HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 31 May 2017

The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) took the chair at 11:01 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.

Bills

PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Conference

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (11:02): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome students from St Joseph's School, Hectorville, to parliament today. They are guests of the member for Hartley.

Parliamentary Committees

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: RETURN TO WORK ACT AND SCHEME

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:03): I move:

That the 28th report of the committee, entitled 'Interim report into the referral for an inquiry into the Return to Work Act and scheme', be noted.

This is an interim report summarising the submissions made up to and including 2 March 2017. The Hon. Tammy Franks from the other place moved for this inquiry into the Return to Work Act and scheme. For many years, South Australia's previous workers compensation scheme, WorkCover, was often cited as one of the poorest performing in the country. It consistently produced return-to-work rates well below the national average, required one of the country's highest employer premiums to operate and was reported to be extremely underfunded. Significant reform was needed.

On 1 July 2015, the Return to Work Act and scheme commenced. Moving away from the focus on medicolegal matters, the return-to-work scheme now better recognises the health benefits of work and has a stronger focus on early intervention and customer service. It uses mobile case managers to provide a greater level of face-to-face service and utilises systems such as telephone reporting to help reduce administrative processes, connecting employers and workers with the support they need sooner.

Since the introduction of the Return to Work Act, average employer premiums have significantly dropped and the scheme is now reported as fully funded. However, the percentage of injured workers who are at work at one, three, six and 12 months post injury has only marginally improved since the commencement of the reformed scheme. The committee will see whether these figures continue to improve, as in more people returning to work. Many submissions received from workers and unions stated that benefit to employers by way of reduced premiums has come at the expense of the support provided to injured workers.

Workers who were in the WorkCover scheme on 1 July 2015 moved to the Return to Work scheme in accordance with the transitional provisions in the act. As a result of wording in these provisions, some workers have been left without income or medical support. The full bench of the South Australian Employment Tribunal found these provisions caused a seemingly unfair outcome to one worker. The committee received submissions with examples of other workers who had no access to income support on the Return to Work scheme as a result of these provisions. These included workers who were on maternity leave or non work-related sick leave at the time the act commenced.

The committee received submissions providing examples of some injured workers who were soldiering on at work and who had been denied weekly payments due to the wording of these provisions. I have met with a number of constituents who have this exact problem and who are in very difficult circumstances. In comparison with workers with physical injuries, workers with psychiatric injuries have always had a great hurdle to overcome when seeking access to the scheme. Workers with a psychiatric injury now need to prove that employment is the significant contributing cause of their injury.

All of us will go through some sort of psychological trauma or stress at one time or another. I think most of us can agree with that. I am getting a lot of nods in the chamber. It is part of life; however, the committee heard evidence of concerns that the new wording—the inclusion of the word 'the'—gives case managers too broad a power to reject psychiatric injury claims when a worker has or has had a personal non work-related stressor in their life.

The committee received an example of one worker who had been sexually harassed at work but had her claim denied. The case manager relied on the fact that the worker had had a miscarriage a year earlier and had sought some counselling for that. They argued that this meant that the employment was not 'the' significant contributing cause in her claim. The committee received submissions detailing a number of examples similar to this.

While there is a slight change in the wording for workers with a physical injury, case law to date indicates that this, we hope, will have minimal impact for them when accessing the scheme. The Return to Work Act introduced the classification of seriously injured worker, workers who have been assessed as having a whole person impairment of 30 per cent or more. The committee does not ignore the significant impact that a work injury may have on a worker's life, even if the worker does not meet the arbitrary, we believe, 30 per cent threshold.

However, the act draws a very distinct and inflexible line in the sand on this matter. The committee received a great number of submissions that strongly expressed concern that this approach does not account for the individuality of each worker and the nuances of their circumstances. Workers who meet the act's definition of 'seriously injured' have access to weekly income support until retirement age, continue to have medical expenses paid and have no obligation ever to return to work. Not since 1992, under this state's workers compensation system, have seriously injured workers been able to access common law rights to sue their employer in cases of employer negligence.

The committee received some submissions supporting this move, citing that it may encourage employers to provide safer workplaces, as well as give workers their day in court. However, many submissions did not support the reintroduction, as the process was thought to be too adversarial, gave rise to fractured worker and employer relationships and went against the objective of supporting workers to return to work. The issue of common law has always been an issue in my time in the industrial relations arena with regard to workers compensation, and it continues to be an issue of debate.

Almost all submissions that provide an opinion on common law stated that the current state of its only being accessible to those people deemed to have a whole person impairment of 30 per cent or more is a token gesture that is most likely not to be used. Workers who do not meet this arbitrary 30 per cent threshold, the key that opens the door to access ongoing support, will find that the support afforded to them is very limited. Weekly income support payments are now limited to 104 weeks, with a further 12 months' medical expenses covered, or, if no income support is claimed, then 12 months of medical expenses is covered.

It is worth noting that the majority of workers—around 70 per cent—will not require income support payments. Of those who do, 80 per cent of them historically have not been in receipt of income support by the 104th week. Many submissions raised concern that the biggest impact will be felt by those workers who have a whole person impairment of less than 30 per cent and who are unable, or have reduced capacity, to work when they come to the end of the 104 weeks. In fact, the committee received submissions stating that for some complex injuries, including psychiatric injuries, 104 weeks is not enough time to allow for adequate recovery.

I have mentioned 104 weeks a few times. It is important to note because towards the end of this month marks 104 weeks since the commencement of the new Return to Work Act. I do not know about other people, but certainly in our electorate office a number of people are now starting to present with concerns about their future medical expenses and also about what income they may be able to access.

It is also when the first group of workers will have income support ceased as a result of this new strict time limit. The committee received a number of submissions from injured workers who are still not able to work as a result of their injuries but whose payments will cease in 27 days. While some workers may be able to seek support from community organisations, government agencies, friends and families, many submissions were clear that these supports were not available for every worker. Some workers fear that they will no longer be able to afford mortgage repayments and will lose their home.

The committee understands that the scheme is still evolving, with the full effects of reform yet to be realised. This inquiry has been of great interest, receiving almost 50 submissions, with more than half from workers and their representatives. I would like to thank everybody who has made a submission thus far. A number of witnesses have come before the committee, but because of the volume of work—anybody looking at the interim report will see that we have received a lot of information—we thought that it was important to publish what we have received thus far.

I would like to thank the members of the committee: the member for Fisher and the member for Schubert and, from the other place, the Hon. John Dawkins, the Hon. Justin Hansen and the Hon. John Darley. I would also like to express my appreciation to the committee staff: the executive officer, Ms Sue Sedivy, and the research officer, Mr Peter Knapp.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:14): I rise to make a brief contribution on the interim report. I was quite cynical when this was first brought to us. I understand that it was being pushed as a potential committee in the upper house by the Hon. Tammy Franks; instead, an inquiry into the scheme was sent to us on the committee the name of which is too long to mention.

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr KNOLL: Yes. I suppose I maintain a level of cynicism around this inquiry because I think what we are doing is happening too early. As the member for Ashford noted in her speech, some of the stricter measures in the new act only really start to manifest themselves as of 1 July this year, and it is very difficult to understand how that is practically going to impact in the broad.

The other reason I think it is too early is that at the moment I understand there are something like 60 appeals on various cases in front of the South Australian Employment Tribunal, and these appeals will set a precedent for how the act is to be interpreted. So, a lot of the criticisms that are being made of the act are made without full understanding of what the tribunal is going to do in terms of its decision, whether any of these get referred to the Supreme Court and what decisions will be made in this regard.

Another thing that has kept me cynical is that almost every single submission made by both employers and employees has acknowledged the fact that this inquiry is too early. What has also happened is that, because it is too early, there are a number of things that we can make judgements on now regarding changes to the scheme, but there is plenty that we still need to wait and see play out. What has happened with each of the groups of employers, employees and unions is that everybody has gone back into the corners that they were in when the bill was first introduced. What I have found frustrating is that we are essentially relitigating the same arguments we had when we put the bill through this place over two years ago.

I suppose there is some frustration on my behalf in regard to the fact that we are looking at this now as opposed to giving it another six or 12 months to play out. In relation to one provision, it seems that, on some of the submissions and evidence we have received, one of the changes with regard to psychological injury may not end up being as some of the submissions suggest. This is regarding the change in the act from work needing to be 'the' significant factor in the course of the psychological injury as opposed to 'a' significant factor. That increases the threshold that suggests that work needs to have had the major impact; it needs to be the main impact.

How that is interpreted is up for debate, and we have taken evidence that some people have tried to quantify the factors that have led to a psychological injury and quantify how that has operated, but it seems from the early judgements of the tribunal that they have focused not on the word 'a' versus 'the' but they have actually focused on the word 'significant' and as such, in essence, it has put a more open and wide interpretation on the acceptance of psychological injury claims.

Having said that, there are some useful things that we have discussed as a committee, and some of the submissions have been insightful. Also, through our discussions and committee hearings, there are a number of useful suggestions that I think have come out in relation to making changes to the scheme where we could potentially make some changes that will potentially have very little impact on the cost of the scheme but may have huge impact in helping injured workers. Those things have been useful, and hopefully we can incorporate some of them into the final report. Certainly, as we go further and take hearings after this two-year cut-off period starts to come into effect and we start to see the practicality of that, I think we will start to get a better understanding of where we are at.

In relation to whole person impairment, that has certainly been one of the most contentious issues around this needing to meet the 30 per cent threshold. That is an issue we are going to have to explore further, and certainly we have taken evidence that some people who are above the 30 per cent whole person impairment threshold are back at work and able to do so. Conversely, there are some people who are under the 30 per cent threshold who are not able to get back to work. How do we deal with that? We are using a definition of injury as opposed to a definition of ability to return to work, if that makes sense.

The other interesting thing we are looking at is that there is a provision in the act that you have to be above 30 per cent to be considered a seriously injured worker, and a seriously injured worker then has the ability to remain on the scheme with income maintenance payments and medical expenses paid for indefinitely. However, we do know that there are now a number of cases where workers have been deemed seriously injured without the 30 per cent whole person impairment test being used, and that is a discretion that is given to ReturnToWorkSA to do.

That is something we need to explore because, if that is used properly, it is potentially an avenue by which we can, I suppose, mitigate some of the harshness that some of the submissions have suggested. As I understand it, there are about 70 people who have already been deemed seriously injured as a result of that provision, and I think we need to explore how that is operating a little more closely.

Whilst I always enjoy my time on a Thursday morning, I find it the most exciting committee to be on—no offence to the member for Little Para—and we do a lot of really good work. I would happily talk about these topics all day, every day, but I would like to put on the record my frustration, and certainly the frustration of a number of the submissions, about the timing of this. This report may actually need to be extended so that we can get to the right time frame, notwithstanding the fact that a statutory review of the act is due to happen in the near future anyway. With those words, I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:21): I would like to say that, unusually, I agree with most of the comments made by the member for Schubert. Interestingly, we are on the same page in this area, and I would like to thank him and the member for Fisher, in particular, in this house for their contributions. It has been really helpful and means that we can have a lot of discussions out of the chamber perhaps about some of the suggestions that could come forward. I am very blessed to have the Hon. John Dawkins and the Hon. John Darley on the committee, as well as our newer member, the Hon. Justin Hanson. Their contribution is exceptional.

This is an interim report. As I said in my opening comments, we thought it was important to publish many of the contributions we have received thus far because it is a big issue in the community. We look forward to further witnesses and further submissions.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MODBURY HOSPITAL TRANSFORMING HEALTH PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 530th report of the committee, entitled Modbury Hospital Transforming Health Project, be noted.

(Continued from 17 May 2017.)

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:23): On behalf of all those on the Public Works Committee, this has certainly been a good project to come before us. I would like to thank the bipartisanship of the committee and all those who spoke on this particular topic in the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2015-16

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 87th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2015-16, be noted.

(Continued from 1 July 2015.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:24): I rise to speak on the Economic and Finance Committee 87th report on the emergency services levy 2015-16. In regard to this levy, the total funding target for 2015-16 was $278.2 million and $7.5 million to the Community Emergency Services Fund, which was to do with costs associated with the emergency services responses to the 2015 Sampson Flat bushfires.

Certainly, what we see as time goes on with this emergency services levy and how it is raised through the state is that it is applied as soon as there is any reasonably sized emergency. It does not have to be a major fire, though we have had some big ones of recent times. We have had Sampson Flat and we have had Pinery, which was absolutely devastating. To get the agricultural year we had afterwards, which was more by the grace of higher authorities than anyone in here, we had plenty of rains, but they were some terrible scenes.

I was fortunate to tour there, and some of the tour was with the Natural Resources Committee, and I thank the committee for inviting me. In the sandy country, as anyone in agriculture knows, it was blowing and blowing. There was no way you could even cultivate it to try to hold the land, which was what they were doing on some of the heavier country. Maybe every 50 metres or so, they were cultivating strips, trying to cut back on the drift that was happening because things had burnt so hot on the couple of days that the fire was going. What really horrified me was how close the fire came to really settled towns like Gawler, where it actually jumped the Sturt Highway on the perimeter of the town.

The issue for me and for us on the Liberal benches is that this is just used as a land tax grab against South Australians. It keeps going up and there seems to be no end to it. This population is already suffering under unrealistic energy costs, state charges, water prices and electricity charges. The emergency services levy does not just hit home owners: it is levied on sporting clubs, community organisations, churches and independent schools.

Time and again we see the Weatherill Labor government just rip money out of South Australians' pockets. What we have seen over the last three years are massive emergency services levy hikes by the Weatherill Labor government, which is an absolute disgrace. Why I say that is that most of the population is struggling to make ends meet.

If we are successful in March next year, we will reduce by $90 million a year the cost of the emergency services levy to South Australian taxpayers, saving an average household up to $150 a year. We will do that by putting the remissions back in place to put that $90 million annually back into people's pockets because people are sick of having massive increases. Some of these increases have been by hundreds and hundreds of per cent of what their emergency services levy used to be.

Being a member of the CFS—and I know there are many other members in this house who are—it appals me that just because there is an incident you know that you are going to get money ripped out of your hip pocket—because that is the way this Labor Party operates. It is just appalling that that happens. I do not want to take away from the volunteers and the people who come from interstate to support us. It is magnificent work that goes on in fighting these fires and these emergencies, but people are literally getting taxed to death with these emergency services levy rises.

We have the highest level of unemployment in this state. We need to put money back into the pockets of South Australians, and that is exactly what we on this side of the house will do. People have a clear choice at the next election, Madam Independent Deputy Speaker. They will have a clear choice in the seat of Florey.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Technically, member for Hammond, it is a bit out of order to indicate someone's party or lack of party allegiance when you address them.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Get back to the people of Florey—that was a good bit.

Mr PEDERICK: Okay. I certainly believe there will be a lot of interesting outcomes at the next election. People need to make a clear choice as to whether they want good governance and money back in their pockets, especially in regard to the emergency services levy. It is a massive commitment from our side of the house to put $360 million over four years back into South Australian products while still contributing with appropriate amounts so that our emergency services operate. We will make this state great again.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:30): I rise today to speak to the Economic and Finance Committee report on the emergency services levy 2015-16. It all seems a long time ago. There have been a number of speakers and it still goes on, but hopefully we will wrap this up today. I congratulate the Economic and Finance Committee on the work they did. There are specific references for this committee in relation to the emergency services levy in regard to the act. The act requires these determinations to be made in respect of:

- the amount that, in the minister's opinion, needs to be raised by means of the levy on property to fund emergency services;
- the amounts to be expended in the forthcoming year on various kinds of emergency services and other purposes specified; and
- as far as practicable, the extent to which the various parts of the state will benefit from the application of that amount.

It is a bit of a vexed issue, as the member for Hammond has just mentioned. We saw in recent times, just two years ago, the removal of the emergency services levy remission, which resulted in a significant increase in the levy payments required from landowners and others, including churches, sporting groups and all the rest of it. It is a direct hit on the taxpayers of South Australia that has effectively become a land tax. I do not believe there is any better demonstration of the arrogance of this Labor government than the removal of this emergency services levy remission.

The Liberal Party has made a significant commitment going into the next election. It has committed to returning $360 million over four years, which is $90 million per year, into the pockets of everyday South Australians. We will be reinstating the remission, which will be a very important part of the way we attack the cost of living pressures that the people of South Australia are under.

This levy is a land tax, and the removal of these remissions really stuck in the throat of many of the constituents in my electorate of Flinders. In fact, it was quite newsworthy for a time because a number of the CFS brigades on Eyre Peninsula decided, as a form of protest I guess, that they would no longer attend emergencies or fires on government land.

This was a very deliberate strategy to demonstrate their disapproval of the government's removal of this remission. As far as I am aware, none of this had to be enacted, but the reality means that, should there be a fire in a national park, conservation park or on SA Water land—all of which cover significant areas on Eyre Peninsula—then these brigades, such as Green Patch and Kapinnie,

have made the decision not to attend. It demonstrates the frustration that these people felt. In relation to the report itself, the total funding target for the emergency services levy in 2015-16, which is nearly a full financial year ago—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: —two, sorry. Thank you, member for Little Para. Time flies in this place. The total funding target for the emergency services levy had been set at that stage at $285.7 million, and that included projected expenditure on emergency services funded by the ESL of $278.2 million but also $7.5 million to the CFS fund to cover the costs associated with the emergency services response to the 2015 Sampson Flat bushfire. The member for Hammond mentioned that.

The Natural Resources Committee visited that fireground in the recovery phase. Fortunately, it was a very good cropping season in 2016 and a lot of that land recovered to its full production, but it does not take away the heartache felt by the people who were involved in that fire and the impact it had on their businesses. During this recovery stage, when the people were trying to marshal their efforts, rebuild their properties and come to grips with the trauma involved with a bushfire, guess what? They were hit with an increased emergency services levy.

As I said, nothing demonstrates the arrogance of this government more. Be that as it may, the Economic and Finance Committee has a legislative responsibility to review these levies, and we look forward to finally getting this report through. No doubt the next report on the emergency services levy is not far away.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:36): The member for Flinders is right: it is not far away. It gives me great pleasure to bring to an end the debate on the emergency services levy report 2015-16 on the very day when the Economic and Finance Committee received the ESL briefing paper for 2017-18. That is a full two years, a full two turns of the clock. I do not have anything further to add to the extensive debate, other than that it gives me great pleasure to end it and I look forward to the next one. I want to thank all the current members of the committee and all the members of the committee as it was then, some of whom have, I think, since retired from this place. I look forward to the next debate in coming weeks.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HACKNEY AND NORTH EAST ROAD TRUNK WATER MAIN RENEWAL PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 520th report of the committee, entitled Hackney and North East Road Trunk Water Main Renewal Project, be noted.

(Continued from 17 June 2015.)

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:37): I do not need to contribute too much to this debate. The opposition supported the project. It is an essential part of Adelaide's water system infrastructure. With those very few words, I support the report.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:38): I thought my previous Public Works Committee contribution was my last, but I have just managed to scrape another one together. I would like to speak on the 520th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Hackney and North East Road Trunk Water Main Renewal Project. The project was very inconvenient for me in travelling along Hackney Road, as it was for many South Australians, but it was part of a water maintenance program continuing to address the number of burst water mains that we so regularly see in this state. Sadly, we never seem to see the minister attending any of those water main breaks.

The objective of the project was to renew the trunk water main under North East Road, Lyons Road and Hackney Road. The two mains were installed 91 years ago and the section had reached the end of its serviceable life. I think that most of us at 91 are probably somewhere around that mark. The hearing was during my time on the Public Works Committee. As I have said, this could be one of my last contributions as a member of the Public Works Committee.

We were told that when a water main is within three to five years of the end of, say, a 90 or 100-year period, its positioning on the ladder of priority of mains can change due to the number of bursts. In this case, it had not changed. The priority has been there since the submission before the 2013 report to ESCOSA, so they knew it was ready for renewal and they knew that it was time for it to be renewed.

The project scope consisted of renewing two mild steel concrete-lined in situ trunk water mains, being a 750-millimetre diameter main running under Hackney Road, and a 900-millimetre to 750-millimetre diameter main under North East Road and Lyons Road. The combined length of these two mains is 12.1 kilometres. We were told that the benefit of the project would be to improve the security and reliability of water supply to customers in the inner northern and north-eastern suburbs.

A portion of the existing Hackney Road pipeline was relined, but the remainder was replaced with new pipe on a new alignment off Hackney Road. The pipeline under North East Road-Lyons Road was decommissioned and its current function transferred to a newer adjacent pipe under North East Road. The project had an estimated cost of $17 million, GST exclusive. Given that it is such a large infrastructure project, we were told that delays were being minimised. There were early morning and late-night construction hours, minimising the impact on any of the city traffic and city events. This was one of the key concerns that I raised as a committee member. Overall, I commend the report to the house.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:41): On behalf of everyone who spoke in the house today and previously on this report, I recommend that it be noted.

Motion carried.

Motions

SPEED DETECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Wingard:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report upon—

(a) the operation of speed cameras and speed detection devices in South Australia;

(b) the relationship between the location of speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents;

(c) the impact of constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage;

(d) the effectiveness and appropriateness of current penalties for speeding offences, including a review of fines imposed;

(e) the operation of the Community Road Safety Fund; and

(f) any related matters.

(Continued from 13 May 2015.)

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:41): I am continuing my remarks. We were talking about the member for Mitchell's motion seeking to establish a select committee into speed cameras and speed detection devices, the relationship between speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents, their effectiveness and so on. I started by outlining that there is quite a clear relationship between speed and accidents; in fact, there is a proven history.

Investigation of accidents over a long period of time in South Australia has shown that the involvement of speed as a cause of an accident is in the 30 per cent range, which is quite a high percentage. In terms of contributing to serious accidents and death, it is similar, up in that 30 per cent range as a contributing factor, to those involving seatbelts, drugs and alcohol and other things.

As I mentioned previously, we are very lucky to have the University of Adelaide's Centre for Automotive Safety Research (CASR), which has done quite a lot of research in the area. It is a world-class research institution focusing specifically on this area of automotive safety. It estimates that the risk of a casualty crash doubles for every five km/h over the 60 km/h speed limit in urban areas.

The crash risk also doubles with every 10 km/h that a vehicle travels over the speed limit on rural roads where that speed limit is 80 km/h or greater. Where a motorist is travelling 10 km/h over

the speed limit in a 60 km/h speed zone, drivers are approximately four times more likely to be involved in a casualty crash, which is a similar risk increase to having a blood alcohol concentration of around .1 per cent, which is double the legal limit.

Past speed limit reductions on South Australian roads have proven to be effective in reducing road trauma. CASR has also shown that the introduction of the default 50 km/h urban speed limit in 2003 is estimated to have saved five fatalities and 69 serious injuries per year, every year, since it was introduced. That is an estimated total of 60 fatalities and 828 serious injuries over that 12-year period.

It is interesting to look at the year-by-year numbers for the road toll, that is, deaths on the road. From 2003, the number of fatalities per year up until that point had pretty much flatlined to around 150 per year, which is obviously significantly down on the peak of the over 300 in 1972. It had flatlined for a little while. In 2003, there was a step change, so we introduced that 50 km/h limit. It was one of the first things the government did. Almost immediately, the road toll reduced, from about 150 over the previous few years to about 120 for the next few years, so it is a step change, straight down.

CASR is saying that they think that five of the fatalities out of the approximately 30 per year can be put down to speed. I suspect it is a little more than that, but that is my suspicion and not research, so you have to trust CASR on that one. However, you can see clearly that, combined with a whole lot of other things—probably development in vehicle safety and everything else at the same time—those reductions in speed have a direct correlation with road safety outcomes.

My argument is very simple: unless you enforce speed limits, people will not obey them. There is also research to show that the more enforcement there is, the more people actually obey the speed limit because they do not want to be fined or lose points. The loss of points is often more motivating than the fines themselves, but certainly that enforcement is having an effect, and it includes cameras, laser guns, red light speed cameras—all the speed enforcement devices—and they have an effect.

The effect is to slow down the traffic. When you slow down traffic, the effect is a reduction in casualty crashes. People have more time, and there is less vehicle energy involved in those crashes. Therefore, if they have an accident, they go into that accident with significantly less kinetic energy, and that results in lower casualty and death rates. Every person who drives a vehicle has a responsibility to be completely in control of that vehicle at all times.

Everyone here and in our society is human, and that means we make mistakes and occasionally we lose concentration. If we are travelling at a faster speed, it means that we are more likely to be involved in a crash, and that crash, when it occurs, is more likely to cause a casualty or be a dangerous crash. The suggestion that we should reduce the level of enforcement and deterrence is, in my view, ridiculous. If anything, we should be increasing the level of enforcement of speeding and increasing the level of compliance amongst the population, not only with speeding but also with wearing seatbelts.

The number of people who do not wear a seatbelt while driving a car is far fewer than 10 per cent of the driving population, but they make up 38 per cent of deaths on the road. That small group of less than 10 per cent makes up more than one-third of the number of people who die on our roads. You can see the relationship between wearing a seatbelt, for instance, and being involved in an accident. It is the same with speed: there is a direct relationship between speeding and the likelihood of being involved in an accident and the severity of the accident as it occurs.

All the equipment that police use in their enforcement, the fixed and still cameras, is well maintained and calibrated according to the National Measurement Act 1960 and its various regulations. Fixed speed cameras are placed in the areas where people are most likely to speed, remembering that speeding is a decision that people make. If it is not a decision that they are making, if they are letting it happen by accident, then that is probably even more dangerous because it means that they are not paying appropriate attention and they are not appropriately in control of their vehicle. I indicate that the government will be opposing the motion.

Time expired.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I notice a group in the gallery from St Joseph's School. We welcome you to parliament today. We hope that you enjoy your time with us. They are guests of the member for Hartley—king of the kids, as you say, member for Flinders.

Motions

SPEED DETECTION

Debate resumed.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:50): I am pleased to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Mitchell. It is an important motion to establish a select committee on the operation of speed cameras. The motion has five parts, but I am specifically interested in:

(b) the relationship between the location of speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents; the impact of constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage;

(c) the effectiveness and appropriateness of current penalties for speeding offences, including a review of fines imposed.

A reasonable number of constituents contact my office and come in to discuss these matters because there is a level of frustration in the community about these specific issues, particularly, as the member for Mitchell states in the motion, the constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage, particularly for constituents who travel regularly on the South Eastern Freeway.

There is digital speed limit signage on the South Eastern Freeway, particularly from the tollgate up to and past the Stirling interchange, and I write to the minister from time to time about this. Constituents go through the speed camera and they receive a fine, but there does not appear to be a reason for reduction in the speed limit. I travel on the South Eastern Freeway quite regularly, and recently the speed limit on the up track came down from 100 to 80 km/h. There was no discernible reason, that I could see, that was clearly evident, for a reduction in the speed limit. There were no roadworks being undertaken, there was no broken-down vehicle on the verge, there was no heavy transport and there was no B-double transport unit broken down on the verge. I could not detect any reason for the speed limit reduction being in place.

That is reflected in the representation I receive from constituents. We are all required to obey whatever the speed limit is posted at the time, but it does create some confusion, as the motion states, with constantly changing speed limits and also with the effectiveness of speed limit signage. The default limit is 50 km/h in the metropolitan area, so if it is not signposted we understand that it is 50 km/h. If you turn from a 60 km/h road onto another road and for all intents and purposes the infrastructure and the physical nature of the road indicate that it would be a 60 km/h road, you do not know until you come across the appropriate signage.

You are in limbo land. You do not know whether it is 50 or 60 km/h or whatever. It is human nature that you just tootle along somewhere between those two speeds until you come to some signage that indicates what the speed is. I think a lot more work can be done in relation to the constantly changing speed limit zones and the effectiveness of speed limit signage. A constituent came in the other day raising some frustration about those particular issues, and I am in the process of writing to the minister about this.

When there are roadworks, invariably the speed limit is reduced and there is signage running up to where the worksite is located. The frustration is that after you pass through those roadworks, the distance between the roadworks and where the speed limit signage restores the normal speed limit for the road is too great a distance. Sometimes, the contractors, or whoever is carrying out the works, rely on the fixed speed limit signage that is located on the road, quite a distance down from the worksite, to indicate to the motorists that they can resume the normal speed limit for that road in normal conditions.

Motorists have to travel several hundred metres before they get to a fixed speed limit sign and can then commence the normal speed limit. That causes frustration because they are well past the works. Again, I have experienced that. You think, 'We are well past the works. Where is the

signage to get us back up to 80 km/h or whatever the normal speed limit is?' I think that is something that the government could certainly pay attention to—as I said, last week a constituent came to see me—and I am in the process of highlighting that it in the letter to the minister, to see whether that can be addressed.

The other part of the motion talks about the relationship between speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents and so on. This is an issue that has been raised here reasonably regularly over the years. If my memory serves me correctly, quite a number of years ago—I am happy to correct the record on this—the Auditor-General in New South Wales undertook a review of the location of that state's speed cameras and the relationship with road accidents.

That office brought down a report and recommended that some speed cameras be either relocated or removed. A number of speed cameras in New South Wales were removed; some were relocated to more appropriate locations where the incidence of accidents was higher, but some were removed. I have a recollection that we had a policy in the 2010 election to undertake something similar to that, but that is seven years ago, so things move on.

Another aspect of this is in relation to the incidence and the likelihood of road crashes occurring. One aspect that we need to focus on is the actual physical condition of the road because there is a direct correlation between the physical condition of the road and increasing the risk of road crashes. I have spoken about this issue in this place previously, and I remember having a bit of back and forth with the member for Newland. I think he might have been the minister for road safety at the time.

We know that there is a massive deficit in the backlog of road maintenance. I think the last count might have been something like $400 million. What we see, particularly on rural roads, is that the roads have been left to deteriorate to such a poor state that, instead of the government committing money and fixing up the roads, they reduce the speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h, from 100 km/h down to 90 km/h, and then down to 80 km/h, only because the condition of the roads is so poor. If they committed some funding and fixed up the roads, the speed limit would be quite appropriate at 110 km/h, the maximum speed limit.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HEAVY VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 March 2017.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:01): I want to acknowledge that I am not the lead speaker from this side of the house, but I want to make a contribution in regard to the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill 2017. This bill amends the Highways Act 1926 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, with amendments to assist South Australia to meet its agreed obligations as a participating jurisdiction under the February 2014 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013 which contains the national law as a schedule.

This bill provides for the creation of a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator (referred to as the Regulator). The national legislative regime for heavy vehicles deals with trucks over 4.5 tonnes in gross vehicle mass. In regard to what has happened, the simple fact is because the registration chapter of the national law has not yet commenced, heavy vehicle registration is still under state legislation. However, participating jurisdictions registration fees are governed by model law, and that is approved by the national Transport and Infrastructure Council made up of state and territory ministers.

Vehicle registration charges are now calculated on the basis of both road user charge and regulatory charge components. South Australia, along with other participating states, has agreed that the regulatory revenue collected as part of registration be transferred to the regulator fund, and this was previously paid by the South Australian registrar into the Highways Fund, providing the regulator

with industry based funding to resource its duties. This is made through amendments to section 31 of the Highways Act.

With amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act, this will clarify that deductions from concessional registration charges for people living in remote areas and primary producers will be taken from the roads component and not the regulatory component of the fees provided to the regulator's fund. This bill is in effect a stopgap measure to pay for the National Heavy Vehicles Regulator until all arrangements are completed. Registration fees we are told will not increase, but instead a portion will be handed on to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator instead of going to the Highways Fund from which the South Australian share would be paid to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator separately anyway. In consultation, from this side of the house, we understand that the industry, including the South Australian Freight Council, is quite pleased with the regulatory harmonisation through the national regulations. That is supported pretty well generally by the industry overall.

Registration fees are a high cost wherever you operate in South Australia, whether you run a small business or a large business or whether you run a farming business. The fees and charges can run into many tens of thousands of dollars over different items of plant and equipment in your possession. I think it can be something like $6,500 to register semitrailers, obviously B-doubles are a lot more than that, and now we have road trains operating in parts of South Australia and there are higher registration fees for those vehicles as well.

I have mentioned in this place before about that three-year road train trial between Pinnaroo and Tailem Bend, in terms of shifting grain; that creates those efficiencies, but it also comes with a high regulatory cost in the registration of those vehicles. It is a charge that does get passed on to the end user. Those registration fees come back as a freight charge to whoever accesses road transport in this state, whether you are primary producers or whether you are farther up the chain in regard to general freight being transported around the state.

There are certainly other registration charges that have also come in in more recent years regarding farming plant, tractors and the like, front-end loaders, Manitous, etc., and even though those charges are not high they keep increasing over time and it becomes quite a high cost. The member for MacKillop was talking about the registration fees for his property, between his trucks and equipment. He has a once-off date which is, he thinks, about the end of January, and I asked him afterwards, 'What would that bill be likely to be, because it is all your registration fees in one hit?' He said that it could be as high as $12,000. That does not surprise me at all, and that is just one family farming unit and the level of fees that affects them.

In the main, I think we need to work together to get more harmonisation with regard to national heavy vehicles. In this country, we have vehicles that travel all the way from Queensland right down to Victoria and freight that goes over to Tasmania. In regard to east-west transport, we have freight that comes from Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide and heads over to Perth and back, and also from Adelaide through to Darwin and back.

It is just a simple fact that our freight is being moved through all states. I do not think that Western Australia is online with the national heavy vehicle registration, which is disappointing. Obviously they have their reasons, but I think for harmonisation it would be better to have everyone on board, to have a standard right across the country. With those few words, we are certainly supporting the bill and look forward to its speedy passage through the house.

Mr GEE (Napier) (12:08): I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill 2016. This bill amends the Highways Act 1926 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. 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 provides for the creation of a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. South Australia and other participating Heavy Vehicle National Law jurisdictions have agreed that the regulatory revenue collected as part of the 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 include the National Heavy Vehicle Accreditation Scheme management and

accreditations, heavy vehicle access permit applications, a national driver work diary and risk classification system for advanced fatigue management, and one set of national penalties.

The amendment 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 road's component and not the regulatory component of the fees.

Heavy vehicles play an extremely important role in Australian society. Without trucks moving products across our wide country, many areas would not be able to access goods and services that every Australian deserves and expects. I want to recognise all the short- and long-haul truck drivers. They provide an essential service to our country. I was chatting to a former truckie while doorknocking last week. He thoroughly enjoyed his time in trucks and the opportunity his job gave him to see our great country.

Truckies see many parts of Australia and many things that most Aussies would never see because they are constantly on the road, moving products across our land. Being a truckie is a hard but rewarding profession. I want to thank the Transport Workers Union for the support that they have provided to our truckies and their families. My constituent, who sadly was not in great health, still loves getting out and about to discover more of our country. Another constituent whose husband was a truck driver for a long time is just about to hit the road as a grey nomad. She was lucky to see many parts of Australia with her husband while he was still part of the industry.

The northern suburbs have three main freight routes heading north, east and west. Port Wakefield Road hosts trucks heading north through to the Northern Territory and Western Australia and through to Port Adelaide and Adelaide Airport. The Northern Expressway and Main North Road host trucks heading through to the Riverland and the Eastern States. The state government has invested in road infrastructure to make sure South Australian roads are safer and more effective for truck movements.

We have delivered the Northern Expressway and the South Road Superway, making access along a major freight routes easier and increasing export opportunities. As a government, we are continuing to invest in vital freight infrastructure through the construction of the Torrens to Torrens project and the Northern Connector—all projects that have or will decrease the travelling time for heavy vehicles to our port or across our great city.

South Australia produces some of the best food and wine in the world, from the wonderful vineyards in the Barossa and Clare valleys, McLaren Vale, the Riverland and the Coonawarra to its meat, cheese, and fruit and vegetables. The names Bickford's, Beerenberg, Jacobs Creek, Maggie Beer and Wolf Blass are known across the world. This produce can only reach the rest of the world and be enjoyed on the tables of Europe, Asia and the US by trucks taking it from the farms and vineyards to the ports and airports in South Australia and then from the ports and airports to the supermarkets and specialty shops in the overseas countries.

It is not only major roads where the state government is investing in road improvements to benefit the transport industry and all South Australians. In my electorate, improvements have been made to the Kersbrook Road, Gawler Road, One Tree Hill Road and Humbug Scrub Road intersection with the installation of a major new roundabout that will make the intersection significantly safer. The local community had long campaigned for an upgrade to this intersection. I was proud to deliver this project with strong support from the local community. This roundabout has been warmly welcomed by the community and makes this intersection safer for the heavy vehicles involved in the grape harvest and the agricultural industry and all the small trucks and cars that use the intersection every day.

Another local project being delivered is an upgrade to the intersection at Angle Vale Road with Curtis Road and McGee Road at Virginia. This vital upgrade will make the intersection much safer, with the realignment of Curtis Road farther west to create a staggered T-junction, which will reduce the risk of right-angle crashes at this location. It will also deliver installation of a sheltered right-turn lane on Angle Vale Road for traffic turning into Curtis Road. Upgraded lighting at the new Angle Vale Road junction with Curtis Road, asphalt resurfacing and new pavement marking will also

be part of the project. This is a very busy intersection, with a number of heavy vehicles using it on a regular basis to carry livestock and horticultural products.

I am also lobbying hard for upgrades to four other intersections in my local area: the intersection of Yorktown Road and Blair Park Drive at Craigmore, the intersection of Main North Road and Dalkeith Road at Kudla, the intersection of Womma Road and Stebonheath Road at Davoren Park/Eyre/Edinburgh North and the intersection of Yorktown Road and Adams Road at Craigmore. I am pleased to advise that the local residents and I have been successful in lobbying for the upgrade to the intersection of Yorktown Road and Blair Park Drive. DPTI will install a new roundabout at this intersection with construction commencing in late 2017—another win for local community campaigning.

In summary, heavy vehicles play a very important role in Australian society, so we need to ensure that we have a strong national regulator to support and police the industry. The South Australian government is upgrading roads across South Australia. 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.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:15): Thank you, Deputy Speaker, Independent as you are. I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill 2017. The national legislative regime for heavy vehicles deals with trucks over 4½ tonnes in gross vehicle mass. The bill is in effect a stopgap measure to pay for the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator until all arrangements are completed.

Registration fees will not increase, but a portion will be handed on to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator instead of going to the Highways Fund, from which South Australia's share will be paid to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator separately anyway. The question might be asked that, if money is going to be redirected from registration fees to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, does that mean that funds will be directed into administration roles? Does that mean that road maintenance will receive a lesser share? That is a concern.

In my great electorate of Chaffey, which covers the Riverland and the Mallee, thousands of heavy vehicles travel through the region daily. The reason for that is that we have a federal highway coming through the region. We also have other state arterial roads. Because we are a major commodity producer, we are a major commodity logistical transport area, but it is not just about heavy vehicles passing through our region from one destination to another or the eastern seaboard sending their goods over or South Australia sending their goods over.

We have a highly populated internal network that takes produce from the farm gate to processing plants and produce from receival depots to processing plants. Whether it is taking it to port, taking it to airports or taking it for domestic consumption, this is a very busy heavy vehicle area, and I think we have seen over a number of years those heavy vehicle movements increasing. Sadly, as a contributing factor, the contracts for two of our rail lines have been lost, so we are not seeing those rail lines utilised.

What the region is able to achieve is being a great economic contributor to the state's economy by producing more with less. We are producing more tonnages of all our commodities, whether it be broadacre horticulture, such as potatoes, onions and carrots, whether it be cereals and legumes or whether it be livestock. We are seeing a huge boom with horticulture, particularly at the moment with a lot of raw product coming off farm to processing plants. For instance, an almond product comes off farm to a cracker, and then it is taken from the cracker to the processing plant to be packaged and refined. The raw products are then stockpiled and milled.

Some of it is sent to other jurisdictions for feed, some of it is used for mulch and some of it is used for fertiliser base, so we are value-adding a lot more of our products off-farm now than we ever have before. That means that we are using our heavy vehicles to move a lot of bulk commodity from one destination to another and we are seeing a huge increase in truck movements. As I have always said, a trip to the regions makes you appreciate the importance of what heavy vehicles mean to a primary production region, particularly in South Australia with our production capabilities.

The Sturt Highway, which goes right through the Riverland, carries 10,000 vehicles per day, and 33 per cent are heavy vehicles. Again, I want to stress the point that those are passing movements going through the region. They are not internal movements going from farm to processing because in most instances those heavy vehicles are not registered as they are not travelling on the Sturt Highway. They use other arterial roads, council roads and state roads to make those movements.

The number of major roads and heavy vehicles that carry people is a contributor. Chaffey is an electorate that has always been alive with heavy vehicles—and no more so than today. The current climate in agriculture production and horticulture production is now totally reliant on the logistics of heavy vehicles. As I have said, the importance of heavy vehicles to the Riverland, and indeed to all agricultural and horticultural producing regions in South Australia in particular, is not to be understated, especially following the cessation of rail.

We are also seeing heavy movements with our rubbish. Sadly, the Riverland region exports its rubbish. It is separated, then a lot of it is sent to the receival depots down at Dublin. A lot more is recycled. We have destinations for our rubbish but, again, it is not being used as landfill. It is now segregated, being the good citizens that we are, but it is having an impact. It is putting more truck numbers on our roads, it is wearing out our roads and it is having an impact on registrations.

I want to talk about heavy vehicle registration in South Australia. I have a number of constituents who are heavy vehicle owners and a number of constituents who run heavy vehicle logistical businesses. I have a real concern that our registration regime is a disincentive for South Australian businesses to register their vehicles, trucks and trailers in South Australia. Some do, but the movement is that a lot are going interstate. It is not just about the cost of registration and businesses trying to make ends meet: it is about a raft of issues dealing with truck and trailer inspections and state government-run inspection stations that are not always open.

As we all know, the transport industry is a cutthroat industry. It is based on the back of price rules. It is about how trucking companies can make efficiency gains and how they can make a living, and they will do anything they can. They will keep their trucks running 24/7 if they have to but, in saying that, they will also go to a price point. If it is cheaper to register a truck in Western Australia or Victoria, that is what they will do. Those businesses are doing just that. I know a number of trucking companies in particular around the state that are doing it because, as I said, it is not just about the cost of registration. It is about having vehicle inspections undertaken and getting defects off, and it is about when highway patrols come up to a regional centre and run their comb over every vehicle they see.

We see the unforgiving decisions of some of those vehicle inspectors or highway patrol officers, defecting a truck for simply having a hole in a mudguard or some other insignificant issue that is a token gesture for taking that truck off the road and sending it back to the workshop so that it is rectified. Once that issue is rectified and the inspection station is not open, what do we do? Do we keep running that truck illegally on our roads? Do we go to Victoria and go to an open inspection station?

The way we get around that is that we have a registered truck in Victoria, we can go to a registered inspection station in Victoria and we can keep our truck running. Our business can continue to make money, we can keep the wheels turning, we can keep the truck drivers employed, we can keep the mechanics employed and we can keep that business as a viable option. I have said that in this place on a number of occasions, yet I do not see any movement with the government addressing this issue.

The only way we are going to do that is to make sure that inspection stations are there for the benefit of trucking operators. We have to understand that when these businesses are registering their trucks interstate they are not putting money into our state coffers. They are not putting money into road funding. They are not putting money back into road maintenance programs, which is a concern. We see these businesses utilising our roads but not putting money into the maintenance programs that are so critical.

There have been some early challenges with operations within the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. I think I have worked quite constructively with the minister and with a number of local truck

drivers with the process of registration renewals, access permits and escort arrangements for wide loads. The wide load issue was a major hiccup with the transfer from the state-administered permit network to the Heavy Vehicle Regulator. I think that has now been rectified. I do not have the logistics businesses coming to me with real concerns that they cannot get the permits on time, which holds up a lot of these movements.

In many cases, a lot of these businesses have requirements within the conditions of movement, such as for wine tanks, machinery and transfer of equipment under powerlines. We all understand what is involved when we move wide, high or extended loads on our highways, but there are also those conditions. If a permit is not issued on time, if a piece of equipment cannot be put on site on time or if wine tanks cannot be moved out of the Riverland then that is a problem.

A great South Australian business, JMA Engineering, is a tank manufacturer. They produce wine tanks, beer vats and all sorts of stainless steel equipment right across the country. They are continuously banging their head against the wall when they try to get those permits so that they can get their product on site, on time, on budget and not have to pay penalties, which obviously would have an impact.

The RAA recently conducted its most recent audit on the Riverland's rural roads—well, 2014 is not very recent, is it?—to assess the current conditions of the road and what improvements could be made. The assessment found that there were still a number of improvements required, particularly on rural Riverland roads. The most common problems found were inadequate lane width and shoulder seal widths, poor signage and line marking provisions, inadequate protection for roadside hazards, roadside vegetation and the list goes on.

We are seeing productive maintenance on our logistics infrastructure allowed to slip. I would like to remind the minister and his government that we need to keep a constant eye on those issues. This morning I met with the minister's department, government ministers and Primary Producers SA—and I thank them—to look at issues around South Australian regional roads. There were about a thousand recommendations. Obviously, I have issues with the effect of bridge audits on our regional roads and federal highways and also the implications of the 2B Restricted Access Vehicle Network.

I would like to put on the record that we have seen shoulder and signage upgrades on the Loxton, Moorook to Kingston road. It is putting real pressure on the town of Loxton, particularly by directing heavy vehicles through Loxton, past a number of schools and kindergartens, past the Orana complex and through a city centre roundabout. As I explained to department officials and the minister, we all know how hard it is for long, heavy vehicles to get around roundabouts in town centres, with dual lanes merging into one and the safety aspects for people. As many people would understand, the elderly on the gophers dealing with B-double trucks coming through the centre of town is a safety issue that needs to be addressed.

There are many issues on all the roads, particularly the highways that run through the electorate of Chaffey, including the Goyder Highway, Murbko, the Old Sturt Highway, the new Sturt Highway, Brownswell Highway, Cameron Highway and Karoonda Highway. Some of the signage and marker post improvements need to be upgraded on the Goyder Highway, Cadell Valley Road, Loxton Main Road, Brownswell Highway and the Lindsay Point Road, which is another very busy road with heavy vehicles, particularly with the almond industry in that area. The list goes on.

The Ral Ral bridge, which was certainly crumbling, is undergoing some quite significant remediation at the moment. A bridge audit was conducted after the overpass issue on South Road. The issue of the 2B restricted access through Loxton raised questions this morning. We have three bridges on the Sturt Highway that will be potentially bypassed if trucks have to take the restricted access road through Loxton.

The Paringa Bridge is nearly 100 years old, so it must be reaching its use-by date. The Bookmark Bridge has a launch ramp at its entrance and it must be in need of work. The Kingston Bridge has some severe scouring underwater on the river path. Again, what are we doing to address the looming issues in maintaining those bridges on federal highways?

We have had a number of fatalities and crashes on the Sturt Highway. The Old Sturt Highway continues to have many crashes—106 in recent years. The Berri-Loxton road has had 59 crashes

and fatalities have occurred. We continue to see that roads are not maintained. They have shoulder issues and are always under the pump. The Riverland region, starting at Gawler, has the Sturt Highway running in an easterly direction towards the Victorian border. A lot of towns have been bypassed. In recent years, the Sturt Highway carried traffic volumes of between 1,700 and 10,800 vehicles a day, and 35 per cent of these are commercial vehicles.

The RAA conducted an audit in 2012 to assess conditions. Roads need to be maintained and a budget needs to be put in place, and to keep it as a federal highway running through a regional centre will come at a significant cost, but it is about improving the infrastructure. As I have said, the Paringa Bridge, the Bookmark Bridge and the Kingston Bridge are of real concern.

Much has changed since the Towards 2020 survey came out: the two rail lines have closed, all rubbish is freighted out of the Riverland, we have had record grain crops. we have had record broadacre potato and onion crops and horticulture is at record limits. Citrus, almonds and all the inputs that go into those farms are seeing more and more trucks on the road. I met with Accolade Wines, which had a 220,000 tonnes crush. To put that into perspective, the Barossa crushed 50,000 tonnes this year and one Riverland winery crushed 220,000 tonnes. That just shows the magnitude of the heavy vehicle movement within that region.

With all that come more farm inputs. For example, the emerging poultry industry and the record numbers of livestock going into our abattoirs highlight the extra truck movements and the need for extra road maintenance. I support the heavy vehicle registration amendment and look forward to contributions from both sides of this house.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (12:35): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Statues Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill and to indicate my support. In 2014, the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2013 came into operation. As others have stated, this bill contains that national law as a schedule. All Australian states and territories, apart from Western Australia and the Northern Territory, are participants in the national heavy vehicle regulation regime. The Heavy Vehicle National Law Act also established the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, which is Australia's first national independent regulator for all vehicles over 4½ tonnes gross vehicle mass.

While the long-term goal is a truly uniform national heavy vehicle system, some aspects of heavy vehicle regulation remain as they were before the National Heavy Vehicle Law Act. Inspections, driver licensing, all matters related to the carriage of dangerous goods and heavy vehicle registration are still the responsibility of the relevant state and territory authorities. As the registration chapter of the national law is yet to commence, heavy vehicle fees must still be dealt with in this place. Registration fees are governed by model law that is adopted by participating jurisdictions. Amendments to the Heavy Vehicle Charges Model Law were approved by the national Transport and Infrastructure Council.

As the member for Napier has outlined, South Australia and other relevant participating jurisdictions have agreed that some of the revenue collected as part of their registration fees be transferred to the regulator fund to meet each jurisdiction's share of the operating budget of the regulator. This will, of course, assist the regulator to carry out their important duties. The bill allows this to occur via an amendment to the Highways Act.

The member for Napier outlined and, in his own way, the member for Chaffey outlined, the importance of maintaining good roads in order to service the freight needs of this state. We have in train, of course, under this minister, under this government, the north-south corridor ongoing and many-faceted project, and in my neck of the woods we have the $1 billion Northern Connector project, which not only connects freight from north to south but also connects freight to the Port River Expressway and to the Port.

Not only is this important for freight movement but it is important for commuter movement and local jobs. Under this government, we have seen an emphasis on local participation in industry, we have seen a renewed emphasis on local employment being part of that equation and we have seen the introduction of the Industry Advocate and his contribution to the framing of contracts that really do emphasise local content, local materials and local employment.

Yesterday, we saw the introduction of new legislation by the member for Kaurna on behalf of the Premier that makes the position of the Industry Advocate a statutory body which will not only ensure some longevity to the position but it will also give confidence to local employers that these sorts of government contracts will always have a component of local materials and also local employment. With those few words, I hope that the bill will assist South Australia to continue to be a model participant in the national vehicle law. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:39): As my colleagues have indicated, the opposition is supporting this bill, but I want to take the opportunity to bring to the attention of the house several matters regarding the heavy vehicle industry. Obviously, industry per se and our society rely very heavily on our road freight industries and heavy vehicle industries, but there are some very strange anomalies that occur as a result of the open economy we have in Australia.

In my electorate, at Millicent there is a tissue factory run by Kimberly-Clark Australia. It is a terrific employer and a great corporate citizen in my electorate. I was talking to a trucking operator quite some years ago who had a contract for carting tissue from that plant. I asked him, 'Where are you carting to?' He said, 'We take it to Brisbane.' I said, 'That's a long way. How long does it take you?' He said that it was so many days. I then asked, 'What do you do then? You obviously backload with something. What are you carting out of Brisbane and where are you going with that?' He said, 'We take the toilet tissue to Brisbane. We unload it and then go down the road to a factory and we load up with toilet tissue and cart it back to Melbourne.'

In a similar vein, I am aware of a trucking business that carts *Pinus radiata* out of the South-East, again out of my electorate, and carts it all the way to Perth, and from time to time it backloads *Pinus radiata* from southern Western Australia back to South Australia. It is a strange industry. One of the strangest stories about that sort of nonsense—I will use that word—is that South Australia has a moratorium on GM plants and, as part of that, we do not allow GM product to be transported across South Australia.

As a result, I am aware of one transport company, a South Australian company, that has a contract to transport GM canola produced in New South Wales. This year, they had eight B-double loads picked up in the Young area in New South Wales. To get it to Western Australia, they had to drive to Mount Isa, across to Katherine, Kununurra and Broome and down to Perth. I happen to know quite well one of the drivers for this company and I rang him several times when he was recently doing one of these trips, and it was about a fortnight-long trip. That is a nonsense.

I do not think we, as a parliament, should be controlling people carting a product across the nation and then backloading a similar product. I do not think that is our role, but it certainly is the role of this parliament to look at the sort of nonsense that is created for industry by banning things such as the transport of GM canola across this state. For the information of the house, a truckload of that product was worth well in excess of $1 million.

The minister's office currently has a letter from me concerning heavy vehicle registration fees. A constituent recently came to me who runs an earthmoving business in my electorate. From time to time, they purchase new trucks, and one of the things they look at when they are purchasing a truck is what the registration fees are going to be. Obviously, one of the other things is to purchase a truck that is going to do the job that they want it to do. This constituent came to me because he could not understand how the fees are arrived at. He buys a truck and, depending on whether he tows a trailer or does not tow a trailer, the registration fee changes dramatically, notwithstanding that the trailer has its own separate registration fee.

I would have thought that there was some connection between the registration fees that he would be charged and the potential wear and tear/damage that the work of that vehicle would do to our road network. But from what I can work out it has no bearing on that whatsoever. He gave me a couple of examples. If he used a prime mover and semitrailer combination and carted a particular load, the registration fee would be X. If he used a truck and trailer combination, a rigid truck and trailer combination and carted the same load, the registration fee was dramatically more. I think there are serious anomalies.

For years I have had complaints from constituents operating B-double trucks. I think it is the A-trailer registration fee that seems way out of whack with the potential load or axle weights that are

created by that particular trailer on the road. I like the idea of this going to a national registration regulatory regime. By and large, we have been in that space for a fair while. I like it because obviously the industry operates nationally. I have mentioned a couple of anomalies, as I see them.

Another thing I want to bring to the house's attention is that when the Liberal Party was last in government there were some moves to change the national registration of heavy vehicles. I remember that Di Laidlaw, who was the minister for transport at the time, had a committee discussing transport matters that I served on. She suggested that there was a windfall revenue gain from these changes and that we set up a fund to put that revenue into in order to fund the sealing of rural arterial roads across South Australia.

The rural arterial roads are those roads that connect small communities, townships of a population up to 200. It meant that the network of roads, particularly in more remote parts of the state, would be sealed and give people reasonable access to a sealed road within a reasonable distance of their property or business, particularly in the farming community. That fund was set up and the activities got underway. I have just talked to the member for Flinders, who tells me that all the rural arterial roads in his electorate were sealed as a result of that. I am aware that there is a road that runs from Mount Burr to Furner, and I live about 1.5 kilometres from Mount Burr. They are two small communities in my electorate. Part of that road was sealed under that program. It was started at each end, as often happens, but there is a big unsealed slab in the middle for about 20 kilometres.

With the change of government, the incoming government in its wisdom said no, as they have done on a lot of areas of service delivery in this state. They said, 'No, this is outrageous that this money gets spent in rural South Australia where we do not have any electorates,' and that fund was shut down and that money was transferred to a blackspot program. Funnily enough, all the blackspot funding occurred within metropolitan Adelaide. I bring that matter to the attention of the house. It is another way in which there was a significant shift of expenditure from rural and regional South Australia as a result of the change of government 15 years ago. I sincerely hope that in the not too distant future we see a reversal of that. I will leave my comments there.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:48): I also rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill 2017. As has been outlined by the minister and other speakers, this is part of a national framework, this national transport reform process that is underway. I understand that the transport minister recently met with his federal and state colleagues, and with all these areas where there is national cooperation sometimes work is slow, sometimes work is fast. When there are particular changes that need to be made, as a state, we obviously need to think carefully about our involvement in them.

In this regard, we have decided that it is a positive move to make to be part of this regime. It makes sure that South Australia is meeting the requirements under the legislative regime for heavy vehicles. This is a regime that all states and territories, aside from the Northern Territory and Western Australia, are committed to. The other six states and territories, including South Australia, are all committed to this regime.

The existence of the national regime under this amendment bill is further affirmation of South Australia's commitment to the regime to help to reduce inconsistencies between jurisdictions and the heavy vehicle operators, cutting red tape and unnecessary burden in their day-to-day business operations, so people can be assured across those six jurisdictions that the same provisions apply to them.

The changes made under this bill, amending both the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and the Highways Act 1926, mean that the regulatory revenue can be transferred to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator fund. Through these amendments, the bill is facilitating an industry-sourced funding model, meaning that the regulator is funded by the revenue collected from heavy vehicle registration fees.

The participating jurisdictions in this national regime for heavy vehicle regulation have agreed that this revenue, collected and transferred to the regulator fund, will go towards meeting each jurisdiction's share of the regulator's council-approved operating budget. I am sure that the council will be ensuring that those funds raised from industry will be used as efficiently as possible. I am also

sure that we would encourage the two remaining jurisdictions, Western Australia and the Northern Territory, also to participate, which would help the efficiencies of the national scheme and consistency across the country.

Recently, the government was able to facilitate the passage of another important and related red-tape reduction measure for the heavy vehicle industry, that is, removing the requirement for heavy vehicle operators to affix registration labels to their vehicles. This came as part of the government's 2016 Simplify Day process and was a reform called for by the heavy vehicle industry itself. I congratulate the transport minister and his officials on their work in cooperating as part of the Simplify Day process. A number of good projects are underway in the transport area, particularly in the heavy vehicle area, to make sure that we are reducing as much as possible the unnecessary red tape burden on businesses in this area.

On the last Simplify Day, we committed to undertake further work in a number of areas, and we have since delivered on a number of those. The minister recently announced that Segways, which were previously banned in the transport area, have been approved across Adelaide and that tourist operators are able to get licences to operate them under certain circumstances. Also, the minister recently announced reforms for historic vehicles and left-hand drive vehicles. I know that this has been very well received by a huge number of people in the general public who have historic vehicles and have been calling for some time for a reduction in red tape in that area.

Heavy vehicle registration stickers reforms mean that heavy vehicle operators will no longer have to take their vehicles off the road for affixing registration labels and will no longer have to worry about the logistical burden that this adds to their business, meaning that they will have more time to get on with their important day-to-day operations. The bill before us is another important step towards further ensuring consistency across jurisdictions for heavy vehicle regulations, ultimately producing better outcomes for the heavy vehicle industry itself.

I would like to say something else in terms of this industry. It is a very important industry for South Australia and nationally, and an increasing amount of our freight relies on heavy vehicles to be transported across the country. It is very important that we pay close attention to the safety of the people involved in this industry, particularly the truck drivers. We know that being a truck driver can be quite a dangerous profession; in fact, some have called it the most dangerous profession in Australia. Figures show that over the last decade some 2,500 people across the whole country have died because of a heavy vehicle accident, which is clearly traumatic for all those families involved.

I would like to add my thoughts that we need to do all we can to ensure that the safety of the heavy vehicle industry is improved. There has been a very strong campaign over the past 20 years by a number of truck drivers, particularly led well by the Transport Workers Union, to make sure that we have improved safety on our highways and improved safety for our truck drivers. A large part of that is about making sure that we improve the safe rates that are provided to those truck drivers so that we do not unnecessarily increase the pressure on them to take more risks on the road when they should not be taking those risks.

We need to do all we can to further improve the safety of those people who are putting themselves in harm's way to make sure that the rest of us have the goods we rely on day to day in our supermarkets and department stores. We need to make sure that we are looking after those people who are out on the roads every day, driving all through the night, and make sure that their safety is protected.

Clearly, there is a very key connection between their rates and their remuneration and safety on the road in terms of the pressure applied to them and the deadlines they have to meet. That is a very important thing we must all strive to improve, to make sure we have not only an efficient and well-registered heavy vehicle industry, as this bill seeks to do, but also a safe industry that protects the people who work in it.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:55): I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill 2017. This bill amends the Highways Act 1926 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 with amendments to assist South Australia to meet its agreed obligation as a participating jurisdiction under the February 2014 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)

Act 2013, which contains the national law as a schedule. The bill provides for the creation of a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator.

The national legislative regime for heavy vehicles deals with trucks over 4.5 tonnes in gross vehicle mass. Because the registration chapter of the national law has not as yet commenced, heavy vehicle registration is still under state legislation; however, in participating jurisdictions, registration fees are governed by a model law approved by the national Transport and Infrastructure Council, made up of state and territory ministers.

Vehicle registration changes are now calculated on the basis of both road user charge and regulatory charge components. South Australia, with other participating states, has agreed that the regulatory revenue collected as part of the registration be transferred to the regulator fund, previously paid by the SA registrar into the Highways Fund, providing the regulator with industry-based funding to resource its duties.

The South-East is well known as a hub of heavy industry, which, of course, is a major employer in the South-East, and I thought I would go through some of the freight companies down there and then elaborate on some information that has been provided to me by those groups. We have K&S Freighters, Kain & Shelton, South West Freight, Scotts Transport, Glen Carron, Clarend Transport, Trans Australian Livestock, A1 Distribution, Gabrielli Transport, Neale and Nulty Transport, Raymond Scott Transport, Charles Crauford, and Van Schaik's Bio Gro. Then we have logging contractors Fennell Forestry, Badenochs, Kevin Boult, Dohnts, Tasman Logging, Merrett Logging, Hans Scheidl, Tabeel Trading, Peter Whitehead. All those industries employ a significant number of people and live their day-to-day operations in this space.

Many of these contractors have come to me in the past, some with very pleasing anecdotes of the minister actually listening to their concern and doing his best to provide solutions to problems they were facing at the time. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:03): I bring up the 568th report of the committee, entitled 'Flinders Medical Centre neonatal unit redevelopment project'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 569th report of the committee, entitled 'Upper Yorke Peninsula regional road network upgrade'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:04): I bring up the 46th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier tell the house yesterday that 'no cabinet in the Westminster system

releases cabinet documents' when cabinet documents were made available to the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption for the Gillman inquiry?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:04): The question relates to a particular matter, and I think it's necessary for us to recall the circumstances of this matter so that—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's probably useful for us to remember the circumstances of this matter. In relation to the Gillman inquiry—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They are either interested in it or they are not. I'm not provoking them, Mr Speaker; I'm just standing here quietly.

The SPEAKER: No, you are not provoking them other than by your silence, and I don't think it's very provocative today—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No.

The SPEAKER: —as your silences go.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you very much. As I was saying, the history of this matter is that there was litigation which involved basically, to use neutral terms, business competitors or commercial competitors, who were not happy with the—

Ms Chapman: You were the minister for urban planning.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, and I am trying to answer the question, if you would all just keep quiet for a minute. What happened was that ACP, who were the parties who were involved in that arrangement, had some commercial competitors who were dissatisfied with the arrangement and who took them to the Supreme Court. The matter was then heard by Justice Blue who, in the course of those proceedings, sought to obtain certain documents from the government, which were essentially cabinet documents.

The government maintained the position that those were cabinet documents and that those documents were not the sort of material that should be made available, by reason of a very longstanding and hardly arcane constitutional proposition that what happens in cabinet should be a private matter. Indeed, the members of the Executive Council swear an oath upon being sworn in to the effect that they will maintain confidentiality about matters that are dealt with in cabinet. What happened then was that some material which was, when it is properly analysed, cabinet material, notwithstanding the government's objection, and wound up being provided to the Supreme Court.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The Supreme Court gave directions in respect of certain documents, which included cabinet material, requiring the material to be provided to Justice Blue. There is a significant material difference between what the Premier was talking about yesterday, which was the executive government handing over cabinet documents to people who ask for them, and the executive government wilfully disobeying an order of the Supreme Court. There is a light year of difference between those two propositions, so there is no inconsistency.

The SPEAKER: Before we have the next question, I call to order the deputy leader, the leader, the members for Hartley, Chaffey, Kavel and MacKillop, and I warn for the first time the deputy leader, the leader and the member for Hartley. Leader.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. How can the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption adequately fulfil the terms of

reference 2, 3 and 4 of his Oakden maladministration inquiry, which deal with what information may have been communicated to ministers and what action they took or failed to take, if he is denied access to cabinet documents?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:10): Pretty simply, he will be able to gain all manner of documents that were communicated between the agency and the minister, and there are all manner of documents which are routinely communicated between a department and the minister.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, the documents prepared for the purpose of cabinet are in a different category, and they represent a very small proportion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time and so is the member for Hartley.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —of the material that will assist him. The ministers will be available to give evidence and explain their discussions. There will be myriad documents. Individual agency staff will be capable of being called, and I'm sure that the commissioner will get all of the information he needs.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given the Attorney-General's statement to the house yesterday that if the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption seeks access to documents, and I quote, 'then the government will cooperate', will this extend to the release of cabinet documents, or does the government intend to ignore any summons from the commissioner for cabinet documents?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:11): Notwithstanding the argumentative aspect of the question, and in particular the concept of ignoring, I will leave that aside because we are trying to be as helpful as we possibly can—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on a full set of warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It might be helpful if I were to explain to some extent what it is that we are talking about when we talk about cabinet documents and what it is that is being sought, as we understand it, in due course by Mr Lander.

Cabinet documents are documents which are prepared specifically for the purpose of consideration by cabinet. Those documents come either in the form of a cabinet submission, a cabinet note, or whatever it might be, as you would be well familiar with, Mr Speaker, and those documents are prepared by government agencies for government ministers, who sign those documents in—because only a minister can sign a document into cabinet—and those documents are used, in effect, as the agenda item for a conversation at the cabinet table.

Those documents do not relate to matters of administrative detail; they relate to matters requiring a decision or a notation or acknowledgement by cabinet. For example, a cabinet submission is from time to time brought in by the attorney-general of the day requesting that members of the cabinet agree to the attorney taking forward a bill to parliament. In doing that, the attorney is not taking to cabinet every piece of conversation that has occurred in the public domain about the subject of that bill.

The attorney is not bringing every piece of legal advice that has been sought or obtained in relation to that bill. The attorney is generally speaking, saying, 'Look, there is a policy proposition I wish to advance. I think the way to do that is with this bill. Here is my draft bill. Can I please have

permission from my colleagues to take this in our case to our caucus to seek approval to introduce it into parliament?' That is the nature of cabinet documents.

As I understand it from what I have read, Mr Lander in his inquiry will be seeking to ascertain essentially this: what was known by whom, when, and to whom did they communicate it and how and what happened. That's a very short summary, but that's basically what he's on about, as I understand it. If you just think for a moment about what he's on about and you think for a moment about what I have tried to explain is the nature of cabinet material, you would see that there is virtually zero prospect of there being an overlap between one and the other.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The second point is—this is nothing unique to South Australia or any Australian state; it is something that is a longstanding matter in all Westminster systems—the conversations that occur in the cabinet room are intended to be able to occur in circumstances of complete confidence, where people can feel free, for example, to criticise a proposition that I might put up before the parliament without any fear that that will cause any embarrassment or difficulty. That is the nature of cabinet discussion. It is not a place where people sit down and ask, 'Where can we conceal this document? How can we avoid this consideration?' This is just not the purpose of cabinet. The whole conversation about cabinet documents is a red herring.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Supplementary: as the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has provided information to the crime and public integrity committee of this parliament, and in fact told them, 'It will make it harder to investigate some matters because I won't have access to the facts,' isn't the government's decision to deny the commissioner access to these documents nothing more than a cover-up?

The SPEAKER: The leader knows that questions of that sort are out of order because it is an impromptu speech and just a commentary. There is no real question there. The member for Light.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister update the house on the implementation of the government's Affordable Homes Program?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:16): I thank the member for Light for his question and his interest in this area. Housing affordability is an important priority for this government and it is one of great concern for a lot of South Australians, particularly in these current times, as we have gone through a period of significant volatility—

Mr Knoll: You obviously didn't get the memo.

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

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And I may have to enforce that by visiting Tanunda and Angaston and Nuriootpa on Sunday, so he can take that as notice. The minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for giving the residents of those areas the representation that they have craved for the last three years. Housing affordability is incredibly important and it has been a priority for this government. In 2007, the then minister for housing made an announcement about a program to give low income households the ability—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —to purchase affordable homes prior to these homes being listed on the open market for sale. The Affordable Homes Program was established and it has been operating over the last 10 years. The aim of the program is to provide eligible people access to lower cost housing options which include newly built homes, house and land packages, as well as former Housing Trust properties. To be eligible, purchasers need to meet certain criteria, which include income limits of less than $75,000 per annum for a single person or $95,000 per annum for a couple. There are also asset limits, of course, and you need to be a resident of South Australia in order to access the program.

Affordable homes that meet the necessary price and quality requirements are listed exclusively for a set period of time and are only marketed to eligible people through popular sites such as realestate.com.au or domain.com.au. There are price caps: $255,000 for most country locations, which is only fractionally lower than the median house price in country locations; $320,000 for Greater Adelaide; and $368,000 for houses which have energy and water-saving features and are close to public transport.

Areas where affordable homes have been bought include developments in metropolitan areas, such as Bowden, Lightsview and Playford Alive, where high-quality affordable home ownership is encouraged, and, of course, across the state—both in metropolitan Adelaide and in regional areas—where eligible people have been able to access homes within those valuation thresholds. In the decade that this program has been running, the statistics show that the program has been successful in assisting people to purchase their home and establish themselves as homeowners and also as members of their community.

Since the program's inception in 2007, more than 2,000 homes have been sold through the Affordable Homes Program and, pleasingly, of the 2,000 people who have purchased homes through the program just under 85 per cent of those people who originally bought one of these qualifying properties still own that home today. It goes to show that helping people into home ownership enables them to establish their home and stay within that home for some time.

At the moment, Renewal SA operates the Affordable Homes Program and is participating in this important process of getting South Australians into home ownership. They are also the agency administering the Renewing Our Streets and Suburbs program, which is helping South Australian homebuilders, construction firms and tradespeople to access a record investment in Housing Trust properties and redevelopments and supporting, I am advised, 1,600 jobs throughout the course of that program. That involves the 1000 Homes in 1000 Days as well as the significant redevelopments or renovations to a further 4,500 properties.

I should also mention that HomeStart Finance has played a key role in helping people into home ownership, with more than 67,000 South Australians assisted into home ownership through that program—one other way on top of things like the First Home Owner Grant and the stamp duty assistance for apartments in the city where we are helping people into affordable homes.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Can the minister confirm that in April 2015, the very month she reassured the member for Makin that Oakden was adequately staffed, that the SA Salaried Medical Officers Association wrote to SA Health warning that the lack of services and resourcing of the older persons mental health service in the north meant that it was 'only a matter of time before an adverse event occurs'?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22): The letter was at the time I had the portfolio of mental health, so I think it is appropriate.

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The letter wasn't forwarded to my office. It was correspondence between the chief executive of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and SASMOA, and it

raised a number of issues, one of which happened to be regarding medical cover at the Oakden facility. The letter certainly never was forwarded to me.

I note that on the same day SASMOA, the union, did write to me—but not about Oakden. They wrote to me about the effect of the Holden closure. So, clearly the issues regarding Oakden they considered, at the time, fairly straightforward and could be dealt with at a local level, and didn't need to be escalated to the minister because they wrote to me on exactly the same day not raising the Oakden issue, but raising issues regarding the closure of Holden.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:23): My question is again to the Minister for Mental Health. Was the minister, as then parliamentary secretary, briefed on SASMOA's concerns about staff shortages in NALHN's older persons mental health service?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:23): No, she wasn't, because any briefing would have come through me. She was my—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: She was my parliamentary secretary, and any briefing would have happened through my office, and the issue wasn't escalated to my office. I can only presume that the union was satisfied with the response that they received from the chief executive of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network because at no stage did they attempt to escalate it to me.

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is called to order, the member for Hammond is warned and the member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time.

Mr Gardner: Sir, I think that's the first time you have warned me. You called me to order a moment ago.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry. We will take it back to just one warning.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:24): Supplementary to the Minister for Mental Health: did SA Health respond to SASMOA's concerns about understaffing of the older persons mental health service by committing to a review of its staffing and services?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:24): I have a lot of time for the member for Davenport; I have known him for a long time, but he is falling into the trap of the Leader of the Opposition where he reads a script and doesn't actually listen to the answers. I have just answered that. If you refer to *Hansard*, I said the chief executive of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network wrote back to SASMOA. They must have been satisfied with her response because they didn't—

Mr Gardner: Was it committing to a review, as per the question?

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —seem to escalate it to me. I am sure SASMOA would be very happy to share the correspondence they received back.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I have viewed what Jackie Hanson wrote back to SASMOA. It was purely an issue about medical cover when a particular clinician was off sick and she undertook to continue the locum arrangements that had previously been in place.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time for interjecting during that answer.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:25): Supplementary to the minister: did SA Health commit to a review?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:25): I will double-check the correspondence, but my—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will double-check the correspondence—

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —but my recollection from having just read the letter is that it was a particular issue about medical—

Mr Goldsworthy: He has all the detail except for this.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —cover at the Oakden facility. It referred to difficulties with having a particular clinician off sick, having adequate medical cover, and the chief executive of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network responded, saying that she would continue the locum arrangements. Whether there was a review or not, I am happy to check, but in the correspondence, from my cursory reading of it before I came into question time, she undertook to do what SASMOA had asked for. I can only presume that they were satisfied with the response because they never sought to escalate this issue to me.

GLOBAL SECURITY INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. What is the jobs impact of additional investment in NEC's Global Security Intelligence Centre?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:27): I thank the member for Little Para for his question. This morning I toured and launched NEC's Global Security Intelligence Centre based in the Adelaide CBD. NEC has provided information and communications technology services to South Australia for around 30 years and has progressively grown its staff numbers in South Australia.

The investment to establish a purpose-built global intelligence centre in Adelaide has contributed to the number of jobs at NEC Adelaide growing from 25 in 2010 to 350 this year. NEC's expansion of its investment into South Australia reflects the impact of Investment Attraction agency SA's short lifespan, securing more than $1 billion in investment and creating and securing almost 6,000 new jobs since its inception not that long ago.

Cybersecurity is a real focus area for South Australia. Our industries and strategic characteristics are highly suited to cybersecurity investment. In this digital age, threats to our economic, personal and national wellbeing mean that cybersecurity must be effective across every aspect of our society, including government, business, defence and research domains, as demonstrated spectacularly in the last week with British Airways.

We see South Australia as an ideal place for companies to grow in this industry. Adelaide leads the nation for cyber, space and surveillance, with a rapidly growing industry driven by defence and national research programs. We are home to some of the world's most sophisticated electronics and cyber projects and many of the world's best known security contractors. We have created what is a sophisticated security industry and ecosystem that includes:

- global prime cyber contractor projects and defence value chain security companies;
- the headquarters of Australia's cyber and electronic warfare capabilities and research programs;
- a high proportion of world-class universities and ICT students;
- clustered industries relevant to cybersecurity innovation, including sectors such as health care, defence, education, utilities, clean tech and mining; and
- shared industry and state government commitment to collaborate.

Over the next 20 years, South Australia will be home to the largest share of Australia's total in-country defence materiel spend, with Adelaide the headquarters for the majority of the nation's defence cyber industry and technology research, development and investment.

This includes the $50 billion Future Submarines project, Australia's biggest ever defence investment and one of the world's single biggest military contracts. This project alone will drive vast activity across defence and associated industries, particularly technology and innovation sectors, and cybersecurity will be at the forefront of this effort.

NEC is emerging as one of South Australia's most prominent investors. What we have here is a leading multinational IT company recognising the advantageous business environment our state presents in making continual investments in South Australia. They are choosing SA. It is another feather in the cap of the state's Investment Attraction strategy which was formed, by the way, by co-locating existing staff and resources from a host of agencies into one agency—something you might want to correct the Hon. R.L. Lucas on in the upper house. In just over 18 months, we have secured $1.1 billion worth—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —of capital investment, 5,600 jobs and a net economic benefit to the state of $4.5 billion. This is an agency that the opposition spokesman in the other place clearly has on his list to axe. How many other agencies and public servants are on that list? I hope we're not back to the 25,000 from milking day. These people are doing a fantastic job, growing jobs and investment in the state and I commend them.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: 98.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The member for Davenport.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Given SASMOA's claim that SA Health met with employee representatives between 2011 and 2014 to consult on an improved older persons mental health service model of care and reform agenda, why did this work not progress?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): I will have to find out what happened, but I can be very clear that SASMOA didn't raise this issue with me. If they had significant concerns about models of care at the Oakden facility, I would have expected that that would have been escalated to me. What they had raised concerns about—and again I emphasise not with me but directly with the chief executive of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network—was about medical cover at the facility. At no stage did they hint at the sort of systemic abuse that was uncovered by the Chief Psychiatrist. Their concerns were essentially industrial and about medical cover—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings, and that's the second time I have told him that he is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —at the facility, and I would have expected that if they had felt that Health had not adequately addressed the concerns they were raising they would have escalated that matter, which they didn't.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:32): Again to the Minister for Mental Health: can the minister confirm SASMOA's claim that SA Health met with employee representatives between 2011 and 2014 to discuss SA Health's proposed investment of $5.4 million into older persons mental health services, being savings from the closure of the Acacia and Jacaranda wards at Glenside?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:32): I'm more than happy to have a look at that particular matter and get a report back—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —but I emphasise what I have already said: SASMOA's concerns were essentially industrial. They were about medical cover at the Oakden facility.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: At no time in any of the correspondence that I have looked at with regard to Oakden from SASMOA did they even hint at the sort of systemic abuse that was uncovered by the Chief Psychiatrist's report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is called to order.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:33): Supplementary to the Minister for Health: was there ever a proposal to invest $5.4 million into older persons mental health services between 2011 and 2014 as a result of the closure of the Acacia and Jacaranda wards at Glenside?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:33): I would need to have a look at that and find out, not—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The question was to me, you goose.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I haven't yet asked the minister to withdraw, but I now do so.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I withdraw. But it is a bit foolish of the Leader of the Opposition to be attacking me for taking a question which was addressed to me but, anyway, put that to one side. I am more than happy to—

Mr Marshall: But you don't know the answer. She is supposed to be the Minister for Mental Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I was the Minister for Mental Health at the time of the issues that the member for Davenport is canvassing.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the leader or the member for Morialta make another utterance outside standing orders, they will both be departing.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am more than happy to have a look and find out what the circumstances of that were.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:34): Supplementary to the Minister for Mental Health: can she confirm if she ever had any discussions in her role as parliamentary secretary, with SA Health or the minister, in regard to the $5.4 million of funding for the older persons mental health service for NALHN?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:35): I don't recollect that issue ever coming up, but I am happy to check

our records and advise the house when I am able to. I don't recall that meeting. In fact, I don't actually recall meeting SASMOA during that time.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:35): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What training is being undertaken by staff at the new RAH to ensure that the hospital will be ready to receive patients in September?

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:35): Oh, you! Oh, dear, Leader of the Opposition, goodness me. I thank the member for Ashford for this very important question.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I know the Leader of the Opposition shifts uncomfortably in his seat whenever the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is discussed in this place. I know he feels very uncomfortable when we start talking about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It's dawned on him how much trouble he's in.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We know the knives are being sharpened on the other side of the house. We know that the Leader of the Opposition can't control the backbench.

The SPEAKER: The minister—

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: They rolled him on pharmacy changes.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health will be seated. I have told the Leader of the Opposition that if he makes another utterance outside standing orders he will be ejected under the sessional order. It's very hard for me to do that while the Minister for Health is provoking him.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, sir, for your wise guidance. Staff training currently underway at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is critical to ensuring the hospital is ready to receive patients.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You read your questions. Fancy someone who can't even commit a question to memory criticising a minister for reading an answer. Isn't that the most extraordinary thing you've ever heard? He can't even keep his questions in his head, so he has to have them written down for him, and then when he hears the answer he doesn't even know how to change the question. It's just extraordinary. I digress.

We need to know that when patients come through hospital doors in September our staff have everything they need to provide lifesaving medical care, and scenario testing is a major part of this. I had the honour to recently witness one such test, which tested staff response to a motor vehicle accident victim being brought to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital via helicopter in a critical condition.

As part of the training, the patient was required to be assessed and stabilised by ED staff before being taken to a technical suite for emergency procedure before being transferred to ICU. Around 27 staff participated in the scenario, including a trauma surgeon, ED doctor, ED nurse, X-ray technician and MedSTAR clinicians. Around 20 staff observed and evaluated the scenario. I was incredibly impressed with the professionalism and dedication of all clinicians and staff during the test. All knew they had a job to do and took their role extremely seriously.

Scenario testing is an invaluable tool in refining critical processes in our new hospital. The scenario I witnessed demonstrated how the modern design of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will function in a real-life medical emergency. All the critical care areas at the new RAH are stacked on

top of each other. This includes the emergency department, pathology and blood transfusion, technical suites, intensive care unit and the helipad.

Mr Bell: How far do they have to go for the records?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm happy not to engage with the opposition, but the member for Mount Gambier is essentially heckling me from the back row. I don't mind, but I will respond. This means that in a trauma situation when time is absolutely of the essence, the building's design will ensure that patients receive lifesaving medical care as quickly as possible. This will assist staff greatly as they deal with life and death situations. While in real life the situation would happen very quickly, the scenarios generally take a few hours, stopping and starting so that staff can discuss the next steps, work through alternative options and take note of any issues.

These scenarios allow staff to learn about the new environment and technology, establishing what is working well and resolving what needs to be improved before they can begin caring for patients. I am told that staff have now completed 18 of the 20 scenarios, which have also included a suspected Ebola case, mental health presentation, bomb threat and fire evacuation. As we approach the September opening, I continue to be impressed by the enthusiasm and energy of our clinicians and staff who will be providing lifesaving care every day at our new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. What is the minister's response to the question posed by Elizabeth Dabars in the ANMF's latest newsletter asking why Oakden was, and I quote, 'not placed under continuing review to ensure that operational and cultural changes had been achieved'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:41): The minister has only been a minister a relatively short period of time. Can I say that to the extent that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know those opposite are fond of—

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know those members opposite—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Those members opposite—

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If I understand the remarks that were made, they refer back to events that occurred sometime hence, and I think the ministerial statement that has been provided to this house by the minister, which recounts the advice that was provided to the then minister for mental health, minister Hill—

Mr Bell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —was to the effect that after a three-year period of supervision in a sense by ACH, a well-respected aged-care agency, a number of the issues associated with the Oakden facility were resolved. In fact, in very clear terms it mentioned that it was a learning organisation, the cultural issues that had plagued it had been turned around and indeed new leadership had been put in place.

It is worth remembering that the trigger for involving ACH was the accreditation issues by the federal agency. The federal agency had then moved to three-yearly accreditation, so in the 44 domains, the federal accreditation agency, which looks at the very issues which are at the heart

of the criticisms at the Oakden facility—there was a clean bill of health given by the federal agency. So, the regular review is a review which is undertaken by the federal agency.

Of course, we do need to understand how it is that this particular institution could have slipped into such an abject state, but part of the explanation is revealed in the Chief Psychiatrist's report—which is the culture of lack of disclosure, which seems to have evaded the detection of even the Chief Psychiatrist, who has general supervisory powers over this institution and, indeed, the community visitor who had been in place and had documented isolated incidents but did not raise the very serious alarms until very late last year, which then triggered the more extensive inquiry.

It is a fair point to make that the supervision and monitoring of this organisation by the various layers of management do need to be examined. I am sure that will receive very detailed examination in the course of Commissioner Lander's investigation. It will also receive our attention. There are a number of ongoing investigations that are occurring, a number of ongoing investigations that are trying to get to the heart of all the disciplinary issues, including management failings, which are at the heart of the Oakden issue.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:44): A supplementary to the Minister for Mental Health: how does the minister respond to Professor Dabars who, in her newsletter from May 2017, says that 'NALHN has not responded to complaints made by staff and ANMF…regarding the prevailing culture at the Oakden facility, including allegations of bullying spanning several months and years'?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:45): What we do know is there is an ongoing piece of work involving changing the standards, the quality and safety framework and the care, most importantly, of the residents of Makk and McLeay.

Mr Bell: That's why you read the report so quickly.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: Ultimately, we will be closing—

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —the Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Service at that site. In only days now, we will be moving people to the Northgate facility to ensure the residents have a better future at that facility. There is a long-term planning piece that we are beginning to undertake, which I outlined to the house yesterday in my most recent ministerial statement about developing a longer-term model of care. All those things go to the heart of ensuring the residents at that site are at the centre of this government's attention and how we will work with staff, the families, the people who support them and, most importantly, the residents to improve the quality of their life as we move forward.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:46): A further supplementary: is the minister aware of complaints that ANMF have actually made in regard to the Oakden facility?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:46): I meet regularly with many stakeholder groups. I haven't met with the ANMF recently; however, any correspondence they may have made to the local area health network I am happy to make inquiries of.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:46): Whilst the minister is making inquiries, could she also inquire as to the time line of when these complaints were first made to NALHN?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:46): Sure, happy to do that.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:46): My question again is to the Minister for Mental Health. What is the minister's response to the question posed by Elizabeth Dabars in the ANMF newsletter when she says, 'Why did SA Health not support ANMF' when they offered to address the level of use of restraints by extending out implementation of the best practice guideline?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:47): We know that the restraint and seclusion data coming out of the Oakden site has reduced by 75 per cent since we have put in additional staff scrutiny and changed the way we do things since January, and we are making significant inroads into those spaces.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, how many records of Modbury Hospital patients have had information apparently added by doctors and nurses who have not worked at Modbury Hospital for months, if not years?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:47): It was a technical issue, which made it look like retired doctors saw patients in the Modbury Hospital emergency department, that's now been resolved. To enable doctors at Modbury Hospital to use Oasis to order pathology and radiology reports, an interface between the Modbury Hospital's computer system, IBA, and Oasis, used across public hospitals in South Australia, was put in place in December 2016.

A glitch occurred in the interface, meaning that some doctors' codes were mismatched on the Oasis list for Modbury Hospital. Due to the doctors' codes being mismatched, when staff entered the codes in IBA, the name of an incorrect doctor was recorded in Oasis when the data was transferred from IBA to Oasis for patients treated in the Modbury ED.

All other information regarding treatment, length of stay, test results, etc. was completely unaffected. This was a simple coding error and wasn't in any way a deliberate ploy to suggest the patient was being treated when they weren't. The error did not affect the treatment of any patients or the statistics that were generated about patients' length of stay in Modbury Hospital. The problem has now been resolved, and the data errors have all been corrected. My understanding is the error occurred over a number of months, so I would have to check how many patients were affected.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:49): Can the minister also take on notice, I assume, to explain who made these allocations and why?

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Sorry, I couldn't hear.

Mr KNOLL: Which personnel made those allocations?

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: The allegations?

Mr KNOLL: Allocations.

The SPEAKER: The allocation of the doctor to the case.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:49): Well, the computer system did.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:49): Supplementary: can the minister also explain to the house who investigated these issues?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:49): I'll check, but it would have been done within the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network. I imagine the e-health unit in the Department for Health would have had some involvement as well. My advice has come out of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:49): A further supplementary: can the minister confirm that this is the same NALHN that also prepared the briefing letter on Oakden that the Premier described as inaccurate?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:50): I have to say it's a pretty extraordinary thing for the opposition to come in here and start attacking doctors and nurses and suggesting that somehow doctors and nurses in the Modbury Hospital emergency department have engaged in some sort of cooking of the books to make statistics look better. I have explained to the house that this glitch had no effect on the statistics regarding length of stay in the Modbury Hospital emergency department. I do trust our doctors and nurses in our hospitals. If the opposition don't, then that's a matter for them.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will withdraw for the next hour under the sessional order for repeatedly defying the standing orders.

The honourable member for Dunstan having withdrawn from the chamber:

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Will the minister appear before the Senate inquiry into Oakden if asked?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:51): I couldn't hear because of the noise—

The SPEAKER: Well, it is actually a hypothetical question.

An honourable member: That would be out of order, then.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it would be.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Will the minister make a commitment to appear before the Senate inquiry into Oakden if asked?

The SPEAKER: It's probably still hypothetical.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:51): It's out of order.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

RATE CAPPING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister advise the house if it is still the government's position to not introduce a cap on local government rate rises?

The SPEAKER: It's quite an unnecessary split infinitive there.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:52): Everyone knows in this house here and in the general public that it is my agreement with the Premier that there will be no rate capping in the term of this government.

RATE CAPPING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:52): Supplementary: does the government oppose the rate capping of local government rate rises?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:52): I think I just answered that question. I will reinforce that and repeat it again: in the term of this government, there will be no rate capping.

COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): My question is to the Attorney-General. Who is responsible for not having a courtroom available last Friday to hear a community victim impact statement from the people of Fregon in the case of the murdered nurse, Gayle Woodford?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:53): I thank the deputy leader for her question. It is a very important question.

Mr Knoll: One that you haven't addressed for a long time; 1,200 prisoners on remand in prison.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert has earned a second warning. Attorney-General.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This is actually a very important question—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright, I call to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This is an important question because we have a circumstance here of a shocking crime against a person who was actually attempting to provide a very important service to a community, and we have a situation where the court was seeking to hear the understandable impact of this horrendous crime on the victim's family. I think everybody would understand how important it was that that occur and that it occur in a way that was sensitive to the needs of that family. Everyone understands that, particularly me.

The actual circumstances, though, go to this: some years ago, during the time, I think, of the Hon. Christopher Sumner being attorney-general and, I think, possibly at the urging of a former attorney-general in the form of the Hon. Len King, more latterly Chief Justice King, there was established in South Australia something that was and remains largely unique called the Courts Administration Authority. This was established by statute.

It means that in South Australia, unlike in every other part of the commonwealth, the courts administration is not something that is controlled by the Department of Justice or the Attorney-General's Department, as the case might be from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but is completely independent of the attorney-general of the day, is not subject to the management or direction of the attorney-general of the day and is a completely separate entity from the perspective of budget but also from the perspective of management. In fact, the Courts Administration Authority is managed by the courts themselves, and the authority is chaired by the Chief Justice and includes the heads of the other jurisdictions. They routinely meet and transact business as they wish to do, to do with all matters relating to courts.

Mr Speaker, as you might recall from your past experience, the courts rather jealously police the boundary between the Courts Administration Authority and anybody else, in particular the Attorney-General's Department. In that context, it is the case that the Courts Administration Authority is therefore responsible, amongst other things, for the routine management of the availability of its facilities, which include courtrooms.

The Courts Administration Authority, for example, would be in charge of the notion of whether or not court A, B or C was occupied between particular hours of the day on particular days of the week and expected to have particular judges or cases heard in those courtrooms. That is something which is entirely within their control. I can assure members that, if I were even to assert an interest in managing that, I would receive a fairly stern response from the judiciary about where my business ended and theirs began.

COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): Supplementary: given the express concern of the Attorney in respect of this circumstance and the identification that

the Chief Justice is responsible, did he make any enquiry as to why this circumstance arose last Friday?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:57): Can I make it clear that I did not say the Chief Justice is responsible for anything.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is warned and, alas, the deputy leader was already on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I want to make it very clear, just in case the Chief Justice is having a break at the moment and tuning in, that I am not asserting—and I underline the word 'not', and if I was putting this on paper I would be using a red crayon now—I am not—in large letters underlined—asserting that there is any deficiency on the part of the Chief Justice in relation to the Courts Administration Authority. He probably has no greater idea as to whether the particular person employed by the Courts Administration Authority, of whom there are probably many, whose job it is to manage the availability of a particular courtroom at a particular moment in time, did their job well or poorly. I imagine he doesn't know, and I wouldn't expect him to know, and I explicitly do not accuse him of anything. I am simply making the point—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is on two warnings already.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am simply making the point that this particular very unhappy circumstance, which all of us agree is unacceptable, I do not put down to malice or misbehaviour or anything of the sort by the Chief Justice. I assume that it is, like most of these things, misadventure, accident or happenstance.

I don't think there was any deliberate attempt by anybody to cause any hurt or harm to this family. I regret it happened—we all do—but I'm not going around pointing fingers at people. I expect, though, that the Courts Administration Authority will have taken notice of the understandable public concern about this and that in the ordinary course of their business they will direct their minds to how they can ensure this doesn't happen again.

Can I make the point again: this is their business; they run the courts. I have every reason to believe that they are just as sensitive to these matters as we are. When I next meet with the Chief Justice, it may well be a matter I raise with him, to say that this has been raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the parliament. I will perhaps even obtain a copy of *Hansard* to share with him so that he knows exactly what has been said in the parliament about this matter.

COOBER PEDY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Did the minister notify the Treasurer of any concerns he had about the governance of the Coober Pedy council before the Treasurer issued a letter, dated 29 March 2016, consenting to the council entering into a 20-year energy contract and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:01): From memory, I think that the agreement eventuated before my time, but certainly I will check and get back to the member.

COOBER PEDY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:01): Was the minister not the Minister for Local Government on 29 March 2016 or sometime after March 2014?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:01): Sorry, Mr Speaker, I didn't hear those words. Can the minister please repeat the question?

Mr PISONI: Did the minister notify the Treasurer of any concerns he had about the governance of the Coober Pedy council before the Treasurer issued a letter, dated 29 March 2016, consenting to the council entering into a 20-year energy contract and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have made some comments in this house previously, and I gave the member a briefing on the Coober Pedy situation. I have had regular contact with the council, through direct correspondence through the Office of Local Government, requesting assurance from the council about an issue with the auditing process. In July 2016, I had a briefing with Mr Neil Brown, the CEO. In August—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The correspondence I had with the Coober Pedy council—I am just trying to understand. I gave the member for Unley a briefing on this direct issue and I am just trying to understand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert has been warned twice. The member for Goyder is now interjecting. The member for Goyder will not interject. Minister.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have had a briefing with the member for Unley—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —and I had some concerns with the non response from the Coober Pedy council about financial returns and I have mentioned that to the member for Unley. At a particular period of time after that, I advised the Treasurer of the anomalies with the reporting through the Auditor-General through the audited returns, and that's when I had the correspondence with the Treasurer.

COOBER PEDY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:03): Supplementary: when were you first made aware or when were you first concerned about the operations of the Coober Pedy council?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:03): I don't have that information directly with me at the moment, but I am certainly happy to get back to the member with that information.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the minister now ascertained why eight infant deaths at the Women's and Children's Hospital were not reported to the Coroner and, if so, why did that not occur and what action has he taken?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:04): It's all on the public record, but I am happy to inform the house in any case. What happened was that there was an infant death. Let's be quite clear: clinicians make decisions about whether a death needs to be reported to the Coroner or not. There was an understanding among the clinicians about what constituted 'a procedure' under the act.

Under the Coroners Act, if there is a death within, I think off the top of my head, 24 hours following a procedure, then the clinician needs to notify that death to the Coroner. The clinician's understanding of what constituted a procedure was erroneous, and that came to light because of a death that wasn't reported. It was clarified with the Coroner that the procedure—a relatively minor

sort of procedure, which would have had no connection with the death of a child in any case—nonetheless should have been reported. There was a case of a death where that didn't happen.

Ms Chapman: Eight.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, there was one death—let me get to that—there was one death. When it became clear that that death should have been reported, the Women's and Children's local health network then had a look back and discovered that there were, in fact, a further seven deaths that should have been reported but were not.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The families have been informed, where it has been possible to locate those families. There are some families we have not been able to inform because we have not been able to locate them. But it's quite extraordinary—all this information is in the Coroner's report that I have provided.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is there—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader for the third time has been told that she is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is there in black and white—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It was tabled—

Ms Chapman: There is nothing in the report.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Nothing in the Coroner's report? Well—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will be removed for the next hour under the sessional order for repeatedly defying the Speaker's ruling and the standing orders.

The honourable member for Bragg having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This was all spelt out at length by the Coroner in the Coroner's report, and he also expressed his satisfaction with the way that the Women's and Children's local health network had handled this matter.

Of course I regret that deaths that should have been reported weren't. I also reinforce the fact that the Coroner did ask a senior doctor to go over those deaths to make sure that there was nothing in them that had to be examined and was reassured that that was not the case in any of those deaths. There were no other circumstances which would have warranted, at the time, a coronial investigation. As I say, this is all dealt with at length in the Coroner's report to the parliament. The deputy leader need only read it.

Grievance Debate

RATE CAPPING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:07): On the front page of the *Plains Producer*, a very well-read paper in regional South Australia just north of Gepps Cross—an area that the government is not very familiar with at all, of course, anywhere outside the metropolitan area—we see the headline 'Copy caps: door wide open for Labor rate capping policy'. The story states:

> Ratepayers across the state can expect some form of council rate capping following the state election in March 2018.
>
> The Liberal Party has already announced its rate capping policy, which it would introduce if it wins government.

That is a policy we took to the last election and a policy we announced nearly five years ago. The newspaper article continues:

The Labor State Government has opposed the policy, which has also been met with strong criticism from the local government sector.

However, the popularity of the Liberals' rate capping policy is looming as a possible factor at the polls.

The Plains Producer understand several local government bodies are expecting the Labor Party to introduce its own rate capping policy and planning their respective Long Term Financial Plans with that in mind.

Treasurer, Tom Koutsantonis, did not respond to the Plains Producer's—

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will be seated. How many times do I have to tell the member for Unley that he will not use the surnames or other names of members of this house? There are standing orders of long standing, going back to the mother of parliaments, saying that members may only be referred to by their electorate name or by the office they hold—for instance, minister or Premier. The reason for that is to prevent quarrels, yet repeatedly the member for Unley, who has been in this house years, uses it and violates it again and again. The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: I am actually quoting from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER: You cannot evade it by quoting.

Mr PISONI: I quote:

The Treasurer…did not respond to the Plains Producer's question asking if he would categorically rule out introducing a rate capping policy ahead of the next election.

So, there you have it. It is not because the government is now concerned about the cost of living in South Australia, or the cost pressures that South Australians have been forced to endure under this government, because if they were we would not have seen a pathetic $3 reduction in the emergency services levy announced just last week. They are doing this because the government has realised that they are wrong with their 15-year opposition to capping rates in South Australia.

The fact is that the government has a very cosy relationship with the Australian Services Union. The Australian Services Union gets whatever it wants when it is dealing with local government because local government simply put their rates up to pay for it. It is extraordinary that we now see that the Labor government will not reaffirm its policy that it has held for the last 15 years. My message to South Australians is: do not trust Jay Weatherill, the Premier. Do not trust the Premier. Do not trust the Treasurer. Do not trust these people when they tell you that they have changed their minds because after the election they will go back to form, if they win, and there will be no rate capping in South Australia.

Rate capping is a South Australian Liberal policy. It has been a Liberal policy for close on five years. It is Liberal policy because we recognise the pressures on South Australians under this government. That is the reason we announced that we will be reducing, on average, $150 per household with our cuts to the emergency services levy. What does Labor offer? Labor offers a mere $3, and they expect South Australians to be grateful for that.

What a pitiful excuse the Hon. Mr Malinauskas in the other place used in the media to suggest that there would be a $90 million cut in emergency services if the Liberals implemented their promise of reinstating the remissions and cutting that tax that Labor put in place back in 2014. The fact is that we did not see a $90 million increase in emergency services levy spending when Labor ripped $90 million out of the pockets of South Australians.

When Labor announce this policy leading up to the election, that they will cap council rates, do not believe them. Judge them on their form. Judge them on the fact that the cost of living has gone up under Labor, whether it be in relation to water, electricity, council rates or the emergency services levy. Labor simply cannot control their costs and they will continue to do what they have been doing over the last 15 years, that is, pushing more services and shifting more costs onto local government and then expecting local government to put up their rates in order to pay for them.

CENTRE OF DEMOCRACY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:13): Today, I would like to put on record my excitement at seeing the Centre of Democracy opened and taking its place as one of the cultural institutions on North Terrace. An election announcement by Premier Weatherill prior to the 2014 election, the

Centre of Democracy goes some way to replacing the Constitutional Museum that occupied Old Parliament House in this precinct until 1995.

Even though the Australian Electoral Commission still maintained an education centre in their office at 1 King William Street, that too was closed in the early 2000s. The loss of both these places left a big hole in the progress of encouraging interest in the democratic process and the value of the vote for schoolchildren and adults alike.

With this new addition and a new parliamentary outreach soon to be underway, I can confidently inform members and the wider South Australian public that you will all benefit greatly from the establishment of this new exhibition space located in the Institute Building on the corner of Kintore Avenue and North Terrace, beside the State Library of South Australia. It does have disability access and it will be open all the times that the Library is open.

This has all happened under the new leadership of the History Trust of South Australia, formerly known as History SA. Greg Mackie, in his speech last Wednesday, during the opening of the Centre of Democracy, at the end of the outstandingly successful History Month, told us about the Centre of Democracy being a collaborative project led by the History Trust in partnership with the State Library of South Australia. At this point, I must single out Alan Smith for his particularly prominent support for the Centre of Democracy project.

I know that many people were involved in the early days of this concept and I thank all of them. The centre's name was chosen to encourage the sense that it is a place that tells stories and fosters activity. I quote from Mr Mackie's speech:

> As a non-partisan place of stories about how people-power has—can—and will change the ways we are represented and governed over time, we intend to connect with citizen-centric organisations around the state, and to recognise that because democracy's journey is frequently contested, it is also a contest of ideas.
>
> We will be active—but not activist.

It is appropriate that the Centre of Democracy has its home in the old heritage listed Institute Building, part of the library for decades, because institutes were once all over the state and the State Library of South Australia in fact grew from that network of places of access to learning and resources—books in particular, beautiful books.

The Centre of Democracy will house primary objects to help tell the story of democracy. Initial loans came from Steven Cheng. He has loaned Don Dunstan's pink shorts, which actually made the newspapers and many of the media outlets. We also have objects on loan from Julie Ellis, Will Seargent, and this parliament, which has lent a page of the original petition. The Parliament Research Library of South Australia has lent books and, of course, the Muriel Matters Society has loaned some of its objects as well. I quote again from Greg Mackie's speech:

> We have been fortunate to work with committed and creative people and companies to bring this project to fruition, and I want to formally acknowledge and thank them for their creativity and their passion above and beyond, on tight budgets—and even tighter timelines.
>
> Exhibition design is by *Arketype*. Another creative group—*Sandpit*—have created the interactive digital artwork—*The Democracy Machine*.

I urge all members to go down and have a look at that.

> An interactive digital wall has been designed and delivered in record time by Molten Studios. And the website, Speakers' Corner and digital object labels are by Digitalbarn. Each of these great South Australian companies deserve to prosper.
>
> Conservation services have been provided by our sibling government organisations Artlab Australia—the State Library of South Australia—and object photography by Kylie Macey.

The project team is drawn from both the History Trust and the State Library: Kath Button, Kristy Kokegei, Andrew Piper and Allison Russel and, of course, curator Craig Middleton and the director of the Migration Museum, Mandy Paul, as project manager.

We also need to thank Madelena Bendo, Teresa Brook, Britt Burton, Amy Dale, Jude Elton, Laura Evans, Prue MacDonald and Michelle Toft. Making this new venture possible has included other people deserving of acknowledgment: Kristy Rebbeck, Bev Scott, Corinne Ball, Jessamy Benger, Oliver Scholey, Catherine Manning, Jenny Scott, Lew Chapman and Toby Woolley.

I would like to also acknowledge my colleague the Minister for The Arts for his help in establishing and opening the facility, and also the member for Ashford, the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith, and the executive of the Muriel Matters Society, especially Robin Matters, who is the president. By bringing the Muriel Matters story to life, we have been able to highlight the importance of the South Australian story, its place in the world and to show that we were first to give women the vote and the right to stand, dual suffrage in 1894. I commend the Centre of Democracy to all members as a place very worthy of a visit and encourage their schools to visit also.

OVERSEAS TRADE OFFICES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:18): Today, I rise to talk about the South Australian Liberal Party's positive plan to grow exports, boost the economy and create jobs in South Australia. This month, the state Liberal leader announced a policy that, if elected in 2018, we would open four new commercial trade offices in Japan, Malaysia, UAE and the United States. This policy is a commitment to growing our export and investment opportunities and investing for the long term, strengthening our relationships and our connections across the world.

Currently, South Australia has just two independent trade offices—our office in Jinan, China, which has just moved to larger premises and has expanded from one staff member to two, and the Agent-General's office in the UK. South Australia had maintained representative offices since the 1970s and peaked at 12 offices in the 1990s. In comparison with other mainland Australian states, Victoria has 18 international offices, Queensland has 15, Western Australia has 11 and New South Wales has six, and an analysis particularly of the New South Wales model shows that, on return, outcome on investment for their trade offices is significant.

We see the importance of providing our exporters with a permanent on the ground resource in key markets in central locations that are easily accessible, and these offices are complemented by our extensive network of officers embedded with Austrade in other countries. Regional trade commissioners in each of our overseas offices will cover a large area in what is a hub and spoke approach.

The markets in which we have announced four overseas trade offices are vitally important to South Australia. We will have staff dedicated to creating export and investment opportunities on the ground in these countries. Malaysia is an ideal gateway for South Australia into South-East Asia and is the state's third largest export market, making up around 7 per cent of our export share. In addition, there are direct air flights to Kuala Lumpur from Adelaide. There is the ability to hub and spoke to neighbouring markets in the ASEAN region within two hours. Malaysia is also a growing export destination for South Australian premium products, as well as service export opportunities, including aged care and technology.

In Japan, the South Australian government currently has no representatives, despite Australia having a free trade agreement with Japan. We believe that Japan is a market with great opportunities for South Australia. It is our fifth largest export market at around 5 per cent of our export market share and a key gateway into north-east Asia. There is demand for our clean green products under blue skies, particularly in premium wine and food and services, such as education, aged care and health care.

Australia's economy is forecast to be $24 billion larger by 2035 because of the free trade agreements with China, Japan and South Korea, and South Australia must take advantage of this. The two other offices will be based in the UAE and the United States, both important trading partners in which South Australia currently has no permanent on the ground presence. The Middle East makes up around 5 per cent of our exports and the US is our second largest export market. There are huge advantages and opportunities for South Australia to tap into both these markets, and I am excited about the export opportunities and investment the state can generate through our four offices.

China will continue to be our largest and most important trading partner, and that is why we are committed to the South Australian office in Jinan. We also currently have a representative embedded in Austrade in Shanghai, and I would love to see the state's exports with China grow even further. I have been working with industry and the business community in putting together a comprehensive policy to boost South Australia's international trade and support our exporters under a Marshall Liberal government.

Currently, our export performance has fallen behind the rest of Australia and our national export share sits at around 4 per cent, when it was 7.4 per cent when Labor came to office in 2002. We believe in an export-led transformation of South Australia's economy and we are prepared to invest in that transformation. Under our plan, we will have a minister with sole responsibility for exports heading an agency with the same mission to drive a whole-of-government export policy. Our program includes the already announced Globe Link, a combination of new road, rail and airport infrastructure to provide a generational upgrade of our freight export infrastructure; and investment into productive infrastructure.

Our approach to export growth will include providing export businesses and start-ups with training, mentoring and advice on boosting existing markets and securing new markets, with more focus on inbound trade missions, increased funding for more extensive eligibility criteria and export funding support. Marketing South Australia is critical if this export program is going to succeed. As to the business and innovation focus, there will be increased funding of initiatives to attract more international students to study in Adelaide and a targeted policy to grow our population and attract more skilled business migrants.

Time expired.

NUCLEAR WASTE

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:23): I rise today to talk about the process that is on the way to determine whether a facility to accommodate domestic nuclear waste is built in South Australia. It is very strange, given the vastness of the Australian continent and, indeed, the concentration of nuclear expertise at Lucas Heights, that the only three sites being considered are all in the electorate of Giles. The reason all the sites are in Giles does not reflect any particular set of comparative advantages. What it does reflect is a fundamentally flawed site selection process. It is a site selection process that has little regard for the impact on the communities that have been put in the spotlight and a site selection process that has absolutely no regard for the division that has been created.

Let me be clear: we do need to manage our domestically-produced waste in a responsible fashion. The adoption of such a divisive process does not, however, represent a responsible approach. The trigger for the engagement process is at the heart of why this is a seriously flawed approach. If you look at Kimba and the surrounding district, and if you look at Hawker and its district, you will see the division that has been caused. The trigger for the Flinders Ranges site was totally centred on the action of one person. That person does not live in the region; he lives in Adelaide. He is an absentee landlord. This absentee landlord nominated Wallerberdina Station which is under a pastoral lease. The absentee landlord is Grant Chapman, a former Liberal Party senator.

The process adopted by the federal government did not call for communities to nominate a site; it called for individuals with land tenure to nominate sites, a bizarre approach which then left communities to react. The absentee landlord did not consult with his neighbours prior to nominating his property. I understand that he did not discuss his intention with neighbouring pastoralists and he did not consult with the local Aboriginal people, some of whom live on the adjoining property at Yappala Station. I spent a night at Yappala, listening to the concerns expressed by the residents. They were shocked by the nomination and the arrogance of the absentee landlord. We now know that the presence of Aboriginal people in the Flinders Ranges dates back 40,000 years. They are not blow-ins, they are not absentee landlords, they have lived and walked the country for generations.

The nomination of Wallerberdina was marked and will always be marked by a complete lack of respect for the Adnyamathanha. The absentee landlord did not speak to his neighbours, neighbours whose connection to the land he obviously has no appreciation of. We are not all that far from terra nullius. His neighbours were invisible. The nomination and the ongoing process has generated division not just in the European community but also in the Aboriginal community. The nomination process in Kimba also centred on the actions of individuals and has also led to community division. In the lead-up to the federal election, the people of Kimba were under the impression that the two sites nominated near Kimba had been taken off the table, only to magically reappear after the election.

Most of the waste generated comes from the Eastern States. Lucas Heights can easily accommodate the long-lived intermediate waste for decades to come. That is where the expertise is

and that is where the more serious waste is generated. When it comes to that waste and other waste streams, we have ample time to get this right, and a starting point at a national level is to initiate a roundtable process involving all the various interests, including non-government environmental bodies. We have an obligation to do this properly and we can build a consensus about our long-term management of nuclear waste. What has happened to date should become a case study in how not to do it.

YORKETOWN HOSPITAL

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:28): I rise today to talk about one of my favourite subjects, Yorketown Hospital. I acknowledge that, while I was unable to be here yesterday, being unwell, a petition regarding Yorketown Hospital, signed by 2,049 people, was presented in my name. To all those people, and indeed all those who sought others out to sign the petition and to show their support for Yorketown Hospital and its surgical procedures, I say thank you. For the benefit of *Hansard*, I will repeat the words of the petition:

> The Petition of the undersigned residents of South Australia respectfully expresses their strong opposition to the State Government's plan to withdraw surgical services from Yorketown Hospital. Your petitioners therefore request that your Honourable House will call on the State Government to: [1] maintain the current range of surgical services at Yorketown Hospital; [2] upgrade and properly maintain the infrastructure of Yorketown Hospital to support the continuation of current services; and [3] direct Country Health SA to engage the community of Southern Yorke Peninsula in the planning of its health services before decisions are made, not after.

Those three issues raised in the petition were quite specific. I am sure people who read it and signed it did so because they wanted to be informed. Part of that cohort of people were amongst the 607 people who attended at the Yorketown Town Hall on 20 April at a public meeting that I convened.

They did so because they are concerned about the facility, but the issues raised that evening, and the opportunity to report on the information attached to it, and the desire to seek out additional information about bequests that might have been provided to the hospital, have still been met with no responses from minister Snelling's office. If I am wrong about this, I will apologise and later retract it, but I am very sure that I have contacted the minister's office on four occasions since February seeking a variety of information about the proposal to remove services from the surgery from 1 February and an explanation of issues associated with that.

I have lodged a freedom of information request about the bequests that had been made, about the funding and balance of those funds that were held at the time of boards of management being in place and later replaced by health advisory committees, and about ensuring those funds that had been previously available continue to be available, and that other than that spent up to this date remain available. I have had no response to that FOI either, and the 28 days associated with the review of that expired 13 days ago. A lot of the information that should be out in the community is not actually out there.

The *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*—a fine local newspaper—in reporting this week about the petition being tabled in the house yesterday also made mention of the fact that Country Health SA, as part of its revised effort to consult with the community, having temporarily forgotten the 1 April date for the removal of the surgery and procedures, held four two-hour sessions, which they hoped would be one-on-one sessions with individuals. That does not give a lot of scope, particularly as most of those sessions were held during daylight hours, and therefore in working hours, making it hard for people to attend.

As I understand it, the highest number of people who attended any of those four two-hour sessions was about 10. I held a public meeting and got 600 there, which shows that an opportunity exists and that when people want to be informed about a matter they will attend even when we had had three inches of rain in Yorketown that day. But since that time, there has been no continued effort.

The *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* this week goes on to confirm that public consultation closes on 9 June, but in what way? They have encouraged people to send emails, but there has been no opportunity to sit down with departmental officers, who hopefully would be decision-makers on this, and actually understand the concerns that exist in the community about any supposed threat of reduction of surgical procedures.

It is this lack of information and the continued frustration of the community that resulted in such a really strong turnout for the petition that was signed by 2,000 people. The southern Yorke Peninsula area is part of a population of probably about 4,000 and a bit, full-time. Getting nearly 50 per cent of the full-time residents to sign a petition shows a really strong commitment to the preservation of the service and an absolute commitment to the fact that they want government to recognise the concerns that they hold.

They are prepared to make an effort to sign and circulate a petition amongst the community and present it to this place in the hope that it is listened to. I urge the government to continue to engage the community in a far better way than they have done in the past, to highlight this petition as an example of that, and ensure that the outcome is a positive one for Yorketown Hospital.

MITCHELL PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:33): Last week, I was very pleased to be able to be part of the 30th anniversary celebrations of the Mitchell Park Neighbourhood Centre. I joined an enthusiastic and excited crowd of supporters and attendees of the centre as we reminisced, cut cake and sang happy birthday to the centre.

Some of the words included here today are courtesy of Marlene Littlewood, a volunteer of the centre since its inception. Marlene recounted on the day that, in the 1970s, the Housing Trust of South Australia provided a house to be used by the community to run school holiday and after-school activities. Marlene told us all that the house was so popular that it soon became a place where mums would escape from their day-to-day routine and, over a cup of coffee, discuss their local issues of concern and exchange ideas that helped many learn new skills.

Thanks to the original centre manager, Lynne McDonnell, and her group, the club was born. This was the forerunner for the amazing hub of activity that is today Mitchell Park Neighbourhood Centre. Marlene also told us that in the early days, along with a group of others, she would approach the then coordinator, Jill, with ideas for programs and she would always listen and was very supportive, with her response always being, 'Okay, we could give it a go.' Marlene told of the fun in producing the community newsletter pre-computer days when everything was typed on a typewriter, hand cut and pasted and then photocopied, and the good old faithful liquid paper corrected all that was wrong.

During the evolution of the centre, the Mitchell Park Kindergarten also recognised the growing needs of the community and met with Marion council and the Housing Trust of South Australia to discuss how these needs of the community could best be met. As a result of these discussions, it was agreed that a permanent meeting place was required and, with funding from the Housing Trust of South Australia and the council, the building was constructed, being built on land partly owned by Marion council and the kindergarten.

When completed, the building was handed over to the City of Marion for fit-out and provision of staff. The official program of the grand opening stated that, when all furnishings and equipment were in place, the total cost of the project would be $145,000, comprising the South Australian Housing Trust's contribution to the building of $95,000, Marion council's contribution to the building of $35,000 and furniture and equipment of $15,000. The centre was officially opened 30 years ago today on 31 May 1987. Before long, the centre became a hive of activity and a meeting place for the community. If local people were not attending a program, they would sit and talk and plan and exchange ideas, an activity that still continues today.

In the official program of the grand opening, the building was described as an excellent example of cooperation between organisations, with the aim of the centre being to provide activities to cover the needs of the local community. This early aim is not so very different from that of today. The Mitchell Park Neighbourhood Centre's aim is to respond to the health, welfare, individual needs and community needs of adults and children. Today's statement gives additional depth to the offerings of the centre as it talks about achieving this by facilitating a fun, diverse and accessible range of social, recreational and educational activities and programs that develop personal growth and encourage wellbeing and a sense of identity and community.

The official grand opening program went on to say that the coordinator had recently commenced duties and was working towards developing a wide range of activities. Exercise classes

and a family planning service were among the first programs to be organised at the centre. The centre's offerings have grown and evolved and today are extensive, with the centre full to overflowing as every space and every minute of the day is filled.

The centre offers flexi fitness; sewing, beading and crafts; a knitting and craft circle; a men's breakfast; a literacy program; English as a second language; a walking group; a women's walking group; an over-50 social group called the Silverliners; the Repair Cafe; mandala colouring; a playgroup; guitar lessons; senior social groups; Under Construction, an Asperger's social group for boys; new arrivals refugee immunisation; Groove Gold; Girls Connect, an Asperger's social group for girls; and much more.

Today, as in the early years, when you first walk through the door you feel a warmth and friendliness and are made to feel very welcome with a chirpy hello. This is how it has always been, and it rightly deserves the title 'the heart of the community'. The centre has unquestionably and successfully provided many services over its 30 years, and I look forward to the centre being able to offer many more programs and activities within the community in the future. Thank you to the wonderful staff of Mitchell Park Neighbourhood Centre and the amazing volunteers and all those who use and attend the great list of classes, activities and groups. Happy 30th anniversary, Mitchell Park Neighbourhood Centre.

Mr PICTON: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

BAIL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:41): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Bail Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Bail (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017 amends the Bail Act 1985 to improve the operation of the act. The bill inserts a further category of prescribed applicant into section 10A of the act, removes the option of seeking a telephone bail review under section 15 for prescribed applicants and excludes a Saturday as a working day for the purposes of the act. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The *Bail (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017* amends the *Bail Act 1985* to improve the operation of the Act. The Bill inserts a further category of 'prescribed applicant' into section 10A of the Act, removes the option of seeking a telephone bail review under section 15 for prescribed applicants and excludes a Saturday as a working day for the purposes of the Act.

Under section 15 of the *Bail Act* an arrested person who is dissatisfied with a decision to refuse bail by a police officer may seek a telephone bail review.

A number of applications for review are from prescribed applicants as a consequence of charges relating to breaches of intervention orders or related bail conditions. A 'prescribed applicant' is defined in the *Bail Act*. For such applicants there is a presumption against bail unless the applicant establishes special circumstances justifying release. The chance of a prescribed applicant being granted bail on a telephone review are extremely low. A magistrate sitting in court has the ability to seek a bail enquiry report and/or a home detention report and information about the attitude of the complainant to the matter. This is not available in the circumstances where a telephone review is sought (i.e.

early hours of the morning and weekends). It is proposed that the Act be amended so that prescribed applicants are not entitled to seek a telephone review. Such applicants will instead be brought before the court on the following working day.

A further amendment to section 10A of the *Bail Act* provides for an additional category of prescribed applicant. Presently, a prescribed applicant includes an applicant who has been taken into custody in relation to an offence against section 31 of the *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009* where the breach involved physical violence or threats of physical violence.

Where serious violent offending also involves a breach or breaches of section 31 of the *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act*, an accused will often be charged with the violent offence on an information laid in the District Court with the breach of the intervention order as an aggravating feature by virtue of s5AA(1)(l) *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*, rather than leaving the major indictable offence progressing as a separate file while the breach of intervention order offence proceeds in the Magistrates Court.

This saves court, prosecution and defence time by having the offending dealt with in one proceeding, and in one jurisdiction, rather than two. It further ensures the complainant is only subjected to giving evidence in one proceeding.

However, this approach has the disadvantage of arguably removing the status of prescribed applicant for any bail application the accused chooses to make. It means that in theory it could be easier for an accused to get bail on a major indictable offence which involved a breach of an intervention order, than it would be for the accused if his breaching offence were less serious.

The amendment provides that an applicant charged with an aggravated offence involving violence or physical violence where an aggravating circumstance is that the accused was, at the time of the offence alleged to have contravened an intervention order, would be a prescribed applicant. The onus would then be on the accused to establish special circumstances to justify a release on bail.

The obvious intention of including people who breach intervention orders by committing violent offences in the list of prescribed applicants was to ensure that people who do breach intervention orders in this way are not entitled to the presumption in favour of bail, and should not be entitled to access bail unless they establish special circumstances. The amendment to section 10A of the *Bail Act* will provide certainty that offenders charged with serious offences involving violence or threats of violence, where the offending breaches an intervention order but the breach of the intervention order is not charged as a separate offence, are 'prescribed applicants' for the purposes of the Act and the presumption in favour of bail is displaced.

The Bill also amends the definition of a working day for the purposes of the Act to exclude a Saturday as a working day. The Act already provides that Sunday and public holidays are not working days. The Magistrates Court and the Youth Court have not usually sat on a Saturday for many years. Removing the reference in the *Bail Act* to a Saturday as a working day will bring the Act in line with current practice.

A further amendment provides that the *Bail Act* is to be taken to have always excluded a Saturday, as well as Sunday and any other public holiday from the definition of *working day*. No liability will lie against the Crown, any officer or employee of the Crown or any magistrate or judicial office holder in respect of any actions taken that may conflict with the definition having included a Saturday.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

3—Commencement

This clause provides that Part 2 of this measure will come into operation on the day on which it is assented to by the Governor, while Part 3 will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Part 2—Amendment of *Bail Act 1985* to commence on assent

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The proposed amendment clarifies that a Saturday is not to be considered to be a *working day* for the purposes of the *Bail Act 1985* (the *Bail Act*).

5—Retrospective effect

This clause makes it clear that it is the intention of the Parliament that—

- the Bail Act is to be taken to have always excluded a Saturday, a Sunday and any other public holiday from the definition of a *working day*; and
- no liability lies against the Crown or any officer or employee of the Crown, or any magistrate or other holder of judicial office, in respect of a failure to bring a person taken into custody before the commencement of this clause before an appropriate authority on a Saturday.

Part 3—Amendment of *Bail Act 1985* to commence on day to be proclaimed

6—Amendment of section 10A—Presumption against bail in certain cases

Section 10A of the Bail Act provides that bail is not to be granted to a prescribed applicant (as defined in the section) unless the applicant establishes the existence of special circumstances justifying the applicant's release on bail. This clause proposes to add an additional category to the list of applicants currently included in the definition of *prescribed applicant*, being an applicant charged with an aggravated offence involving physical violence or a threat of physical violence if an aggravating circumstance of the offence is that, at the time of the alleged offence, the applicant is alleged to have contravened an intervention order of a court and the offence lay within the range of conduct that the intervention order was designed to prevent.

7—Amendment of section 15—Telephone review

Section 15 of the principal Act makes provision for the review by telephone of a decision of a police officer or a court constituted of justices not to grant bail to an arrested person in certain circumstances. The proposed amendment provides that the following classes of person will not have the right to such a review:

- a person (other than a child) dissatisfied with a decision made on application to a police officer on arrest who can be brought before the Magistrates Court constituted of a magistrate by not later than 4 pm on the next day following the day of arrest;
- a person dissatisfied with the decision made on application who is a prescribed applicant within the meaning of section 10A of the principal Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

LAND AGENTS (REGISTRATION OF PROPERTY MANAGERS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:42): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Land Agents Act 1994. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:42): 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.

The Land Agents (Registration of Property Managers and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017 (the Bill) amends the *Land Agents Act 1994* (the Act) to provide for registration of property managers and increased consumer protection provisions, colloquially referred to as the Property Management Reforms (the Reforms).

Presently, a person must be registered as a land agent to carry on business of selling, purchasing or otherwise dealing with land or business. An employee of a land agent acting for or on their behalf in relation to the acquisition or disposal of land or business must be registered as a sales representative. This includes commercial property management, but does not extend to residential property management.

The Bill defines the term property manager and requires employees of land agents acting for or on their behalf for this purpose to be registered. This will introduce a class of registration, similar to the sales representative registration, which reflects the different scope of work with targeted requisite qualifications. This recognises the distinct functions of property managers in the real estate sector.

The Reforms respond to issues experienced by Consumer and Business Services (CBS) in the regulation of the real estate industry. CBS receives around 180 calls per month from tenants, property managers and landlords that involve either inadequate service or alleged inappropriate or poor behaviour from a property manager.

Complaints are wide-ranging in nature and frequently include tenants reporting faults such as broken hot water systems but no repairs being done, property owners being billed for work that was never completed and theft or misappropriation of trust monies. For example, allegations of stolen and /or misapplied trust money of $25,000 (a 2015 investigation) and over $70,000 (a 2014 investigation). In both cases, the alleged offenders were residential property managers and CBS could only pursue a prosecution case against their employer, not the individual.

There are three key elements to the Reforms; increasing consumer protection provisions, reducing the regulatory burden on commercial property managers and empowering the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs (the Commissioner) to address misconduct.

The Bill seeks to increase protections for tenants and landlords by ensuring that property managers have satisfied minimum probity requirements and possess the knowledge and skills required to perform property management duties. This includes defining property manager and mirroring existing requirements relating to sales representatives and land agents, such as the entitlement to be registered, cause for disciplinary action and training and supervision.

The Bill reduces the regulatory burden on commercial property managers (currently required to be registered as a land agent or sales representative) by introducing a registration limited to property management with targeted requisite qualifications. Commercial property managers will save time and money, as the requisite qualifications are anticipated to be cheaper, require less time out of the office for training and have a lower periodic fee.

The Bill empowers the Commissioner to take compliance and enforcement action in a timely manner to better protect the community. This includes a new offence relating to fiduciary default, revised penalties that will have a greater deterrent factor, and the suspension or variation of a registration in urgent circumstances.

Presently, a registered land agent is liable under the Act for offences committed by their employees relating to trust account money. However, the land agent may rely on the general defence that the offence was not the result of any failure on their part to take reasonable care. In these circumstances, the land agent may report the conduct, or the Commissioner may refer their investigation to South Australia Police to consider prosecution under the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. Therefore, it is proposed that existing offences relating to trust account money be extended to all persons who receive, deposit, withdraw or otherwise deal with trust money. This will empower the Commissioner to take action against the appropriate individual, whether or not they are registered under the Act (i.e. trust account administrator, accountant, auditor or lawyer).

Further, existing trust account offences in the Act are narrow and primarily relate to the deposit or withdrawal of trust money to or from an Approved Deposit-Taking Institution (ADI). It is proposed to introduce a new offence that more appropriately reflects the dishonest nature of serious misconduct involving the defalcation, misappropriation or misapplication of trust money. For example, ongoing conduct that includes abusing a position of trust, falsifying records to prevent detection, causing financial detriment to property owners and significantly undermining the credibility of the real estate industry. The new offence proposes higher penalties commensurate with the dishonest nature of the misconduct and risk to the community. The proposed penalties are measured in contrast to the maximum penalties of a South Australian Police prosecution for the same misconduct.

Similar to recent amendments to the *Building Work Contractors Act 1995*, *Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995* and *Second-hand Vehicles Dealers Act 1995,* it is proposed to empower the Commissioner to suspend or vary a registration in urgent circumstances. These provisions will only apply where there are grounds for disciplinary action, the alleged offender is likely to continue to engage in the misconduct, and there is danger that a person or persons may suffer significant loss or damage. This aims to minimise consumer detriment and protect the community while the Commissioner considers or progresses a prosecution case.

Lastly, the Bill proposes that individual property managers and sales representatives operating unregistered are liable to the same penalty as their employer and the Commissioner is empowered to commence prosecution proceedings within five years of an alleged offence.

Subject to the passage of the Bill through the Parliament, it is proposed to consult with the real estate sector on the implementation of the Reforms, including the length of the transitional period and requisite qualifications for the property manager registration. Similar to sales representatives, it is anticipated that a property manager registration may be granted by the Commissioner, subject to conditions relating to training and supervision. This will ensure that the Reforms do not create any unnecessary barrier to employment.

The Reforms and measures contained in the Bill have received broad support from the real estate and community housing sectors, including industry and tenant advocacy groups. The Reforms aim to increase protections for tenants, landlords and the broader community engaging the real estate sector.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Land Agents Act 1994*

4—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the Act to include a reference to property managers.

5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment inserts a definition of property manager and registered property manager and makes consequential amendments to the definition of sales representative. A *property manager* is defined to be a person who, for or on behalf of an agent—

(a) grants leases, tenancy agreements or licence agreements in relation to land (whether or not that land is to be used for residential purposes or for the purposes of a business); or

(b) induces or attempts to induce, or makes representations or negotiates with a view to inducing, a person to enter into such leases or agreements; or

(c) ensures compliance with the terms and conditions of such leases or agreements; or

(d) performs a function of a kind prescribed by regulation.

The regulations may also exclude functions from the ambit of the definition.

A *registered property manager* includes a person who is registered as a property manager, or a person registered as a sales representative and also additionally registered as a property manager.

6—Amendment of section 6A—Sales representatives to be registered

This clause increases the maximum penalty for breaching section 6A(1) (requirement for a person who acts as a sales representative to be a registered agent or a registered sales representative) from $5,000 to $20,000.

7—Insertion of section 6AB

This clause inserts proposed new section 6AB.

6AB—Property managers to be registered

This clause provides that a person must not act as a property manager for an agent unless the person is a registered agent, is a registered sales representative who is additionally registered as a property manager, or is registered as a property manager. It is also an offence under this clause for an agent to engage a person to perform the functions of a property manager unless the person is registered as an agent, registered as a sales representative and additionally registered as a property manager, or is registered as a property manager under the Act.

8—Amendment of section 8B—Entitlement to be registered as sales representative subject to conditions relating to training and supervision

This clause increases the maximum penalty for breaching section 8B(3) (agent failing to properly supervise a sales representative whose registration is subject to conditions relating to training and supervision) from $5,000 to $10,000.

9—Insertion of sections 8BA and 8BB

This clause inserts 2 proposed new sections couched in similar terms to the provisions relating to the registration of sales representatives.

8BA—Entitlement to be registered as property manager

This clause sets out what is required for a person to be entitled to be registered as a property manager. The person must have the qualifications required by the regulations or, if the regulations allow, the qualifications considered appropriate by the Commissioner (for example, equivalent qualifications from interstate). The person must also not have been convicted of an indictable offence of dishonesty or been convicted of a summary offence of dishonesty in the preceding 10 years, must not be suspended or disqualified from practising or carrying on an occupation, trade or business under a law of this State, the Commonwealth, or another State or a Territory, and must be a fit and proper person.

8BB—Entitlement to be registered as property manager subject to conditions relating to training and supervision

Proposed section 8BB provides that if a person does not have the qualifications required by section 8BA, but otherwise satisfies the requirements of that section, the person may nevertheless be registered subject to conditions that the person undertake training (unless the person has previously failed to comply with such a condition). There is also a requirement that the person be supervised as specified in the regulations, with failure by an agent to properly supervise the person being an offence attracting a maximum penalty of $10,000. Subsection (5) enables the Commissioner to cancel the registration of a person registered under the section.

10—Substitution of section 11B

Section 11B is replaced.

11B—Registration card to be carried or displayed

Current section 11B requires a natural person registered under the Act to carry the person's registration card and to produce it on request by authorised officers or persons with whom they have dealings. The new section has the effect of extending these requirements to registered property managers.

11—Insertion of Part 2AA

This clause inserts Part 2AA and section 11BA into the Act.

Part 2AA—Suspension or variation of registration in urgent circumstances

11BA—Commissioner may suspend or impose conditions on registration in urgent circumstances

This section gives the Commissioner a new power, in urgent circumstances, to suspend a registration or to impose conditions on a registration where there are reasonable grounds to believe that a registered person's conduct constitutes grounds for disciplinary action and a danger of significant harm, loss or damage to another person. The section also grants appeal rights to the District Court. This section is similar to sections included in recent times in other occupational licensing Acts such as the *Building Work Contractors Act 1995*, the *Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995* and the *Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995*.

12—Amendment of section 11C—Commissioner may cancel, suspend or impose conditions on registration

This amendment extends the application of this section to property managers.

13—Amendment of section 12—Interpretation of Part 3

This amendment makes a minor change to the definition of *trust account*, required for a better fit with the amendments to section 13 of the Act.

14—Amendment of section 13—Receiving and dealing with trust money

The amendments to section 13 extend the reach of this section to include property managers, other persons who receive trust money in relation to an agent, and persons who are entitled to deposit money into, withdraw trust money from, or deal with trust money in, an agent's trust account. There are specific obligations on such persons when receiving and dealing with trust money, and also an additional subsection that makes it an offence for agents, sales representatives or any of those additionally specified persons to cause a defalcation, misappropriation or misapplication of trust money.

15—Amendment of section 14—Withdrawal of money from trust account

This section is cast in the passive voice to enable consistency with the amendments in the previous clause.

16—Amendment of section 29—Indemnity fund

These amendments extend the application of section 29 to property managers.

17—Amendment of section 42—Interpretation of Part 4

This clause inserts a definition of *property manager* to reflect the fact property managers must now be registered under the Act.

18—Amendment of section 43—Cause for disciplinary action against agents, sales representatives or property managers

This clause amends section 43 with the effect of applying the disciplinary provisions to registered property managers as well as registered sales representatives and registered agents.

The amendments also match the amendments made by clauses 6, 7 and 9 of the Bill with the effect that property managers must be fit and proper persons in order to be registered, not just after registration. (There will still be cause for disciplinary action under section 43 if events have occurred after registration such that the person is not a fit and proper person to be registered.)

19—Amendment of section 47—Disciplinary action

This clause amends the definition of *prescribed offence* to include a reference to the proposed new offence against section 13(3) set out in clause 14 of the Bill.

20—Amendment of section 49—Delegations

This clause amends section 49 to extend the ability of the Commissioner to make a delegation to a person under an agreement between the Commissioner and an organisation representing the interests of property managers (as well as sales representatives and agents).

21—Amendment of section 50—Agreement with professional organisation

Section 50(1) of the Act provides that the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Minister, make an agreement with an organisation representing the interests of agents or sales representatives, for the organisation to undertake a specified role in the administration or enforcement of the Act. This amendment extends the operation of this section to organisations that represent the interests of property managers.

22—Amendment of section 61—Prosecutions

This clause amends section 61 to extend the time within which a prosecution for an offence under the Act must be commenced from 2 years to 5 years from the date the offence is alleged to have been committed (other than for an expiable offence). Currently, section 61 requires the Minister's authorisation for a prosecution to be commenced after 2 years, but within 5 years.

23—Amendment of section 62—Evidence

This amendment extends the operation of section 62 to property managers, with the effect that the Commissioner may issue a certificate that a person was or was not registered as a property manager on a specified date as constituting proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary of that fact.

24—Amendment of section 65—Regulations

This clause provides that the regulations may make provisions of a savings and transitional nature as a consequence of this measure. Such a regulation may take effect from the commencement of this amendment (and if that is a date earlier than the publication of the regulation, only if the provision does not operate to the disadvantage of a person by decreasing the person's rights or imposing liabilities on the person).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (INTERVIEWING VULNERABLE WITNESSES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:43): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:43): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Summary Offences (Interviewing Vulnerable Witnesses) Amendment Bill 2017 amends the Summary Offences Act 1953. The bill addresses a potential gap in the Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Act 2015 arising from the recent Supreme Court decision. In light of this decision and recent changes in SAPOL operational practices, legislative amendment is prudent to provide for the explicit admissibility of a video interview with a vulnerable party in criminal proceedings for all offences, not just, as at present, for a 'serious offence against the person'. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

A 'serious offence against the person' in this context is a sexual or serious violent offence or a breach of an intervention or restraint order or stalking but not such other offences as assault or assault causing harm under s 20 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. A 'vulnerable party' in this context is 'a person with a disability that adversely

affects the person's capacity to give a coherent account of the person's experiences or to respond rationally to questions.'

The Bill explicitly authorises the taking and use of a video interview with a vulnerable party for all offences and is not confined, as at the present, to a 'serious offence against the person'. The Bill provides that it is an issue for the investigator's discretion whether to take a video interview with a vulnerable party for other than a serious offence against the person. The Bill extends to those video interviews with a vulnerable party for other than a serious offence against the person conducted between 1 July 2016 when the *Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Act 2015* commended and the date on which the Bill will come into effect.

The *Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Act 2015* (and the supporting Regulations) now require that the account of a vulnerable party for a 'serious offence against the person' to be taken by a specially trained investigator in the form of a video interview. This video is expressly admissible under the 2015 Act at the court's discretion at trial in lieu of examination in chief. There is only express provision in the 2015 Act for the admissibility of a video interview with a vulnerable party for a 'serious offence against the person'. There are no express provisions regarding other offences.

The *Statutes Amendment (Attorney General's Portfolio) Act 2016* in its transitional scheme sought to provide that video interviews with vulnerable parties conducted under the old law before 1 July 2016 remained admissible after 1 July 2016 in respect of all offences. This construction was accepted by the Supreme Court, however a potential gap was identified regarding offences other than a 'serious offence against the person'.

Legislative amendment is prudent to make it clear that video interviews with a vulnerable witness to any offence are admissible.

The Bill explicitly authorises the taking and use of a video interview with a vulnerable party for all offences. The Bill provides it is an issue for the investigator's discretion whether to take a video interview with a vulnerable party for other than a serious offence against the person but, if one is taken; any video is explicitly admissible in a court's discretion.

The Bill also provides for the taking and use of video interviews conducted with a vulnerable party for other than a serious offence against the person between 1 July 2016 and the date on which the Bill comes into effect with the Governor's assent. Without such a provision, there is a likelihood that any such video interviews may be inadmissible requiring a vulnerable witness for other than a serious offence against the person to provide their account at trial in the usual way. This is undesirable.

The Bill also supports recent developments in the context and prosecution of cases involving family violence. An example where an interview with a vulnerable party will be explicitly admissible under the Bill is a 10 year old child who witnesses his or her mother assaulted by their father and the resulting charge is assault causing harm, not a serious offence against the person.

The Bill maintains an accused's right to a fair trial. The defence right to cross-examine a vulnerable party is fully retained. Any video interview with a vulnerable party for other than a serious offence against the person is only admissible in the court's discretion and if the vulnerable witness is available for cross-examination.

The Bill provides further support to vulnerable parties, namely children aged under 15 or a person with an intellectual disability, within the criminal justice system.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal. There being no commencement clause, this measure will come into operation on the day on which it is assented to by the Governor.

Part 2—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

3—Section 74EC—Admissibility of evidence of interview

The first 2 proposed amendments to section 74EC are technical and clarify that a 'prescribed person' is a 'prescribed interviewer'. The other proposed amendments are more substantial. Section 74EC of the Act currently provides that the admissibility of evidence of an interview between a vulnerable witness and a prescribed person is, for the purposes of section 13BA of the *Evidence Act 1929*, restricted to the investigation of a serious offence against the person. The proposed amendments will broaden this to provide for a court to have discretion to admit evidence of an interview between a vulnerable witness and a prescribed person in relation to the investigation of any other offence if the requirements of the section are followed in relation to the conduct of the interview.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

The transitional provision will make provision for the admission of an audio visual record of a statement of a vulnerable witness to whom the clause applies made to an investigating officer after the commencement of Part 5 of the *Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Act 2015* and before the commencement of Part 2 of this measure as part of a formal interview process in relation to the investigation of an alleged offence (other than a serious offence against the person). The audio visual record of the statement may be admissible under section 13BA of the *Evidence Act 1929* as evidence in the trial of a charge of the offence as if the recording had been made pursuant to Division 3 of Part 17 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953* in accordance with the requirements of that Division as in force following the commencement of Part 2 of this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

INDUSTRY ADVOCATE BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:44): On behalf of the Treasurer, obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the appointment of the Industry Advocate and to provide for the powers and functions of the Industry Advocate. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will secure local jobs in South Australia in the building and construction industry, along with other key industries, by establishing the role of the Industry Advocate as a statutory position and strengthening its powers to hold contractors to the commitments they make to utilise South Australian workers or materials.

Three years ago, the South Australian government took a nation-leading approach and introduced the economic contribution model which forms the basis of the South Australian Industry Participation Policy. A key priority for the South Australian government is to grow the economy, create jobs and support the diversification of South Australia's industry sectors. One of the practical ways government can do this is by making sure that businesses creating jobs in South Australia are given every opportunity to deliver the goods and services to government itself.

The South Australian Industry Participation Policy recognises that the economic contribution to the state is a legitimate purchasing consideration for the government and it focuses on local jobs, investment and supply inputs. It is fair to say that the state's Industry Participation Policy and the role of the Industry Advocate have made a marked difference for local businesses and the economy. Since the government incorporated the meaningful measure of economic benefit as part of the tender evaluation in 2014, the buying behaviour of both government agencies and head contractors has changed noticeably.

In developing this bill, the government has taken into account the strong desire from South Australian business leaders and industry associations to see the Industry Advocate role be given more teeth. The bill recognises the important role the Industry Advocate plays in advocating to resolve complaints, removing impediments to South Australian businesses and improving procurement practices and processes. The bill establishes a statutory role for the Industry Advocate and confers stronger powers on the advocate to hold contractors to their commitments to utilise South Australian workers or materials.

Under Industry Advocate Ian Nightingale's watch—it is great to have him in the chamber today—local products, materials and labour now make up an average of nearly 80 per cent of South Australian goods and services procurements or around 90 per cent of major infrastructure projects. We want to continue to build on this success and make smart procurements central to the development of public projects, from conception through to delivery, and ensure that maximum economic activity is generated in South Australia, giving local producers, entrepreneurs and businesses every opportunity to be successful.

The bill requires the South Australian government to maintain an industry participation policy that seeks to promote (a) government expenditure, the results in economic development for

South Australia; (b) value for money in public expenditure; (c) the economic development of the steel industry and other strategic important industries for South Australia; and (d) full, fair and reasonable opportunities for capable South Australian businesses to participate in government contracts.

The government's steel policy has delivered outstanding results for Arrium and the steel industry more broadly. For instance, the Northern Connector road project, won by Lendlease Engineering, will use about 7,500 tonnes of reinforcing or structural steel from the Arrium steelworks in Whyalla in the $985 million construction project.

The functions conferred upon the Industry Advocate under the bill include advocating on behalf of businesses and investigating complaints about industry participation. This could include how government agencies and authorities are applying the policy through to enforcing the commitments made by businesses under the industry participation plan. The bill provides some powers and functions for the Industry Advocate to ensure compliance with the South Australian Industry Participation Policy. The Industry Advocate will develop an enforcement strategy in consultation with key stakeholders to ensure these powers are carried out in a fair, transparent and measured way. This will include a strong emphasis on education, advice and persuasion in the first instance, before escalation to a more formal response.

The bill includes a power for the Industry Advocate to be able to require participants contracting with the government to provide information or documents in his or her possession. The Industry Advocate must issue a notice to the participant and specify a reasonable time for the information or documents to be provided. What is a reasonable time will depend upon the nature of what is being requested. If a participant does not provide the documents or information within the time specified, a penalty of up to $20,000 can be applied. If a participant is found not to be complying with their contractual obligations, the Industry Advocate can direct the participant to comply with their obligations.

Following the principles of natural justice, the participant must be provided with an opportunity to respond to the notice and explain why their actions are reasonable and justifiable in the circumstances. If after considering the participant's response the Industry Advocate remains satisfied that the participant should be required to comply with the direction, the advocate may refer the matter to the minister with recommendations for further action. The minister can decide to pursue a breach of contract in serious cases of noncompliance.

The bill is a flexible and modern piece of legislation that carefully balances obligations on participants in government contracts with the value of work being tendered for so as to not create unnecessary red tape. The role to investigate and monitor a contractor's compliance with the commitments made will also extend to participants in local government contracts where councils have chosen to adopt industry participation policies. It is not the intention of this bill to require councils to adopt industry participation policies, but it is a function of the Industry Advocate to encourage them to do so.

The other important aspect of the Industry Advocate's role is building the capability and the capacity of businesses based in South Australia. The Office of the Industry Advocate has run many very successful Meet the Buyer events over the past few years, with almost 5,000 businesspeople attending. To ensure the integrity of the position, the Industry Advocate will be a statutory officer. Under the Public Sector Act 2009, the advocate will be required to produce an annual report, which will be tabled in parliament, and is a senior official for the purposes of the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995.

The bill evidences the government's commitment to ensuring that the procurement practices of the state government will provide long-term benefit to the state by supporting economic diversity and employment growth, rewarding businesses that want to work in our state, employing South Australians and creating jobs, and, at the same time, investing here and buying supply inputs from South Australian businesses. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the measure.

Part 2—Establishment of SAIPP

4—Establishment of SAIPP

This clause requires the Minister to establish and maintain the South Australian Industry Participation Policy.

Part 3—Industry Advocate

5—Industry Advocate

This clause provides for an Industry Advocate to be appointed by the Governor.

6—Functions

This clause sets out the functions of the Industry Advocate (including taking action to further the objectives of the SAIPP).

7—Ministerial direction

The Minister may give directions to the Industry Advocate in accordance with this section.

8—Terms and conditions of appointment

The Industry Advocate is to be appointed for a term not exceeding 5 years and on conditions determined by the Governor (and will be eligible for reappointment at the end of a term). The clause also sets out grounds for termination of appointment.

9—Deputy and Acting Industry Advocate

The Minister may appoint a Deputy Industry Advocate or an acting Industry Advocate.

10—Honesty and accountability

The Industry Advocate, the Deputy and any person appointed to act as the Industry Advocate are senior officials for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

11—Staff etc

This clause makes provision for staff of the industry Advocate.

12—Delegation

The Minister and the Industry Advocate may delegate functions and powers. The Industry Advocate may not however delegate any prescribed powers and functions.

13—Power to require information and documents

The Industry Advocate may, by written notice, require a participant in a contract to provide (within a reasonable time specified in the notice) information or documents in the participant's possession that the Industry Advocate requires for the performance of the Industry Advocate's functions. Failure to comply is punishable by a maximum fine of $20,000, however the clause does not override the privilege against self-incrimination or legal professional privilege.

14—Issue of directions

The Industry Advocate may give directions to a participant in a government contract if the Industry Advocate reasonably believes that they are not complying with their contractual obligations in respect of the SAIPP. The participant may provide a response if they believe the failure is reasonable and justifiable.

Part 4—Miscellaneous

15—Reports to Minister

The Industry Advocate may report to the Minister on relevant matters and must report in relation to any failure to comply with a direction under clause 14 (unless the Industry Advocate is satisfied that the failure to comply with the obligations was reasonable and justifiable).

16—Confidentiality

This clause provides for confidentiality of personal information, information relating to trade secrets or business processes or financial information acquired in connection with the administration of this Act, except in certain circumstances.

17—Application of Freedom of Information Act 1991

The Industry Advocate is to be an exempt agency under the *Freedom of Information Act 1991* except in respect of—

(a) financial and administrative information relating to the operations of the Industry Advocate; and

(b) statistical information that does not identify any particular person or business.

18—Regulations

The Governor may make regulations for the purposes of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Bell.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HEAVY VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:52): I resume my comments by talking about the depth of knowledge in the trucking industry in the South-East. It would be remiss of me not to mention what is possibly the best example of that—Allan Scott—for founding Scott's Transport, which grew to be one of the biggest freight companies in Australia rivalling Linfox.

In 1988, Allan Scott purchased Mount Gambier rival transport company, K&S Freighters, and then listed it on the Australian Stock Exchange. In 1997, Allan Scott became a major sponsor of the Port Adelaide Football Club upon their entry into the Australian Football League—and I wish them all the best for tomorrow night's game against Hawthorn.

Mr Scott was awarded a Medal of the Order of Australia (OAM) in June 1986 and an Officer of the Order of Australia (AO) in June 2006 for service to the development of the transport industry focusing on heavy vehicle driver safety training and through lobbying for improved infrastructure and development of an integrated freight network and for service to the community through a broad range of sporting, medical research and aged-care organisations. Unfortunately, Mr Scott passed away on 28 October 2008 in the Mount Gambier hospital.

The knowledge gained by Mr Scott was certainly transferred to his son, Ray Scott, with whom I have had intimate dealings around freight issues and improvements for South Australia, because at the heart of that great family is a desire to see South Australia grow and prosper. That desire is being handed down to Ray's son, Ashley Scott, who is moving forward in the same vein.

We had an interesting conversation around permits and heavy vehicle registration fees and creating an equal playing field so that South Australian companies will support South Australia and the South Australian government. There does need to be an equal playing field because at the end of the day these are businesses with very tight margins. There is a backlog on rural and regional roads. In particular, the increase in forestry and the number of truck movements between Mount Gambier and the Port of Portland will need ongoing attention going forward.

Before I was even elected to parliament, Ray Scott would talk to me about diverting traffic out of Adelaide at Murray Bridge. I remember sitting down with maps at his desk and looking at those. In a way, that has led to certainly part of the Globe Link, which is an alternative corridor for heavy freight to avoid the heavily populated areas of existing freight routes and be a non-stop direct link into South Australia's biggest port, Port Adelaide.

A generational upgrade of our freight export infrastructure is required to provide our companies with the competitive advantage they need to get our premium South Australian products to markets across the globe. There has been a lack of development in an alternative route and it is something that we will take to the 2018 election as a cornerstone policy for the freight industry. With those brief words, we will be supporting the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill and I commend it to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge some visitors to the gallery today, students from Blackfriars Priory School, Connor Watson and Thien Nguyen, who are guests of the member for Unley. Welcome to parliament.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HEAVY VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:57): I rise to speak briefly in support of the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill. The Heavy Vehicle National Law, which came into operation in 2014, established the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, Australia's first national independent regulator for all vehicles over 4.5 tonnes gross vehicle mass.

Through the amendment bill before us today, South Australia joins other states and territories, with the exception of Western Australia and the Northern Territory, as a participant in the national heavy vehicle regulation regime. This will help to ensure that South Australia is meeting the requirements under the legislative regime for heavy vehicles and it aids in reducing inconsistencies between jurisdictions for heavy vehicle operators by cutting red tape, an unnecessary burden in day-to-day business operations.

The long-term goal of the Heavy Vehicle National Law is to establish a uniform national heavy vehicle system. There are, however, some regulations that remain the same, including inspections, driver licensing, all matters related to the carriage of dangerous goods and heavy vehicle registration, which is still the responsibility of the relevant state and territory authorities. Unfortunately, the registration chapter of the national laws is yet to commence. Therefore, heavy vehicle fees must still be dealt with in this place.

Through these amendments before us today, the bill is facilitating an industry-sourced funding model, meaning that the regulator is funded by the revenue collected from heavy vehicle registration fees. South Australia and other relevant participating jurisdictions have agreed that the regulatory revenue collected as part of their registration fees will be transferred to the regulator fund to meet each jurisdiction's share of the operating budget of the regulator, which will assist the regulator to carry out their important duties. I commend the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill to the house.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:59): As previous speakers have indicated, the opposition supports the bill. It is not a controversial bill and is part of what is happening around the nation. I indicate that I am the lead speaker. The bill amends the Highways Act 2006 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, with amendments to assist South Australia to meet its agreed obligations as a participating jurisdiction under the February 2014 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013, which contains the national law as a schedule. The bill provides for the creation of a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator (known as the Regulator).

The national legislative regime for heavy vehicles deals with trucks over 4.5 tonnes in gross vehicle mass. Because the registration chapter of the national law has not yet commenced, heavy vehicle rego is still under state legislation. However, participating jurisdictions' registration fees are governed by a model law approved by the national Transport Infrastructure Council made up of state and territory ministers.

Vehicle registration charges are now calculated on the basis of both road user charge and regulatory charge components. SA, along with other participating states, has agreed that the regulatory revenue collected as part of the registration be transferred to the regulator fund—this was previously paid by the SA registrar to the Highways Fund—providing the regulator with industry-based funding to resource its duties.

Amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act clarify that deductions from concessional registration charges for people living in remote areas and primary producers will be taken from the roads component and not the regulatory component of the fees provided to the regulator's fund. The bill is, in effect, a stopgap measure to pay for the NHVR until all arrangements are completed. Registration fees will not increase but, instead, a portion will be handed over to the NHVR instead of going to the Highways Fund from which SA's share would be paid to the NHVR separately.

We are seeing a focus on more transport and more freight happening around the nation, and particularly South Australia, being where it is—right in the middle of the east and the west—we see a lot of both rail and heavy vehicle traffic coming into South Australia, and there is no doubt that we will continue to see that increase. This was the reason why earlier this year the Leader of the Opposition and I, as well as the South Australian Liberal team, announced our Globe Link promise—that is, if elected in 2018, a Liberal government will develop an alternative corridor for heavy freight called Globe Link. Globe Link will boost the South Australian economy with the creation of jobs in construction, transport and, of course, beyond that, exports.

After 15 years of a Labor government, our share of the national export market has dropped, from about 7.5 per cent to around about 4 per cent, costing valuable jobs and export income. There is no doubt that when you look at employment figures from around the nation you can see that South Australia lags well and truly behind when it comes to the creation of new jobs. Last month alone, we saw a massive spike in South Australia's unemployment level, and I think that we are now running close on 30 months of having the nation's highest unemployment, either on a trend or seasonally adjusted level or a combination of both.

There simply has not been a focus on growing the economy here in South Australia. Our Globe Link program, which will enable goods to get to market more quickly, will take heavy vehicles—many of the heavy vehicles that travel in our suburbs—out of the suburbs, particularly for those who are living in the seat of Elder, through Westbourne Park, through Kingswood; for example, those who are living in Plympton and around the seat of Badcoe and those who are living around South Road. The government's plan, Labor's plan, is to turn Cross Road into a major truck thoroughfare, seeing more and more trucks heading through the suburbs of Adelaide, more and more trucks down Portrush Road and right through the suburbs of Adelaide.

Globe Link will shift the rail line out of the suburbs, bypass the Adelaide Hills and link up with the northern part of the track for it either to continue on to the west or, alternatively, hook into the northern suburbs where the bulk of our trade and freight activity happens in South Australia. It will remove all those freight trains out of Adelaide and Cross Road will no longer be the problem that it is, with 14 or 15 trains now close to two kilometres long holding up traffic at any time of the day or night.

It is particularly frustrating for those who are caught in that situation at peak hour because cars are pulled back from the intersection, or stopped, heading both west beyond Goodwood Road and east beyond Unley Road. It takes quite some time for that to clear once the train does pass. That will be a thing of the past for those who rely on South Road to move from east to west. Of course, it will take away the necessity for heavy vehicles to use Cross Road to get into the north-south corridor on South Road. We know how important transport is to our economy. We know how important it is to get goods to market quickly.

We know the enormous growth potential just north of us as the middle class continues to grow throughout China and South-East Asia when more and more people want to spend their discretionary money on the quality, healthy food we produce in South Australia. The trick, of course, is to get it to those markets quickly and to get it to those markets fresh. With the private sector taking up the option of a freight-only airport around Monarto, which is part of the Globe Link plan, we will have a situation where crayfish can leave in the morning and be served on restaurant tables in Shanghai and Hong Kong that evening. It will be an extraordinary feat for our food producers.

I commend the bill to the house and look forward to more work being done so that we can continue to service those who service us so well—those in the transport industry—so that they can continue to do their job safely and effectively for the benefit of their businesses and the economy. I want to finish by saying how disappointed I was to hear the member for Kaurna continuing to support

the TWU's call for safe rates, which we know have been an absolute disaster for small business people throughout South Australia.

We have a situation where the only motivation for the Labor Party to introduce this in the first place was to force contractors who have their own businesses, who have taken out mortgages on their trucks against their houses, to get out of the trucking business and work for a big company that is unionised so that they are then forced to be union members. This is all about building the width and breadth of the base of the pyramid of politics that we see in operation in a Labor Party through unions, such as the shoppies union and the TWU.

Of course, it is no coincidence that the TWU and the shoppies union are in cahoots when it comes to who they put into the parliament in their delegates to the national conference or the state conferences for preselection. It is certainly no shift of ideology that we saw Russell Wortley, the flag waver of the left, now a flag waver of the right—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not sure if this is actually pertinent to what we are supposed to be speaking about.

Mr PISONI: It's not?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we need to draw you back to the nub of the bill.

Mr PISONI: A former union official of the Transport Workers Union?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we need to draw you back to the nub of the bill.

Mr PISONI: Certainly. In that case, I conclude my remarks.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:09): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees) Bill 2017 and recognise its importance, given the enormous freight task that goes on across my electorate, across this state and across the nation each and every day.

The bill amends the Highways Act 1926 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 with amendments to assist South Australia to meet its agreed obligations as a participating jurisdiction under the February 2014 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act, which contains the national law as a schedule. Of course, we all remember that debate, which the opposition supported at the time. It is all part of the harmonisation process of transport, particularly heavy vehicles, across the country, although my recollection is that Western Australia did not jump on board at that time and may still not have. I am not sure about that, but they have decided for a time at least to go their own way.

There is no doubt that there has been increased regulation as a result of the harmonisation, but in essence the legislative regime, the national scheme or regime, deals with heavy vehicles over 4.5 tonnes in gross vehicle mass—so any truck, anything above a farm ute comes under this regulation. Because the registration chapter of the national law has not as yet commenced, heavy vehicle registration is still under state legislation. However, participating jurisdictions' registration fees are governed by model law approved by the national Transport and Infrastructure Council.

Vehicle registration charges are now calculated on the basis of both road user charge and regulatory charge components. South Australia, along with other participating states, has agreed that the regulatory revenue collected as part of registration be transferred to the regulator fund, previously paid by the South Australian registrar into the Highways Fund, providing the regulator with industry-based funding to resource its duties. There is likely to be plenty of funding there.

Amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act clarify that deductions from concessional registration charges for people living in remote areas and primary producers will be taken from the roads component and not the regulatory component of the fees provided to the regulator's fund. The bill is in effect a stopgap measure to pay for the NHVR until all arrangements are completed. Registration fees will not increase (which is pleasing to hear, and I will touch on that in a moment), but instead a portion will be handed to the NHVR, instead of going to the Highways Fund, from which the South Australian share would be paid to the NHVR separately anyway.

All that sounds rather complicated, but in essence it is part of the harmonisation process and makes an attempt to simplify the transport industry across the nation. As I mentioned earlier, the freight task undertaken by heavy vehicles—by trucks, road trains and B-doubles—across my

electorate, this state and nationally each and every day is extraordinary. I do not know the tonnage, and I do not know whether anybody has ever stopped to calculate it, but without doubt this nation would grind to a halt if it were not for the task that our heavy vehicles undertake.

Truck registration is very expensive, tens of thousands of dollars, and I hear constantly from freight line operators, and even small business operators who might operate one or two trucks or a road train if it is a farmer, about the cost of registering heavy vehicles. In many cases, it is difficult for them to justify, and the government is well aware that trucks are a necessary part of these businesses, and most certainly they are compelled to pay if they want to stay on the road and stay in business. I hope that the government does not view vehicle registration simply as a cash cow, but it has become prohibitively expensive for many freight operators.

As to my own electorate, it would be remiss of me if I did not mention the freight duties that are undertaken there. Given that the Minister for Transport is here and leading the government's debate in this chamber, I will mention once again the Tod Highway on Eyre Peninsula in the electorate of Flinders and what a vital freight route that is in the west of the state and how much we appreciated the money expended on shoulder sealing over the last financial year and look forward to an ongoing program.

I have been lobbying for an upgrade to the Tod Highway for the whole time I have been in this place and will continue to do so until I have seen completed a shoulder-sealing operation in between Kyancutta and Karkoo—a distance of about 110 kilometres, I believe. Without doubt, I firmly believe and will say always that a wider road is a safer road. Particularly in these days of bigger, heavier and faster transport operations, a good, solid, wide and safe road for those to operate on is of paramount importance.

The other thing I will touch on quickly regarding local issues is the importance of gazetting local roads for road train operation. Slowly but surely, the department is winding the approvals out for even some minor roads to be available for road train and B-double access, but I believe it cannot happen quickly enough. Particularly now, when farmers are sowing yet another crop across this state and on Eyre Peninsula, we desperately need broad access for road trains to handle the freight task. With those few comments, I commend the bill and look forward to its swift passage.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:15): Can I thank the member for Flinders as well as the other contributors for their contributions on this bill. It may not appear to the house to be the most substantial bill that we have considered in recent times, but it is an important bill nonetheless. It represents the latest stage of what has been a period of very significant reform when it comes to the regulation of heavy vehicle transport in Australia.

This period of reform has been underway, as I said, for several years, most notably of course with the establishment of a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. Australian jurisdictions have progressively passed over to that national regulator a series of roles, powers and responsibilities when it comes to administering heavy vehicle access to our road network and increasingly also playing a role in monitoring and enforcement. As several speakers have mentioned already today, that process continues as we speak.

In recent days, I have participated in the latest six-monthly transport ministers' meeting, which was on the Gold Coast. We considered a further range of changes that will see those participating jurisdictions pass some of the responsibilities they currently carry out with respect to this industry over to the national regulator. But I do pick up on some of the things that have been said today, in that the transfers of those responsibilities are not yet complete and not all jurisdictions have agreed to participate.

Western Australia, of course, is the most notable. Their rationale is that they have had the capacity over the last 10 years, as they have gone through a period of extraordinary economic growth and have been in receipt of extraordinary numbers of extra billions of revenue into their state budget, to quite substantially reduce registration and other charges that are levied upon the heavy vehicle industry in Western Australia. They see, for mainly that reason, little benefit in moving the regulation of the Western Australian industry into the national scheme. Western Australia, as is its wont over

the economic cycle, goes through stages. They go from being extremely prosperous through their mining activities to being nothing but rent seekers, which is of course what they are at the moment.

I remember, when I first started as a mere adviser to a state treasurer, that there would be a coalition of smaller states that would meet before each treasurers' conference. Treasurers such as South Australia's Treasurer; the Western Australian treasurer, Eric Ripper, and other treasurers in smaller jurisdictions like the ACT, Tasmania and the Northern Territory would have to get together the night before treasurers' conferences and try to plot how they would go about stopping the rapacious states of New South Wales and Victoria trying to cleave additional GST revenues away from smaller states like Western Australia and South Australia and protect their revenue bases against those other states' avaricious inclinations.

Of course, Western Australia distanced itself from those discussions when it was in receipt of extraordinary mining revenues. They then claimed that they were not getting their fair share and that, just like New South Wales, they should get more. They seem to be drifting back once again. It is extraordinary that those sorts of ebbs and flows of economic growth and prosperity affect Western Australia like that. As I have explained to some small extent, that has influenced their decision not to participate in this, which is a great shame because we are already seeing the benefits of moving to national regulation.

That includes, as the member for Flinders said, the increasing trend—perhaps not increasing fast enough—of gazetting more and more routes for higher capacity and higher productivity vehicles, not just in South Australia but principally across borders as well for those highways that stretch across borders like most of them do. That is a great benefit to the transport industry, moving from smaller vehicles like semitrailers to B-doubles, or B-doubles to road trains, etc. There are significant increases in productivity, and having a nationally efficient system—and some would debate whether we are there yet—is extremely important.

I am pleased that in more recent years South Australia has been leading the charge on improving heavy vehicle access to South Australian roads, principally in regional areas, by giving greater access to those higher productivity vehicles. It has taken, I think, a terrific effort of leadership by government agencies, including the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, the Department of Primary Industries and also the regional development minister, to drive a process where together we speak with those people who rely on the heavy transport industry across South Australia and see what benefits they would like delivered to them.

We are delivering those benefits. In our first tranche of efforts, through what we call the 90-day project, we are delivering a modern transport system for the agricultural industry. We have delivered over $50 million of benefits a year to that industry simply by improving the access to the roads that we give them. I am also pleased to say that, rather than just doing that, we are also increasing the amount of money we spend on regional roads. Certainly, I think it is becoming better and better understood amongst South Australians that, as a state, we went through a process, particularly during the 20-year period following World War II, of either building new roads or sealing what had been unsealed roads, particularly in regional areas.

We did that according to the standards of the day, and then for the next 30 or 40 years we did not keep up with the maintenance, let alone improvement, of those roads to more contemporary standards, particularly the standards of vehicles that were increasingly being produced in the heavy vehicle industry. That has led to us having parts of our regional road network in a state which we would say is not good enough for regular travel, let alone for more productive uses such as the uses of the heavy vehicle industry.

But I am very pleased that, a couple of budgets ago, we kicked in an extra $110 million for shoulder sealing, road rehabilitation and pavement upgrades, and those are making their presence felt across South Australia. The member for Flinders quite rightly raises the Tod Highway, which basically heads north-south from the Eyre Highway, apart from one infamous stretch of curves where the road has been very narrow. It has seen the beginning of some upgrades, and we have more upgrades to go in that area. That is the sort of effort that we need to bring to the remainder of the arterial road network in regional areas.

While we have spent significant amounts of money, particularly on the Dukes Highway upgrade, the Sturt Highway upgrade, and certainly in the last 15 years the condition of the Lincoln Highway has increased significantly, as well as other upgrades in different areas in the South-East, the Mid North, the Far West and Eyre Peninsula, better connecting these efforts will be increasingly important. That is why increasing our spending on these regional roads is really important.

I say that not to detract from the comments the member for MacKillop made to the house a little earlier today, when he bemoaned the loss of the situation. I am not sure if this is correct, so I will just quote what he advised the house, but he said that he can remember those good old days, back when the now Liberal opposition occupied the government benches and they had a Liberal transport minister, when they reformed heavy vehicle registrations and the then transport minister of the day said to some of her Liberal colleagues, 'Well, this is going to result in a revenue windfall.' I find that extraordinary. Surely, if you are going to do that, you try to do it on some sort of cost neutral basis rather than shoving the government hand into the pocket of private industry in regional areas.

Notwithstanding that claim by the member for MacKillop, he then said that the then minister for transport came up with a scheme whereby those windfall revenues could be put into fixing up roads in the areas that Liberal MPs represented. I know I am younger, and perhaps I do not wear the rose-coloured glasses when I look back on that period of the state's history of things like gerrymanders and pork-barrelling, and maybe that is a different view that I hold compared with, say, that of the member for MacKillop.

However, when it comes to road investment, rather than bemoaning that the current Labor government might have stopped that somewhat dubious practice and diverted those funds into blackspot funding, which I would argue is probably a good thing for the community rather than saying what the member for MacKillop said in bemoaning that it was an extraordinary and wasteful diversion of resources, I would have thought that it would be a good thing. Then again, I recognise that I stand opposite the member for MacKillop not only physically in this chamber but probably ideologically as well.

I have to say that I think it is with some regret that we will be farewelling the member for MacKillop from this parliament as he looks to hang up his hat in 2018 after a 21-year period of service. I for one will miss those little pearls of wisdom.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not misleading the house, are you?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In fact, I am at risk of misleading the house by saying I will miss those pearls of wisdom, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are reminded then.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, thank you for guiding me back to the substance of the bill at hand. I am pleased to say that, rather than just leave our efforts in additional road funding at things like creating a State Black Spot program and increasing road maintenance funding in regional areas, we have also secured record amounts of funding, particularly in the last three years, for major road upgrades in metropolitan Adelaide, which will deliver vast benefits to the freight industry and the heavy vehicle transport industry.

The member for Little Para mentioned the Northern Connector project, which of course can be supplemented with the Torrens to Torrens project, which sees over 50,000 vehicles using that section of South Road, which will now be taken underneath the intersections of Torrens Road, Port Road and Grange Road. That has been a priority of this government principally for the reason that there is such a benefit to the freight industry for that part of the north-south corridor, part of South Road at the northern end of the corridor, where trucking movements tend to be higher.

We recognise that, when we are looking at investing vast sums of money in our road network, we should be seeking to maximise the benefit we can deliver to the community. When we have sections of road that take not only a very high number of vehicles but a significant proportion of heavy vehicles, then those projects become even more important. That project in particular, for the benefit of both heavy vehicles and light vehicles, had an extremely strong cost-benefit ratio of approximately 2.4, if I remember off the top of my head. It is important with these road projects that we do push

forward those that can make a positive contribution to the state economy, let alone to the transport network, which incorporates those parts of these roads which are to be upgraded.

That is why we went to the last state election promising to do Torrens to Torrens. The Liberal opposition said that they would cancel that project and instead prioritise Darlington. What we were able to do was not only obviate that choice by delivering both but we negotiated effectively to secure the Northern Connector project as well, and these three projects will see extraordinary benefits to the heavy vehicle industry. In contrast, we have seen one of the most bland, disinterested effusions on behalf of the Liberal Party's policy for what they call Globe Link.

The 'um' and 'ah' riddled, softly spoken, slump-shouldered, unenthusiastic contribution from the member for Unley, trying to promote the policy says it all. In fact, the number of people in the chamber to hear the contribution could have been counted on one hand, which would be an exponentially greater number of people than have come out in support of that policy. We have not only had the South Australian Freight Council, the independent board which provides advice to the community and to government on what freight priority should be in South Australia, slate this plan but we have had local government directly affected by this project, the Coorong council, slate the plan as well.

When the opposition was grasping around for advocates for this, they tried to leach themselves onto the owner and developer of the Toowoomba airport, erroneously claiming that it was a great model for their freight-only airport, which they considered to be a central plank for their Globe Link proposal. What did the owner of the Toowoomba airport say? That freight-only airports will not work because his airport was not a freight-only airport: it was a freight and passenger airport. They had not even done the most fundamental and basic research about their plan.

I mentioned earlier the strong cost-benefit analysis we were able to do for our South Road upgrades and, in particular, the Torrens to Torrens project. I can contrast that with the work that has already been done and published and out in the public arena about their plan, which shows that just the proposed rail connection itself was uneconomic and did not stack up. The cost-benefit ratio was less than one, which means that expenditure on that project withdraws benefits from the economy. It does not replace them, it does not get to one for one and it does not provide additional benefits: it actually withdraws benefits from the South Australian economy.

The claim by the member for Unley that Globe Link is some economic shot in the arm, that there will be some nirvana of jobs from it, is patently false, and in fact the opposite of his claims is accurate. It will be an economic detractor from South Australia, which is the last thing we need at the moment as this state experiences economic conditions that are softer than we would like to see. You do not even need to take my word for it. The fact that none of the regional MPs from the Liberal Party who contributed to debate on the bill mentioned this policy shows how little support for it there is internally, let alone how little support for it there is amongst the community of South Australia.

They say that this will set up some enormous contest within metropolitan Adelaide, a battle of political ideologies about which transport upgrade is more important. Not only do we know that they are uncosted, uneconomic, unendorsed or disendorsed policies that have no advocates out in the community but we know what they are based on: it is a desperate attempt to fend off the growing spread of orange in the Adelaide Hills.

The polling that has been done for the Nick Xenophon team, now called SA-Best, is extremely strong. In fact, based on the last federal election polling numbers, we would see a swathe of seats in the Adelaide Hills lost to Nick Xenophon. Even those extraordinary performers, the most prominent seats of the Liberal Party—and I am thinking of the member for Kavel, despite all his hard work—those seats and others like Heysen are at extreme risk of being lost. This policy is designed to appeal to a few thousand people who might live either side of a particular rail line to try to shore up the Liberal Party's political support in that area.

There is then the erroneous claim by the member for Unley that this new plan, which they claim the Labor government has, will see trucks for the first time diverted down Cross Road. Well, it is not our plan. It is a plan that has been endorsed and indeed released by the federal Coalition government. The 10-year strategy for the upgrade of the north-south corridor in South Australia's

metropolitan area was a plan developed between the state and federal Coalition governments, released by a Coalition minister and spruiked by a Coalition minister. This is nothing new.

But let's assume that the Liberal Party is successful in prosecuting its case for this dreadful policy they have cobbled together to fend off Senator Xenophon and his political support in the Adelaide Hills. What will that mean? It will mean that we will not get the remaining South Road upgrades. Those people the Liberal Party is desperately trying to woo in seats like Elder and Badcoe will be denied the sorts of benefits to their local transport networks that people in other electorates, such as Adelaide, Croydon, West Torrens, Cheltenham, Port Adelaide, Lee and Colton, are all experiencing from the upgrade of South Road—but a mere hour more.

That is the choice we will be presenting: either we have a poorly thought-out, unresearched, uncosted, uneconomic policy put forward by the Liberal government, or we have a strategy, developed and endorsed between state Labor and federal Coalition governments that is part funded and already under delivery in the upgrade of the north-south corridor. Ironically, their policy ignores the statistics, which are available, that up to 85 per cent of heavy vehicles circulating around metropolitan Adelaide that come down the South Eastern Freeway must pick up or drop off in the metropolitan area. They have no choice but to use the South Eastern Freeway and the arterial road network in metropolitan Adelaide.

They propose a multibillion-dollar road upgrade for approximately 15 per cent of the trucks that travel past Tailem Bend. If you wanted a clearer example of why this policy they have put forward is uneconomic, there it is. It is crystal clear why this project will never fly—it will never stack up. The rail does not stack up, the airport does not stack up and the road does not stack up. Of course, if trucks were not to use other roads in the arterial area, they would continue thundering through the electorates of Dunstan and Hartley, as they currently do.

What will the members for Dunstan and Hartley tell their constituents? That a genius idea that a couple of 20-something staffers came up with in the Leader of the Opposition's office is going to cost their communities ever more thundering truck movements past their schools, their community clubs and their retirement homes in those electorates. Of course, that is not what the Labor government will be offering South Australians.

As I mentioned earlier, this is an important bill that will see the revenue that we currently collect from heavy vehicle registration fees, which is currently hypothecated into the Highways Fund, paid to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator in a manner that is not currently provided for in legislation. This change to the bill will enable us to do that.

There was a comment earlier from either the member for Unley or the member for Mount Gambier about making sure that these national bodies are spending these funds wisely and that they are not ramping up the amount of money they are spending on administration and, as a result, unfairly charging the heavy vehicle industry high registration fees that otherwise could not be justified. I am pleased to say that I raised this very matter at the last transport ministers' meeting.

It is time that South Australia, along with the federal government and the other states, had a thorough and detailed look at how all the transport agencies across the federal sphere are using the money that they are funded by jurisdictions and by the federal government. That is a body of work that South Australia will be leading, along with the federal minister, Paul Fletcher.

I look forward to trying to identify opportunities for efficiencies and maybe even returning some dividend to the heavy vehicle industry should we find that there are excess revenues being generated and used on work that is currently superfluous, doubling up on work that other agencies are doing or perhaps not necessary and can either be delayed or, indeed, just not undertaken. With those brief comments, I now move that this bill be read a second time.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:43): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:43): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government Business, Notice of Motion No. 1, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Thursday 1 June, to be taken into consideration forthwith.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Motions

PORT GAWLER CONSERVATION PARK

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:46): I move:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 29(3)(a) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 to abolish the Port Gawler Conservation Park.

The purpose of this motion is to allow for the area to be added to the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park—Winaityinaityi Pangkara, under section 29(3)(a) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. The Port Gawler Conservation Park was originally constituted in 1971 and protects 418 hectares of mangroves, samphire and coastal dune systems and the species they support.

The Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary is an internationally significant area for endemic and migratory shorebirds, traversing approximately 60 kilometres of coastline on the eastern shores of Gulf St Vincent, which has been formally recognised with a Certificate of Participation in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway, a network of international entities committed to the preservation of migratory bird species.

The Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park has been created as a core protected area within the bird sanctuary. The proposed change in status of the land is consistent with the characteristics and values of the land and will contribute to the recognition of this area as an important part of the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary. Both the bird sanctuary and the new national park have received broad support across the community, local government and the native title claimant group, reviving hope and positive aspirations for the northern Adelaide communities.

The existing Port Gawler Conservation Park does not permit any mining access. The land will be subject to that same restriction on being added to the national park. Once the Port Gawler Conservation Park has been abolished, it can be reconstituted by proclamation as an addition to the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park pursuant to section 28(1) of the act. The Governor will proclaim the abolition of the Port Gawler Conservation Park and the proclamation of the land as an addition to the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park on the same day.

I would like to add my personal pleasure in seeing that we are contributing to the success of the International Bird Sanctuary National Park—Winaityinaityi Pangkara—for two reasons; one is that my electorate has a portion of the bird sanctuary within it. I know how much it has been welcomed by locals in the area. The process that has been used to identify the values of the bird sanctuary in the national park has been extremely inclusive of community views, and I admire the process that has been undertaken by the department.

The other reason, on a more personal note, is that while I was growing up, my father, who was a very keen ornithologist, or birdo as we used to call them, frequently went to what was then called the ICI salt fields (Penrice) to see and count migratory birds as part of SAOA's (South Australian Ornithological Association) efforts in working out how our environment was going and particularly how hospitable we were being to migratory birds which, after all, come an enormous distance. If they do not have their destination in good nick, they are unable to feed, breed and return.

I am pleased to see such a great advance in the care and maintenance of our birds, particularly for the international migratory birds. It reminds me fondly of times in the back of the Kingswood, bored or reading a book, while my father was engaged in far more lofty and important activities. I commend the motion to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought you were going to tell us that that is how you learned to count.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (16:50): I would like to speak in support of this motion. Although not having much ornithological expertise, my partner is a member of BirdLife Australia and our house is littered with books on birds. After every walk we go on, we come back and refer to whatever birds we may have seen, so this has been part of my life for many years.

The Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary plays a significant role in enhancing South Australia's reputation as a biodiversity and conservation hotspot and tourist attractor. Many people like coming to South Australia for that very reason. As the minister has already said, the bird sanctuary covers approximately 60 kilometres of coastline on the eastern shores of Gulf St Vincent.

I am told that each year more than 25,000 migratory shorebirds arrive at the sanctuary and spend six months feeding and roosting. Each shorebird needs to put on more than 70 per cent of its body weight in preparation for their flight to the Northern Hemisphere. I feel I have something in common with these birds. It is hopefully never 70 per cent, but there seems to be something going on here that I can associate with.

The job of the sanctuary in providing nourishment for these shorebirds is very important and that is the main reason why the government is committed to expanding the area covered by the national park. The Port Gawler Conservation Park area will be reconstituted by proclamation as the newest addition to the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park. The change in status of this land will recognise the area as an important part of the sanctuary.

As the Presiding Member of the Natural Resources Committee, I am afforded many opportunities to go and visit different parts of the state. It has always given me a lot of pleasure to work with and talk to not only local residents, including Aboriginal people, but also the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources staff who support the different natural resource committees and our committee, as well as the general community. There have been a number of recent trips I would like to mention.

In March this year, the Natural Resources Committee met with Mr Ian Falkenberg. He is DEWNR's Operations Coordinator of the Adelaide Bird Sanctuary at Port Arthur on the top of Yorke Peninsula. Mr Falkenberg spoke to us and also presented a lot of charts for us to have a look at with regard to the Adelaide Bird Sanctuary. He also coordinated a trip in May, when our committee went to the Gluepot Reserve, in his capacity as the Deputy Chair of Gluepot Reserve Birdlife Australia. I, along with other members and staff, was impressed by the work done at Gluepot, with assistance being provided by the department and the absolutely magnificent volunteer effort.

There were a number of people with us on both the March and May field trips that we undertook. I would like to make special mention of Trevor Naismith, Regional Director, Natural Resources, Northern and Yorke. I would also like to acknowledge Sonia Dominelli, Manager of Environment and Conservation, Natural Resources, South Australian Murray-Darling Basin NRM. We had with us a number of other people including Matt Humphrey, Natural Resources SA Murray-Darling Basin, Rod Ralph from the board, and Ian Falkenberg, as I mentioned. We also had from Yorke Peninsula Terry Boyce, Krystyna Sullivan, Andy Sharp, Van Teubner and Max Barr.

I should also mention that about 12 months ago, in April, we visited the Alinytjara Wilurara natural resource region and we went to Ceduna, Googs Lake, Maralinga, the whale watching centre at the Head of Bight, Yalata, Oak Valley community and the Nullarbor Caves. We were very ably supported by a whole host of people from the AWNRM board—Parry Agius, Mima Smart, Mick Haynes and Brian Queama—as well as the staff from the department: Fiona Gill, Tim Moore, Yasmin Wolf, Bruce Macpherson, Nathan Williams, Amanda Richards, Latisha Richards, Codee Spitzkowsky, Robbie Sleep, Tamahina Cox, Andrew Sleep, Jamal Lebois and Dirk Holman. All those people assisted us during different parts of our field trip in translating and explaining to us what we actually had before us.

The board members who made time to meet with us included Peter Miller, Presiding Member of the Far West Coast Aboriginal Corporation Board; John Mungee; Leonard Miller; Wanda Miller; Sue Haseldine; Clem Lawrie; and Dorcas Miller. All these people, on the three trips that I have mentioned, assisted the Natural Resources Committee and the local members who travelled with us. I would particularly like to make mention of the member for Goyder, who is a big supporter of natural resources but is also someone we have co-opted onto our committee. Wherever we go, it is really amazing to note the workers in this area, the volunteers in this area and also the people who serve on our local natural resources committees. It is with great pleasure that I support this motion and look forward to the future for the international bird sanctuary in particular.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (16:58): I rise to speak on the motion that is before the house today:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 29(3)(a) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 to abolish the Port Gawler Conservation Park.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you the lead speaker?

Mr SPEIRS: Yes, I am the lead speaker for the opposition. I wish to indicate that the opposition would like to give its wholehearted support to this motion. The motion is largely administrative in nature, but in many ways it gives effect to a very important environmental initiative, and I am certainly not afraid to congratulate the government on progressing the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary and the national park associated with that sanctuary. The sanctuary stretches along 60 kilometres of Adelaide's coastline and spans four local government areas: the City of Port Adelaide Enfield, the City of Salisbury, the City of Playford and the Adelaide Plains Council.

The sanctuary and national park, which work together, aim to protect migratory shorebird habitat, improve water quality entering Gulf St Vincent and protect the coastline, particularly samphire, dunes and mangrove environments, from the impact of a changing climate. Importantly and vitally, the most likely driving motivation for the creation of the national park and sanctuary is that it sits right on the southern end of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway—a vital migratory pathway that shorebirds use to travel from their Northern Hemisphere breeding grounds to their Southern Hemisphere feeding grounds. As such, the sanctuary forms a key feeding and roosting site for migratory birds that use that flyway every year.

In coming to understand the motion that is before the house today, and learning about the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary, I have learnt a huge amount about the flyway, its immense value to these migratory species and the huge importance of governments all across the world working together in a bipartisan and integrated way to protect the flyway. These birds are incredibly vulnerable as they make their lengthy passage across the world, often flying from as far away in the Northern Hemisphere as Siberia and Alaska, passing through 22 countries and ending up in the Southern Hemisphere in Australia and even through to New Zealand with some species in some circumstances.

The flyway is used by more than five million birds each year across the whole flyway, and around 27,000 of these birds end up in Adelaide in what has become known as the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park. They call this area home for several months of the year. These are essentially their winter feeding grounds when it is winter in the Northern Hemisphere, which obviously is quite harsh. They are not necessarily able to survive the winter in those conditions, so they move down through the flyway and end up in their Southern Hemisphere feeding grounds.

As I just said, the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary is one of these very important feeding grounds. As the member for Ashford reminded us, they have to put on a considerable amount of weight during that feeding period to enable them to make that journey back north to their breeding grounds in those colder climates.

The sanctuary, whilst being one of Adelaide's longest continuous conservation areas, is home to 263 unique fauna and flora species. Of course, the sanctuary is not only valuable for the migratory species that were a significant impetus to its development and proclamation, as there are also many other important species of native fauna and flora that find themselves within the boundaries of the national park. There have been 263 fauna and flora species identified in that area to date.

In particular, the sanctuary helps to protect resident and migratory shorebirds. Shorebirds are seen as a particularly important part of this sanctuary. These birds include threatened species. There are many species there, not all of which are threatened but all of which will benefit from protection on that site. The threatened species in question include the curlew sandpiper, the ruddy turnstone, the red knot and the eastern curlew. They find themselves in a landscape that is also vital to South Australia's environment in that it will see productive mangroves, marine and coastal assets, river systems and many significant terrestrial species and ecological communities preserved and revitalised in the national park that is being created.

Turning specifically to the motion before the house today and the administrative nature of this motion, the fact that the new national park encompasses an existing protected area—that being the Port Gawler Conservation Park—requires a motion to come before both houses of the South Australian parliament to extinguish that conservation park because the existing protections that come with a national park will continue, so there is no need to duplicate that by having the Port Gawler Conservation Park remain in existence. The abolition of the Port Gawler Conservation Park will allow that area to be reconstituted as an addition to the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park.

The Port Gawler Conservation Park itself has been an important ecological environment for many years, which has been protected. I had the opportunity to visit that site a couple of weeks ago and see its valuable mangrove landscape in particular. It is obviously home to many of the species I just mentioned, both those migratory species and the threatened local species. The Port Gawler Conservation Park is located centrally within the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary and so forms a very important part. It will not be forgotten simply because it is going to be wound into the new national park. In fact, it is being held out as a very key part of that landscape that is to be protected.

The government advises that the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary and the new national park have received support from the general community around that area—local government and the local Kaurna people, as well as migrant and school communities in that region. It is also worth mentioning that the addition of land to the park does not require the approval of parliament and will proceed once parliament has considered the excision of the Port Gawler Conservation Park. It will proceed automatically once the Port Gawler Conservation Park is wound up.

In conclusion, I would like to once again reiterate the opposition's strong support for this policy and also my personal support. I would like to thank the minister and his department for arranging for me and a staff member to go to the Northern Plains and visit those coastal areas that will form part of the bird sanctuary. It was great to be able to go there a couple of weeks back. I am grateful for the assistance of DEWNR staff, particularly Jason Irving and Arkellah Irving, who provided me with a guided tour of the area. I learned a lot on that occasion. With that, I commend this motion to the house and once again reiterate the opposition's support.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (17:07): I rise to support the motion. The Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park is fast becoming a valued asset for the protection and conservation of bird species. It holds an amazing story of bird migration. Thirty-seven species carry out some of the most incredible migrations of birds in the natural world. Every year, they journey thousands of kilometres between Australia and their breeding grounds, commonly in the Northern Hemisphere. Some shorebirds are smaller than a matchbox and can travel up to 10,000 kilometres in just a few days, traversing 22 countries to reach Adelaide's northern shores.

Our flyway is one of nine across the globe and is known as the East Asian-Australasian Flyway. The flyway is home to more than 50 million migratory shorebirds. As part of the state government's commitment to creating the sanctuary, a submission was presented to the global flyway partnership, based in Korea, to consider the inclusion of the sanctuary in the network of important migratory shorebird sites. The inclusion in the network strengthens the conservation value of the area and contributes to the worldwide effort to protect migratory shorebirds. In late 2016, the sanctuary was accepted and is now formally recognised as a globally significant site for migratory shorebirds, many of which are endangered.

This is an excellent achievement for our state and places Adelaide on the global map of must-see birdwatching destinations. It demonstrates the South Australian government's ongoing commitment to protect and conserve our valued natural assets. Being part of the partnership grants

opportunities for sister site exchange, enabling the sharing of science, information and culture across countries, and places the sanctuary at the table with global leaders in this field. The park will be further strengthened by the inclusion of Port Gawler, joining up much of the important shorebird habitat along the northern coastline. I fully support this inclusion.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:09): I rise in support of the motion, which has the effect of formalising the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary as a national park. This is part of a process to deal with the abolition of the Port Gawler Conservation Park. I am happy to support that. I think it is pretty clear in South Australia that we do not need to watch a David Attenborough program to understand the significance of birds and the opportunity we have at a local level to enjoy these magnificent creatures.

As the owner of some coastal country in South Australia, I have had the pleasure of growing up with sea eagles and seeing their regular nesting as they return to coastal areas of the north part of Kangaroo Island. Notwithstanding all the amateur fishing that goes on out there, they do not seem to be deterred and are happy to continue to occupy their own territory. Playing on the beaches in public areas and watching hooded plovers and the like is something South Australians have the opportunity to grow up with, and we need to be part of a national and international community to ensure that we protect the flight paths and breeding areas.

Recently, our Burnside Rotary Club hosted an annual awards night to recognise those involved in parks and wildlife activity, either as a conservation officer or as a volunteer. I attend it annually, and there is now over 20 years of contribution. I am pleased to recognise the work of many, both in paid employment for the state government and as volunteers, in our parks and wildlife areas. This year, we had the pleasure of the shadow minister for the environment's attendance, which was most gracious.

Every year, the club invites the minister for the environment to the award night. I think minister Gago attended one year. This year, a representative from the Australian Labor Party attended. Although it is a rare occasion that a minister attends, we always welcome them. We particularly have the pleasure of the company of a number of people from the Department of Environment, who are absolutely committed to attending this occasion.

Mr Dene Cordes was instrumental in the establishment of the volunteers of parks in South Australia. He had a long-term commitment as a Department of Environment employee. He was also in attendance. Sadly, today his wife's funeral takes place, and the member for Finniss is attending. We will all miss her. As a team, they were very instrumental in securing continued education and involvement of our volunteers in the work that is done in parks.

With the acquisition of parks—in this case it is a transfer from one format to another, as a sanctuary already exists in this particular area—and the proclamation or statutory inclusion of an area for conservation, preservation or to provide for a specific purpose (in this case, the migratory patterns and path of birds), comes with responsibility. Firstly, I read with interest in today's paper that Biosecurity SA spent $60,00—and it was presented in a media sense as some kind of sensation, as though it came with a huge bill—sending out officers from their department to track down and destroy 10 bird pests, including the red whiskered bulbul. Apparently, the exercise was successful. I am very pleased to hear it.

I commend Biosecurity SA for undertaking this work. In my view, $60,000 is a drop in the bucket compared to the decimation these birds could inflict upon our state's $370 million wine grape industry. I understand from the media reports that I have read that citrus and strawberry industries and the like could also be severely affected. This is really important when there is an introduced species in this state—in this instance, birds.

Apparently, you can buy these birds in Melbourne or Sydney and they cost about $100 a pair. Everyone has these great ideas about acquiring pets but later find out they have become pests. If only someone had had such initiative with the introduction of rabbits in Victoria, we might not have had the disaster we had. I want to say well done to Biosecurity SA and remind the house about the significance of protecting not just landscape but the fauna and flora we enjoy in this state. It is important to be ever vigilant and maintain the agencies that are responsible for introduced pest species. Whether they have legs or roots, they have to be dealt with.

I remind our shadow minister that if he ever has the privilege of becoming minister I want him to make sure that there is no amendment to the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, particularly to section 54. This provision provides that it is lawful for any person, without a permit or other authority, to kill an Australian magpie that has attacked or is attacking any person. Those are the only circumstances in which this precious bird, which is protected, can be lawfully killed. They are in the category of poisonous reptiles. If you are under attack or likely to be attacked by a poisonous reptile—I am not sure that you would hang around long enough to find out which category that would be—or are in the position of having some reasonable anxiety of this happening, then it is lawful, without a permit, to kill that poisonous reptile. Magpies are in this very special category.

Sad to say, for those of you who are Crows supporters, schedule 10 relegates the humble little crow and Australian crow to the category of unprotected species. They get no quarter of protection, nor should they. Birds are plentiful and abundant in South Australia and our native birds must continue to enjoy the protection of their migratory path. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:18): I will not hold the house up for very long. I am very pleased to rise to support this motion. A lot of people have talked about birds, and I do not think there is anything else that I can add to what has already been said by the various members who spoke about these beautiful feathered creatures that are treasured not only by South Australians but by people from around the world.

The point that I want to focus on today is something that has been touched on, but I want to elaborate upon it; that is, I believe, the government believes and I am sure everyone in this chamber believes, that the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park offers a unique experience for tourists and those who call our state home—so, those from South Australia, those from interstate and those from far away. There are lots of people who get the little binoculars out and go and watch birds and study them. That in itself is part of what I think can be the tourism experience when people visit South Australia.

This is the 22nd national park in South Australia and the first new park in 10 years. As we have heard, the bird sanctuary creates a safe haven for shorebirds, whilst also serving as another important destination for interstate and overseas tourists, as I mentioned. By reconstituting the Port Gawler Conservation Park land to the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park, it recognises the area as an important part of the bird sanctuary zone.

The mangroves north of Adelaide—they go all the way through to the member for Goyder's area, all the way up and even a bit farther—are a unique part of South Australia and a haven for various aspects of flora and fauna. I am very pleased that they have started a program to rid the area of deer in most recent times, as I understand it, and that is a good thing. I am sure there are people who enjoy shooting those deer but who also benefit from the venison. The area is also benefiting by getting rid of this feral creature from that very fragile environment that could be damaged by those wild deer.

It will be in an important part of the bird sanctuary zone, as I said, but it will also further enhance South Australia's reputation as a 'must visit' tourist destination for international and domestic travellers. If you look at South Australia and look at our future, I think South Australia has a good future, despite some of the ways by which people opposite in this chamber might continue to put down South Australia.

I expect that if they are in government next year—and who knows whether that will be the case or not—their attitude will change because they know that South Australia is a fantastic state in which to live and that it also offers great opportunities in a variety of areas, not the least of which is bringing people from interstate and overseas to this state not only to view but to interact with our pristine environments—whether that be on beautiful Yorke Peninsula, whether it be on the west coast, whether it be in the Flinders Ranges, or whether it be, in this instance, in the bird sanctuary and those areas north of Adelaide along what is, essentially, a mangrove trail.

I think that part of our future, and the economic future of South Australia, is in highlighting and exhibiting these things that we know make South Australia great and distinguish us from other parts of Australia and other parts of the world. To this extent, we know that the government's intention and aim is to expand the tourism sector to $8 billion and provide 41,000 jobs by the year 2020. I like

stretch targets, and I am not suggesting that necessarily it is, but I think we should aim high. I think that is good because if we do market ourselves properly and we highlight to the rest of the world what we have to offer, I believe that tourists will continue to flock to South Australia.

In that regard, nature-based tourism, such as a bird sanctuary, will be an important part of this approach to be able to increase our tourism sector in the manner that I have just mentioned. By 2020, we expect to see the sector create a thousand new jobs and inject $350 million into the local economy, and I do not think that is a big ask. We should be able to do that. That will be underpinned by the government's Nature Like Nowhere Else strategy. I say that in South Australia we have nature like nowhere else.

I remember the discussions that occurred, despite the fact that I was absolutely vilified by some sections of the community, in regard to marine parks. Again, that is another example of the unique environment we have here in South Australia in which 80 per cent of the wildlife flora and fauna, the marine flora and fauna, the fishes and everything else that live in the water, are unique to this area—and that offers great opportunity as well. We need to protect and preserve that and maximise the benefit to South Australia through nature-based tourism, and fulfilling that will be the government's Nature Like Nowhere Else strategy.

The bird sanctuary is part of an outstanding coastal experience for visitors. In fact, I have had some preliminary discussions with my colleagues who have electorates along the coastline (save and except a few of them) about how we might focus on what the tourism experience will be from all the way down to Aldinga and Willunga, and even farther down to Victor Harbor and the whales, all the way up to the bird sanctuary. There is a lot we can do in that area to make sure that we have something that complements not only the coastal park trail that we have but an environmental trail as well that looks at the amazing things that exist and are part of that trail and that region.

The bird sanctuary is part of an outstanding coastal experience for visitors, as I said—and this includes the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary and marine parks, as I mentioned earlier—and has a range of nature-based activities presented to visitors such as kayaking on the Port River with dolphins, beach and trail walking, and birdwatching in the bird sanctuary.

I was fishing off the beach the other week and I never mind sharing the mullet that I catch down there with the dolphins; I think it is fantastic. Once you see the dolphins come through, you see these mullet jumping out of the water to try to get away from them and you know that you are not going to catch many fish thereafter, but I am happy to share those mullet with the beautiful dolphins. People know I am a bit of a joker, Deputy Speaker, and I know you might think this is horrible, but it is just a joke.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am sure I won't.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I remember one woman coming down one day and she said, 'Are you catching any fish?' I showed her my bag and she said, 'Wow! What type of fish are they?' 'They're mullet.' The dolphin came through and I said to her, 'Do you know what breaking strain you need to catch one of those things?' She cringed, thinking I was horrible, but of course it was just tongue in cheek. I explained the same thing, that I am happy to share my catch with these beautiful mammals that inhabit our waters. It is as simple as that.

That is one the things that will attract people. Where else in the world can we see this type of activity along a coastline 10 kilometres from the CBD? Our coastline here is not as pristine as those waters that we are talking about in other parts of the state, but it is still clean enough to ensure that these activities undertaken by these mammals and other creatures can occur.

You can tell I am excited by this motion, Deputy Speaker, and I am. I am going to finish off now. I know that you will be disappointed about that because I can tell by looking at you. I say that expanding the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park is a great example of not just a government commitment but also, as indicated by the member for Bright, a bipartisan commitment by the opposition of enhancing and preserving our state's unique natural environment and supporting, amongst other things, our local tourism industry. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (17:26): I am pleased that the member for Colton is excited by the plan for the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary, as am I. I want to provide the house with some

personal experiences that I have had associated with the wider Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary, which only go to support the intention of this motion. Can I say that in this area I believe minister Hunter has done good things with the changes that are occurring.

One interesting aspect, though, has been the community engagement that has been undertaken. I have attended two meetings at Thompson Beach and one at Two Wells where community feedback has been sought about the impact of management plans that are required for the International Bird Sanctuary. As far as I am aware, they are not yet available in a draft form, which causes a level of frustration because I think there should have at least been some indication of what the intention was on how to manage access onto the site and from the site, particularly for those communities that are likely to be adjoining it.

I know there are some coastal communities north of Adelaide that are part of the electorates of Goyder and most likely Taylor where there will be some impacts. There is a level of frustration that exists, but there is an overwhelming sense of goodwill, too, for the International Bird Sanctuary to be established. I also attended the information sessions where we were shown some of the graphics of the distances travelled by the birds, and it something like 11,000 kilometres.

It is hard for me to conceive the capacity of a bird to actually fly that far and how it manages to stay aloft. It gets here in a much smaller state than it left the Siberian tundra, but it arrives in South Australia. It is an exciting part of what nature provides for us in the world that we can still view. While the world has gone through many changes in the last 100 years in particular, there are still some amazing aspects that not many of us know much about.

When the member for Colton talked about tourism opportunities, he is exactly right about the chances that it provides through the support being provided to create this International Bird Sanctuary, to promote it and to ensure that not just locals but also visitors to our state and our nation get the chance to experience it, because it is enlightening.

Early one Saturday morning, a collection of us decided to get out of bed early and go to one of the coastal communities on the gulf and do some birdwatching. That is not something I normally do, but I was pleased to be with the group. I had a different level of conversation with that group of people than I normally do with most others. I was given a set of good bird-spotting glasses. It was amazing to have someone who knows what they are talking about to explain the different characteristics you are looking for, their size and how they intermingle with others.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a bit like being in here, isn't it?

Mr GRIFFITHS: You could equate it to that, Deputy Speaker, yes. I enjoyed doing that. I am not sure if part of my life post parliament might be spent watching birds, but we will see. However, I would like to experience it in the future. I commend the initiative that has been shown here; it is a good thing.

The Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary will create some significant opportunities. There is still a need to engage, negotiate and determine with the community the management plan issues that impact upon them. Some of those are quite varied and some, I believe, will not necessarily be included, nor should they be. However, this is an example of where our little place in the world is a unique aspect of the wider world, and we need to do all that we can legislatively within this building to support the ongoing development that it creates.

Importantly, from a government perspective, the member for Bright, who I hope will be a future minister for the environment, will show his personal support post March next year to ensure that the opportunities in the International Bird Sanctuary only build upon those good efforts made so far by minister Hunter, his staff and the Labor government and what we can all do to do make it better. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

At 17:32 the house adjourned until Thursday 1 June 2017 at 10:30.

Answers to Questions

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS EXPENDITURE

93 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (22 September 2015). How much does the Aboriginal Regional Authorities Framework cost to run and how will it operate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has been advised as follows:

The South Australian Government has committed $1.585 million across the forward estimates to support implementation of the Aboriginal Regional Authority Policy. Further details about the Aboriginal Regional Authority policy are available at http://www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au/aboriginal-affairs/aboriginal-affairs-and-reconciliation/initiatives/aboriginal-regional-authority-policy

RANGEVIEW DRIVE, CAREY GULLY

206 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12 June 2016). What action has Revenue SA taken to recover the $10,000 in outstanding Emergency Services Levy at the property at Range View Drive, Carey Gully, since the son of the registered proprietor died in 2011?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The Commissioner of State Taxation advises that the secrecy provisions of the *Taxation Administration Act 1996* and *Emergency Services Funding Act 1998* prevent the Commissioner of State Taxation from disclosing what action has been taken by RevenueSA in relation to any outstanding taxes associated with the property situated at Rangeview Drive, Carey Gully.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND RECONCILIATION DIVISION

246 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 September 2016). In reference to 2016-17 Budget Paper 5, page 83, how were operational efficiencies achieved to the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation program within the Department of State Development?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has received the following advice:

Operational efficiencies were achieved in 2014-15 as a result of the cessation of the National Partnership Agreement for the Remote Service Delivery program and through managing staff vacancies.

The ongoing additional savings targets allocated to Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation will be met through monitoring and management of staff vacancies and operational costs.

APY LANDS

248 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 September 2016). In reference to 2016-17 Budget Paper 4, volume 4, page 67, what is the current status with communities in the APY Lands that are in threat of closure?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation advised:

The South Australian Government respects the rights of Anangu to live on the APY lands and has no plans to close any communities on the APY lands.

STATE BUDGET

264 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 September 2016). In reference to 2016-17 Budget Paper 5, page 20, how many women will be assisted through the secure and affordable housing program initiative outlined in the 2016-17 budget?

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): I have been advised:

An objective of the New Housing Options for Older Women—Shared Equity (New HOWSE) initiative is to increase the availability and affordability of home ownership for older single women.

As the initiative is still being developed, the final number of women to be supported under this initiative is not known.

RANGEVIEW DRIVE, CAREY GULLY

291 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (21 February 2017). How much is the current outstanding emergency services levy on the property at Range View Drive, Carey Gully occupied by a squatter and what action is RevenueSA taking to recover the same?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): 'The Commissioner of State Taxation advises that the secrecy provisions of the *Emergency Services Funding Act 1998* prevent the Commissioner of State Taxation from disclosing any information in relation to this matter, including what action has been taken by RevenueSA to recover any outstanding taxes associated with the property situated at Rangeview Drive, Carey Gully.

STATE SCHOOL GOVERNING COUNCILS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (21 February 2017).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

All school governing councils are provided with indemnity by the government but only in respect to personal injury and property damage claims.

Estimates Replies

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE CLAIMS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The South Australian Financing Authority advises that 152 claims were received in 2015-2016. This is approximately 10% higher than the previous year.

The claimant will often wait until his/her injury has stabilised to enable him/her to formulate their claim to ensure that the settlement encompasses all of their requirements. This formulation occurs subsequent to the lodgement of the claim.

SAICORP has agreed in many instances to pay interim settlement amounts to enable the claimant to access treatment or other services to assist in their recovery prior to receiving their formulated claim.

Eighty eight (88) claims were resolved/paid out in 2015-2016. Of these eighty eight (88) claims, 10 of these payments related to claims actually made within the 2015-16 financial year. The remaining claims that were resolved/paid-out in 2015-16 relate to claims made within the 2007-08 to 2014-15 financial years.

ARRIUM

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The Department of Treasury and Finance advises that Arrium has not been afforded any payroll tax relief or other state taxation relief except royalties as described below.

The *Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958* governs Arrium's royalty fees payable.

The Variation of the Indenture under the *Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958* dated 15 March 2013 (House of Assembly 9 April 2013) varied the royalty rates payable by Arrium for iron ore sold dependent on where the ore was sourced until 30 June 2016:

- Iron Chieftain 1.5%
- All other Middleback Ranges operations 3.5%.

After 30 June 2016 royalty rates payable on all iron ore sold by Arrium reverted to 5% which is consistent with the *Mining Act 1971.*

There are no royalties payable on iron ore used to feed the steel works for steel manufacturing until 30 June 2022.