to young South Australians—this is a policy designed for people 17 to 30 years of age. What we are going to see here is South Australians saying, 'I can stay in South Australia and just get a part-time job in the Public Service or I can go interstate and try to find work elsewhere.'

The Premier has not looked to support businesses. This government is not growing jobs in our state. They are not helping industry. They are not helping businesses grow jobs. By contrast, we have already said that we will return ESL remissions to South Australians. That is a big help to South Australian businesses and to South Australian families. It is \$90 million a year—\$360 million over four years—back in the pockets of South Australians and back in the pockets of businesses so they can employ more people in sustainable jobs for the future.

We also have our council rate capping policy, which is again putting money back in the pockets of South Australians and making sure that this money can be spent elsewhere. There is also Globe Link, a great project which our party has put forward which will grow opportunities in South Australia, grow jobs and give a future to our young people. We need the ability to move goods and services through South Australia far more easily and get them to export markets and to grow into export markets.

As the leader said, we are not going to get rich selling lattes to ourselves. Whilst those on the other side think that is how it is going to happen, South Australians know that it is not. They are awake to what this Labor government is doing. They are not delivering opportunities for South Australians and that is what young people are looking for. We have to get off the bottom of the ladder when it comes to youth unemployment.

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:11):** Today week, we will mark International Women's Day. It should be noted that the Minister for the Status of Women moved today to begin planning for the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of dual suffrage in South Australia—the first place in the world to grant its female citizens such equality.

In talking about equality for women, it will come as no surprise to all here that the example of Muriel Matters has done much to inspire me over the past almost 10 years. It was as Muriel Matters, with members of the Muriel Matters Society, that I was proud to participate in the Fringe parade on 18 February along North Terrace. I thank the people involved in the Fringe parade for making this opportunity available to me. Although not scantily clad, I am able to let you know that we were welcomed by the crowd, and it was in response to cries for equal pay for women that we received the greatest acclamation—there is a tale in itself.

Muriel's example has become an inspiration to a wider group throughout the state and nationally via the activities of the Muriel Matters Society, especially at schools, and the society's soon to be published monograph, *That Daring Australian Girl*, will soon be distributed to all schools and libraries throughout this state, along with a copy of the DVD docudrama, *Muriel Matters!*, produced through Ronin Films, and I acknowledge their kind assistance in this initiative. The monograph text has been written by Dr Collette Snowden and the design is in the capable hands of Mr Mark Thomson.

Muriel will also be at the Western Australian and South Australian International Women's Day breakfasts. This year, as her profile grows so too does the influence of her example to us all. There are so many social justice areas and issues that she was attracted to and supported—assistance for domestic violence victims and quality education for all through her work with Sylvia Pankhurst and her Montessori school in the East End of London.

Sylvia was a remarkable woman, a daughter of the suffragette, Emmeline Pankhurst. Sylvia's son, Professor Richard Pankhurst, recently passed away and we send our condolences and sympathy to his wife, Rita, and daughter, Helen, who is a life member of the Muriel Matters Society UK and who has been a great personal supporter of me, for which I am truly grateful.



Another link to Muriel and her advocacy for working families is her relationship to BHP in Broken Hill, for it is family lore that she was romantically linked with Theo Delprat, whose father, G.D. Delprat, became assistant general manager of BHP in 1899. There is a Bedford family link too, through George Randolph Bedford, a slightly older contemporary of Muriel's, as he was born in 1868, who was also involved in theatre in his early years, which no doubt contributed to his involvement with the Australian Workers Union, that mighty union associated with Broken Hill. George Randolph Bedford was their MP in the Queensland seat of Warrego, which was the union stronghold in 1923, a seat which he held until his death in 1941. I am pleased to see in his entry in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* that he was 'rebellious against party discipline, so was never elected to cabinet', a true Bedford trait.

However, I do digress and must get back to International Women's Day. Muriel was also passionately involved in agitation for world peace through her work as a conscientious objector with the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. This is a concept we all need to keep in mind as the world sees a rise in militarism. Muriel's early days in Adelaide bring me back to International Women's Day and what it means for us and all the young women we influence by our behaviour and example.

As we begin to focus on International Women's Day events here and all over the world, I urge members to become involved in events throughout their community and wherever possible. By fostering the ideals of equality, we lift everyone and we lend our voice and efforts to make the world a better place.

#### HARTLEY ELECTORATE

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:15):** I wish to draw the attention of the house to two local issues in my community: a local primary school and a local bus stop that has been of enormous concern to local residents. I have in my hand a petition signed by about 100 local residents drawing the attention of the house to the demand for a safer bus stop location for bus stop 14 on Magill Road, which is the north-west side.

The position of this bus stop near the T-junction of Galway Grove and Magill Road, Tranmere, is a safety concern to local commuters, as they are forced to take risks when entering the junction due to parked buses waiting at the timed stop. This situation has led to a number of impatient drivers taking risks with their safety and that of others just to access Magill Road. I have raised this issue on a number of occasions with the Department of Transport. I continue to do so today and I will continue to lobby until the right outcome is reached.

The bus stop in question sits just metres away from the busy T-junction of Galway Grove and Magill Road. As it is currently situated, the bus stop blocks the vision of local traffic attempting to turn right onto Magill Road from Galway Grove. To make matters worse, this is a timed bus stop. That means that, when buses are running early, they sit and wait at this stop for prolonged periods, hence forcing local traffic to creep out onto the busy road, unable to see oncoming traffic, risking an accident. This is an unnecessary risk for local commuters to have to take. My fear is that it will inevitably result in a serious and foreseeable collision.

I put the government on notice that that is the case and urge them to do something about this quickly. To place a busy bus stop so close to an intersection certainly seems careless, but to then make it a timed bus stop is asking for an accident. I would encourage the government to listen to the concerns of the residents and the community and relocate this bus stop to a less hazardous location that does not hinder the safety of local traffic. I will continue to lobby the local council and the state government on this important issue.

I also recently visited East Marden Primary School, and I want to draw the attention of the house once again to certain issues about that school in my electorate. This is an outstanding school that, unfortunately, has been let down by this state Labor government that has now been in power for 15 years. It is about time that this state government gave East Marden Primary School the attention and the extra resources it deserves.

As I have said in the past, this school has incredible demand from families looking to send their kids to the school. This is a result of not only outstanding results but also the exceptional culture

within the school. That demand has also been exacerbated by the increased density in the surrounding area. To date, this state Labor government has not delivered East Marden Primary School with the upgrade to the facilities that it needs to give students the absolute best learning environment possible.

This school does an exceptional job, which is a credit to the principal, the teachers, the governing council and also the parents. The school does an exceptional job with the facilities it has, but it is certainly in desperate need of more. The government has a clear responsibility to this school to improve these facilities and to do so quickly. I ask this government to build the much needed extra classrooms, the much needed extra toilets and other buildings, and improve facilities that are needed to meet the increased density and demand for this school.

I especially ask the minister to address recent building issues raised within the department. As the member for Hartley, I will continue to advocate for improved educational facilities to ensure that every child has the best learning opportunities possible in our local area. I will return to speak about this issue in this place on another day.

### NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:19):** Last time I spoke in this part of our proceedings, I talked about the importance of the National Disability Insurance Scheme to people living with disability and their families. I talked about how the new NDIS is about ensuring that people living with disability are able to have a dignified life and be treated with dignity. I also spoke about how this group is one of the most vulnerable in our society, deserving every bit of support the NDIS will provide it.

Fortunately, this scheme is about ensuring that these people get quality services, quality support and also support for their families. It is the most important reform in social policy since the introduction of Medicare. All this good work is now under threat because the federal Liberal government is linking federal budget cuts to people on low incomes and pensioners so that they can provide additional funding for the NDIS. It is a disgraceful and deplorable act that the federal government is pitting one group of vulnerable people in our community against another, ostensibly for budget repair.

The omnibus bill seeks to boost funding for the NDIS by cutting financial support for low income earners and pensioners. The federal government believes that the ever-growing income and wealth inequality in our community are good for our economy and our society. That could not be more wrong. In my opinion, it is this growing income and wealth inequality that underpins the growing dissatisfaction with mainstream political parties and gives rise to political groups that undermine our democracy.

I would like to paraphrase a very insightful article by Michael McGuire on page 15 of yesterday's *Advertiser*. It says that these new groups are about blame culture. It is about immigrants, it is about Muslims, it is about unions, it is about gays, it is about banks, it is about whoever you want it to be—but it is not about you. This group does not want an open, generous, engaged Australia. They want a closed, mean, selfish Australia. It is policies like that of the federal Liberal government, which seek to cut support for the most vulnerable while at the same time giving tax cuts to the most wealthy, that give rise to these groups in our society.

It is policies like this that continue to support and feed these groups. In my opinion, it is counterproductive that we can choose to attack the leaders of these groups, when they are merely giving voice, albeit quite unproductively, to ordinary people's concerns. Their concerns are about economic security and economic justice. Those are the concerns of these people who choose to vote for this growing number of minor parties—economic inequality and income insecurity. Over the past 10 years, it is no accident that the rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer, not only in Australia but across the Western world. Who has paid for it? The people who have paid this price are middle and low income earners.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** We have a federal Liberal government. We have had the Abbott government, we have the Turnbull government, so do not blame Labor.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Davenport.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Give me a chance; I will come to it. The global economy has created new wealth, but it has not distributed it fairly, and that has given rise to inequality in our communities. While the federal government cuts pensions, it wants to give its mates in the multinational companies a \$52 billion tax cut, which makes the wealthy more wealthy. The federal government supports cuts to penalty rates for those on low income in the cleaning and hospitality industries, people on minimum wages. They want to cut the wages of young people and women, who disproportionately make up this workforce and will be hit the hardest.

These policies will make it harder for these groups to have home ownership. While Liberal party members of the federal parliament talk about how people should get better jobs to afford home ownership, their mates are supporting cuts to wages for the poorest in our community. Rather than attack the leaders of these emerging political groups, the Liberal Party should introduce policies that create a fairer Australia. The federal Liberal omnibus bill is more ominous than people realise. It hurts more than just ordinary people: it undermines our democracy.

### KANGAROO ISLAND PLANTATION TIMBERS

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:24):** I would like to raise a couple of issues in the house today, one in particular relating to Victor Harbor. The Fleurieu tourism people and the mayor and business group in Victor Harbor are particularly keen to get cruise ships going there. They want to share in the cruise ship market, and I am supportive of that and think it is a good thing.

There are some issues with getting in there, mooring ships and getting people ashore, which they are fully cognisant of and want to do something about but, having visited cruise ships going into Port Lincoln where they can pull up right alongside the wharf in the middle of town, which is extremely good, I support what Mayor Graham Philp and the people of Victor Harbor and the Fleurieu are trying to do. Getting cruise ships going in there would be a great boon for the region. There is plenty to do and see and, in a town the size of Victor Harbor, this would only increase the opportunities to come with Oceanic Victor, which starts soon and will be good. I am going to a lunch to hear more about that next week.

The other thing I want to talk about today is the issue of Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers. A fortnight ago, the Deputy Premier granted them major project status. I am pretty comfortable with the major project status, as I think it gives the opportunity for things to be explored, but there are some major issues going on. I do not know the answer to this, but today the ASX has said the securities of KIPT will be suspended from official quotation from 1 March 2017 following failure to lodge their half-yearly reports and accounts for the period ending 31 December 2016, in accordance with ASX listing rules.

As I say, I do not know the technicalities of that. It may be easily explained, and I respect that if that is the case, but there are a number of things taking place. I am afraid that I do not have a great deal of confidence in the board and management of KI Plantation Timbers. I have met them two or three times, and I fail to be satisfied that they really understand the complexities of trying to put in a port at Smith Bay.

Even today, I have been in contact with people on the Island who have contacted me about drilling taking place out off the coast, ostensibly without approval. The government agencies are working on that as we speak but, if indeed there is illegal drilling in the water, this is the second time this has taken place. KI Plantation Timbers had contractors drill along the shoreline in the coast protection zone last year or the year before without any approvals whatsoever. Fortunately, they were made to stop very quickly. They were down on the foreshore drilling without any permits.

I do not understand the psychology or where KI Plantation Timbers are coming from. Nobody on Kangaroo Island objects to removing the timber and doing something about it; it would be the best possible thing that could happen. Interestingly, I have also just noticed on the internet that the port of Portland has an enormous stockpile of timber which they currently cannot sell. While KIPT are saying they have a firm market for the timber if they can harvest it, which is good, I would like to know how that is going to fit in with this stockpile at Portland, which is absolutely enormous. One wag said it was so big that it had snow on top of it.

The situation is very detailed in relation to the current abalone farm that exists on Kangaroo Island with some \$30 million worth of infrastructure. Absolutely nothing KI Plantation Timber have told me convinces me that they have any idea about the operation of an abalone farm or what is required to make that place tick along. They seem to rely on bits and pieces. They cannot substantiate evidence on the figures they have provided to me quite openly in the presence of two other members of parliament, I might add. They are all figures that have been drafted up.

I look forward to putting in a submission in relation to the major project status at the time. I want the timber industry to work, but I do not want the port at Smith Bay, nor does the vast majority of Kangaroo Island residents.

#### **CLEMENT, MS T.**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:29):** Today, I rise to pay tribute to a dedicated, passionate South Australian who was a well-known, valued and loved community member within my local area (the electorate of Elder) and beyond. I speak with deepest respect about Tricia Clement who, sadly and unexpectedly, passed away late last year on 23 November. Tricia was an enthusiastic supporter and attendee of the Active Elders Association, a club bringing senior citizens together in friendship and companionship in the heart of my electorate. Tricia also attended many, if not all, of the club's special days and enjoyed the homestyle-cooked meals on many occasions.

With her vision for community, Tricia initiated and implemented the interschool bowling competitions with Ascot Park and Marion primary schools. She attended them all and was thrilled with the interaction between the seniors and the children. She also encouraged olden-day games days between the two groups. Tricia loved Active Elders Australia Day celebrations, and one year was awarded the Active Elders Australia Day award. This, I am told, she apparently accepted with great delight and wore the cardboard medal all day with great gusto.

Tricia was a member of the executive of the Council of the Aged in South Australia and assisted, volunteered and helped in aged care and social clubs. She was also a committed supporter of Riding for the Disabled organisation, helping them and others with obtaining grants and fundraising for them. Tricia used her experience and expertise gained from volunteering at COTA to help numerous groups acquire many grants, especially the Active Elders Association for senior citizens.

Tricia was always welcomed into my office, and she was a breath of fresh air and kept me across what she was involved in as she assisted others in obtaining grants, which I was only too happy to support. Together with her partner in crime, Jan, the Treasurer of Active Elders, they were a formidable and successful force. Recently, the City of Marion honoured Tricia's life with a moving and reflective memorial service, and I read from Jan Hedger's tribute when she reflected on Tricia's life and their friendship. Jan said:

I first became involved with Tricia when I was struggling with a grant and in desperation rang COTA [South Australia] and asked for someone to help me and COTA put me in touch with their volunteer for our area, being Tricia.

Our first introduction to working on a grant together was when she came to my home and we worked furiously until midnight. We found we were very much on the same wavelength and worked well together bouncing words and titles off one another. Many giggles and belly laughs ensued when trying to give the grant a name. For example in the case of a grant we received from the City of Marion for Wii video game consoles for Active Elders, we wickedly came up with the title 'Teaching Seniors to Wii'. Anyway, we received a grant, [and] I am not sure if it was the name or the content that got us through.

Tricia worked tirelessly with Jan for 2½ years when, on behalf of Active Elders, they applied to the Marion council for a grant to extend the kitchen and hall. The pair were required to apply for three grants and to contend with the associated reams of paperwork from the council. Jan tells me that while at times she was ready to give up, Tricia never was and never considered this as an option. Instead, she persisted and inspired Jan to continue and persevere. Tricia and Jan's persistence won the day, and Active Elders gained a beautiful and spacious new kitchen and expanded hall.

Tricia was fundamental to the applications and presentations that resulted in the Active Elders senior citizens winning the COTA SA Every Generation awards—not once, but twice—an amazing achievement. Tricia also encouraged Active Elders to become involved with the City of Marion over-50s forum, and she was also instrumental in establishing the justice of the peace forum

and community dinner that is now in its eighth year. To close, I quote Jan again with her heartfelt words as she spoke at the memorial service, acknowledging Tricia's valuable contribution to making South Australia a better place. She said: 'Active Elders and especially myself will miss her greatly. Much love from myself and Active Elders.' Vale, Tricia Clement.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE SACA PREMIER CRICKET MERGER DECISION**

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:34):** By leave, I move:

That the select committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

*Bills*

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (HEAVY VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES) BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:35):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Highways Act 1926; and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:36):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill amends the *Highways Act 1926* and the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*. The amendments are intended to help meet South Australia's obligations as a participating jurisdiction in the national legislative regime for heavy vehicles, which are vehicles over 4.5 tonnes in gross vehicle mass.

On 10 February 2014 the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*, which contains the national law as a schedule, came into operation. It provided for the creation of a national heavy vehicle regulator (the Regulator). In addition to South Australia, all Australian States and Territories, apart from Western Australia and the Northern Territory, are participants in this national heavy vehicle regulation regime.

As the registration chapter of the national law has not yet commenced, heavy vehicle registration still falls to state legislation. The registration fees are governed by model law that is adopted by participating jurisdictions. On 6 November 2015, amendments to the Heavy Vehicle Charges Model Law (1) were approved by the national Transport and Infrastructure Council (the Council), comprised of each State and Territory government's Transport and Infrastructure portfolio Ministers. For the first time, since 1 July 2016, heavy vehicle registration charges, as reflected in the Motor Vehicles (National Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Variation Regulations 2016 (the Regulations) made under the Motor Vehicles Act, have been calculated on the basis of components comprising a road user charge and a regulatory charge.

In addition, South Australia and other participating heavy vehicle national law jurisdictions have agreed that the regulatory revenue collected as part of their registration fees is to be transferred to the Regulator fund to meet each jurisdiction's share of the Council approved operating budget of the Regulator. This will provide the Regulator with an industry-sourced funding model to resource its important duties, which is now being collected by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles (Registrar) in this state.

The Bill amends section 31 of the Highways Act to ensure that the regulatory component of heavy vehicle registration fees collected or received by the Registrar is deducted from the registration fee monies due to be paid into the Highways fund. This revenue will instead be paid into the Regulator's Fund.

The amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act will require the transfer of this regulatory revenue collected by the Registrar from heavy vehicle registration fees to the Regulator's fund. The Bill also clarifies that any deduction resulting from concessional registration charges payable pursuant to sections 34 and 37 of the Act, for people living in remote areas and primary producers, is to be taken from the roads component, and not from the regulatory component of the fees. This ensures that the full amount of the regulatory component will be provided to the Regulator's Fund.

I commend the Bill to the House in order that South Australia can meet its national commitments to the Council and to the Regulator, to deliver agreed support for the national heavy vehicle regulation regime.

(1) Schedule 1 of the National Transport Commission (Model Heavy Vehicle Charges Act) Regulations 2008 (Cth)

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Highways Act 1926*

###### 3—Amendment of section 31—Highways Fund

This clause amends section 31 so that the Treasurer is not required to pay the regulatory component of registration fees collected or received in respect of heavy vehicles into the Highways Fund.

##### Part 3—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

###### 4—Insertion of section 28

This clause inserts new section 28.

###### 28—Payments into National Heavy Vehicle Regulator Fund

Proposed section 28 requires the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to pay the regulatory component of registration fees collected or received in respect of heavy vehicles into the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator Fund in accordance with a scheme agreed with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pisoni.

### **RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS NO 3) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 February 2017.)

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:37):** I rise as the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. The Liberal Party supports the government's bill. In December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments implemented national rail safety reform, creating a single rail safety regulator, and developed the Rail Safety National Law. The Rail Safety National Law commenced operation in January 2013, with Queensland also adopting the law last year. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator now operates in all jurisdictions. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator was established as a body corporate under the law. It facilitates safe rail operation through accreditation of operators, industry guidance, education, training, etc.

The national training commission identifies legislative amendments in cooperation with the regulator and participating jurisdictions. Ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council approved this bill on 6 November 2015. South Australia, as host jurisdiction, is responsible for the passage of the amendments through the South Australian parliament, subsequently being automatically adopted into legislation by other participating jurisdictions through an application act.

The bill is the third amendment package brought to the South Australian parliament and similarly has additions to the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012. The amendment introduces powers of the regulator to charge additional fees to major rail projects designed to ensure that regulatory oversight and operations can be properly maintained as the number of rail projects increases. The bill also includes a review mechanism that will allow a rail transport operator to seek a review of the regulator's decision that the project is a major project.

It also specifies that the Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board Ltd is a prescribed authority for the purposes of sharing information to achieve national law objectives. It clarifies that a registered person may surrender a private sighting of his or her registration without the need to

surrender the entire registration or go through a variation process, as is the current case. It introduces the procedure for a rail transport operator to surrender an exemption granted by the regulator separate to the regulator's power to suspend or cancel an exemption. Subordinate legislation will specify the additional project component fee amounts and the criteria that the regulator must consider when determining whether a project component fee is payable. I also understand that this bill has the support of the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, the council and major stakeholders such as the Rail Industry Association. On that basis, we support the bill.

**Mr GEE (Napier) (15:40):** Today, I am pleased to speak on this important bill, which is continuing the improvements to rail safety across the nation. As the house may be aware, the Rail Safety National Law commenced operation in January 2013 with the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator also being established. The Rail Safety National Law is currently enacted through legislation in all jurisdictions except Queensland, which is expected to become a participating jurisdiction on 1 July this year.

Since its establishment, the national safety regulator has successfully discharged its obligations, including providing a scheme for national accreditation in rail transport operators, promotion of national policies and procedures, and guidance to industry, as well as making positive progress on education and training in relation to safe rail work operations.

This bill will allow the National Rail Safety Regulator to charge additional fees for major rail projects. While no-one likes additional fees, the fact is that when the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator was established in 2012 investment in major rail projects had an estimated value of \$15.4 billion. However, in 2016 major rail projects announced, or having already commenced, total in excess of \$60 billion. Naturally the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator is not resourced to provide the level of oversight necessary without the introduction of this major rail project fee.

While we are on the topic of major rail projects, it would be remiss of me not to mention the \$238 million Torrens Rail Junction Project. Stage 1 of the Goodwood and Torrens Rail Junction Project was finished in 2014, with the completion of the Goodwood rail junction and Adelaide Showground station upgrades. Stage 2 works are now underway and include a grade separation of freight and passenger lines at the Torrens rail junction, a new overpass at the Mike Turtur bikeway over the rail line at Goodwood Station and grade improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the Leader Street rail crossing at Wayville. Stage 2 is expected to support about 212 jobs a year during construction.

This Labor government is getting on with delivering real improvements in conjunction with other major road projects, such as the Northern Connector Project, the Darlington Upgrade Project, and the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project. I might add that the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project has also seen the removal of a busy level crossing, with the construction of the Outer Harbor rail overpass. This would never have occurred if those opposite had won in 2014, as they promised to scrap the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project in favour of the Darlington Upgrade Project, which this Labor government is also doing. It reminds me a bit of the old El Paso ad, except that instead of, 'Why don't we have both?' we could say, 'Why don't we build both?'

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GEE:** I am glad they found that amusing. I am pleased that the government has earmarked the Broadmeadows and Smithfield railway stations for a possible upgrade, which I am sure will be welcomed by the many people in my electorate who use the Gawler line. This government is also committed—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond, what were you on before question time?

**Mr GEE:** —\$152.4 million towards the electrification of the Gawler line from Adelaide to Salisbury.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are out if you continue, member for Hammond, another noise and you are out. Your voice carries. Sorry, member for Napier, that is not fair.

**Mr GEE:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The state government will shortly be issuing a tender for the electrification, with construction to start in the second half of this year. However, sadly, electrification of the Salisbury to Gawler section remains unfunded, due to the Coalition walking away from the project in 2013. During last year's federal election campaign, federal Labor announced that it would reverse the \$76 million cut, but the Coalition failed to make the matching offer, which shows their lack of commitment to the people of the north.

**Mr Bell:** We gave you \$50 billion for the submarines.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Mount Gambier!

**Mr GEE:** The member for Unley complains that the Gawler electrification is ranked in the lower order of proposed initiatives by Infrastructure Australia and that this means that the government is asleep at the wheel. I wonder if he means his counterparts in Canberra, who pulled the funding for the project, are asleep at the wheel or maybe indeed it is he who is asleep at the wheel, not calling on his mates at Canberra to reverse those cuts.

I note that the Liberals' Globe Link plan—also known as the great Adelaide Hills sandbag—is also not on the Infrastructure Australia priority list, and the commonwealth department responsible for evaluating, planning and investing in infrastructure knows nothing about it, nor has any information on it, as we found out during Senate estimates on Monday. This is on top of failing to consult with key industry groups such as the South Australian Freight Council—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond, the next time you speak you will have to leave.

**Mr GEE:** —Adelaide Airport and the Adelaide Airports Association. It appears that, as usual, those opposite are the ones who might be asleep at the wheel. I am pleased to support this bill and I hope the Rail Safety National Law continues to improve rail safety across the country.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You do not really deserve to be recognised, do you, member for Hammond?

**Mr PEDERICK:** I know I am little, Madam Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No! You know you should have left the room for interjections, is what I mean. We are all now going to listen to you in silence, which is a courtesy you did not extend to the member for Napier—

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If the member for Mount Gambier moves his lips once more, he can leave, too. Member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:46):** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I acknowledge your tolerance. I want to speak to the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous No 3) Amendment Bill 2017. I am quite happy to speak on this bill after that withering attack from the member for Napier.

In December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments implemented national rail safety reform, creating a single rail safety regulator, and developed the Rail Safety National Law. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator was established as a body corporate under the law and facilitates safe rail operation through accreditation of operators, industry guidance, education, training and other matters. The National Transport Commission identifies legislative amendments in cooperation with the regulator and participating jurisdictions.

Ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council approved this bill on 6 November 2015, and South Australia, being the host jurisdiction, is responsible for passage of amendment bills through the South Australian parliament, subsequently automatically adopted into legislation by other participating jurisdictions through an application act. This bill is the third amendment package brought to the South Australian parliament, similarly to additions to the national Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012.



This amendment bill introduces powers for the regulator to charge additional fees for major rail projects, designed to ensure regulatory oversight of operations, so that they can be properly maintained as the number of rail projects increases. The bill also includes a review mechanism that will allow a rail transport operator to seek a review of the regulator's decision that a project is a major project.

The bill also specifies the Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board Limited as a prescribed authority for purposes of sharing information to achieve national law objectives and clarifies that a registered person may surrender a private siding from its registration without the need to surrender the entire registration or go through a variation process, as is currently the case. It also introduces a procedure for a rail transport operator to surrender an exemption granted by the regulator separate from the regulator's powers to suspend or cancel an exemption.

There will be some subordinate legislation that will specify the additional project component fee amounts and the criteria the regulator must consider when determining whether a project component fee is payable. From what I understand, this bill has the support of ministers of transport, the infrastructure council and major stakeholders, such as the rail industry associations.

I want to talk about a few issues to do with rail in this state. I note that the member for Napier brought up the issue of Gawler electrification. Yes, it has been a long time coming. We have seen the poles put in and nothing else happen. We have seen the embarrassment of diesel engines having to take electric trains to be serviced because there are no electric facilities to do the job. I have a long family connection to the Gawler area, with both sets of grandparents having lived there and one of my grandfathers having been a porter on the railways back in the day when you had porters.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** You should run for Light.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I have plenty of contacts. There are plenty of Pedericks buried in that area, up at Gawler River on our country. Yes, I probably could have had a run up there, but I have never lived up there. My father lived in that area.

Certainly, there is the issue of when that electrification is going to happen, if it ever gets off the ground. I look at what has happened with the Seaford line, where we have seen major breakdowns with the loss of power, poor quality cabling in place, services having to stop for many hours and substitute buses so people can have public transport on the Seaford line.

Another rail issue I want to talk about is the demise of the Mallee lines, which I think is terrible. It is sad that there have not been enough dollars put into the Mallee lines to keep them up to speed. I know that when they were last operating a couple of years ago the trains had to go very slowly, and they were just grain trains heading out to Pinnaroo or out through Karoonda towards Loxton. You certainly have to have the trains running only at night and certainly on days like this, when the temperature would be in the high 30s during harvest, the trains run at 25 km/h, so, yes, they were inefficient. In the end, I believe that was used as part of the excuse to shut those lines down.

The offset of that effect is that it puts thousands of more tonnes on the road, and that was certainly exemplified in this most recent harvest, which was the biggest harvest in South Australia's history and when so many more tonnes of grain had to come up those Mallee roads. I have talked in this place before about getting some overtaking lanes out there. There have been various theories about how the Mallee highway, up through Lameroo and Pinnaroo, was built; some say someone followed a goat and one theory is that perhaps they were paid more to survey more corners into the road because it certainly looks like that.

As someone who travels along it many times a year and has travelled along it many times over my lifetime, it is a terrible road. In fact, plenty of people have put to me that, if the rail corridor is not going to be used, it would have a much straighter road, but that would be a huge project. I think you would be far better off bringing the rail back to speed instead of going down that path, but it is certainly something that has been discussed in Mallee circles.

With the loss of those lines, we do lose a whole range of opportunities. I fear that we will have issues where Victoria will gazump us in getting rail freight around to the north. Victoria is looking at putting in rail through Mildura and further north in Victoria, whereas our rail lines out to the Mallee

are closed down. This is a real pity for road users because those roads are getting pounded now by that extra tonnage.

During harvest, Viterra did get there in the end, but they were a little bit slow in building bunkers at Tailem Bend. I was talking to them during harvest. I suggested to them before harvest that they would need to build some bunkers in that area and they thought they would hold off. Just before Christmas I was told, 'They might build four or six bunkers.' In the end, they built 12 scratch bunkers, and they had the capacity of 220,000 tonnes. Tailem Bend is that inland strategic site or that inland grain port.

I should never get a text message from Viterra saying they are full of a variety, and I did say that to them at times. They want grain to go to Tailem Bend, but they are bypassing sites such as Peake and Geranium, and the Coonalpyn bunkers were not open and I am told will never open again. Coonalpyn is obviously in the South-East, not on the Mallee line, but in the direct line to Tailem Bend. We need to have grain in there and certainly there was a need for Lameroo's bunkers to be opened because of a whole host of tonnage of barley coming over from Victoria on our roads again.

I think we have missed a real opportunity with the rail where we could have had some opportunities for two-way freight in Victoria. I can understand why Viterra would not want to do it. Why would they want to put grain into Victoria when their ports are in our state? I get that, but there is also a lot of grain that goes that way, especially in a big grain year like this. Whatever happens, there is opportunity for grain to go over there for piggeries, feed lots and other uses, which could have been carted more suitably on rail.

Sadly, we are where we are and I am just glad that the Adelaide-Melbourne line is in good nick, and that is certainly utilised to a large extent by Viterra and others. They can load some pretty big trains—3,000 or 3,500-tonne trains—and they can do a couple of them a day. They can get grain going to port relatively quickly, so we want to see that continue. I noticed the member for Napier, as the other side do because they did not think about it, had a crack at our Globe Link policy.

**Mr Bell:** Good policy.

**Mr PEDERICK:** This is good policy, member for Mount Gambier. I think it is great policy. This has been an idea that has been thought about for 15 to 20 years and we have said, 'Let's get it out there. Let's get it progressing.' This is not just a rail bypass around the Hills but also a road bypass around the Hills, and a freight airport that can operate 24 hours a day out of the Monarto region in my electorate.

I reckon I could just about read the minister's mind of what he will say about rail freight going around north of the city. I know the minister has said in the past that 80 per cent of truck freight has to come into Adelaide. I have not checked those figures, but what I do know is that you could send trucks around to the north and connect up with the road train route where you have trucks towing two trailers coming straight into Port Adelaide, which they do now.

There is a real opportunity with Globe Link for road freight, bringing those trucks around to the north of Adelaide pulling two trailers. The junction could be at Monarto where they hook up the second trailer. They could then go in around the top, making that far more efficient. We could also do that with the rail. As far as freight is concerned, rail freight is not really that viable between Adelaide and Melbourne because we are too close.

The simple fact is that with rail freight you need those long leads, whether you are going through to Perth or Darwin. You certainly do not need to go up the Hills from Monarto, up through Mount Barker, going through all those Adelaide Hills areas at Blackwood and down through there. But Labor's plan obviously is that they will just keep trains going up through the Hills, through Blackwood, upsetting all those constituents, and then they will have to come down into the city.

As far as truck freight is concerned, currently a lot of the freight comes down the hill. In the past, we have seen some terrible accidents at the bottom of the hill, at the Glen Osmond intersection. The freight goes around Portrush Road, shoots around to Hampstead and heads down to the Port. I can tell you from experience of driving that route that it takes about 45 minutes to get to the port from Glen Osmond. Again, the Labor Party, the Labor government, do not want to bypass. They want to

shoot the trucks straight into Badcoe, up near Elder, giving grief to all those residents throughout the City of Adelaide.

This is going to grow into the future as our freight grows into the future. We have a great opportunity with Globe Link to bring both road and rail around the city. This also links in with our plans with Globe Link to have an airport. As far as the eastern side of our state is concerned, I think it is the best location you could have. It would only be about four hours from Port Augusta, four hours from Mount Gambier, two or 2½ hours from the Riverland, 20 minutes from the Hills and on the doorstep of the Murraylands and Mallee. I think it is an ideal location to aggregate freight, as many companies have done over years now.

We have a Big W forwarding centre at Monarto. They use great code technology to split up their loads to be sent around Australia from that location. So, it is already being used as a freight area, and there is great opportunity for other companies. I know Scott's and a whole range of others that have gone in there, as has Australian Portable Camps. There is so much opportunity from that area to expand not only rail freight options but road freight options and air freight options as well.

These things do come at a cost. People have asked me, 'How are you going to pay for it?' Well, it will not be our money because we will not have the billions of dollars in this budget to pay for it, especially after this government is finished with it. It will need federal funding, private investment and some state co-investment. It is visionary ideas like this that really will lead us into the future in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There are lots of opportunities and we need to grasp them. We need to stop shutting down rail in this state, and we need to embrace opportunities and develop them.

As we have said, if we gain power in March 2018, in our first 100 days we will spend \$20 million putting the business case together on why we should have Globe Link, why we should have that better, faster access of rail around the City of Adelaide to save all that freight going up through the Adelaide Hills, coming up past Blackwood and down into the city, blocking up intersections along Cross Road with train freight that could be far better suited going around to the north of Adelaide. There may be some freight that has to come into the city, and it could tap in from the north. As I indicated, there are so many options, not just with the rail freight but with road freight and a potential increase in road train operations to get efficiency and far better freight movements into the future.

Let's hope we get some far better outcomes. I say to the government, do not debunk our ideas just because they are great ideas and are forward-thinking. Just get on with it, and let's have some great transport designs into the future. With those few words, I support the passage of the bill.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:05):** I rise to make a contribution on the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous No 3) Amendment Bill and provide some background to this bill. In December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments implemented national rail safety reform, creating a single rail safety regulator developed in Rail Safety National Law.

The Rail Safety National Law commenced operation in January 2013. With Queensland last year adopting the law, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator now operates in all jurisdictions. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator was established as a body corporate under the law and facilitates safe rail operations through accreditation of operators, industry guidance, education and training. South Australia, as host jurisdiction, is responsible for the passage of amendment bills through the South Australian parliament subsequently being automatically adopted into legislation by other participating jurisdictions through the application act.

Turning to the details of the amendment bill, it introduces powers for the regulator to charge additional fees for major rail projects, designed to ensure regulatory oversight of operators can be properly maintained as the number of rail projects increases. The bill also includes a review mechanism that will allow the rail transport operator to seek a review of the regulator's decision that a project is a major project.

It also specifies Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board Limited as a prescribed authority for the purposes of sharing information to achieve national law objectives, and it clarifies that a registered person may surrender a private siding from its registration without the need to surrender the entire registration or go through a variation process, as currently is the case. The bill also

introduces a procedure for a rail transport operator to surrender an exemption granted by the regulator, separate to the regulator's power to suspend or cancel an exemption.

While I was doing a little bit of research on the rail, I was astounded to read that, in the National Rail Safety Regulator Annual Report 2015-2016, the total number of suicides relating to our rail system in Australia is quite concerning. Due to the nature of these incidents, they are often not reported. There were 73 deaths through suicide in Australia, which is a huge number. One is too many, but the three that happened in South Australia were just a small amount of what we have seen happen on a national scale.

On another note, there were also a number of people hit by trains in 2015-16 sustaining injuries. Some of the major train crossings in metropolitan South Australia have pedestrian access over the train line, but the smaller crossings mean that people have to potentially directly walk across the path of an oncoming train. Of the 462 serious injuries in Australia in the 2015-16 year, around 81 per cent related to slips, trips or falls while crossing a train line. In New South Wales this comprised 85 per cent of their reports on serious injuries; in Victoria, 51 per cent; in Western Australia, 50 per cent; and there were no serious injuries resulting from a slip or a fall in South Australia, which is good news.

As at 30 June 2016, there were 45 operators accredited by the National Rail Safety Regulator under the Rail Safety National Law for operators in South Australia. There are three primary rail networks in South Australia: the Adelaide Metro passenger rail network, the Defined Interstate Rail Network; and the Genesee & Wyoming rail network, comprising approximately 1,870 kilometres. While we will touch on the issue of Genesee & Wyoming in the great electorate of Chaffey in the Riverland and Mallee, I worked with the minister on ways that we could avert the closure of those two rail lines, to keep those rail lines that were in need of repair. They had not been maintained for a number of years.

The rail line was at a point where it had become inefficient. It had heat restrictions, it had speed restrictions—it had restrictions of all sorts, which meant that rail was becoming more and more inefficient, and it was keeping about 200,000 tonnes per annum off the road. What we are seeing now is that extra 200,000 tonnes on our roads. This year, we have seen a record grain harvest, so we are seeing more than that put on our roads.

What we are seeing now is that road transport is becoming the only option. We are seeing trucks of all denominations, all shapes and sizes, that are using the Mallee Highway, the Karoonda Highway, and the Sturt Highway. Sadly, even though there was a bit over \$2 million spent on the Karoonda Highway and some minor works undertaken on the Mallee Highway, we are seeing those roads fall into an acute state of disrepair. We are seeing trucks being used to carry grain or broadacre horticulture. When I say 'broadacre horticulture', I am talking about potatoes, onions and carrots. We are seeing all sorts of horticulture, and the vintage is currently underway, so all these trucks are now diverting their path of delivery via the Sturt Highway because it is a road that is not destroying their trucks.

We are seeing shoulders that are falling away and potholes. We are seeing the undulation on all these roads, but particularly the Karoonda Highway and the Loxton to Pinnaroo road are in such a state of disrepair that trucks are having to travel much further distances so that they do not destroy their suspension or their trucks on these roads that seem invisible to a government's budget when they are crying out for help.

What we are concerned about now is that the rail has ceased. Genesee & Wyoming has the lease over the infrastructure, and they are not maintaining it. The rail corridor is overrun with weeds. I would like to know whether any of the rail infrastructure has been looked at. Has it been checked? Is there a need to check it? Will it ever be used again? I have always been a very strong advocate of never saying never because you never know.

The closure of Loxton to Tailem Bend and Pinnaroo to Tailem Bend has put huge pressure on our roads. It has put a huge blight on the rail network in South Australia. All the commodity groups are acting accordingly; that is, our grain wholesalers and grain receiving depots are adjusting prices to transport and deliver grain so that it is taken from the farm to the port. It is taken to Roseworthy. It is taken to receiving depots that best suit them.

The rail network on these two lines has now been abandoned. It shows no respect for what it is doing to not only the condition of roads but also the nature of the impact on all vehicles, not only on trucks, heavy vehicles and passenger vehicles. Safety is now being compromised. That shows that, while we have a government that is continually focused on its back door, with the money that is currently being spent in Adelaide and surrounding areas, it is not focusing on spending money on our roads and productive infrastructure in South Australia. Sadly, the focus is certainly not on that productive infrastructure.

I have already acknowledged that the minister has put some money towards the Karoonda Highway with the \$2.3 million upgrade. That was for 20 kilometres of shoulder sealing along some of the worst sections. The Premier and the Minister for Mineral Resources came up only a couple of years ago with pomp and ceremony when Murray Zircon reopened its mine at Mindarie in the Mallee. They made a pledge to upgrade the shoulders there. There is a small amount of shoulder sealing next to Mindarie, but some of the worst parts of that highway were not addressed. Now that the mine has closed, we are still seeing a small amount of zircon leaving the unused site. We are reducing the use of zircon, but we are seeing an increase, particularly in agriculture, of livestock on our roads.

In terms of commodity prices, there is an increase of grain production. Many people understand that the commodity price for grain is reaching a point where you have to produce volume to keep your business viable. So, we are growing more grain, using more technology, with poorer roads, now with B-doubles. We are trialling B-triple and road trains at the moment, and I acknowledge that. I think it is a step in the right direction. While we are doing that, we also need to address the increasing number of trucks, which need better and safer roads. Obviously, that all comes down to money. It is becoming a safety issue in South Australia.

I intend to talk about a report undertaken by the RDA in 2014. They came to the conclusion that the cessation of rail in the Mallee would increase by 30 B-doubles per day. I challenge that number. I think it is more in the vicinity of an extra 60 to 70 B-doubles. They were talking about four extra B-doubles from Karoonda to Tailem Bend. We took an extra 12 B-doubles from Lameroo to Pinnaroo. All of these truck numbers are adding up. The once up to 200,000 tonnes of grain that was put on rail is now put on the road, so we are seeing more and more pressure put on roads, and safety issues, particularly with passenger vehicles, are becoming more apparent. Something needs to change.

The minister needs to acknowledge that we need better shoulders and a better line of sight on our highways. We need to address the issue of the parallel rail line on highways. Once upon a time, if a truck pulled out onto a highway, its rear trailer crossed the rail. The rail is now not operating, so what are we going to do to get a better line of sight on our highways?

It is stated by DPTI that on an average daily volume you could expect marginally, at peak transfer times, that low-volume traffic highways have the capacity to manage these increases. Viterra would also have to reprofile the domestic and export mix that new facilities carry to help optimise larger transfers. As I said, these larger transfers are now being stimulated by the cost of freight to keep the trucks on the road longer and get it closer to port. What it means is that what was once upon a time a mixture of road and rail is now no mixture; it is now all road infrastructure, a road network only, that, as I said, is leading the state to a point where we are becoming less and less productive, less and less efficient.

We see the number of truck breakdowns, the number of accidents. I note the two recent truck rollovers on the Karoonda Highway. They were both grain trucks, and those trucks rolled on a negative camber corner. So again, are we addressing the safety of our roads, are we addressing productivity gains, are we addressing making South Australia a target for transporting our grain straight to port rather than having to double handle, and in some cases triple handle, that grain?

A couple of the speakers on this side have listened to the minister, particular in question time yesterday, when he talked about the South Australian Liberals' Globe Link proposal. He answered a Dorothy Dixer, and I thought it was an outstanding answer from the minister, particularly when he selected quotes from the Senate inquiry, with questions asked about Globe Link. There was no reference to the South Australian Liberal policy, it was just, 'Have you heard about Globe Link? Have you heard about Globe Link or a globe or a link in South Australia?'

That was a fairly selective Dorothy Dixier, particularly when it comes to what I think is an outstanding policy. It is about productive infrastructure, it is about taking what we would call an inefficient transport system here in South Australia, whether we talk about freight on roads coming down the South Eastern Freeway, coming down from Mount Barker. Just imagine the number of mothers taking children to school, anyone in a passenger vehicle, looking in their rear vehicle mirror waiting for a truck that has lost its brakes, is out of control. We have seen it happen all too many times.

Look at the trucks once you get onto Portrush Road. That is one of the most inefficient freight networks I have seen anywhere in the country. Again, Globe Link is trying to circumnavigate those unsafe areas. We are looking at putting it more on flat-gradient type country and running parallel with rail, getting that freight through the Northern Expressway, Sturt Highway into the ports via the Northern Connector.

It is about productivity, it is about double stacking containers so that they can actually create a productivity gain. Currently, you cannot do that, going through the tunnels, and going through the Adelaide Hills they have to run at slower speeds to keep the noise down. Where is the vision for this productivity gain in South Australia? The increased amount of freight we are seeing on our roads now is all happening because we are embracing research and technology, we are embracing new means on farms, we are producing a lot more grain per hectare, we are doing continual rotations and we are looking at new ways of driving our economy, being more productive, being able to compete with international markets.

By doing that, we have to reduce our costs on farm, but we are not seeing any support when it comes to reducing our logistics, getting our product from farm to port, getting our product from farm to airport. The minister's Dorothy Dixier yesterday really did not tell the story. Of course, the minister is always going to pooh-pooh anything of quality, and that is the Globe Link proposal put to South Australian transport operators. They think it is a sensational idea.

We have also heard that the Freight Council said they did not think it was a good idea. Well, why would they think it was a good idea when Adelaide Airport is their number one member? I visited Toowoomba Airport last week and met with the owners. We talked at length about the viability of an airport and the catchment area needed to make that airport viable, with either a combination of passenger or freight or freight alone.

Let's be plain about this. We are not talking about an airport that is going to be built tomorrow: this is a 20-year project. It is something that is in our sights in the '2036' document and it is something that we in South Australia are missing. Again, we need to make sure that South Australia does move forward, its rail is made safe and its roads are safe. I ask the minister to respond.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (16:25):** I rise to make a very brief contribution to the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous No 3) Amendment Bill. As we know, the Rail Safety National Law is currently enacted through legislation in all jurisdictions except Queensland, which is expected to become a participating jurisdiction on 1 July this year. As we know, this bill will allow the rail safety regulators to charge additional fees for major rail projects. This is required due to investment in major rail projects more than tripling since 2012. Naturally, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator is not resourced to provide the level of oversight necessary, without the introduction of this major rail project fee.

This Labor government is getting on with delivering rail improvements, such as the Torrens and Goodwood Rail Junction Project in conjunction with other major road projects such as the Northern Connector, the Darlington upgrade and Torrens to Torrens. I am not as familiar with the numbers for Darlington and Torrens to Torrens but, with the Northern Connector particularly, the jobs figures are as important to us as the infrastructure build itself, particularly for people in my electorate where, as we know, Holden is closing on 20 October. I am pleased that Lendlease, which is building the Northern Connector, has built up a very good relation with the Holden Transition Centre and with our automotive task force, which is looking after the supply chain people who previously supplied Holden.

The minister and the government have built into the tender process requirements about local economic benefit, and this translates to jobs for people in the northern suburbs. We are hopeful and

we predict that we will exceed at least 50 per cent of jobs in the north from that project. I have heard that there were similar projects around Torrens to Torrens and Darlington, and the minister can correct me if I am wrong. Certainly, the local jobs figures are improved by these infrastructure builds.

I know that many people in the western suburbs are looking forward to the level crossing at Park Terrace being removed as part of the Torrens rail junction project, just as we in the north are looking forward to the day the Northern Connector project is finished. The people in the electorates of Light and Schubert are probably looking forward to that as well. That is due to be finished in 2019.

The Torrens Road to River Torrens project has also seen the removal of a busy level crossing with the construction of the Outer Harbor rail overpass. This would not have occurred if those opposite had won the last election in 2014, as they promised to scrap the Torrens to Torrens project in favour of the Darlington upgrade project.

This government has also committed \$152.4 million towards the electrification of the Gawler rail line from Adelaide to Salisbury, which is great if you live in Salisbury. The state government will shortly be issuing a tender for this electrification with construction to start in the second half of this year. This is great but it does not go far enough. Sadly, the electrification of the Salisbury to Gawler section, which will benefit people in my electorate and benefit people in Light and Schubert, as I said before, remains unfunded due to the Coalition walking away from the project in 2013.

We did see some reports that this was due largely to the fact that apparently DPTI had not produced a business plan. Again, I stand to be corrected if I am wrong, minister, but I think in 2012 a business plan of 150 pages, I am led to believe, was submitted to Infrastructure Australia. I could be being led up the garden path, but I believe that is the case. I may have even seen a copy, but again, we hear the member for Unley, I think, make that claim. Again, I could be wrong, but I think it was the member for Unley.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Either I am wrong or the member for Unley is wrong. We will see what happens. During last year's election campaign, the federal Labor Party announced that it would reverse the \$76 million cut, but the Coalition did not. I call upon those opposite in this place to stand up for South Australians and stop doing everything that Canberra demands. After all, we are here to represent the best interests of South Australians and not the best interests of the Coalition government in Canberra. I am pleased to support this bill, and I hope that the Rail Safety National Law continues to improve rail safety across the country.

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (16:29):** I would also like to make a contribution on the rail safety national law bill and put on the record that we on this side of the house support the bill. I want to make a few comments on South Australian rail transport and rail infrastructure because, for those who know, they are huge parts of the electorates of Davenport, Waite and Elder and the surrounding areas of the Mitcham Hills.

On a daily basis, the people I represent are affected and impacted by rail in this state. The rail line—that is, the Belair passenger line and the freight line—cuts through the Mitcham Hills, passing thousands of homes and businesses on a daily basis. Taken together with the Cross Road intersection at Hawthorn, about 63,000 vehicles cross the track daily in this section, so we are talking about a bit of rail line that affects tens of thousands of South Australians on a daily basis. Anything we can do to improve the safety of the rail line for commuters, to improve the efficiency of the rail track for both passenger and freight and anything we can do to increase patronage, especially on our passenger rail service, is very important.

To that extent, I would like to speak about the need for additional park-and-ride facilities in my electorate. The reality is that people will not use public transport if they cannot find a car park close to a station. Of course, as we all know, the use of public transport is vital in reducing road congestion, but it needs to be accessible and an attractive alternative for commuters. There is no point asking commuters in my community to catch the train if that train journey is going to take 40, 45 or 50 minutes in the morning when the alternative is to drive.

If you drive to the Eden Hills train station to catch the train for your morning commute and you have not parked your car by 7.30am, you will not get a car park. Commuters end up turning

around and driving down the hill into the city, adding to congestion issues. Just this week, we saw that the ARTC will no longer be making available their portion of land at Eden Hills for car parking, which means that there will be further pressure on the existing department car parking at the Eden Hills train station. If we do not address this issue, we will see fewer people using the Belair service.

Of course, an additional park-and-ride and an expansion of the current park-and-ride stations along the Belair train line are both critically important. I say that especially in relation to Eden Hills and Bellevue Heights. At the 2014 election, the Labor government pledged funding for a scoping study for park-and-ride facilities across various locations in Adelaide, including Bellevue Heights, but so far there has been no action, much to the disappointment of local residents. As I said before, if we want people to use public transport, especially rail transport, we need to provide a service that is accessible and efficient to them.

Another really big concern for my community—and this actually goes to the heart of rail safety—is that of the repeated boom gate failures along the Belair line at Blackwood, Glenalta and Coromandel railway stations, but in particular at the Glenalta station. It is an ongoing issue for residents and commuters. The boom gate failures, which are too many and too frequent, hold up traffic and cause frustration. I am still waiting for a response from the minister about the boom gate failures in late January, which of course closed the Blackwood, Glenalta and Coromandel stations simultaneously.

It is a risk in an emergency situation. Emergency vehicles have difficulty accessing the Mitcham Hills area and, in the event of an evacuation, the gridlock you would see through my community in the event that the three boom gates were down would just be horrendous. On a too regular basis and, dare I say, even on a monthly basis at the moment, we are seeing boom gate failures on the Belair line.

Governments should plan for the worst and hope for the best. Should the worst ever happen when the boom gates were down, as I said before, it would be truly catastrophic for the Mitcham Hills. Despite that risk—we all know about the risk and hopefully we are now at the back end of the bushfire season, even though there is another month or two to go—the infrastructure continues to be neglected by the government. The government has failed to fix the issue on an ongoing basis since 2015 when works were started to fix the ongoing signalling issues, but they have not been fixed appropriately.

The government has constantly ignored calls from me, local residents and, of course, a parliamentary committee in 2009 that sought huge investment in the road and rail infrastructure of the Mitcham Hills to ensure that issues like boom gate failures did not occur. We need action and we need to improve the reliability of the level crossing boom gates. There is a petition in my office collecting signatures on this issue for residents of my community. In the first month of the petition running, hundreds of people contacted my office to raise their concerns about the issue of boom gate failures along the Belair line.

As I said before, the rail use through my community is incredible. It is probably one of the biggest rail corridors through suburban Adelaide. It has the Adelaide Metro line, which provides a passenger service, and of course it has a freight line, which is the central corridor of the Melbourne-Adelaide-Perth rail line. That rail freight line causes lengthy delays at all crossings across the line and frustrated commuters are trapped on a daily basis in peak hour bottlenecks.

The cost of traffic congestion in terms of lost productivity and the impact on quality of life is incredible. Of course, that means less time at home with family and friends, more time on the commute and a frustrated worker when they get to work. There are also health concerns for local residents from the noise pollution as a result of the topography of the Adelaide Hills in that it is just not suitable for modern trains. There are steep gradients which, combined with tight corners, emit noise squeal at an intense level.

If you were to design a modern rail freight network, you would not put kilometres of rail freight line through the Adelaide Hills. As I mentioned before, bushfire safety is a constant concern for my community and there are justified fears of freight line derailments, especially on fire danger days. Freight trains may start a fire from sparks emitted when the freight trains brake heavily on tight curves



through the Hills. In February 2014, a fire began in the Belair National Park and it is believed that it was as a result of a freight train.

The other issue with the freight line going through my community and through the Adelaide Hills is that of limited capacity. The Adelaide-Melbourne rail line has served our community since about the 1880s and capacity constraints are going to hit us before we know it. As I said, the tight curves, the steep gradients and the height restrictions along the Adelaide Hills corridor limit our ability to increase the freight load. If we are to become an efficient state again and a state that drives its economic activity through exports and through our primary producers, then we need to have freight operating efficiently in South Australia.

By 2030, we expect to see a 90 per cent increase in freight capacity going through South Australia, going to about 10.7 million tonnes. This 10.7 million tonnes is the expected capacity of the freight line, so within a decade we will be hitting capacity for freight movement in South Australia. What we are saying at the moment is that within 10 years we will not be able to improve our economic capacity or our economic growth in terms of freight movement as a result of capacity constraint on our freight lines in particular.

South Australia is at risk of being cut out of interstate freight movement. It would be an absolute shame for this state if providers and operators saw an inability for efficient freight movement through South Australia and created alternative networks. There is a solution to all this, and that is simply to invest in the infrastructure. We need a modern rail network, one that capitalises on improving technology, one that manages increased train speed and load-carrying ability, one that is internationally competitive and a network that can improve end-to-end supply chain efficiencies for South Australian businesses, exporters and potential investors.

It is not just me and members of the Liberal Party who are talking about this issue at the moment in terms of capacity constraints and the need to do something about it. This week, Infrastructure Australia released its priority initiatives. It talks about the Melbourne to Adelaide to Perth rail upgrade. On page 104 of that document, it states the problem:

The interstate rail freight network in South Australia comprises links between Melbourne, Adelaide, Perth, Sydney and Darwin and was identified in the Australian Infrastructure Audit 2015 as a key part of the National Land Transport Network. The track handles 80% of the land-based east-west intercapital freight market and is also utilised by regional mineral and agricultural producers in South Australia.

The track is expected to become capacity constrained over the next 10-15 years due to steady growth in the east-west non-bulk freight task (expected to double by 2030) and future mining and agricultural production. Some sections of track are approaching the end of asset life and have alignments that impose speed and axle load restrictions.

The combination of congestion, poor alignment, and asset age is expected to impact travel times and the reliability and productivity of the interstate freight network. The viability of future mining projects may also be affected.

Those are not my words: they are the words of Infrastructure Australia. They recognise that there needs to be a solution to the rail line that goes through suburban Adelaide, through my community and beyond. Of course, there is an answer: it is called Globe Link. That will remove rail freight from the suburbs and the Hills. There are 41 level crossings along the corridor between Adelaide and Murray Bridge. Moving rail freight would improve the daily commute of an estimated 135,000 drivers. It would lead to efficiency gains, as nearly 80 per cent of all rail freight passing through suburban Adelaide is travelling to Perth from Melbourne. It no longer makes sense for this journey to be made through the Hills.

A failure to develop a future network capacity as outlined by Infrastructure Australia will have a devastating consequence on the economic future of our state. It does not make sense for this journey to be made through the Hills. It does not make sense to force the double stacking of trains on the existing line, which can only be achieved by the costly widening of tunnels. It does not make sense to see trains of up to 1.9 kilometres in length being pulled through the Mitcham and Adelaide Hills.

For those opposite who think it is acceptable to have double-stacked 1,900-metre trains chugging through my community, through the Mitcham Hills and the Adelaide Hills, going over Cross Road, going through the intersection and then B-doubles coming down Cross Road, which they want

to see as well, it is simply ludicrous. There is a better way, and we need to invest in that better way. We need a long-term plan. The Liberal Party, the alternative government of South Australia, has that plan. The Labor government's plan is to have long trains, double stacked, going through suburban Adelaide, leading to further congestion.

To me, this is an absolute travesty. It needs to be dealt with. It needs a long-term solution—and it is Globe Link. In addition, Globe Link will see road trains exiting our roads in metropolitan South Australia, coming off the freeway and coming off Portrush Road, because a road bypass will be coupled with the freight bypass at the same time. It is unacceptable to my community and to so many other commuters to see B-doubles going down Cross Road, as the transport minister is advocating, and going down South Road, leading to further congestion.

Roads such as Cross Road cannot be widened. There is no capacity at the moment for what goes down that road. I would just love to see the havoc that will be caused during peak hour when we have a 1.9-kilometre, double-stacked train going through the Cross Road intersection, with four or five B-doubles at that railway crossing at the same time. The disruption that will cause to suburban Adelaide and our road network cannot be calculated.

There is an alternative to improve rail safety through South Australia, through my community, and that of course is the Liberal Party's Globe Link plan. I suggest that the government actually look at this plan. From what I understand, they have been looking at it, and the reason why you see the minister daily attacking this plan is that he is jealous that the Liberal Party pipped him at the post because we know—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**Mr DULUK:** We know you have been working on this plan. We know you have been developing an alternative transport plan. You know that having double-stacked trains through the Mitcham Hills is not sustainable and is not workable. You know there is a better way, and I implore you to get on board with our plan that will see improved rail efficiency for South Australia.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:45):** I rise to speak briefly on the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous No 3) Amendment Bill 2017. Before I begin, I would like to make some comments regarding the member for Davenport's contribution. When I listened to his speech very closely, it sounded like he was running for election to Burnside council.

Just recently, one of the councillors on Burnside council made it very clear what Burnside council's view is about things. The member for Davenport was saying, 'Rail freight routes are not good for my constituents. Send them somewhere else. Let the plebs have them.' That is what the member for Davenport was saying. It is the classic nimby response.

I will explain why it is important for the member for Davenport to promote his global link or Globe Link or whatever they call it. However, getting back to the actual amendment bill, my understanding is that it is part of an ongoing national reform that aims to support a seamless national rail transport system, to improve existing levels of rail safety, to streamline the regulatory arrangements and reduce the compliance burden for business, and to improve national productivity and reduce transport costs generally, which are very noble objectives. I understand the bill has the support of the ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council and major stakeholders, including all rail industry associations, so for that reason I am supporting this bill.

Very interestingly, the bill has the support of the national council and also major stakeholders, including rail industry associations, unlike Globe Link, which does not. The member for Davenport says that we oppose and speak against Globe Link. The biggest critic of Globe Link is actually from the industry itself—the Freight Council. The member for Davenport spoke a number of times about freight rail, yet the representative council of that industry actually opposed the proposal. I will quote—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, I will quote what the executive officer of the South Australian Freight Council has said, word for word, but let's just look at Globe Link. In 2008, the commonwealth department of infrastructure, transport, regional development and local government provided \$3 million to undertake an Adelaide rail freight movement study. The independent study was undertaken by global engineering group GHD to determine how Adelaide's rail freight network could

be made more efficient to increase capacity to cater for higher freight volumes in the future, and included an assessment of moving the freight line out of Adelaide.

The study was released in June 2010 and considered five options for the future management of rail freight. Options 2, 3 and 5 in the study broadly resemble the rail bypass put forward by those opposite, also referred to as Globe Link. What did the independent study say about these options? The capital costs outweigh the benefits, as there was 'significant negative net present value'. Operational benefits would be modest and social benefits would be marginal.

Infrastructure Australia—an independent body—has also had this report since 2010 and has not included it in their infrastructure priority list released just last year. Infrastructure Australia recommended the \$440 million Goodwood and Torrens junctions upgrades to improve efficiency to future freight capacity of the freight line. These were jointly funded, with Goodwood junction delivered in 2013, and with the Torrens junction works underway.

It is not just rail freight that has been comprehensively investigated, but also road freight. In 2013, the federal government, first under former federal transport minister Albanese, and then also under assistant minister Briggs, funded the north-south corridor 10-year strategy. The strategy was completed and published in the first half of 2014. The strategy has informed decisions by the South Australian Labor government and federal coalition government to invest \$2.5 billion into upgrading three sections of the corridor.

These upgrades on South Road are necessary because 80 per cent of heavy vehicles travelling west on the South Eastern Freeway at Murray Bridge remain bound for Greater Adelaide because they pick up or deliver to businesses in metropolitan Adelaide. Further, 10 per cent of heavy vehicles currently use existing roads to bypass Adelaide. There is already a road bypass available for heavy vehicles which is already being used.

Not only have those opposite not bothered to consider the economics, the logistics, the projects already underway, and the existing evidence base, they did not even bother consulting with industry—not only industry, they did not consult with interested local councils such as the Coorong council, which wrote a letter to the Premier on the Globe Link proposal, requesting that the government consider other opportunities as an alternative to the short-sighted Liberal policy that is being pushed.

I would have thought the Coorong council would be a bastion of socialists. I would have thought that within the Coorong council there would be a lot of farmers and a lot of small business people, so not exactly people on our side of politics. It is interesting that, on their side of politics, there are people who think it is a dumb idea. I would now like to quote Evan Knapp, who is the South Australian Freight Council Executive Officer. The council speaks on behalf of industry, and I quote from an opinion piece which was published in *The Advertiser* on 8 February. I assume that the member for Davenport has taken exception to the industry not liking the idea at all. Mr Knapp said:

People in larger countries, cities or states may be blasé about spending billions of dollars, but South Australia doesn't have that kind of money to splash around—every infrastructure dollar is valuable.

Meaning that it has to be spent in the most effective way. Why would the Liberal Party go on this journey to I am not sure where, and spend billions of dollars of taxpayers' money? We will come to that in a second because I am sure there is an answer to that as well. I continue to quote Mr Knapp:

That's why the Liberal's Globe Link plan seriously concerns the SA Freight Council. The plan includes a 24-hour freight-only airport at Monarto, near Murray Bridge, and a combined road/rail bypass to the north of Adelaide.

But it won't work—

that is the industry's conclusion: 'it won't work'—

here is why.

Airports are almost never sustainable purely on freight. The majority of any exports goes in the belly of passenger aircraft, and it requires a combination of the two to make such services viable.

He goes on to say:

There's a second problem with a rail bypass—it's not in our interest to be bypassed.

'It's not in our interest', in other words the state's interest, 'to be bypassed'. I am quoting him here. These are not my views, not the government's views: this is the industry council's view. Mr Knapp continues:

If Melbourne-Perth trains cease to go through Adelaide, they won't stop to pick up our freight.

Relatively speaking, we have only a small number of containers to be picked up and dropped off—this volume will not support the number of services we currently receive in the presence of a bypass option.

So why would we spend billions of dollars to cut ourselves off from additional rail services?

Like other industry organisations, the SA Freight Council supports further evaluation of the road corridor.

That is fine. He continues:

However it should not be viewed as a panacea for the South Eastern Freeway or Portrush Rd.

About 80 per cent of trucks that use the South Eastern Freeway have business in Adelaide and will use the freeway regardless—the proposal is likely to have greater benefit for inter and cross regional movement of goods.

Even the members who spoke in support of Globe Link this afternoon said it is not funded, and they are not sure where the money is going to come from, but it is going to come from somewhere in the future. If I understand it correctly, that is a 20-year project beyond 2036—like 2056. For all this hoo-ha about how this is going to do everything, most people will not benefit from it. It will be so far away even if it did occur.

The South Australian government is obviously looking to invest billions of dollars in other ways. The question remains, and this is the key question in this whole Globe Link debate: why have South Australian taxpayers been asked to fund a project to protect the interests of the future members of Heysen, Davenport and Waite? That is what this project is about: it is sandbagging three electorates from the X factor. It is simple, that is it. South Australian taxpayers are being asked to fund the re-election of three Liberal members, and that is just appalling.

The member for Davenport mentioned car parks for park-and-ride, of which I am a great supporter. I would like one constructed in my electorate as well. Some of them would have been built by now if the Liberal Party had not blocked the revenue stream in the upper house. The money would have been in the coffers and the car parks would have been constructed today. I remind people that the Liberal Party blocked the revenue stream in the upper house, and that is why we do not have a park-and-ride in my electorate. Why did the Gawler rail electrification not go ahead? Because Tony Abbott said that no way would the federal government support public transport. With those few comments, I support the bill.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:56):** I rise, as have others on this side of the house, to support the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous No 3) Amendment Bill 2017. In December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments implemented national rail safety reform, creating a single rail safety regulator, and developed a Rail Safety National Law. One of the very first debates I was involved in, as a newly elected member in 2010, may have been in relation to that regulator.

The Rail Safety National Law commenced operation in January 2013, with Queensland last year also adopting the law. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator now operates in all jurisdictions right across Australia. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator was established as a body corporate under the law, and it facilitates safe rail operation through accreditation of operators, industry guidance, education and training.

The National Transport Commission identifies legislative amendments in cooperation with the regulator and participating jurisdictions. Ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council approved this bill on 6 November 2015. South Australia, as the host jurisdiction, is responsible for the passage of amendment bills such as this through the South Australian parliament, and they subsequently are automatically adopted into legislation by other participating jurisdictions through an application act. We have significant responsibility in relation to this bill.

This bill is the third amendment package brought to the South Australian parliament, similarly as additions to the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012. The amendment bill introduces powers for the regulator to charge additional fees for major rail projects designed to

ensure that the regulatory oversight of operations can be properly maintained as the number of rail projects increases. Let's hope that they do. The bill also includes a review mechanism that will allow a rail transport operator to seek a review of the regulator's decision that a project is a major project.

Subordinate legislation will specify the additional project component fee amounts and the criteria that the regulator must consider when determining whether a project component fee is payable. I understand that the bill has the support of the ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council and major stakeholders such as the rail industry associations. As part of this debate, I would like to refer to the rail system on Eyre Peninsula. My electorate covers much of Eyre Peninsula. The railway line was first begun as an act of parliament in this place in 1904 or 1905 and ultimately reached its maximum extent by the 1920s.

By that time it had extended from Port Lincoln first to Cummins and then from Cummins to Penong, west of Ceduna, and also from Cummins to Buckleboo. So, the line branched out at Cummins. There was also a branch line from Yeelanna to Mount Hope, and the family farm that I grew up on was actually adjacent to one of the sidings on that line, the Yeltukka railway siding. There were also a couple of spur lines surveyed but never built; one was out to Mangalo in the Cleve Hills, and there was the intention, at one stage, to even extend the line out into the country north of Buckleboo.

Of course, it was a critical part of the settlement of Eyre Peninsula and focused very much on the ports of Thevenard and Port Lincoln, from where the produce of the district was exported to the world. Unfortunately, over the years we saw the demise of the rail service on Eyre Peninsula. I think by the time the mid-sixties came around the railcars had ceased, and the freight line, the grain line, now terminates in Wudinna and Kimba, so it is probably at about half the extent it once was. Of course, there is a line from Kevin near the Penong gypsum mine into Thevenard, which is used by three trains a day.

However, it remains busy. Up to a million tonnes of grain each and every year are carried on the Eyre Peninsula line, from Wudinna down to Port Lincoln, from Kimba down to Port Lincoln. That is exported mostly to Asia these days, but also right across the world. It is an important factor in giving Eyre Peninsula farmers the ability to get their produce to market. It is an efficient and effective rail system, and, of course, it takes one million tonnes out of a total of three million tonnes of Eyre Peninsula grain off the state's roads. Apart from any other argument for keeping, for upgrading and supporting the rail line on Eyre Peninsula, it is the fact that one million tonnes, which would otherwise have to go on the state's road system, is currently on rail.

Back in the late 2000s, and I am thinking probably 2008 or thereabouts, there was a \$43 million road and rail upgrade project that was supported by the state government, supported by the federal government and supported by both Viterra, the owners of the bulk handling system, and also by Genesee & Wyoming. I might also add that it was supported by the farmers of Eyre Peninsula, who contributed around \$2 million, through a levy system, to that total of \$43 million.

It was a big outlay at the time and it was a very important project, but in the end \$43 million does not go very far. In fact, most investment was in that 42 miles between Port Lincoln and Cummins. A little bit was spent farther north, but the majority of it was in that southern part, south of Cummins, the busiest part of the line, and you can understand that. Through my own observations, I can certainly vouch for the fact that the trains through Edillilie travelled much more quickly after that money had been spent.

However, it remains in a precarious state once you travel further north on Eyre Peninsula, and my concern is around the future of Eyre Peninsula rail. I did have a very brief conversation with the minister towards the end of last year about how we might attract investment into this very important part of the state's rail infrastructure, and I look forward to continuing that conversation through this year. At the moment, I understand there are three-year contracts in place between Viterra and Genesee & Wyoming to ensure that the million tonnes of grain remain on the rail line, but of course what is vitally important is that the rail line has the capacity to continue to carry that freight.

It has certainly had minimal spend, I guess that is the best way of putting it, and that was known in the early days. Even the initial railway line was built out of second-hand material that had been salvaged from other railway lines around the state. So, it has not had a lot investment in more

than 100 years, and I look forward to being part of attracting some more investment and ensuring the long-term future of the Eyre Peninsula rail system.

There are some practical issues that I might bring to the parliament's attention. I have certainly had correspondence with the Minister for Road Safety and the Minister for Transport about this practical issue relating to the rail crossings up and down the Tod Highway, in particular where the railway line and the highway run parallel to each other. They are actually adjacent; there is not much room between the rail corridor and the road.

Of course, there were six and seven-tonne trucks in the old days, such as Bedfords and all the rest of it—short wheel-base trucks—and there was not a problem. In this day and age of road trains, there is simply not enough room for a road train to obey the law and stop at the stop sign at the rail crossing and not have the second half of the truck, the second trailer, hanging out onto the highway. It is a very dangerous situation.

Minister, I know you and I have corresponded on this issue. It has not been resolved yet; it remains a problem. I am not sure what the answer is. Probably money spent on the highway creating slip lanes is the most practical solution. Of course, that will come at a cost, but unfortunately, if we do not spend this money, it creates a quite dangerous situation for traffic up and down the Tod Highway—and, of course, we do have to stop at a stop sign.

Looking through the Infrastructure Australia priority project list, I notice that some rail projects have been listed. The Adelaide to Tarcoola upgrade acceleration has been listed as a priority project. That is well underway. In fact this year, 2017, is the centenary of the Trans-Australian Railway. Somewhere near the siding of Ooldea, the two lines met and Australia was joined east to west. It is a hundred years since that occurred, so that will be an important project.

The Iron Road proposal is also listed as an Infrastructure Australia priority project. This infrastructure project is very much about the development of a magnetite mine at Warrambo. Should the project go ahead, an important part of getting that product to market will be a rail and infrastructure corridor winding its way through eastern Eyre Peninsula to a proposed port. It has not been built yet, but a port is proposed at Cape Hardy near Port Neill. Once again, that will involve rail.

The Gawler Craton rail access has also been listed as an Infrastructure Australia priority project. This is probably just at the concept stage although, should a deep-sea port be built somewhere on the east coast of Eyre Peninsula or the west coast of Spencer Gulf, that could give Cape Class availability to the Gawler Craton. In recent months, there has also been talk of a rail line from Whyalla to the proposed new port at Cape Hardy.

Lots of infrastructure ideas are being thrown around. Many of them relate to rail and involve rail, but of course ultimately three things are required: a market, a product and funding. With those few comments relating to my electorate, I remind the house that I support this bill and we, as an opposition, support this bill.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (17:08):** I wish to contribute to this debate for reasons that will become clear in a moment. First of all, I indicate my support for the bill. On Sunday, I happened to be at a function with a number of Ashford constituents, and they raised again with me the concerns they had with regard to freight trains going through different parts of Ashford, including the issue they have been campaigning on for quite some time about reducing the speed of the freight trains as they go through the crossings in local Ashford and their concerns about the noise of those freight trains at some stages.

This remains an ongoing issue in the electorate and, while I have some sympathy for the comments made by the member for Davenport because we have similar problems and I have family members who live in Davenport and the area the freight trains go through, I know some of the concerns they have raised, particularly about noise and screeching of the bogies as they go through the Hills. There are other parts of his contribution, of course, I did not agree with, but I will not go through them because I am sure the minister will be able to correct him on those points.

I need to make the point that in my dealings with the Australian National Rail people I have found them to be very polite, but there has not been any action over the years. I feel very concerned

that a number of constituents are still complaining, as recently as Sunday, about the same things they have been complaining about for the past few years.

I am not a rail enthusiast as such but, having grown up next to the Draper and Largs Bay stations—and I know that the Draper station would be very close to where the minister lives—I have a fairly high tolerance with regard to the noise trains make, even passenger trains, with their horns and all the other things that happen with trains. These particular constituents are really at their wits' end, so I hope we may be able to look at this issue again.

The EPA, through minister Hunter, put in noise meters along the track where we were having the most complaints. Interestingly, the residents seemed to think that, for the two weeks the noise meters were there, there did not seem to be as much noise as there had been in the past. So, one of things I am thinking of doing is seeing whether minister Hunter can help us again with the EPA putting in noise meters to see if we can mount a case about what they consider to be unreasonable noise levels.

One of the other things I should mention is that there are a number of enthusiasts in Ashford for rail, and special mention should go to the Kintookie rail group, which has model trains and a number of rail enthusiasts who live around the Ashford area. Unlike some of the constituents, they are very pleased for any rail to be going through Ashford.

After surviving the electrification of the passenger rail line with the residents, I am pleased to say that, all this time on, people generally seem to think that it was a good measure. I very rarely get complaints on that level but, because today we are talking about the Rail Safety National Law, it is important that I raise the concerns of Ashford constituents with regard to freight trains.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (17:13):** Rather than thanking the members who made a contribution, I will thank the parliament for their consideration of this bill. As members may be aware, South Australia is home to the National Rail Safety Regulator. As part of the agreements that were reached by national transport ministers some years ago, South Australia is the lead legislator for the National Rail Safety Law. When there are changes and amendments made to that Rail Safety Law, then it is the South Australian parliament that is responsible for making them and that then enables the remainder of the jurisdictions, which are party to the rail safety regulator, to follow suit and make sure that they have mirror provisions in their jurisdiction.

Having said that, I would also like to thank the members for their contributions. This is a relatively brief bill, but one which has certainly elicited a far-ranging discussion on a number of topics.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** You are going to get us back on track, are you?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As the member for Light says, let's get things back on track, on the straight and narrow, and I am sure there are several other—

**Mr Duluk:** Not really through the Mitcham Hills; it's quite windy.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes. As the member for Davenport interjects, there is a huge amount of obfuscation when it comes to his local community, and he is probably one of those responsible for it. That is what I understood his interjection to be in any event. Perhaps I slightly misheard it, but I do not think I did.

Can I address some of the comments that have been made by members and particularly the topics that they raised. I particularly want to address those comments that were made by the first couple of speakers from the opposition, the members for Hammond, Chaffey and Flinders, who highlighted a significant concern in regional South Australia regarding the future of freight rail lines being used for the benefit of those communities. It is particularly relevant, given we have just come out of the harvest season with a harvest that I think was 50 per cent above the previous largest harvest. So, we have had an extraordinary amount of grain and other commodities moved around these communities.

As the member for Chaffey mentioned, it is unfortunate that in recent years, to be fair, despite both our efforts—mine as minister and his as local member—the Mallee rail lines are no longer being used. The member for Chaffey is certainly correct that those rail lines have suffered from a lack of

investment in recent years, which has caused them to have all the restrictions the member for Chaffey mentioned: speed restrictions, restrictions on its use during periods of hot weather and axle load restrictions because of the condition of the line.

It is at this juncture that some people can surmise why that is an important fact to point out, because some people would have you believe that it is a direct result of the careless underinvestment by the rail operator, which I think is perhaps not quite capturing the whole of the fault when it comes to the upkeep of these rail lines. There has certainly been a big concern since the loss of the single desk arrangements that farmers have had to organise the freight of their produce at the behest of one multinational company.

Not unlike other multinational companies, this multinational company has a primary focus, as well as secondary and tertiary considerations, and perhaps a secondary or tertiary consideration would be how profitable the farmers' operations might be. The primary focus might be something about returns to shareholders, investments on capital and so on. I think they have forced those rail line operators to be price takers when it comes to freighting grain around those regional communities, getting them to Tailem Bend so that they can be transported directly down to Port Adelaide for export. Or, as the member for Flinders says, there is a similar arrangement on Eyre Peninsula, where we fortunately still have rail freight operations servicing the grain industry in that part of South Australia, but for how long?

What we need to see is the arrest of this trend of these regional freight lines no longer being used because Viterra is just chasing the cheapest possible transport price to pick up that grain or other produce from the farm gate and get it to a silo or a rail head, such as at Tailem Bend or, in the member for Flinders' example, at those rail collection sites along the freight line on Eyre Peninsula. That is an arrangement or a trend that needs to cease. I have certainly made it clear year after year in the federal context that, for a very modest investment from the federal government, to which the state government would be willing to contribute, that could be averted on Eyre Peninsula.

Maybe one good thing the rise of Nick Xenophon's popularity across South Australia has done, other than eliciting the first forays into public policy development by the Liberal opposition anywhere, let alone in transport—tepid and unworkable and uneconomic as they are, but I will come back to that—is to place a little bit of pressure on the federal member for Grey. Maybe he is now sufficiently incentivised to make a compelling argument to the commonwealth government's cabinet that, for a very small investment, the member for Flinders can look his community in the eye and say, 'We have fixed this problem,' at least for the next 10 or 15 years.

People would not need to worry—not about what happened in the Murray Mallee area, where a couple of hundred thousand tonnes was taken off the rail and put onto the road, but about over a million tonnes being taken off rail and put onto the road, as the member for Flinders said. That would be a completely unacceptable outcome for everyone, particularly for the local communities. I commend the member for Flinders for raising that, and I thank him and also the member for Chaffey for mentioning it.

It would be remiss of me not to address the other comments from the member for Hammond, who really was the first cab off the rank to completely mix the transport metaphor in trying to defend the uncoded, uneconomic, impractical, unworkable and, as the member for Chaffey said, not short-term or even medium-term policy of Globe Link, or 'Glob Link' as the member for Unley insists on calling it. It was interesting that the member for Chaffey said that this is not going to happen tomorrow: this is something that will happen in 20 years' time, which I think will be interesting to talk about in the context of the coming election campaign.

Someone who did give a slightly more spirited defence of the policy was the member for Davenport, or should I say 'né Davenport' because he is hoping there is some marriage of convenience which will take him to another, probably unfortunate, bride in the seat of Waite, but we will see how that goes at the next state election. I say 'slightly more spirited' because it was not what you would see from the Liberal opposition. If they were really serious about giving a speech to the parliament, they would have had the camera crew come in from the leader's office. The jacket would have been buttoned. We would have seen all the gesturing as if they were B grade actors in a 1950s, Cecil B. DeMille, thong-and-sandal epic: 'Mr Speaker, I implore the parliament.'



There was none of that, so I know the member for Davenport was not really serious in his defence of Globe Link. However, he did start to kick things off. He did try to warm himself up about his experience on the Belair line. The member for Davenport should be thankful we are not like the previous state Liberal government, which gave up half the corridor and started forcing these Belair trains to run on a single track with crossing loops, thereby nullifying almost any efficiency gains that can be made into the future, as well as closing down train stations on the Belair line, which we have had to come back in and reopen—like in the electorate of Ashford. I thank the local member for the seat of Ashford for the strong advocacy.

**Mr Duluk:** Who makes this up?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It is really needling you, isn't it? I have not even warmed up. We are going to be here for at least 45 minutes; you might even miss the dinner break. So, he did start on the Belair line—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —and he did concede that the government is investing in the signalling upgrades, which have, certainly over the second half of last year—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —seen the average reliability of Belair train services—

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It would be a shame to boot him, wouldn't it? Well, not really. It has seen the performance of the Belair line increase in its reliability thanks to the ongoing rollout of those signalling service improvements but, as the member for Light said, it was not just about the performance of the Belair line and the signalling upgrades—my recollection is that he lauded the state government for that.

He lamented the lack of parking infrastructure on the Belair line. It is a lament that the member for Hartley, albeit for a different mode of transport, has made about his own electorate, or perhaps the border of his electorate and the member for Moriata's. He has lamented the lack of parking infrastructure next to transport nodes in that seat as well.

Would you not think that it is ironic that those Liberal members, those members of a caucus that took a view to break decades, if not well over 100 years, of tradition by not only supporting supply but by supporting the appropriation bills of the government of the day, chose to break that tradition so that there would not be sufficient funds, there would not be a revenue stream, to invest in park-and-ride facilities?

You can see—slowly, course, because that is how it needs to happen for the member for Hartley—the penny gradually dropping that this is going to be a matter which we will campaign on very heavily in the coming election, as these members have ensured that their local communities do not have access to expanded park-and-ride facilities. It is not just the leaflets of the member for Hartley's head that we will put under every windscreen wiper on a daily basis out at the Paradise park-and-ride so that people fully understand who is responsible and the outcome of the actions of the member for Hartley and his colleagues. It will be, as the member for Davenport says, in those places where parking has become at a premium, like at Eden Hills, for example.

We will be telling those constituents exactly what happened and who is responsible for it. I do say of the member for Davenport that he has almost shaken the monkey off the Liberal Party's back. He has uttered the first comments I have heard for many years from a Liberal Party MP supportive of public transport. Remarkable—absolutely remarkable! We have had generation after generation of Tories in this place and in the other place who have not been interested in public transport.

There was not even a transport policy at the last election from the Liberal Party, but at least the member for Davenport has made some warm, encouraging noises about whether public transport is important for communities. Maybe it is an outward sign of frustration at the current leadership of his party—maybe it is. That is almost the farthest possible distance he could sit from the leader's chair. Who could possibly say whether that is causing his frustration and these outbursts of contrarian public policy positions? Maybe that is what it is. Maybe that is causing his frustration and these outbursts against Liberal Party policy position.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. S.W. Key):** Member for Davenport, could you cease, please? I know that the Deputy Speaker has left the chamber for the time being, but you will find that I can be as harsh as she can be, so I warn you to behave yourself.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** On a slightly more serious note, picking up what he was talking about earlier, I have written to him, as has, I think, the former minister for emergency services, cautioning him and the Leader of the Opposition about what can only be almost dangerous rhetoric, saying that people, in the event of a high bushfire danger day, should be able to flee their home or business at the last possible minute, and that the transport networks should provide them with unfettered passages to flee those communities.

That is precisely the opposite advice to that which emergency services provide to people. Emergency services tell our communities that they need to prepare earlier and that they need to make an early decision about whether they stay or whether they leave. They do not wait to see the flames flickering at the fence before they make a decision whether they should leave their properties. They have to make a decision early.

Just as the member for Davenport points out that if a boom gate was down during one of those periods and somebody was trying use the road network to travel away from danger, it is equally true that the network can become impassable for such a motorist if there is an accident. That is exactly why emergency services do not provide the advice or specifically counsel against people making late decisions, and for anyone to try to convince a community that they have some safety net about making late decisions, because of the performance or otherwise of the road network or the rail network or the intersections between the two at rail crossings, is irresponsible and I would counsel very strongly against it.

Just before we move away from the performance of the Belair line, there are two other things that I would like to say. Firstly, the member for Davenport says that he is about to issue us with a petition of his constituents, whose details he has been collecting, in an effort to convince us to improve the car parking facilities at and around the Eden Hills train station. I look forward to getting their details. We will communicate with them, specifically about what some of the challenges are and how they have been caused, in relation to car parking facilities, in the community that he is seeking to represent at the next state election.

Then, of course, we transfer to a discussion about the freight line and how the freight line needs to be taken away from its current alignment for all sorts of reasons, under the auspices of the Liberal Party's first foray into policy-making, Globe Link. As the member for Hammond said earlier this afternoon in his contribution, this current operation is upsetting constituents. That really is at the heart of why this policy has been developed.

It is about targeting a relatively small number of constituents in a few target, otherwise safe, Liberal seats along the freight line, and trying to sandbag those seats against the threat of Nick Xenophon, who, at the recent federal election, has proved very, very effective at carving votes away from the Liberal Party and keeping them for himself, to the point where they were able to dislodge one of the jewels in the crown of the South Australian Liberal Party—the federal seat of Mayo. They took it against a former federal assistant minister, somebody of very high profile, somebody who had the capacity and, indeed, took the opportunity to be in the media on a very regular basis and so was able to communicate directly with many constituents on a more regular basis than perhaps any of the other people he was contesting for that seat in that election.

That threat became very real when that seat changed hands in the Hills from Liberal to the Nick Xenophon Team. That is what this policy is about. This is a multibillion-dollar sandbag against

that threat of Nick Xenophon in these Hills' seats. There are all sorts of dress up around it, about why it is good. There is the talk about 'We will be able to remove all of the road freight movements from trucks from Adelaide.'

I have said it before, and I will say it again: the figures we have from the transport department show us that at least 80 per cent of trucks that are coming down the South Eastern Freeway drop off or pick up business in greater metropolitan Adelaide. These are not trucks that are carrying commodities that are just trying to transit through from one part of the state to the other. There are those trucks, they do exist, they are a small minority and they are already using those parts of the road network which can avoid greater metropolitan Adelaide. They are choosing, from Taillem Bend, to detour up towards Mannum and come around what you could call the back of the Hills, around to the northern side of greater metropolitan Adelaide.

Those truck movements are already happening. It is the other truck movements, the more than 80 per cent, that are coming down that hill that need to service the community or the communities in greater metropolitan Adelaide. These are the trucks that are delivering the goods and the equipment that allow tens of thousands of businesses and hundreds of thousands of households to go about their daily business or to go about their daily lives. Those trucks cannot be relocated.

We have heard the argument against moving trucks from Portrush Road—and, once again, another thing that the member for Davenport got wrong; there are no road trains that use Portrush Road, and a simple Google search of the department's website would have shown that that is the case. Yes, there are B-doubles but they are not road trains, they are very different combination vehicles and they do not use Portrush Road. We have a plan which has been developed by the state government and signed off by the federal Coalition government, a 10-year strategy to update the north-south corridor.

Not only has it been signed off by the federal Coalition government, it is being funded. They are putting billions of dollars on the table to provide the transport improvements that those people who live along that corridor need, whether they are people who reside in the (at least current) seats of Mitchell or Elder or Badcoe or West Torrens or Adelaide or Croydon, all the way through to what will be the end of the corridor up at the furthest reach of the Northern Expressway, up in the member for Schubert's electorate. That is the plan that has been developed, costed, signed off, funded and delivered by both levels of government.

Inherent in what the member for Davenport claims—that heavy vehicles should not use Cross Road they should not enter onto a predominantly lowered motorway away from residents, away from local businesses, away from road safety risks, that they should not go down there—is leaving them on Portrush Road. How would the good burghers of the seat of Dunstan feel about that—a marginal Liberal seat? Well, we will ask them in some detail how they feel. When we talk to the electors of Ashford—soon to be Badcoe—or Elder, we will ask them whether they want the same transport improvements that the current constituents in the electorate of Croydon are enjoying.

The improvements that they are enjoying are the lack of rat running; the lack of traffic on their back streets, their suburban streets; the lack of people who are whizzing past local schools; people are now able for the first time to get a park outside their local businesses; the lack of traffic going past those places, those playgrounds, those kindergartens, those other meeting places where the community recreates—they are all the benefits of an upgraded transport corridor.

The Liberal Party's position is that they do not want those benefits for hundreds of thousands of South Australians. What they would like to do is to spend billions and billions of dollars on a transport plan which has already been thoroughly investigated by an international engineering firm, GHD. That firm has concluded that the benefits are less than the cost, so the investment in this piece of infrastructure is actually a drag on the South Australian economy. As any economist will tell you, it is the study of the best use of resources, in this case, financial resources.

The Liberal Party's position is not to invest in those projects with a very positive benefit cost ratio but to invest in a project that has costs outweighing the benefits. That is the reason why the South Australian Freight Council has criticised this plan so severely, because anybody with the most cursory interest in freight or transport movements in South Australia—anyone, whether it is the

member for Schubert or anyone else who spends time on a laptop—could find and tell you what the right transport solutions are for greater metropolitan Adelaide.

Now that we know that Globe Link will not service the heavy vehicle industry and it will not service trucks because they will still need to come into metropolitan Adelaide, and it will not provide a benefit to those trucks already bypassing Adelaide, how will it fund this new link? They propose a new tax on the industry. This is the member for Bragg's old attitude of, 'Let's introduce tolls. Once again, let's ignore that they are uneconomical here in South Australia and let's make sure'—much like her presence here—'that we have a 1990s solution to what is a contemporary problem. Let's make sure that we come up with something which, once again, can be a drag not only on the state economy but on a particular industry here in South Australia.'

Is any part of the north-south corridor being upgraded with private sector charging? No, it is not, and that is very deliberate because we know that not only do tolls not stack up for the heavy vehicle industry, or even for the light commercial vehicle industry, but they do not stack up for private car owners either. They are wholly uneconomic. Logistically, for heavy vehicles, Globe Link does not work. Economically, it does not work, and for the industry it does not work. So now you can turn your attention to the freight rail element, and this is really at the heart of the policy of wanting to sandbag these safe Adelaide Hills Liberal seats against the threat of Nick Xenophon.

The member for Ashford outlined very clearly the problem that needs to be dealt with, and most of it is noise. It is not, as the member for Davenport would have you believe, the huge number of times that the boom gates come down for freight rail movements in peak hour—which is what he said earlier. In fact, I was so interested in that that I googled it, and do you know what the first result of that Google search was that anyone could do on a smart phone or a tablet? The first result was ARTC's train movement timetable for all these trains.

Do you know how many freight train movements there are in peak hour, in South Australia, affecting that section of the line that the member for Davenport is so passionately interested in between Belair and Keswick? I wonder how many it could be? It sounds like it must be a large number if the member for Davenport thinks that it happens all the time. It is four times; it is four times in peak hour that it comes down.

**Mr Duluk:** Four times a day.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Four times in peak hour it comes down.

**Mr Duluk:** Four times a day.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think we are warming up for a personal explanation from the member for Davenport. He would like to correct the record because he was so manifestly inaccurate earlier.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** As I left the room the member for Davenport was on two warnings, and I dare say I did not hear his voice just then. At this moment, I might take the opportunity to recognise our visitors in the gallery this afternoon, Mr Som Parkash, who is a member of the Legislative Assembly in Punjab, India. We welcome him and his wife, Mrs Anita Parkash, and obviously your family and group who are travelling with you. I welcome you to our parliament and thank you for the honour of this visit.

#### *Bills*

#### **RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS NO 3) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (17:42):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Now that you have

taken that opportunity, could I also welcome some other important guests who reside in the very important location of the seat of Lee.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not think you are allowed to do that.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, I am not, but it has just been done I think.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If you told me what to say I could think about it.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It seems what is done cannot be undone. I apologise.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If I were saying their names, what names would I say?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Now you are testing both my memory and also my eyesight.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We just know they are important because there is that aura around them as they sit there.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I can see a former Speaker of this very chamber sitting up there, the Hon. Mr Norm Peterson.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Norm, I do declare. Welcome to our parliament today. I am on notice too now because he knows the rules.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You are; let's just pretend this never happened. Where were we? Four—that is where we were—as opposed to the more than 60 boom gate crossings that occur for Adelaide Metro Belair train services. In order to fulfil the member for Davenport's desire to remove these level crossing interactions, is he suggesting that we get rid of the Belair train? Can he finally make good on what Diana Laidlaw came so close to doing? She got half the way there—she got rid of one track. It seems there is only one to go for the member for Davenport. Is that what he is supposing?

From that one small example, as well as what I have already said, it is clear that just the most cursory of Google searches could provide enough information to enlighten the Liberal opposition when it comes to coming up with a decent transport plan for South Australia. I was able to do it while he was on his feet—he spoke for no more than 13 or 14 minutes—but there was one more element to the plan. In fact, I heard the groan of frustration; you all thought I was going to wind up then. There was one more part to the Globe Link plan which has not been as well thought out, and that is the concept of having a freight-only airport.

They quoted the experience of the newly built Toowoomba Airport to show just how successful regional freight-only airports can be, inconveniently overlooking that it is not a freight-only airport. It is an airport which, yes, services freight, but it also services passengers just as we do in South Australia at Adelaide Airport. The reason more airlines want to fly into Adelaide is not just to carry more tourists into South Australia or outward bound to destinations, such as the Middle East or into China, as we have secured with further airline services, it is so they have this new fast-freight route in the belly of all these aeroplanes. That is the business model that makes it work.

It is a great disappointment to me that at the coming election we would be seriously contemplating spending billions of dollars just to sandbag these safe Liberal seats on a transport plan which is manifestly uneconomical, which is logistically impossible for the heavy industry freight industry and which ignores the fact that freight capacity improvements are already being provided via an industry-Australia sanction and a federal Coalition government-funded initiative, which is the upgrade of the Torrens rail junction on top of the Goodwood rail junction, which has already been provided. It is extraordinary.

No matter how much they dress this up as being some sort of seminal fight that will be played out in the seats of Elder and Badcoe, the opposite should be true for them because the compelling offering that this government has for them is that they will get massive traffic improvements, massive improvements to their local communities and massive improvements in their travel times through the upgrade of the north-south corridor, all of which, under a future state Liberal government, will be wiped away.

It is timely that the deputy leader has come into the chamber right now because of course she was the one who quite proudly late in 2013 said that, should the state Liberals be elected to form government in South Australia, the Torrens to Torrens project will be scrapped. Never mind the 480 jobs per year which that project has supported and never mind the improved access to and from the CBD for all those people who live in the north-western suburbs like—

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport wants to leave us?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Never mind that for all the people who rely on Torrens Road, Port Road and Grange Road to get to and from the city, let alone all those communities in those suburbs—whether it is Ridleyton, West Croydon, West Hindmarsh or Hindmarsh—who will benefit from that project, those benefits would have been denied to those communities of South Australia. Not only would those jobs not have been supported, but bear in mind that currently 98 per cent of the people who have been working on that project are South Australians.

Never mind the 6,000 or 7,000 tonnes of Arrium steel underpinning these constructions on the bridges for Grange Road, Port Road and Torrens Road, let alone all the piles that are being built in between the bridges along the new lowered motorway corridor. That is why this government as well as no sane federal funding body will be looking at funding that ridiculous policy called Globe Link. That is why this current federal Coalition government is instead joining with the state Labor government to fund the upgrade to the north-south corridor.

With that, Deputy Speaker, I thank you and the parliament once again for your indulgence in dealing with what is a relatively minor bill and what could be considered a fairly routine administrative bill. What we have had as a result of the national rail safety reform is a consistent national framework governing all rail operations—whether they are passenger-related, freight-related or tourism-related—and we have also managed to attract its head office here. We have also taken on the responsibility of lead legislator, which is why we move this bill through this chamber.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (17:50):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Parliamentary Committees*

#### **CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. J.E. Hanson to the committee in place of the Hon. G.A. Kandelaars (resigned).

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. J.E. Hanson to the committee in place of the Hon. G.A. Kandelaars (resigned).

#### **PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. J.E. Hanson to the committee in place of the Hon. G.A. Kandelaars (resigned).

#### **NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. J.M. Gazzola to the committee in place of the Hon. G.A. Kandelaars (resigned).

**JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that, pursuant to section 5 of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985, it had appointed the Hon. J.M. Gazzola as the alternate member to the President on the committee and the Hon. J.E. Hanson as the alternate member to the Hon. T.T. Ngo.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (SURROGACY ELIGIBILITY) BILL***Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly to its amendment No. 1 without any amendment.

**INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL***Final Stages*

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

No. 1. Clause 4, page 3, lines 16 and 17 [clause 4(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

No. 2. Clause 10, page 5, after line 34 [clause 10, inserted section 29A]—Insert:

*foreign intervention order* does not include an order (whether registered or not under Part 4) that is declared by regulation not to be a foreign intervention order for the purposes of this Part;

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (17:53):** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** You're out of order and you're out of your seat and you can now leave for 10 minutes. I can do that from here without even looking.

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

Motion carried.

At 17:54 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 March 2017 at 10:30.