

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 4 June 2014

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

### *Personal Explanation*

#### **MEMBER FOR HEYSEN**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:01):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** Last night during the debate on the privileges matter that was put before the house, the member for Heysen said:

I know that the member for Morphett also tried to raise the issue of the president of the Housing Trust Tenants Association, who was putting out absolutely false allegations about policy...

She continued on, and then you, Mr Speaker, said:

I don't want to interrupt the member for Heysen unnecessarily, but I have a letter from the Electoral Commissioner saying that no complaint had been made.

The Liberal Party wrote, on my behalf, to the Electoral Commissioner on 24 February 2014. I have a reply from the Electoral Commissioner on 25 February 2014, signed 'Kay Mousley, Electoral Commissioner'. The Liberal Party wrote again on 27 February 2014, and I have a reply from the Electoral Commissioner, signed 'Kay Mousley', on 27 February 2014.

**The SPEAKER:** I shall get my letter from the Electoral Commission and we will compare notes.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** Thank you, sir.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PORT AUGUSTA POWER STATIONS**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:02):** I move:

That the interim report of the committee be noted.

This was a report that was received and authorised for distribution in accordance with standing order 204 after session papers by you on 17 December. The reason I mention that straight-up is to highlight the fact that the select committee that was established to look into this issue would have liked more time, and it would have liked the opportunity to do more work on this. Of course, however, parliament was finishing for the year, and in fact finishing for the session, so we put in an interim report. Having said that, though, we are very satisfied with the work we did, and I think it was very important work.

This work came about because Beyond Zero Emissions came to Port Augusta about three years ago now and gave a community presentation in regard to the possibility of the development of a stand-alone solar thermal power station at Port Augusta to replace the existing coal power station. Shortly after that, they gathered together and helped to form a local group of people from Port Augusta and the surrounding area, called Repower Port Augusta.

Beyond Zero Emissions actually came back to Port Augusta a few times to raise this issue with locals. In fact, I invited them to come and present to MPs in Parliament House because I thought what they had to offer was very much worth considering. I proposed that we establish a select committee in this house, and the government agreed to that. That is how we got to where we were. The terms of reference for this committee were important, and I hope everybody does read the report but, in case they are not able to, they were:

To investigate and report upon the effects of the proposal by national group 'Beyond Zero Emissions' and local group 'Repowering Port Augusta', that the Northern and the Playford coal-fired power stations at Port Augusta

(which are owned and operated by Alinta Energy) be replaced by a concentrated solar thermal power station when the coal supply from the Leigh Creek mine is no longer viable.

It included looking into:

- (a) the full cost of implementation of this proposal and how it may be met;
- (b) the impact on household and business electricity prices;
- (c) the impact on employment in the region;
- (d) the ability of solar thermal technology to provide a reliable power supply comparable to other mainstream technologies; and
- (e) any other relevant matters.

The 'other relevant matters' were also exceptionally important and the committee decided that they were:

- i. health considerations for the Port Augusta community;
- ii. lifespan of the Leigh Creek mine and therefore the power stations;
- iii. environmental issues;
- iv. strategic context ie the need for policy direction in terms of:
  - energy policy and CST research and development for SA, and
  - the future of the city of Port Augusta and Leigh Creek township, and therefore the communities that they serve; and
- v. the approval mechanism for implementing the proposal to develop CST power plant at Port Augusta.

I consider those other relevant matters to be equally and in some cases more important than some of the key issues in the terms of reference. Nonetheless, the committee looked at all those very importantly and thoroughly.

I do thank my colleagues, the members for Little Para, Ramsay, Port Adelaide and Flinders, and the staff who supported us in this, including a contract officer, Mrs Anne Strong. We put a lot of work into this, and I really do commend this report to the house. This is an exceptionally important issue. This is not just a Port Augusta issue. This obviously affects Port Augusta and Leigh Creek. Without coal mining at Leigh Creek, there is no Leigh Creek township. Without a Leigh Creek township, there is no service centre for the entire north-east part of northern South Australia. In exactly the same way as Coober Pedy services the northern north-west, Leigh Creek is equally important, so there are an enormous number of important social issues that extend far beyond Port Augusta itself.

I know that the Repower Port Augusta group were primarily focused on Port Augusta and primarily focused on health and the environment, but I think it is fair to say that they did have understanding and gave credence to some of these important broader issues as well. While, of course, it is never possible to mention everybody—and a large number of people, many of whom I know well (and some are friends from Port Augusta), contributed to this effort—I would like to single out Mr Daniel Spencer, who is actually not a Port Augusta person but did spend a lot of time in Port Augusta, Ms Elizabeth Zyla and Ms Lisa Lumsden as key people who really drove this process locally. I commend them for the work they did.

This is an exceptionally important issue. As I mentioned, in terms of health impacts Port Augusta has a higher than state average incidence of smoking but a much higher again than state average incidence of lung cancer and other related illnesses. There is a strong belief throughout the community that that may well be linked to emissions from the power station over many decades.

It also must be pointed out that the production of electricity is very important. We need electricity, and the electricity produced at Port Augusta goes into the grid and supports many other parts of our state, so it really is a statewide issue. Employment is incredibly important as well. The Port Augusta power stations—one that operates and one that does not—and the Leigh Creek coalmine are by far the single biggest employers, I suspect, in the north of the state. No, sorry, BHP would exceed that, but certainly there are about 500 jobs between those two places and, within Port Augusta, Alinta's power station is the single largest employer and incredibly important.

People would really understand that very difficult issue that communities have dealt with for over 100 years throughout the world: how do you balance these differing demands? There are people who have done work that they know was not necessarily good for their health or good for their community, but they needed the income. And that was going on 100 years ago in coalmines in the north of England.

The world has improved significantly since then, and I do not suggest that the health impacts in Port Augusta are anything other than a fraction of the example I just gave, but some of the difficulties that the people face in trying to weigh up these things exist both from the employees', the employers' and the local community's perspective.

I am sure every person in this house would prefer not to have coal burnt to produce electricity. It is a pretty straightforward thing because it creates pollution, but, at present, our community as we know it cannot survive without it. There is a very important focus in saying, 'How can we move on? How can we move forward?' If you never start to consider these things seriously, you never get to the end point that you want. Of course, a very sensible end point for us all would be completely renewable energy production for our whole state and our whole nation. We are not there yet and we are not even close to being there, but we have to start trying to look at these things.

Alinta has been very responsible. They have responsibilities to shareholders; they need to earn a buck. They run a power station that has lost a lot of money over a few decades now and they are turning that around. They have responsibility to their shareholders, but they have a responsibility to their employees and a responsibility to the community and they are doing the very best that they can and they participated proactively with our committee in terms of saying, 'Look, this is what we do, we actually foresee a life for the coalmine and the power station for probably up until around about 2032 at the moment. Nonetheless we are more than happy to participate in trying to look at how we could move forward and how we could do what we do better.'

To that end, Alinta is a key contributor financially to the feasibility study that is being done at the moment to look into this exact issue, as is the state government and the federal government. One of the key recommendations from the select committee was that this proposal for a feasibility study gets real traction from both state and federal governments and also industry, and we are very pleased that that has happened.

A key issue that needs to be considered at the moment by the steering committee for the feasibility study which will run over the next two years (and I believe a decision is imminent) is whether they look into stand-alone solar thermal power production or hybrid solar thermal power production which would almost certainly just be solar power production hybridly produced with the coal-fired power station. They are looking at that and they have an announcement which they will make very shortly.

My strong preference is that they look into stand-alone solar thermal power technology with storage because, if the feasibility study is favourable, if it looks like it can proceed, then the life of any potential renewable development would not end when the coal-fired power station life ends, which would be the case if it was hybrid. I think it is important to look at stand-alone technology in the feasibility study but, as I said, Alinta and ARENA and PIRSA will make a joint announcement on that very soon I hope.

It is also important to point to ARENA's involvement in all of this. The Australian Renewable Energy Association is a federal government body that was established by the former federal Labor government. It has been announced in the recent federal Liberal government budget that it will be disbanded. No doubt it has been one of the very difficult decisions that the federal government has had to make. It does not cause me any difficulty at all to say very publicly that I wish they had not made that decision because I think that is an organisation that has done—and has the capacity to continue to do—extremely good work. I can only imagine the difficult decisions that have to be made when you make any budget and I guess it was a decision that the government decided they had to make.

The reason I mention that is that, while ARENA has contributed significant funding to this joint feasibility study, it was also a potential funding source that may have been accessed if the feasibility study had been favourable and if a development was to proceed. That opportunity today is not there, but let me be very genuinely optimistic and say that it will take two years for the feasibility study to be completed. It would be two years before recommendations and findings from that study

could be considered, so it will probably be two to three years before anybody is seriously out there looking for funding to develop solar thermal technology in Port Augusta if the feasibility study recommends that. Let us hope that by that stage there are other funding sources available. I would be very optimistic that that would be the case.

Regarding the recommendations from the select committee, I will not go through the whole report, but I do encourage all members who have an interest in energy production and/or local communities and/or the environment to consider it. Recommendation 1 states:

That in the event that ARENA contributes funding towards a feasibility study into the development of concentrated solar thermal power (CST) generation at Port Augusta, as requested by Alinta Energy, that government works jointly with Alinta Energy to achieve an outcome which provides a thorough and rigorous analysis of the capital and other costs of building a commercially viable CST operation in SA. As a minimum, outcomes sought by government should include:

- (a) cost/benefit analyses of available zero-carbon power generation technologies including renewable energy, and hybrid options with the capacity to match the nature and extent of supply from the existing Port Augusta power stations,
- (b) where possible, the identification of the financial value of externalities associated with available power generation technologies including, but not limited to, health, social, and environmental impacts

That is something that our committee considered extremely seriously, because there is a lot more to this issue than just the cost of electricity, although that is incredibly important. It continues:

- (c) the most appropriate methods to fund such major infrastructure development should be identified, and
- (d) suitability of Port Augusta as the appropriate location for such infrastructure development should be considered, in a strategic context, in the interests of SA as a whole.

Of course, that is an exceptionally important issue for me as the local member. Recommendation 2 states:

That state and local government work together towards a cohesive strategy for the future of the City and community of Port Augusta, and of the surrounding region, in relation to the anticipated life expectancy of the Port Augusta power stations.

That is important with regard to employment, the environment and health, of course. Recommendation 3 states:

That state and local governments work together with the Outback Communities Authority towards a cohesive strategy for the future of the Leigh Creek township, and in particular for the ongoing provision of essential services to the community of the Far North Pastoral Area, in relation to the anticipated life expectancy of the Leigh Creek mine.

I really do urge all members to consider this report very seriously. Our findings included that in some ways solar thermal was better than expected. In some ways it was not quite as good as expected or put forward by proponents, but it deserves very serious and thorough consideration.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:17):** I wish to speak very briefly on the motion brought forward by the member for Stuart. I thank him for bringing this forward today. I had the pleasure and the fascinating experience of chairing this committee, but I want to state from the outset that the idea and the driving force for this committee came from the work and the interest of the member for Stuart, in response to his own constituents, and indeed grew out of his own private member's motion.

As a result, I am not going to go over all the issues mentioned by the member for Stuart, other than to agree that the motivation behind this committee, regardless of whether the ultimate solution for that area is CST technology, is that Port Augusta and the surrounding area (and I use the term surrounding area advisedly, because I understand it is a large area we are talking about) are almost completely reliant on the generation of power. In other words, if that industry was taken away it would leave an enormous hole in that loosely defined area.

The community out there is understandably anxious about the future. It is also anxious about the health consequences of the current arrangements in Port Augusta. Broadly speaking, the interim conclusions of the committee were that CST technology, as the member for Stuart just said, is a workable technology. It is a proven technology; it is technically feasible; it is a technically feasible way of generating baseload power. We have seen it work, but the main sticking point, of course, was whether it stacked up economically, and as the member for Stuart said again, the committee ran

short of time, and probably expertise and resources, to make a real assessment of the economics of that technology. I am obviously pleased that the feasibility study is going ahead and that the study will be able to make these economic determinations that we could not, due to time, resources and expertise.

In passing, I also want to join with the member for Stuart in his disappointment at the scrapping of ARENA. I think this was a short-sighted measure. I am not going to bang on about the budget but, along with a lot of other measures, I think it was short-sighted. I sincerely hope that similar schemes fill that gap because it is such an important area for all of our futures. Finally, as per the final recommendations of the committee report, I hope that, whatever the outcome of this feasibility study, the future of Port Augusta, Leigh Creek and that surrounding area I was talking about stays firmly on our agenda for all of the reasons the member for Stuart outlined.

I want to thank all of the members of the committee, particularly the member for Stuart, obviously, the secretariat David Pegram and our researcher Anne Strong. It was a fascinating experience. It was the first experience I have had of that kind in this place and I enjoyed it. I hope that members find the report interesting, and I hope it brings some benefit to the constituents of the member for Stuart.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:20):** I too rise today to speak on this particular motion and make a contribution as a member of the committee that investigated the solar power thermal generation options and possibilities for Port Augusta. I congratulate the member for Stuart on bringing an issue to the parliament which is, I know, dear to his heart and crucially important, particularly to the people in Port Augusta but also those in Leigh Creek and, of course, the broader electorate of Stuart, and not just to them but to the state as a whole because the Port Augusta power station, as it exists at the moment, is a significant contributor to electricity generation for much of the state.

I congratulate and compliment the member for Little Para on the way he chaired the select committee. Like himself, it was the first opportunity I had had to be involved with a committee such as this. It was ably chaired and we were joined by the member for Ramsay and the member for Port Adelaide. We were all relatively new members of this place at that time, I must say, and we threw ourselves wholeheartedly into the brief that was given us. I will also say thank you to staffers David Pegram and Ms Anne Strong, who provided support to our committee.

It was an extensive brief. We started from scratch, essentially, although we did consult widely and many, many submissions were received, both written and in person. These were driven particularly strongly by the group known as Repower Port Augusta which, of course, really came out of their concerns about the health aspects and environmental aspects that were imposed on the people of Port Augusta, in particular, with regard to a coal-burning power station. I admire their tenacity and contribution.

No doubt, there will be a suite of solutions for our energy in the future. Solar thermal may well be one of those. The presiding member (the member for Little Para) and I decided to take the opportunity and make use of our travel allowance to travel, on behalf of the committee, to Spain. Spain is the largest generator of solar thermal power in the world and we thought, 'Where better to go than southern Europe to look at this?'

It was interesting. We had excellent support from minister Koutsantonis and also his department. Austrade also helped us out with our agenda and visits. The initial motion with regard to this select committee was:

...to investigate into and report upon the effects of the proposal by national group Beyond Zero Emissions and local group Repowering Port Augusta [who I have already mentioned] that the Northern and the Playford coal-fired power stations at Port Augusta (which are owned and operated by Alinta Energy) be replaced by a concentrated solar thermal power station when the coal supply from the Leigh Creek mine is no longer viable...

Of course, this was a pet project of the former mayor of Port Augusta, Joy Baluch, who, of course, is no longer with us. She was really quite passionate about this.

As well as visiting Spain, the committee as a whole visited Port Augusta and took evidence. We also visited the Leigh Creek coal mine, which was interesting for me; it was my first opportunity. Of course, part of the presumption of the select committee was that eventually that coal supply would run out. Mines have a tendency to go on for longer than what is predicted. Certainly, the suggestion

was that about 10 years of coal supply remains in the mine at Leigh Creek, but that has been the situation for many years. What I am saying is that there is 10 years' supply left, and there may be—

**Ms Redmond:** Perpetually.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Perpetually—'infinitely finite', I think is a term I have heard with reference to natural resources, and that appears to be the case with the coal supply in the area of Leigh Creek and surrounds. So, with that consideration, I suspect that there will be coal-fired power stations for a long time.

One of the sites we visited in Spain actually had a solar thermal power generation, but it was in conjunction with the burning of wood. It was a hybrid situation, and is known as a hybrid. That is not something that we were really charged with as a committee, but it is certainly a possibility with regard to these projects in the future. In Spain, they regarded the burning of wood from a local forest as a renewable resource, and carbon neutral, which the presiding member and I found rather interesting.

As the members for Stuart and Little Para have said, we were probably restricted by the amount of time we had available. In the end, a committee has to come to a close, come to a conclusion and make a recommendation, but this particular topic was so vast and the submissions were so many that the time for consideration, and in fact the technical expertise, was difficult to access.

We came up with some recommendations in the end, and they have been alluded to. I do have a copy of the report here with me, and I will just very quickly mention the recommendations. I will not read them all, but recommendation 1 was:

That in the event that ARENA contributes funding towards a feasibility study into the development of concentrated solar thermal...generation at Port Augusta, as requested by Alinta Energy—

Of course, Alinta are a listed company; they need to make a profit. They are in the business of power generation, and it is a business—

that [the] government works jointly with Alinta Energy to achieve an outcome which provides a thorough and rigorous analysis of the capital and other costs of building a commercially viable CST [concentrated solar thermal] operation in [South Australia].

The capital costs were never really put to us in a definitive form, and in many ways the committee was struggling to get across the actual numbers involved with such a project. Interestingly, in Spain, the presiding member and I certainly got the impression that those particular power generation plants would not be operating at all without significant government support.

The Spanish government at the time (pre-global financial crisis, I must say) had made a concerted effort to support the renewable energy sector. There were many concentrated solar thermal plants right across the country, as there are across much of southern Europe—there seems to be a bit of a theme here—but we also saw many wind farms.

The suggestion was, at one point—we were never able to verify this, but it was suggested to us on a number of occasions that a significant proportion (up to 25 per cent) of Spain's not insignificant national debt was as a direct result of the government's support of renewable energy, and concentrated solar thermals in particular. So, that really gives a word of caution—

*Ms Redmond interjecting:*

**Mr TRELOAR:** That's right, member for Heysen: 25 per cent of the Spanish national debt was attributable to their government's support of renewable energy, and that puts some perspective, I think, into these sorts of projects and how governments can sometimes get things so wrong with their economic settings. We are going to hear more about that yet today, I am sure. The second recommendation was:

That state and local government work together towards a cohesive strategy for the future of the City and community of Port Augusta—

That was one of the primary intentions of the member for Stuart, as it should be—

and of the surrounding region, in relation to the anticipated life...of the Port Augusta power stations.

Recommendation 3 states:

That state and local governments work together with the Outback Communities Authority towards a cohesive strategy for the future of the Leigh Creek township, and in particular for the ongoing provision of essential services...

Of course, Leigh Creek is a mining town. Almost everybody there is involved, in some way or another, with the coal mine there, but it also provides a really important service centre for the surrounding pastoral district. If Leigh Creek, for some reason or at some time in the future, were to change its nature then those pastoral communities would have to look further afield for their services and support.

I congratulate the member for Stuart on bringing this issue to the house's attention. I thank the other members of the committee who worked diligently, and the staff members. As I said, we were all relatively new members at the time and enjoyed the experience very much. I think it is a useful report. I would urge all members to read it and get themselves across this brief, because there is no doubt that the generation of electricity will be a contentious issue and a challenge for us in the future. My suspicion is that, in the end, we will end up with a whole range or a whole suite of solutions with regard to power generation.

Motion carried.

*Personal Explanation*

**MEMBER FOR HEYSEN**

**The SPEAKER (11:31):** Before we move to the next item, I will respond to the member for Morphett's personal explanation earlier on. He has viewed my correspondence and I have viewed his and we are both right and we are both wrong. Yes, a complaint was made by the Liberal Party to the Electoral Commission and it was about domestic violence victim and domestic violence volunteer worker Julie Macdonald using a post office box in authorisation of her material. After the Liberal Party complaint, she was required to use her home address, which she did. The complaint was not about the material being false and misleading to a material extent, so that is the distinction.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON A REVIEW OF THE RETIREMENT VILLAGES ACT 1987**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:32):** I move:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

I rise to support the report that was handed down by the select committee that was established on 10 April 2013 into the review of the Retirement Villages Act. The members of that committee were: the former member for Giles, the Hon. Ms Breuer; the current Minister for Regional Development and Local Government, the Hon. Mr Brock; the former member for Kaurana, the Hon. John Hill; myself; the member for Heyesen; and the former member for Mitchell, Mr Sibbons.

As there are no members from the government (the Labor Party) able to speak about this who were on the committee then I think it is important—because this committee truly was a bipartisan committee, which met on 13 occasions, there was unanimity about the recommendations—that we recognise not only the work that was done but, more importantly, the recommendations of this committee. There were 11 terms of reference that were given to us by the parliament to investigate. There were a range of items, which members in this place can look at at their leisure. I will not take up the house's time with that today.

The bottom line is that there has been a long history of angst, some legal argument and a lot of money spent by a lot of people on both sides of the argument in trying to work out the rights and wrongs of the retirement village industry in South Australia. I can say from a personal point of view, having listened to the evidence, that I would be very reluctant to go into a retirement village under the current circumstances, and this is what the recommendations of this committee are hoping to change. I would expect the government not only to look at these recommendations, which they have, from the minister's responses, but to go further than just responding by actually doing something about amending the legislation.

The committee, as I said, met on 13 occasions, and we received a range of witnesses. There were 12 witnesses representing various entities and organisations, which ranged from Aged & Community Services SA & NT, the Council of the Ageing South Australia, Independent Living ECH Homes, Lifestyle SA, Masonic Homes, National Seniors Australia, the Office for the Ageing, the

Property Council of Australia (SA Division), the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, the South Australian Retirement Villages Residents Association, Southern Cross Care, and the Valuer-General.

We had six witnesses who were representing themselves as individuals, and I will not name them here. All the evidence that we received was very informative, well researched and well prepared. We were able to digest that evidence, and it was a great help in our coming to our final recommendations and the deliberations involved in that.

The written submissions were varied; some of them were very lengthy, others were quite succinct. We received 95 written submissions: there were 10 from various entities and organisations; there were seven from residents committees; and then 78 individuals wrote to the committee with their views on life in retirement villages and also their opinion on changes that needed to be made. The committee was a very good committee to work on, certainly with the experience of some of the members in this area, particularly the member for Heysen. I was very pleased to be able to not only participate but absorb the information and also contribute in my small way to the final recommendations.

I will just read some of the foreword in the committee's report for the information of the house, and I would hope that members do go back and look at the recommendations and the government's response to those recommendations. In the foreword, the presiding member, the former member for Kaurana, John Hill, wrote:

One of the most compelling features of the next 30 years will be the ageing of our State's population. The greying of the Baby Boomer generation and the management of its demands and needs will require considerable finesse by society in general, and Government in particular.

At the heart of this challenge will be the issue of funding. Who pays, how much and for what....It is clear, from the evidence provided to the Committee, that most residents enjoy and value life in their villages; most appreciate the companionship, the 'carefree' nature of village living and the security and safety that goes with it. However, there is considerable concern about the perceived lack of clarity about contractual and some administrative matters.

On the other hand, the operators of villages, while they are supportive of greater transparency and clearer information being provided, are opposed to measures which might impact upon their flexibility and running costs.

The Committee attempted to walk the line between these interests very carefully and our report makes a series of common-sense recommendations which will aid consumer understanding and confidence without unduly burdening the operators.

On behalf of the Committee, which reached unanimity on all recommendations, [we]...thank all of the witnesses who made written and/or oral submissions, our parliamentary officers, Paul Collett; Serjeant-at-Arms, and Shannon Riggs; Parliamentary Assistant, and our Committee advisor, Cathy Pedler; Senior Retirement Villages Officer, Office of the Ageing.

The committee officers are recognised and thanked in this place, but certainly the committee officers in this case did an exceptionally good job. The information provided by Cathy Pedler, the senior retirement villages officer for the Office for the Ageing, was very helpful indeed. In fact, Cathy came down to address the Independent Retirees group at Partridge House in the electorate of Morphett (my electorate), and she was able again to give very comprehensive and informed answers to their questions, which did satisfy, I think, every question in the place—it was well answered—and people went home very happy.

The 34 recommendations the committee has made are over a range of areas. Can I say that the vast majority of the recommendations, which, in many cases, have two or three sub-recommendations in them, have been either supported by the minister or supported with some further investigation that is required.

I will not go through every recommendation but I will highlight for the house some of the issues that have been raised by the minister in response to the recommendations. Recommendation 2 part (c) is:

That consideration be given to renaming the Act to more accurately reflect the current status of today's villages.

The minister's response was that this is supported, and they need to change the name of the act, but that they just need to investigate it further. We did not make a suggestion as to the way the act should be named in the future. The minister's response was:

There are many varying definitions of retirement and differing views of what a retirement village is. In line with the above recommendation, not all residents will be retired and the name of the Act will not necessarily reflect



their lifestyle. Further investigation into a possible name that is representative of the lifestyle and could contemporise villages and the way they are viewed within the wider community [will be investigated].

Recommendation 4 is an issue that was raised with us on many occasions, that is, the fees involved in entering, staying in and then, if you want, exiting the village. Concerns were raised about the complexity of some contracts and the need for greater contract disclosure prior to entering a village. In light of these concerns, the committee has recommended in part (a):

That the Act be amended to introduce a standard disclosure document, prescribed by Regulations, to assist residents in comparing villages and in understanding their rights and obligations.

There are some other things in (b) that went on to another area, but I should mention recommendation 4 part (c) (and this was raised with us on many occasions by the village operators and also individuals and representative groups), which states:

- That the standard disclosure document includes information relating to:
  - all fees and charges which residents will be responsible for:
    - prior to entering a village
    - while residing in a village
    - upon leaving a village;
  - examples of exit fee scenarios;
  - definitions of fees, charges and funds;

I cannot emphasise enough how many times that particular concern was raised with us, and the committee, obviously, in its recommendation has sought some action by this parliament to alleviate that constant concern.

The government did support (a) to (c) and in part supported (d), that is, that residents have an extra 15 days to cool off. The government (and I mean the minister, speaking for the government) did not support part (e) of this recommendation:

That a web-based calculator be developed so residents are able to enter exit scenarios and be provided with examples of how much their refund amount would be under various scenarios.

And the minister did not support (f), which states:

That the Property Council be encouraged to produce a set of pro forma contracts that are the recommended templates for operators.

In relation to the web-based calculator, the minister thought that would be a very difficult thing to do, but I think the minister should do something like that and it should be investigated further. I would think the members of the committee need to watch what happens there, because I think there should be some way of potential residents being able to have a look at these scenarios and just see where they are going to go. The minister's response was that this was not supported and it states:

The Office for the Ageing currently produces a pro forma contract that is reflective of the Act's requirements—we are hopefully going to change the act, so let's hope that the pro forma contracts reflect any changes—

is free of charge and available for use by administering authorities. The construction of a document that attempts to encompass all forms and variations of retirement villages without limiting new schemes being developed in the future would potentially be both lengthy and costly to operators and residents.

I think if the government can look at something like that and develop it, rather than passing on the costs to residents, that would be a good thing. I move on to recommendation 10(a):

That a unique 'retirement village' CPI be developed.

This was not supported by the government. In fact, recommendations 10(a) (b) and (c) were not supported. Part (b) states:

Increases of recurrent charges above this percentage should be approved by residents.

Part (c) states:

If residents do not approve an increase in recurrent charges beyond this percentage, an administering authority can apply to the [Residential Tenancies Tribunal] for approval of the increase.

Yes, it would be difficult to construct a retirement village CPI, just as it is with a local government CPI, a health CPI and a whole range of CPIs, but because it is difficult does not mean you do not attempt to do it and come up with something that is as comprehensive as possible. There will be some areas where the normal CPI, as we could call it (as applied to everyday living by governments), could be applied, but there will be other areas where utilities and fees do go up at an increased rate, so a mix-and-match of that combination, to blend it together to come up with a retirement village CPI, I do not think is impossible.

The need to give residents an increased say in how much the fees and charges go up is something about which the committee had serious concerns. The need to continue to watch that and to make sure we are giving residents a fair go is very important, because that is all they want—they just want a fair go. Most of the people really enjoyed living in their retirement villages, and those who did not wanted to get out. There they had the problem with exit fees, but that is something we will try to work through.

Recommendation 17 states:

That criteria be developed for the valuation of retirement village properties which accurately reflect the purchase of a licence to occupy under a retirement village scheme.

This was a real concern, because when people were leaving retirement villages in many cases it would be a person associated with the retirement village or the company running the retirement village that was going to sell their property for them, and there were concerns about the way the valuations were being done. The government supported this in principle, but the note was:

It is noted that the implementation of such changes would require significant reviews to existing legislation and the manner in which rating and taxing responsibilities are distributed in the community.

Just because it will take significant changes does not mean that we should not undertake those significant changes. The need to look at the recommendations, as we have put them together—all 34 of them—and look at the minister's response, is something the whole parliament should do, with the ageing population in South Australia, including ourselves as we look to our future (if you want to go to a retirement village or something like that).

These villages are changing to resort-like places in which to reside now, not just what we used to think of, that is, a whole lot of flats or units put together. It is a different position altogether, and we should look at the recommendations from this report very carefully, and I recommend the report to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen.

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (11:47):** I thought we would normally go to the other side of the house—I was quite prepared for the member for Ashford to speak. She was the relevant minister when I first came into this place and very graciously allowed me to participate with the very good work she did in reviewing the retirement villages legislation way back in 2002-03, I think it was. There was then another tranche of amendments to the Retirement Villages Act before this committee was set up.

The reason for that was that the Retirement Villages Act, when initially promulgated, was to deal with what was effectively a very small number of retirement villages in this state, and that small number of retirement villages was largely created by church and charitable organisations and run on a not-for-profit basis. Now we are in a situation where there are some 500 villages in this state, accommodating over 24,000 people.

If we look at the information in the report (and I will not detail the report, as the member for Morphett has done a more than adequate job of going through the detail), in general terms it is clear that two things have happened: first, in South Australia our villages still generally have fewer residents on average than the number who are generally in retirement villages in other states; but, more importantly, over the last few years particularly, an increasing number of people have become involved in the retirement village industry on a commercial basis, and that has dramatically affected the way matters are dealt with and the need for continuing reform of this legislation. I have no doubt that even if the government were to agree to every one of these recommendations, it still would not permanently fix the issue because, under our Retirement Villages Act effectively at the moment, we have a situation where people buy either a licence to occupy or make a loan to the organisation, but they are fundamentally changing the way they own the right to live in their premises.

Most of us in this place probably either own outright or own with the bank our home that we live in, and we own what is called the fee simple. When people go into a retirement village they give up that right, by and large. There are a few exceptions, but by and large they give up that right and the fundamental issues that have arisen in relation to retirement villages largely relate to the fact that people do not have a sufficient understanding when they are transferring from the rights of absolute ownership that they have always had to this new system under a retirement village that says, 'No, you have a right to live here, but you no longer control everything about these premises. You do not own these premises.' Indeed the operator of the village will control a whole range of things including how you will go about departing, what the cost will be, and so on.

When the committee looked at this issue what we did was we divided the report—for those who have not read it—into three sections. They were before you go into a village, when you are in a village and when you are leaving a village. In general terms it could be said that the operators, by and large, and very much largely represented these days by the Property Council in a new role for them, said, 'Look, there is nothing much wrong with the legislation.' However, the people who came before the committee, and that included quite a good range of individuals as detailed by the member for Morphett and quite a range of retirement village representatives en masse, really had difficulties with the interpretation of the documentation that had led them into the village.

My view is, on a personal basis, and as the member for Morphett said, 'None of us on the committee, having heard all the evidence, would in our wildest dreams contemplate going into a retirement village, particularly under the current legislation.' However, that said, as our population ages there is no doubt that not only is there often a need for people to downsize from the premises that they are in—I for one am now living in a house where I raised a family, but I have a lot more room than I really need and at some stage I may well downsize—but there is then the added issue of the government wanting to encourage that to occur to free up some of that larger housing and get more people living in higher density places closer to the city for issues of transport and all sorts of other things.

If we want to encourage that I think we are going to have to find new models, particularly as the baby boomers come through. The baby boomer generation has now reached the unofficial or official retirement age of 65; the first of the baby boomers are already passed that. People are heading into retirement and they are going to have to make these decisions about where they are going to live. I think increasingly we will see a need for the development of retirement villages which are actually based on an ownership concept, rather than simply a licence to occupy. At the end of the day, the point of moving into a retirement village is often that of having smaller premises to look after, having less of the looking after to do, having security and having lifestyle.

Members may be aware that on one of my two overseas trips that I have undertaken since I have been in this place I was looking specifically at ageing and, while I was in the US lecturing at a university about the issue of ageing in Australia, the retirement village I visited was just extraordinary because it was like a five-star resort. It cost quite a lot of money, but people were prepared to pay that money to get certain facilities.

I expect that what is going to happen is that retirement villages will become increasingly about providing a lifestyle, and that might be similar to one I visited in Gawler where there is a bowling green attached to the premises, where there are swimming pools, happy hours and all sorts of facilities where people are prepared to forgo some of the benefits they might have from owning their own home or having complete control of everything in order to have a lifestyle in return which is something they feel they can enjoy. Increasingly, of course, with our grey nomad generation, it is something they can simply lock up and leave to make life somewhat easier for them.

However, as I said, the main issue with people in retirement villages at the moment is that the fundamental financial shift from ownership of their home into this situation of a retirement village is not fully understood and appreciated by people before they go into the village. I think overall it would be fair to say that the committee reached the view that, most importantly, if we could address that—and that is why within the 34 recommendations there are some suggestions about how we might have better disclosure and better comparison and so on, because people do not realise when they are going into a retirement village that when they leave they may well not get back anything like the amount of money that they have paid to go in.

We are used to a situation where people buy a home and, over a period of years, if they are in occupation of their home, when they sell, they will in fact come out financially better off with some level of capital investment for them which secures their future. Most of the baby boomer generation, I would suggest, expect to be able to pass that benefit on to their children and grandchildren, but they often do not realise when they go into a retirement village that in doing so they may severely affect the financial outcome from when they actually leave to go into a nursing home or leave for other reasons or pass away. That is the fundamental problem that the committee sought to address.

We made a number of other recommendations. Over the period of time that I was involved in legal practice—and I have mentioned it in this house before—we had a particularly problematic retirement village in Stirling where under the Retirement Villages Act matters went to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and, in a period of six months around the state, there were only 19 matters that went to that tribunal under the Retirement Villages Act and, of those 19 matters, 13 of them came out of one village in Stirling. I think I was probably involved in acting for the residents in each one of those, and we had some very significant wins but there were problems. For instance, in relation to the incredible legal costs incurred by the village in fighting some of those cases, the village would then pay the legal costs but turn around and add those to the costs that they were then going to charge the remaining residents of the village. Those sorts of things were simply inequitable and not just. With those few comments, I support the member's motion.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:57):** It might sound unusual in this place but I have to say I support everything the members for Morphett and Heysen have said on this topic. I understand their views are very much along the lines of my own in that the former member for Mitchell and I had lots of discussions behind the scenes with members both on this side and the other side about the ongoing issue with regard to retirement villages.

I would also like to compliment Cathy Pedler in particular, of the Office for the Ageing. As the member for Morphett said, with the former minister (member for Kurna, John Hill), she made sure that the information was accessible to all of us wherever we called for meetings, and I am very pleased to say that there were a number of meetings both in Mitchell and Ashford with relevant members. I think, Deputy Speaker, you had seminars in Florey as well looking at the issue of retirement villages.

I think the select committee, which the former member for Mitchell Alan Sibbons and I lobbied for successfully, really did bring the issue back onto the agenda. Members had very strong views about retirement villages because of constituents presenting before them with issues, particularly contracts that they in many cases had not really looked at properly. I also acknowledge the support from the South Australian Retirement Villages Residents Association; that is a fabulous organisation and I would really like to commend the people in that organisation. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### *Bills*

### **SUPPLY BILL 2014**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2014.)

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:01):** Much has been said about the state of South Australia's economy in this series of addresses about the Supply Bill, and there are many statistics which can be run out to underline this. We have heard lots of them over the last couple of days, so I will not go through all of them; but, suffice to say that South Australia is in deep trouble. Debt is soaring towards \$14 billion, a deficit of \$1 billion, and by 2017 we will be covering \$1 billion every year in interest charges. That is more than \$3 million every day. It is oft quoted that this is greater than the budget for the South Australia Police.

Imagine what could be achieved every day with that money: school upgrades, environmental projects, improvements to disability services and support for our regions. But, no, this is dead money lost to interest payments. Yet, the government tells us that much of this expenditure in recent years has been to keep South Australians in work. Has this been effective? Arguably not, because as well

as a financial crisis we have a jobs crisis in South Australia today. In Adelaide's south, the area which I am privileged to represent in this place, 21,300 jobs have been lost in the last 12 months alone, with the jobless rate skyrocketing from 4.2 per cent to 7.9 per cent.

We could argue that things would be worse if it were not for the government stimulus, but there is no way of quantifying this, and it is often used as an excuse for 'fiscal indiscipline'. Debt is not necessarily a bad thing. Surpluses should be dipped into in hard economic times to help create jobs and keep industries working, but a general rule of thumb is that the projects funded should leave a productive legacy; that is, funding that helps to stimulate the economy today and helps us to grow and recover tomorrow.

Sadly, over the duration of this government increased GST payments and dividends from our property boom did not go into building roads, ports and other productive infrastructure. Instead, this funding was channelled towards a bloating of the public service and a multitude of big government initiatives which saw government creep further into the lives of ordinary South Australians. We are now competing with Tasmania—yes, Tasmania—for the most economically dysfunctional state in the nation.

I often feel sorry for Tasmania, which was actually a destination for my honeymoon and of which I obviously have fond memories. There is Tasmania, always down there at the bottom of the pack, every other state comparing their performance and using it as a benchmark for dysfunction. It makes you wonder what Tasmania did to deserve all this unwanted attention. Well, I will tell you, Deputy Speaker, what Tasmania did. It ushered in 16 years of dysfunctional Labor government. The latter term being a wacky alliance with the Greens which further trashed that state's historically weak economic foundations and drove the economy off a cliff.

However, all is not lost for Tasmania, because now it has a solid centre-right government which, if history is anything to go by, will turn the state around, and soon South Australia will be the state about which we will scare our children with stories, telling little Johnny, 'If you don't save your pocket money you're going to end up like South Australia.' We are rapidly becoming the state which is held up as an example of ill-disciplined fiscal management, sadly symbolised by our AAA credit rating, the loss of which, of course, the Premier saw as a badge of honour, describing it as 'expendable' in January 2012.

Our current situation follows 12 years of Labor government. As mentioned in my maiden speech a few weeks ago, there has never been a Liberal government during my lifetime in Australia. The Labor government commenced in March 2002 and my family moved here in December 2002.

**Ms Redmond:** Bad timing.

**Mr SPEIRS:** Very bad timing. We are talking about a generation of Labor rule. We cannot hark back to a time before this government to blame someone else for our economic situation today. Yet what have the contributions in this place done to assist? I sit in my new seat, trying to stay fresh and positive and hoping that we can all work together to make a positive contribution to our state, but I do find myself feeling rather disillusioned by it all.

Cast your mind back to the Governor's speech on the occasion of the opening of parliament. I actually felt sorry for His Excellency. This was his final speech in the role; all those years of loyally serving South Australia, rolling up to the other place to read boring speeches prepared by the government. And you would have thought he might be given something special to regale us with one final time. But no, the Governor's speech was beyond boring; it was mind numbingly dull. No disrespect to the Governor—and this has nothing to do with his delivery style—but I would have had more fun eating that speech than listening to it. Where was the vision, the plan for economic recovery, the tax reform, the planning reform, the local government reform, the Public Service reform, the plan to grow our jobs and exports? It was just empty, boring words.

When 2014 ticked over I decided to be a bit healthier leading into the election campaign. I am pretty healthy anyway, but you can always do better, so I started to eat quinoa. Now you can jazz up quinoa by adding all sorts of stuff to it but sometimes, because I am a bit of a glutton for punishment, I have quinoa porridge for breakfast—and I do not add anything to it. Well, when I eat my unsweetened, unsalted, empty quinoa it reminds me of this government; just a grey gruel of nothing, dull, uninspiring nothingness.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** But good for you.

**Mr SPEIRS:** Well, it is not good for you, Madam Deputy Speaker, because it discourages you from eating healthily in the future. South Australia deserves better. We are a great state. In speech after speech in this place people talk about what a brilliant place this is to live, work and play. So where are the ideas to make things a bit better? I want to throw some ideas into the debate today for our lifestyle, our business environment and our governance.

First, lifestyle. When I talk about lifestyle opportunities I mean for both our residents who live here as well as people from interstate and overseas. South Australia should be a playground for our whole region and we should be drawing people here from every corner of the globe, both to visit and to live. The Liberals went to the last election committed to growing our population to kickstart our economy, and I remain absolutely committed to that policy—a policy which, I note, the Hon. Patrick Conlon, a former Labor minister, vocally endorsed at a public function last week.

We should not have trouble attracting people to live, work and play in our state, but we do. Our population growth is sluggish, under 1 per cent, and we are losing our best and brightest to interstate and overseas. Some come back but many do not, evidenced by our net loss of 35,000 people over the past 12 years.

Yesterday the member for Finnis talked about things not going very well in his electorate. Electorates like his and electorates like the member for Schubert's should be alive all year round. Kangaroo Island, which the member for Finnis said was really struggling, has the brand and attractions to pull people from every corner of the globe. We should be leveraging this to have an incredibly successful tourism market. We should be overflowing with tourists, but the industry appears neglected and run down.

Businesses cannot even afford to open on public holidays and this disproportionately impacts our lifestyle and tourism businesses. I was down at McLaren Vale on Good Friday—and it is great to see the member for Mawson here—and I could barely find a restaurant open on Good Friday, in one of our premier tourist towns on a public holiday. Why? Because it was not worth these businesses opening their doors. That is a tragedy.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** People may have religious beliefs and they don't want to open.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is out of order to interject and it is even worse to respond to it so I will ask you to go on with your speech, and ask for no interjections.

**Mr SPEIRS:** I also want to put forth some ideas about South Australia as a place to do business. South Australia today is a bad place to do business with high taxes and dysfunctional WorkCover schemes. However, I want to particularly talk today about exports. We need to do much better in this area. An economy cannot be founded on servicing ourselves. We must export our goods and services elsewhere and get other organisations and societies hooked on what South Australia has to offer.

Yesterday, the member for Hartley rightly identified China as a place we must be directing effort to grow that nation's understanding of what South Australia can give them—and he is spot on—but there is also Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam, Thailand—modern and populous nations in our region with rapidly growing middle classes. I applaud the government for following the Liberal Party's lead in developing a South-East Asia trade strategy, and I hope this does not just become another list of dot points on a website but becomes an active strategy that opens doors for South Australian businesses to get what they have to offer into these growing markets.

The third point that I want to discuss today is good government leadership. I am delighted that the member for Port Adelaide is the minister on duty at the moment. Yesterday, our leader, the member for Dunstan, talked about the need for renewal in the state's Public Service. You will note that I will not use the term 'public sector', a sterile, terrible term which takes the concept of service out of the institution. What is wrong with serving, I ask?

As members would know from my maiden speech, I have a great interest in Public Service reform having spent a number of years working at the heart of the Public Service in the cabinet office, a centre of politically neutral goodness. Some people believe that the Public Service is only there to implement the vision and initiatives of the government of the day and, to an extent, that is true. Therefore, a dysfunctional Public Service is likely to be a logical conclusion from a dysfunctional government. However, I like to think that an institution as large as our Public Service should be able to drive some reform and vision from within.

I am encouraged by the Minister for the Public Sector's statement yesterday that the government is setting up the office for the public sector which brings together a disparate bunch of officers who often do not know what each other is doing. Hopefully, this will give them some strategic rigour under the leadership of Erma Ranieri, someone who I personally have huge respect for.

One area I hope that this office will be able to drive is leadership reform in the Public Service. I believe that many of the problems facing the Public Service come back to leadership or lack thereof. Leadership in the service is so deeply politicised, so lacking in merit selection and so compromised by 'jobs for the boys and girls' that it cannot lead. You cannot be a leader when you cannot give truth to power. You cannot be a leader when you cannot cast your own independent vision. You cannot be a leader when you cannot ruffle feathers. If you are reliant on your job for the wrong reasons and you risk losing that job if you rub the minister up the wrong way, you cannot be a leader.

When you are talking about an institution as large as the South Australian Public Service, you cannot expect culture change to be driven from the bottom up. The bureaucracy is just too big, too unwieldy and too impenetrable for grassroots action to alter the *Titanic's* course. Granted, individuals and groups may be able to have some impact along the way but this will be isolated and ad hoc. A seismic shift in culture will not occur without the commitment of the leaders.

Let me tell you about those leaders. During my time in the Premier's department I had the opportunity to address the state's Senior Management Council on a number of occasions, and this is why I am so glad that the member for Port Adelaide is here because she is probably one of the few people in the building who would also have had the great pleasure of being in this room with the Senior Management Council at times.

**Ms Redmond:** Do I detect a note of sarcasm?

**Mr SPEIRS:** No sarcasm, member for Heysen. The Senior Management Council, always abbreviated to SMC by public servants (presumably to give it authority in the same way that ASIO has moved into the mainstream lexicon) is a quasi-public sector board made up of chief executives of each state government agency. They come together once a fortnight to discuss stuff, to monitor things and to remind each other that they are holding South Australia together, because our state is in such good nick, and all of that.

Invariably these meetings are held on Level 15 of the State Administration Centre, the austere, unmodernised office block which houses the Premier's and Treasurer's departments in Victoria Square. Level 15 is the Premier's floor, so you would tiptoe around in silence, looking at the weird artworks while you waited to be called into the conference room and enter the presence of greatness. Except once you got inside, you realised that, sadly, it is sans greatness.

These are the 'leaders' of the Public Service—the men and woman (singular) who drive forward change and implement the government's vision for South Australia. I would go there from time to time to update them on the projects I was working on. SMC is an old boys club. Once ushered inside you sit at the head of the table and look around—greyness everywhere. The silence is broken by a clinking teaspoon aimlessly stirring cold tea.

The sound awakens a fossilised executive who coughs and pretends to have been listening to the proceedings. He must ask a question. The topic is community engagement. He must sound trendy. He should mention social media. He waves his hand to the Chair and gets the nod. 'The FaceTube—my department is using the FaceTube. In fact just last week I appeared on the FaceTube. It can be used to get young people involved.' He goes back to sleep. It has all the makings of a sitcom, except it would be cancelled after the pilot episode.

I remember a man who had a beard heckling me once. I cannot remember what about and I did not take it personally. It was not about me: it was about him spraying around some testosterone and reminding his brethren that he was a tough leader. One of the more stressful moments of my Public Service career was taking a photograph of the Premier and the Senior Management Council together. It was for use in the front pages of Better Together—a community engagement strategy that I was involved in writing—and it was meant to symbolise the Premier giving chief executives the mandate to go forth and engage with the great unwashed.

We gathered all the chief executives in the Premier's press conference room and asked them to take off their ties for the relaxed and comfortable look. God forbid! It was as if we had asked Mother Teresa to cavort nude in the streets of Calcutta. 'I haven't taken this tie off for 28 years,' I am sure I

heard someone wheeze. I was made the chief tie holder and stood awkwardly out of camera shot carrying a stack of Target ties, while the great ones stood awkwardly with the Premier, their shirt collars standing to attention in shock at their rude defrocking. The ones who still knew how to smile smiled, others grimaced, one curled up at the back of the room and went back to sleep, dreaming of his next appearance on FaceTube.

I digress. The point of my ruminations about SMC is that the place is devoid of leadership or inspiration. No-one wants to do anything; they do not want to push the boundaries, be creative, be different. They like the status quo. They like being homogenous, male, white, mindlessly dull, and they like knowing best. The good people—and there are plenty coming and going in the lower ranks—find it all too hard as their briefings are sent back and forth to have commas replaced with semicolons and superlatives removed from their text.

I once had a briefing that came back seven times for changes that really were not critical to the overall outcome. Eventually I put it up on the shelf and no-one ever asked me for it again. That was four years ago. In January 2014, when I packed up my desk, I slipped that briefing into the shredder. Goodbye, small innovative local government idea from 2009. I hope that that little insight into the Senior Management Council illustrates the magnitude of the shake-up required in Public Service leadership and I hope that the new Office for the Public Sector has the appetite to take it on. I know that the member for Port Adelaide is the person to lead that reform wearing her bright jacket because that will just blow the Senior Management Council away.

Those are just some ideas around lifestyle, our business environment and our governance that I would like to seed into this place and I will hopefully get a chance to build on them in future speeches. There is no point just criticising. We need to be part of the constructive policy debate and use the privilege of being here and the access and resources which that brings to contribute ideas, and work across this chamber to make them happen. We have challenges in South Australia—that is for sure—but I believe that we have a tremendous number of things going for us. What I believe we lack though is the political will and leadership to drive serious reform.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:20):** I wish we had asked the member for Bright to speak at about 11.30 last night, I think we would have kept people much more involved—not that there was anything wrong (I should hasten to say) with the contributions being made at 11.30 last night. They were superlative, and examples of members standing up for their communities in the best possible way. However, I think the member for Bright's contribution was more amusing and I do not think that other members will be offended by that. I congratulate him on that excellent speech using humour to demonstrate some of the problems in government and its use of money it has appropriated on behalf of the South Australian people.

We are debating the Supply Bill and we are nearly finished. The Supply Bill seeks to appropriate \$3,941,000,000 from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the state for the coming financial year. Other members have pointed out that this, of course, is because the budget is coming down on 19 June and, as the last sitting day of the financial year, there will not be time to pass the budget and the Appropriation Bill of the budget before the end of the financial year.

A number of other members have pointed out the unusual nature of this, and I think this is my ninth speech on the Supply Bill and the Appropriation Bill since being elected. I probably pointed out before that it is an unusual way of running a rail yard. Nevertheless, this is what we do here in South Australia. To put it in context, what I say is that the government is asking us for \$4 billion to put on the government credit card and asking us to take on trust that they are going to use that money in a wise and useful way. After 12 years—although we are going to pass this bill and support the continued payment of Public Service salaries because it is so important to do so—it is hard, it is testing for those of us on this side to take this government on trust when they have demonstrated over 12 years their complete incapacity to deliver for the people of South Australia in a way such that the people of South Australia deserve.

All governments take money and pay their Public Service salaries, so it is not necessarily the quantum that I am particularly going to be concerned about raising today. However, I am concerned about priorities. A budget is being handed down next sitting week and perhaps a salient warning to the Treasurer about some of the directions that he is taking—and some suggestions too—which I propose to bring forward in this speech particularly related to my electorate of Morialta, but also on a more general front.



It is probably always worth starting with a concept of where we are. How has the government been going over 12 years at spending our money—in fact, spending the bank's money borrowed on behalf of the people of South Australia? 'Not well' is the answer. As I have said previously once or twice, one of the main reasons I ran for parliament was that I have children and I want for them to grow up in South Australia, for them to want to stay in South Australia, for them to have career opportunities and to progress in South Australia.

The member for Bright (who came here in 2002) is an example of the successful migration to South Australia. He is actually in a minority because far more people leave South Australia than come here from interstate. We have a reasonable international migration program, and we can be grateful to the federal government for assisting in that way. Previous federal governments which made South Australia a special migration zone did better, and I think the member for Bright came here at that time. But those who leave South Australia are greater by a net of about 3,000 a year than those who are coming here from other states.

This is a sincere concern, and it is one that has affected me in my life. So many people of my generation have been leaving South Australia, and when they leave they tend to leave (the statistics say 60 per cent) between the ages of 15 and 35, and very few come back. Certainly, if they have not come back by the time they have children, they are unlikely to come back because once the children are in school it is very hard to uproot them and bring them back to South Australia, these young people who are going to grow our economy, who are going to spend their money, who are going to put their entrepreneurship on the line and contribute to South Australia's future.

The indicator above perhaps any other of how South Australia is going is necessarily going to be employment, and it concerns me that there are 18,000 fewer full-time jobs just since this time last year, since the 2013 state budget. South Australia's jobless rate has increased from 4.8 per cent to 6.3 per cent since Labor's 2010 jobs promise of 100,000 new jobs, and it is worth pointing out that the national rate at the moment is 5.8 per cent.

As the rest of the nation, with Liberal reformist governments, has been improving over that time, South Australia has been deteriorating. As the rest of the nation has been going ahead in terms of exports—the sorts of business opportunities that are going to drive jobs growth—South Australia's exports have been contracting. It is a stark exposition when South Australia is clearly doing so much worse than the rest of the nation.

It is clear that although the government talks about this issue, although it claims to have a focus on jobs, what in reality is happening is that the sustainable employment opportunities that are going to drive South Australia's future, those that are created by business, those that are not paid for necessarily by the taxpayers but created in an environment designed by the state government, are not growing. The private sector is not leaping ahead as it should.

In terms of Labor's jobs promise, when I was elected it was the 2010 state election and the major keynote of Mike Rann's re-election strategy was this promise of 100,000 new jobs—100,000 new jobs by 2016. We are two-thirds of the way through and we are going backwards. In fact, between now and 2016, according to the ABS stats from last month, Labor must now create 4,400 jobs a month to meet its promise. Since that promise was made, across the four years there have been only 2,900 new jobs. They must increase their performance by a rate of 200 times better than they have been going up until now. I do not have a lot of optimism for how they are going to do.

In particular, young people are affected. Out of 79 regions measured across Australia, northern Adelaide has the second highest youth unemployment rate in the nation, with 45 per cent of youths unemployed (those who are not in training obviously), that is, 45 per cent of youths are unemployed. The Premier, when we have asked him about this from time to time, always responds saying, 'This is a false statistic.' For a while it was as if he was suggesting we were making it up. I think he has accepted that it is in fact an ABS statistic, so his rhetoric more recently has been to say, 'This isn't a useful statistic. This isn't a statistic that is meaningful of a broad representation of the South Australian young people.'

But it is in fact thousands of young people in the northern suburbs of Adelaide unemployed. If you do not believe me, or you do not believe the Liberal Party, go and talk to the NGOs in northern Adelaide, those groups that are trying to get young people into training, that are trying to get young people into employment. They will tell you that Adelaide's northern suburbs are crying out for assistance. For all its crocodile tears, for all its soft words, for all its talk, talk and endless talk about

standing up for the disadvantaged, this government's policy settings have terrible outcomes for the disadvantaged.

The fact that out of the 79 regions across Australia that are measured by the ABS, the northern suburbs of Adelaide have the second highest rate of youth unemployment is a sad indictment on the way that the Labor Party has failed those most vulnerable people in our community, and I am particularly concerned about the way this is going to go. Where are the jobs going to come from? Where is the future going to come from? Where are the future career opportunities going to come from for South Australia's young people unless appropriate government settings are put in place?

That is going to need tax reform. That is going to need regulatory reform. That is going to need a will, a desire and a capacity to make hard decisions and strong decisions for South Australia's future. Unless the environment is created for businesses to prosper in South Australia, unless the government is willing to give up some of its sacred cows, give up some of its previous focuses and admit that its direction has been wrong, then I do not see the situation improving, and I have serious concerns about how it will ever fix this situation. So much for jobs.

There is, of course, another side to the equation: the things that the government spends money on. I was appalled to read in the press this week that, as I understand, the government is yet to provide funding certainty for Operation Flinders. The group of people who are served by Operation Flinders are those who are described as 'at risk'.

Many of the young people who are helped by Operation Flinders are not, in fact, troubled or of concern, but they have been identified by either their school or by Families SA as somebody who is going to benefit from this program. Then, of course, there are many young people who are troubled, who have experienced the juvenile justice system or are identified as being at risk of being involved with the juvenile justice system. Thousands of these young people over the last couple of decades have been assisted by Operation Flinders, yet its funding is at risk.

I call on the Treasurer to actually give some certainty to this group. Their funding from the Attorney-General's Department runs out at the end of June. They receive \$440,000 a year from the state government, and the government refuses to provide them security. I urge the government to come out and, if they plan on continuing the funding, let them know so this sincerely important organisation can have its future secured. Operation Flinders is very important. I know a number of members of the house have been out to Operation Flinders and seen the work that they do.

I attended Operation Flinders with the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Chaffey and the member for Unley about three years ago. It was a remarkable experience because the turnaround in the young people going to Operation Flinders and experiencing the wilderness therapy program over that week was magnificent. Many of them lacked confidence, and certainly lacked an appreciation of the nation's wilderness in that way, but they gained in terms of other things, like teamwork, their response to authority figures in the program and their belief in themselves that they could achieve things in the future. From when we spoke to young people commencing the program to when we spoke to them concluding the program, there was a remarkable transition.

John Shepherd made us do some of the things that they were making young people do. I have to say that the abseiling came easier to some than others. It came easier to the member for Chaffey than it did to me, I suggest, but when they told me that the previous member for Schubert had gone through with it, then I certainly was not going to squib from it myself. I imagine just going through that experience of trying something so terrifying for me because, I swear, it is not natural to propel yourself backwards off a 50-metre rock cliff attached only by some rope that they swear never breaks but you can never be sure—that is not natural.

But when those young people are able to try these new things and challenge themselves to do these new things, you can see how it helps them develop. Operation Flinders, which has been in existence since 1991 and which has been evaluated in many different ways since, does a magnificent job of turning these young people's lives around, but it also does important work in following them up after they have finished at Operation Flinders.

The Supply Bill in question here, which we are passing today, is to appropriate \$3.9 billion. Operation Flinders is reliant on funding. They raise a lot of money themselves, but the money from the government assists them very sincerely in doing some of the important follow-up work as well as

taking some of the groups. That money would amount to 0.01 per cent of the appropriation we are making today, so I would submit that it is not a bad place to start, with the money being provided in the Supply Bill to give Operation Flinders that security and give the thousands of young people who have benefited from it that security.

There are 6,000 young people who have gone through it. When they take the young people out in groups of eight to 10, I believe there is always a mentor who is a previous graduate of the program, somebody whose very own life has been turned around. So, many of these young people are contributing in an ongoing basis to the 40 or so teams they send out every year and, indeed, there are professional staff as well.

The member for Dunstan and the member for Adelaide have previously done a great deal of fundraising in their local areas to assist students from their areas in going along, and I have assisted them in that, as has the member for Chaffey. I am pleased to say the member for Hartley and I are looking to set up a Campbelltown chapter this year. We have been speaking to the local principals of our two major public schools, and with their support and one of their staff members hopefully going along, we look forward to hopefully being able to send out a team either later this year or early next year.

This is in fact a program which assists young people from across South Australia. There will be young people who could be helped by this program in the electorate of every member in this parliament, so I urge those opposite to lobby those who sit in front of them to ensure that this program can be continued at the same level of support that it gets at the moment.

It is one of the things that the leader was talking about yesterday: it may come up as an expense on this year's balance sheet, but it is investing in something that is not only going to significantly impact the individuals involved, it does save the government money down the track. For every individual young person who ends up involved in the juvenile justice system or in an adult correctional facility because their life has not been turned around, it is tens of thousands of dollars, while the investment of \$1,500 and getting them involved in an Operation Flinders-type expedition in the short term is tiny by comparison. I commend the continued support for Operation Flinders to the house, and to the Treasurer in particular.

Locally, in Morialta, there are a number of issues that require some attention. I do not know if I am going to have time to deal with them all in this contribution on the Supply Bill, so I will continue potentially on some of them at a future opportunity. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but I hope that some of the \$3.9 billion, and no doubt the \$13 billion that is to follow in the Appropriation Bill in a couple of weeks, might go towards sorting out some of the issues we have locally, some of the things that halt the productive capacity of our local area to contribute to business growth.

I will start with local roads. The studies that the Centre for Road Safety often comes out with point out the economic loss whenever there are road accidents. One hotspot in the Morialta electorate that I have been talking about for several years now—and I hope that the transport department will listen at some point—is on the corner of Gorge Road and Silkes Road. It is a high-level intersection where there are significant delays to people commuting to work or going around, but it is also a significant safety risk, because it is an unsignalled intersection and on the top of the T, a Wacky Warehouse child play café was built several years ago.

It is an area near a bus stop, so there are people crossing Gorge Road (which for those of you who have been there, you will know it is a very busy road) and there are particularly young people, children, very vulnerable children, crossing that road with their parents when they cannot get a park inside the play café. Meanwhile, because of the increased use of Gorge Road due to urban infill, thanks to the government's Strategic Plan, the sheer quantity of traffic on that road is far greater than it was in the old days when Athelstone proudly did not have a single set of traffic lights.

There is significant public interest in this. The member for Heysen and I held a public forum on this several years ago, at which there were around 200 local residents from Athelstone, Paradise and Newton in attendance. Unanimously—we took a show of hands and every single hand at the meeting went up, calling for the government to put in traffic lights there.

I have lobbied successive transport ministers on this matter, and I look forward to the new transport minister coming to Morialta in July, I think, sometime—we have a tentative date planned—and I will talk to him further about this then. I hope that he will be able to assist, because the issue

that the transport department always raises when we say this needs some funding to get some signals there so that we can have a safer and more sensible traffic flow, they always use this test based on the number of casualty crashes: X number of people have died in a crash on this intersection; X number of people have been injured; therefore, on their index, I think they classified this intersection based on an average of the last five years as equal 401<sup>st</sup> in the list of priorities.

That methodology, I would submit, is significantly flawed. Just because we have been lucky so far that there has not been a child die at that intersection because of the high level of young children going past and just because there has not yet been enough casualty crashes, Blind Freddy could see that there is significant risk going forward.

The changing nature of the traffic flow could be demonstrated by anyone who wants to go and have a look. The increased risk could be demonstrated by anyone who is going to accept that there is a play café there, yet it seems that this never comes into the department's considerations. I urge the new minister to have a look at the way that they make these decisions. There are other intersections in Morialta: there is significant call for it outside the Dernancourt shopping centre on Lower North East Road. Again, the increased traffic to that shopping centre and the increased traffic along Lower North East Road, yet the significant, obvious risks do not come into the department's considerations.

On the corner of Graves Street and Newton Road, outside the St Francis of Assisi church, we have a group of vulnerable elderly people going to church and a large number of young people going to the growing school, there are crashes at the traffic lights on the corner every month, it seems, sometimes. Thankfully, no-one has passed away. What I am concerned about is that that is what it seems to take to get any funding to fix it. I urge the government to take all of these local issues into consideration as the budget process goes forward. I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:40):** I will be very brief and I certainly will not need to extend any time. I rise in support of this Supply Bill. It is an important bill because it allows for the continuation of government service delivery in a variety of areas critically important to South Australians, but these services are under threat. They are under threat from a federal budget that has been roundly condemned by a significant number of Australians, all state governments, NGOs and others. However, there is one group here in South Australia that seems to think—no, in fact, believes—it is a good, necessary and sound budget. Who might that group be? That is, as they like to refer—

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I do note, whilst it is well within the rules, the churlish approach to this matter by the Opposition Whip, who I listened to in silence during his contribution, notwithstanding the status of the house at that time, but if that is the way you want to play the game.

**Mr Gardner:** I think there was a quorum here, from my memory; everyone was here.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I can tell you there wasn't, but if that's the way you want to do things—

**Mr Gardner:** Everyone was here.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Be churlish and keep interrupting, because that's your style. That's fine. Not you, Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I remind all members of the standing orders which preclude interjections and responding to them, and ask us to return to the debate.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I apologise, Deputy Speaker. However, as I was saying, there is one group here in South Australia that seems to think—and I will repeat that: no, it believes—it is a good, necessary and sound budget. Rhetorically, who might that group be? It is, as they like to refer to themselves, Her Majesty's loyal opposition in South Australia. Not only do they like to refer to themselves as Her Majesty's loyal opposition but, the way I see it, they should start referring to themselves as Tony Abbott's blindly loyal acolytes—a federal government that can do, in their eyes, no wrong. The opposition is out of kilter with every state government, I might add, which are, except for the ACT, Liberal governments.

I have had numerous calls from many of my constituents in my electorate—the young, the not so young, the employed, the unemployed, pensioners, self-funded retirees, those with disabilities—and, to a person, all are concerned, and those who are not concerned, their concern goes beyond that: they are scared—scared about what the implications are and are going to be for them if the federal budget is implemented as proposed. They know that it is going to seriously impact them, their families, their community, their state and their nation.

I do not think that you could look at this Supply Bill or our forthcoming state budget outside of looking closely at the most cruel, ideologically-driven federal budget Australians have ever witnessed. As I have said previously, it is a budget based on a lie, based on dishonesty, that dishonesty, which I have mentioned before, as have others, that the economy is wrecked, it is a mess, that it needs to be fixed and that its remedy requires addressing what is a budget emergency. As I have said, and I and others spoke about this earlier, this federal budget is based on a false premise. Beyond that, it is based on what is, quite simply, a dishonest assertion.

It is true, and I acknowledge that certainly some remedial work needed to be done to address the income side or the receipt side of the economy and should not be addressed as proposed in the federal government's divisive, unfair and cruel budget.

So, what is their response to addressing the income side? It is to implement measures that will hurt the most vulnerable and affect those least able to afford the cuts that are going to be imposed on them—our young people, through the Newstart benefits, and particularly the most vulnerable, through the GP co-payments, the dismantling and the cutting of Aboriginal programs, the cut to education. In relation to Gonski, leading into the federal election, I might be wrong, but I remember the then opposition leader saying, 'This is a unity ticket—

**Mr Picton:** Match them dollar for dollar.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Match them dollar for dollar. Well, what we have seen is a backpedalling on that. I have looked at education and some of the more bizarre proposals. Speaking of those who are acolytes, and there are those in this room, there is Christopher Pyne, the education minister. I think that one of the best ways to judge members of parliament is not so much how they perform in opposition, and I say that Christopher Pyne was a very good opposition member of parliament, but it is their ability to transition through to being good ministers and, on any fair assessment, he has failed, and I think that he is starting to lose favour with his leader and certainly those people here in South Australia who think that he is just not going to cut the mustard.

Anyway, there are the cuts to education, as I said, to Gonski, that was once a unity ticket, the concessions that are going to be cut to seniors, the cuts in funding to health, which so many in this house, including the member for Kaurana, have highlighted previously the impact they will have on our hospitals here, the breaking of the national partnerships agreement, the withdrawal of funding for roads, amongst many other things that are going to be dismantled, cut or decimated if the federal budget is delivered in full.

What have we seen as a response from the state Liberals, bearing in mind that I am saying that what we are seeing federally is a glimpse of what we would have seen should the opposition now be in government, despite their assertion that 53 per cent of people should have delivered them to government?

What we are seeing is their support. We are seeing their acquiescence. We are seeing their blind, but certainly misguided, loyalty to their bosses—the Abbotts, the Hockeys, the Pynes, the Liberal federal government. But where is their loyalty to the 53 per cent of South Australians who they say should have delivered them to government? There appears to be none whatsoever.

I think that, like the Prime Minister, the state opposition here will regret their position and the silence that they have adopted with respect to the federal government. The people of South Australia most certainly will not let you forget that you are not here to support them—that you support the decimation of health services and education services, the co-payment levy and the inequitable taxation that is going to favour those better off in the community. As far as I remember we are called the Commonwealth of Australia, and this budget is not about distributing and making the wealth of Australia common: it is about isolating those people who already have got and taking away from those people who haven't got. Outside of this budget—

**Mr Whetstone:** No wonder they're ringing you.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Why are they ringing me?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Again, I need to remind members that interjections and responses to interjections are not acceptable.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I am assuming—and this is not necessarily a response to an interjection—that, whilst my constituents are ringing me about the federal budget, that no-one in the seat of Chaffey, for example, and I pick that because I can see him over there—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He is out of his seat as well, so—

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —or even the member for Finniss or the member for Flinders. Of course, with 79 per cent two-party preferred I guess everyone over there is happy with not only you but the federal government and what is going to be imposed upon them. So, I am assuming that the 53 per cent two-party preferred vote that they got at the last election includes some people in my electorate who actually want it, because I know that a 46.7 per cent primary vote was cast in that electorate for the Liberal candidate, but they are the people who are ringing me. So I assume there are no problems—nothing to see here in the electorates held by the opposition over there.

What I am saying is that the budget in South Australia will be greatly affected by this cruel, dishonest federal budget and, certainly, the people of South Australia will not forget where the blame for this lies, even if those opposite continue to deny it. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Supply Grievances*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (12:53):** I move:

That the house note grievances.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:53):** Ma'am, I had a few other things to say but, after the diatribe from the member for Colton, I think it wants a bit of a response.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**Mr PENGILLY:** Can I have the floor?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PENGILLY:** It is interesting that the member for Colton seemingly has forgotten what the Australian people did in September last year when it threw out, comprehensively, the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd government. He seems to have forgotten that. They threw them out, consigned them to history. As I mentioned last night, I hear no mention of that from the member for Colton.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PENGILLY:** This is the same member for Colton who just said he never interjects when other members are speaking, I might add.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I don't want anyone provoking anybody at five minutes to one.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I live in fear of the comments coming from the member for Colton. It is interesting, because about half an hour ago I happened to be up in my office listening to ABC News 24, and they suddenly had a press conference with the federal Treasurer, Mr Hockey, who had excellent announcements on GDP, that things are lifting, that it goes right along with the policy of the federal government and that they are delighted with where things have gone and they hope to improve as the year goes on.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Well, again, because their budget was based on a lie.

**Mr PENGILLY:** You have had your go. The reality is that, yes, I have had people comment to me in my office regarding the federal budget and you know what I tell them? I tell them to ring up Bill Shorten. He picked up the reigns of disaster from Rudd/Gillard/Rudd and he has to answer it, not

me. The people of Australia elected a government to sort out the mess the Labor Party had left behind federally. So, you can come in here. Now we have a rally out the front at 1.30.

Interestingly enough, one of my HAC (Health Advisory Council) reps, who sits on one of my HACs, rang me this morning. He went to a meeting last night, and there was a letter from the state Minister for Health, tabled at the HAC meeting, calling on staff in the health services, the Department for Health and HAC members to appear on this day of protest today and, if possible, to appear out the front of Parliament House in Adelaide, or wherever you happen to be. Here is a minister of the crown, the Minister for Health, who has absolutely no direction whatsoever over staff employed by the Department for Health, insisting that people take action against the federal budget.

Let me tell you, apart from a few old wavering lefties around the traps, this campaign of fear that has been brought on in direct opposition to the federal budget will die with a whimper—I will bet you that. I will watch with interest what happens in Canberra over the next few months, and I am sure we all will when the new Senate takes place, and a few will learn a few harsh realities about life when they get into that place and work out what it is all about. There are some new senators going in there who I do not believe have much idea at all about democracy and the parliamentary Westminster system, and they are in for a pretty rude shock very quickly. A few are making all sorts of claims at the moment.

In the few minutes I have left I want to turn back to some issues in my electorate. I want to raise the matter of crime. Very sadly, we have had a couple of dual fatalities down in the Victor Harbor area recently, which are tragic. The first would appear to be the result of some mental health issues—that is a tragedy. A couple of weeks ago we had another murder/suicide, which is a tragedy as well. I do not want to dwell on those particular things, but I know one of the children of the lady who was murdered. I want to pick up on their attitude towards domestic violence, which was in the paper on Monday. This has to stop, or at least strong attempts have to be made to make it stop. It is a tragedy that cannot go on. One woman is killed every week in Australia, as I understand it, murdered through domestic violence. We should hang our heads in shame about it.

For my part, I want to pay absolute tribute to the emergency services people—the police, the ambos, etc.—who had to deal with these issues. It has traumatised the community in Victor Harbor—it has certainly stirred them up. You do not expect this sort of thing to happen in small country towns or regional places like Victor Harbor. Where it will happen next, who knows. I place on the record my appreciation to those emergency services personnel who dealt with those issues and have to go out the next day, back to work, and get on with the job.

I would also like to briefly mention the town of Port Elliot. A couple of years ago we had the tragic death of a young child there who was hit by a car and died and it caused a great deal of angst in that area. The family is still suffering immensely, but the issue for me is one of attempting to get some sort of stop lights or crossing signals put in there to enable people to cross that road. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00]

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (LEGAL PRACTITIONERS) BILL**

*Message from Governor*

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

*Ministerial Statement*

### **CHINA TRADE**

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:03):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** As Minister for Investment and Trade, I am determined to further South Australia's engagement with China, our state's single largest trading

partner. In the 12 months to March 2014 South Australian exports to China were \$3.12 billion. This represents more than a quarter of our state's exports. Amazingly, the value of exports to China was up more than 44 per cent on previous years, demonstrating the significant capacity for growth in this region.

Due to the forthcoming restructure of the automotive manufacturing sector and the deferral of the Olympic Dam expansion, it is now more important than ever that South Australia supports new industries and open market opportunities, and attracts international investment. As a state we must capitalise on our international partnerships and our proximity to the accelerated economic growth occurring on our doorstep. That is why the government has fully committed to a China engagement strategy by consolidating resources, refocusing our approach, and building strategic relationships. This commitment has been supported by three outbound missions by the Premier in July 2012, April 2013 and April 2014. These trips have been supported by further groundwork from the Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy, and the Minister for Trade in DMITRE.

I must pay tribute to the government's China Advisory Council and its chair, Sean Keenihan, DMITRE's China Director Mr Jing Li, and Director of Major Projects and Investment Attraction, Ms Narelle Slivak, for their important work in supporting the government's achievements.

As part of the government's ongoing commitment to the Shandong sister state relationship, the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation recently led an outbound trade mission, including myself and 65 delegates representing 27 South Australian companies with a consolidated turnover of \$50 million. Sectors covered by this mission include wine, seafood, agribusiness, medical devices and bioinnovation, water industry, waste management, mining and film.

Two key events were held during the mission: an investment event in Jinan and trade event in Qingdao. DMITRE and the Shandong Commerce Department cohosted the Jinan investment event. Over 80 Shandong companies attended the event to hear 14 investment proposals from South Australian companies seeking a conservatively estimated \$75 million worth of investment. DMITRE and the Qingdao Commerce Bureau cohosted the Qingdao trade and investment event. Over 75 Qingdao companies attended and 19 South Australian companies presented their trade and investment proposals.

DMITRE is proactively improving its process and strategy for outbound missions by pre-qualifying investment and trade-ready companies. Ahead of the most recent mission, companies were required to attend a session with a panel of investment experts who provided feedback and advice to companies on their investment pitches. A pre-departure cultural awareness workshop was organised to prepare delegates when engaging with Chinese businesses. I pay credit to my colleague and friend the member for Port Adelaide and her predecessor the member for Newland for the excellent work they did as ministers.

DMITRE's China team has received early feedback from delegates expressing strong appreciation for the event from AMPCO Films, Australian Bight Seafood, Pendleton Estate winery and Purus Group. DMITRE is continuing to work with each delegate individually to collect comprehensive feedback and improve outcomes.

These are relationships that must continue to be enhanced. I am honoured the Premier has given me the opportunity to serve in cabinet in a portfolio that allows the chance to explore new opportunities, on behalf of South Australian small businesses, for trade between our state and China. I look forward to working with cabinet and the business community on our state's engagement with this important trading partner.

#### **AIR WARFARE DESTROYER PROJECT**

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:07):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** Today federal Finance Minister, Matthias Cormann, and Defence Minister, David Johnston, announced the commonwealth's response to a review of the Air Warfare Destroyer (AWD) Project, which was led jointly by former US Secretary of Navy Don



Winter and former Transfield chief and current member of the state's Defence SA Advisory Board, Dr John White. The Air Warfare Destroyer Project has faced a number of issues, leading to schedule delays and cost overruns.

**The SPEAKER:** Could the minister be seated? There is a camera (second from the right) which is using artificial lighting. Thank you for turning it off. Minister.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** Thank you, sir. While not necessarily unusual for a project of this scale and complexity, clearly the commonwealth is right to take remedial action. As part of its response, the commonwealth has committed to a reform strategy which will:

- improve shipbuilding productivity at the air warfare destroyer builder, ASC, and its subcontractors BAE Systems, Forgacs and Navantia;
- include the urgent insertion of an experienced shipbuilding management team into ASC; and
- after augmented shipbuilding capacity has been put in place, pursue the reallocation of blocks between shipyards to make the AWD more sustainable.

The AWD project has faced a number of issues. Faults with blocks produced in Victoria meant a significant reallocation of work in mid-2011. Another reprofiling of the project was required in 2012. The commonwealth has said they have confidence in the Australian Submarine Corporation—a very important point—who are undertaking work on the AWD project in South Australia, and their board to ensure the project is delivered.

The commonwealth provided additional endorsement for ASC in regards to their management of service contracts for the current submarine fleet. The commonwealth has made it clear that it wants the AWD project delivered. I am confident the South Australian defence industry has the capacity to work with the measures announced today to ensure the project is delivered as effectively and efficiently as possible. As the second largest investor in the program, given the major investment in Techport Australia, South Australia clearly has a significant interest in successfully delivering the AWDs to the Australian Navy.

South Australia remains firm in its partnership with the commonwealth and stands ready to appropriately support any efforts required to ensure the program's success. Could I pay tribute to my predecessor in his role as the former minister for defence industries, who championed Techport and the AWD project throughout his tenure.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** The issues raised today should not just be viewed in the context of the AWD project. It is important that we learn from these lessons and consider all of Australia's future shipbuilding needs. A continuous shipbuilding program would give Australia's defence industry the experience and capacity to avoid the sort of problems that have occurred with the AWD project in the future.

As I have already flagged publicly since becoming Minister for Defence Industries, it is important to ensure the commonwealth develops a long-term shipbuilding plan that can cost-effectively support the needs of Australia's navy while sustaining the Australian industrial shipbuilding base. Indeed, the independent review of the AWD project identified this as an underlying systemic issue. Such an approach to deliver consistency and work would give industry a greater level of confidence and ability to invest in Australia.

While this consistency is important to our national defence capability, it will also be important in further enhancing South Australia's mantle as the defence state. As Minister for Defence Industries it is important to me, and to the government as a whole, to provide industry with the opportunity to grow the more than 28,000 defence industry-related jobs here in this state. To achieve this, we are committed to working with industry and the commonwealth government to promote South Australia as the home of shipbuilding in Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Ah, Father Gapon—sorry, the Minister for Health. Would he be seated. Before I call him, I call him to order, for accepting the congratulations of the opposition about his term

as defence industries minister, and I call to order the members for Hammond, Schubert, Morialta and Heysen, and the member for Hartley I call to order and warn a first and second time. Minister for Health.

### HEALTH BUDGET

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Today the Premier and I attended a rally on the steps of Parliament House. This rally was organised by the SA Health Alliance, a coalition of South Australia's leading health unions, health consumers, community groups and service providers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** It's nice to hear some activity opposite. They couldn't be bothered turning up to the rally, but nice to hear a bit of interest now, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, be seated! If the minister continues to use his ministerial statement not to share with the house public affairs and affairs of administration but instead uses it to beat the opposition over the head, I imagine that leave will be withdrawn; and I warn him a first time.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The rally was part of a day of action organised to protest against an unprecedented attack on South Australia's healthcare system. That attack is by the federal government and involves vicious cuts that will remove more than \$600 million from our state health budget over the next four years.

The Alliance and rally involve people from diverse areas of our health system, including the Royal Australasian College of Physicians, Australian Medical Association, Mental Health Coalition, South Australian Council of Social Service, SA Salaried Medical Officers Association, United Voice South Australian branch, SA Network of Drug and Alcohol Services, Public Service Association of South Australia, Health Services Union, Public Health Association, Health Consumers' Alliance of South Australia, Ambulance Employees Association, Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia, Anglicare, and Rural Doctors' Association of SA. The rally involved many of our hardworking nurses, doctors, ambulance workers and other health staff who want this state's high standards of care to be maintained.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** It also involved many individual South Australians who, like this government, understand the importance of quality health care and refuse to accept the withdrawal of millions of dollars from our public hospitals and the healthcare system.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** When the Leader of the Opposition was invited to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the doctors, nurses, paramedics and other allied health professionals, he refused. The Leader of the Opposition refused to stand up with our doctors and nurses and be counted with them, unlike his—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order—

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —interstate Liberal colleagues.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Has the minister finished?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I would finish by saying the Leader of the Opposition is gutless—absolutely gutless.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health is warned a second and final time, and he will withdraw.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I withdraw, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** There are many opposition members who might have been warned during that diatribe, but they were not because they were sorely provoked.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Point of order, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am just wondering what the Speaker's approach is going to be to ministers who make inflammatory remarks for the purposes of gaining the media grab tonight only to then withdraw them, and whether the Speaker is intending to ask the media not to report comments that are withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** I would hope the media would responsibly and ethically report a withdrawal, just as they comply with the Evidence Act and report an acquittal in a criminal case they have extensively covered.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:18):** I bring up the second report of the committee.

Report received.

*Question Time*

**CAR PARKING LEVY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Given that the Premier has had since November last year to get an answer, can the Premier now advise if the proposed car park tax will be subject to GST, which will take the impost to \$825 per car, per year?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:18):** We have held extensive consultations on the transport development levy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I've just started—or are you going to accuse someone else of corruption with no evidence again?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Oh sorry, too soon, is it? We have held extensive consultation and we have asked interested bodies, whether they be the Property Council, individual developers or other governments, to discuss with us what the impacts of the TDL will be. We have received, I think it is fair to say, many, many submissions from many interested parties and I think it is fair to say that it has caused a great deal of controversy. But there has been one group that has not made any submissions and that is Her Majesty's most loyal opposition. I find it interesting that, after we had points of order trying to claim media stunts, and that after we hold a long period of consultation, one body—

**Ms REDMOND:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen has a point of order.

**Ms REDMOND:** My point of order is about the relevance of the answer. The question was specifically about whether the GST would apply to the car park tax. The only relevant organisation to consult about that is the ATO, surely, or maybe the Treasury, for which the Treasurer is responsible.

**The SPEAKER:** I think I've got the point of order; I uphold the point of order. The Treasurer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is called to order and warned a first time—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I'm glad you're grateful—and the member for Chaffey. The Treasurer will answer with the appreciation that he is not responsible to the house for what the opposition does.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Someone needs to do, sir, because no-one is quite sure what they're doing. It's not my fault that they are having a bad week and I think that little hysterical outburst just then shows the amount of pressure the Leader of the Opposition is under.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer will answer the question and not do a commentary on the opposition. Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir. The government is not responsible for what the federal government imposes the GST upon. That is a responsibility of a commonwealth government and I know in what high regard their commonwealth colleagues hold this current opposition. I am sure that if they make a telephone call to their colleagues in Canberra, they will give them an opinion. I will make all this available on budget day, and then after the budget and through the estimates process the opposition can ask all the questions they like.

#### **CAR PARKING LEVY**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:22):** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary question, member for Davenport.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Further to the Treasurer's comment about the opposition not making a submission in the consultation, given that the opposition put out a number of press releases opposing the tax, given that we made speeches in the parliament opposing the tax and given that we put out a state election policy opposing the tax, what further consultation did you want from the opposition regarding the matter?

**The SPEAKER:** That question is probably out of order and the answer is probably going to be out order but let the cards fall where they may.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:23):** I think it is interesting that the opposition says that they have had a consistent view on the transport development levy, and I think, by and large, that is accurate, and they have had a consistent point of view other than the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Before the election and immediately after the election, the opposition was very clear that if the TDL was part of the budget process, they wouldn't stand in the way.

But they did say if a Liberal government were elected there would be no transport development levy imposed on the CBD. That was their policy and they were clear about it, as were we about our policy, and if we formed government we would impose a TDL. As recently as 5 May, the opposition leader went on radio and said that, of course, they don't want the TDL, they went to the election opposing the transport development levy, but if it was part of the budget, well, that's the government's right and they won't get in the way. Indeed, as recently as 5 May, the Leader of the Opposition also said:

We will not be obstructive. We want this parliament to work, we need it to work.

Well, how things have changed. And what's changed? Well, his former leader is out of control, his party is falling to pieces and they're blaming everyone else for their loss other than the person responsible for their loss. The one person who told everyone at the last election from that side of the house to go out and vote Labor wasn't the member for Waite: it was the Leader of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Show your anger at him, not us!

**Mr MARSHALL:** A supplementary sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Before the supplementary, the member for Chaffey is warned. Leader.

#### **CAR PARKING LEVY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** Does the Treasurer have any idea whether or not his new TDL is subject to GST and, if so, can he advise the house?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr Marshall:** You've got no idea!

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for the second and final time, and so is the member for Chaffey. Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:25):** We'd hate to lose him sir; he is our best asset. The truth is that the commonwealth government will decide how the GST is applied to the transport development levy.

**Mr Gardner:** What's your advice?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Well, it's not my job to give you our internal advice. I will make an announcement once the measures are introduced to the parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Mr Speaker, the opposition are the ones—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Finniss is called to order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** This levy is causing the opposition much angst, and the reason it's causing them angst sir—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —is that there is a long tradition in this house that both parties have observed—and that is a long and fine tradition—to give good government to the people of this state; that is, we do not block budget measures—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We do not block budget measures.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is called to order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We did it when we were in opposition. The opposition thus far have not done it in opposition, but one person is attempting to change that precedent, and if members opposite want to follow him over the cliff, go ahead, but there will be long ramifications for the choices they make in this budget. The decisions you take about following this loser off the cliff you will wear for a long, long time.

**Mr MARSHALL:** A supplementary sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order for addressing me in the second person. The leader.

#### **CAR PARKING LEVY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** Given that we have had no answer from the Treasurer, can the Premier please advise whether he understands whether GST is payable on the transport development levy that the government plans to introduce in just a few days' time?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MARSHALL:** We already know you've got no idea!

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, will you be seated. One more outburst like that and the leader will depart, and I do that most reluctantly. Please, no more. The Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:27):** I want to help, I really do. I know you're having a bad week and I'm here for you.

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is warned.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir. Whether a car park is subject to the GST will be explained in full in the budget bills. It goes to the point of ownership or lease. I will explain that in the second reading speeches of the bill. But what the opposition is attempting to do is to distract people from what's going on internally within the Liberal Party.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We have pronouncements, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** The house will not be distracted by what's going on in the opposition, if indeed anything is. Would the Treasurer please answer the substance of the question. The Treasurer thinks he has, okay.

**Mr MARSHALL:** A supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary.

#### CAR PARKING LEVY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** I would like to direct this question to the Minister for Health as the former treasurer. I wonder whether he knows whether there will be any impact of the GST on the transport development levy on the people that are working within this department?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:28):** Unlike members opposite, we speak with one voice. Unlike members opposite, we are united—whether it's the health minister or the Premier, or our newest minister, sir, we are one. We are one, Mr Speaker, we are one. And now we are many! I can only imagine the pain you are feeling.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer will be seated. The member for Chaffey is very close to departing. Are there any further questions?

#### CAR PARKING LEVY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** Yes, sir. My question is to the Treasurer. Will the car park tax be charged from 1 July, given the enabling legislation has not been introduced to the parliament as yet?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:29):** I will make that all clear in the budget, sir.

#### WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:29):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about changes to federal funding for the children's Palliative Care Service at the Women's and Children's Hospital?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30):** I thank the member for Taylor for this question; it has been of particular concern to her. I am very pleased to advise the house today that the future of the Women's and Children's Hospital Palliative Care Service has been secured by the government. Palliative care is one of a number of services that have been impacted by the loss of federal funding. The Women's and Children's Palliative Care Service is too important to South Australian families to be lost, and we will not put this at risk.

Currently, the state government contributes around half a million dollars a year to fund the service, and the federal government provides approximately \$250,000 a year. The federal government's decision to cease their funding contribution to this service beyond December 2014 is nothing short of callous and heartless. The doctors and nurses at the Women's and Children's Hospital do a fantastic job caring for South Australian children who have a life-limiting illness. They provide care for our state's sickest children and support for their families during a very difficult time.

The Women's and Children's Hospital palliative care service provides care and support to around 80 children every year. The service provides care to children and their families at home and in hospital. Any uncertainty created by the federal government's decision to cease their funding to this program has only added more stress and worry for those families.

I am happy to advise the house that the state government has committed to fully funding this service. I hope this announcement relieves families and the community from any unnecessary worry about the service's future but, with the federal government's vicious cuts of more than \$600 million from our state health budget over the next four years, the state government cannot commit to save every service affected by Tony Abbott tearing up the national agreement on health.

#### HOMESTART FINANCE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:32):** My question is to the Treasurer. What was Project A undertaken by the Department of Treasury?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:32):** Sir, I don't know. I will get an answer for the member and get back to the house.

#### HOMESTART FINANCE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:32):** Supplementary, sir: was Project A the scoping of the sale of HomeStart Finance, and has the government scoped HomeStart Finance for sale?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:32):** Sir, I don't know what Treasury have done while preparing incoming opposition briefs. Treasury would have prepared two sets of briefs for the incoming government: they would have prepared a set for the Labor Party, and a set for the opposition. No doubt, I suspect that in their briefs they would have done scoping work for all of your plans—sack 25,000 public servants, privatise—

**The SPEAKER:** All of the opposition's plans, not my plans.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir, I apologise; you are with us—plans to sack public servants, plans to privatise SA Water, plans to sell off the Housing Trust stock. I am sure they did all that work, sir. Have they done it on behalf of the government? Sir, I have not seen anything that would suggest that we have, but I will go back and check. I can assure the members opposite that it is not this government that has plans—or had plans—to privatise assets; I think members opposite should look closer to themselves about what they had planned. But I will, of course, go back and check and get a detailed answer for the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Further supplementary, member for Davenport.

#### HOMESTART FINANCE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:33):** Mr Speaker, I ask the Treasurer: does he want to correct the record, given that I have received a freedom of information response from his agency that prevents me from obtaining the following documents: a covering minute to the Treasurer regarding HomeStart Finance review of loan book; a cabinet submission with Deloitte reports, costing comments and speaking note attachments, including a Deloitte valuation report, a Deloitte preliminary scoping report, a cabinet costing comment, and speaking notes prepared for the minister to address parliament?

**Mr Pisoni:** Jay forgot to tell you about that one.

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:34):** If the shadow treasurer is saying that I have somehow misled him—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —in my previous answer, I disagree with him. I don't think I did and I will check, but I did not say to you that they had not done the work. I said to you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will go back and check—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —but the pertinent point here is that, no matter what work is done by agencies, it is cabinet decisions that matter and it is government outcomes that matter. Cabinet considers many options; some are proceeded with, some are not. Judge us by what we do. I think that is the important question here: has the HomeStart book been privatised? Has it been sold? It has not.

**The SPEAKER:** Third supplementary, member for Davenport.

#### HOMESTART FINANCE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:35):** Does the Treasurer accept that, if the cabinet submission re the scoping of HomeStart Finance had gone to cabinet in May or June last year, he would have seen it, being a minister of the cabinet, and will the Treasurer rule out selling HomeStart Finance?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:36):** First and foremost, I think HomeStart does an excellent job and I do not have plans to sell it or otherwise. I think it does an exceptional job for people on low incomes. It does great work for South Australians trying to buy their first home. It is not something that I have got front of mind. I am not going to detail to the house what the cabinet chose to do or not to do.

**Ms Redmond:** He didn't ask you to.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Well, I am answering it. One day you may understand what I am talking about. The reality is, like I have said to the member for Davenport, it is not my intention to mislead him or the house. I make that very clear to him. The government has not privatised HomeStart.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** Before we go to the next question, I welcome students from Flinders University, who are guests of the member for Davenport; students of Woodville High School, who are guests of the Premier; and students from the Adelaide Secondary School of English, who are my guests. The leader.

#### *Question Time*

#### HOMESTART FINANCE

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37):** My supplementary is to the Treasurer. Will he unequivocally rule out the sale of HomeStart?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:37):** I am not going to play the rule-out game with the opposition, other than to say that I value the work that HomeStart do. When I was minister for housing and urban development, I was the minister responsible for HomeStart. I had a very good relationship with the board. I think



they do excellent work. They make a good return for government. They provide a good service for South Australians. I think they do an exceptional job. I have exceptional confidence in Mr Jim Kouts, who is the new presiding member of the HomeStart board. I think he will do an exceptional job over the next years in running HomeStart. Again, I say to the opposition: judge us on what we do. Cabinet is entitled to make decisions. The government did not decide, and has not privatised HomeStart.

#### STATE GOVERNMENT REVENUE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:38):** My question is to the Treasurer. Is it the case that the up and coming budget will see a write-up in state government revenue, given that yesterday's Queensland budget wrote up revenue by some \$3.7 billion over the four years, beginning this year, compared with what was predicted in the Queensland mid-year budget review?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:38):** Obviously, the final figures will be released on budget day and members can make their own judgements then, but it is fair to say that our own receipts are down, offset by receipts from the GST, so the net benefit is minor. I will make a much more fulsome answer to the house on budget day.

#### STATE FINAL DEMAND

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:39):** My question is again to the Treasurer. Why has South Australia's state final demand fallen for two consecutive quarters?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:39):** In precise terms, because the net effect of South Australian household expenditure, up 0.5 per cent, and construction of new houses, up 1.4 per cent in the quarter, were offset by a substantial reduction in spending in government agencies, so public sector capital spending was down by 8.3 per cent and investment spending by businesses down 2.6 per cent.

So the net effect is a small reduction in state final demand, but it needs to be borne in mind that this obviously is a tapering off of the public sector investment that we have seen, and we are now beginning to see some private sector investment take its place, and that process is one which we predicted and which we were planning for and have been seeking to encourage. But the truth is that state final demand, as we have had the debate in this house before, is not the best representation of the growth of the economy because it only measures spending here; it does not mention production in the state economy. That figure is one which last year was in positive territory despite those opposite predicting that we would be in recession and had been in recession. When the numbers finally came out, it was demonstrated that in fact we grew again, just as we have grown for each of the previous 22 years.

The reality is that state final demand does not pick up a very significant component of productive activity in the South Australian economy, and that is exports, both interstate and internationally. We know from the most recent figures that our export performance in the year to March 2014 has reached record levels. The year-to-year growth is the second highest in Australia behind the Northern Territory at 14 per cent, so there is good reason to believe that the economy in aggregate is continuing to grow.

I know that those opposite—and we have had this debate ad nauseam, and I would have thought that in this parliament maybe they would desist from the tactic—will pick any shred of evidence, any small statistic to support their conclusion that we are all ruined. We, of course, are optimistic about the future of South Australia. We believe in it and we would ask those opposite to get in behind our efforts, as many are beginning to do now, to talk up South Australia and advance a positive vision for South Australia's future.

**The SPEAKER:** Before we move to the next question, the member for Unley is warned a first time and the members for Heysen and Morialta are warned a first and second time. The member for Davenport.

#### STATE FINAL DEMAND

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:42):** A supplementary question to the Treasurer: what is the impact on the budget of state final demand annual growth of 0.4 per cent released by the

ABS, given that the January state budget update forecast state final demand growth of some 2.25 per cent for the 2013-14 year?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:42):** The one aspect that the member for Davenport is not taking into account is the underlying metrics of the economy, which are quite strong. What we are seeing is new housing building approvals up quite dramatically, and we are seeing exports at record levels. The economy is doing exceptionally well. Government spending is down but, mind you, that is something that the opposition have been calling on us to do and now they are lamenting it, which I find interesting.

The reality is that there is a twofold problem here. Consumption amongst South Australian households is up and, quite cleverly, immediately after the last federal election, Treasurer Hockey and the Prime Minister were doing all that they could to instil confidence in the economy across the country to try to get spending up, and that has been largely reflected in the GST. But what has happened since the commonwealth budget is that those consumer indexes, those indexes that show consumer confidence, have plummeted because people are terrified of what the commonwealth is doing.

Quite frankly, that is why premiers like Campbell Newman, Mike Baird and Denis Napthine are all of one voice with the Labor Premier here in South Australia crying out against these cuts to the economy, because they are frightening people and people are withdrawing from the economy and spending less. They are hitting confidence, and hitting confidence hurts our economy.

So I would ask members opposite to speak to their commonwealth colleagues about what they are doing to the strength of our national economy, because we need that strength, we need that resilience so that people can go out and spend and be confident about their economy, because South Australians are doing the hard work. Our farmers are doing the right thing; they are being very industrious. They are doing excellent work by growing our economy and increasing exports. Our miners are doing it tough. Exploration in minerals is down but in petroleum it is up. That is why we don't need any unnecessary inquiries into unconventional gas just to try to win one seat, which is a dent to confidence.

What we do not need is people talking down the economy. What we need is people talking up the economy. We do not need people saying that we are constantly in a recession, constantly talking down this state. We need people to be champions for South Australia, champions for their regions, not celebrating every time there is an ABS stat they can pull out of thin air and say, 'This ABS stat says we are doomed. It is all over. We are finished.' Never mind exports are up, never mind unemployment has gone down, never mind those statistics. Quite frankly, this economy is in good shape. People are spending, new housing approvals are up, the tax cuts are working, and members opposite are doing all they can to try and rain on our parade because they do not want to see South Australia succeed.

*Members interjecting:*

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

#### STATE GROWTH

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:45):** My question is again to the Treasurer. As the ABS stats I used in the previous question were all for the March quarter which was before the federal budget, why was the state's growth so much lower than budgeted? The federal budget had no impact on that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:45):** The one stat he does not mention, again by selectively quoting, is that we are 0.4 per cent higher than we were a year ago. Oh, but don't worry about that. That is irrelevant to my argument. Don't let that get in the way of a good story. Don't let that get in the way of your narrative. We are better off than we were a year ago, but they do not want to talk about that at all. That is typical of the Opposition, prepared to talk down this state at every opportunity that they get and, quite frankly, South Australians are sick of it.

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46):** My question is to the Premier. Was the Premier wrong in relation to ministerial involvement in the FOI processes when he stated on 15 April 2013, 'FOIs are not processed by government. They are processed by independent FOI officers according to law, so we don't get involved in that process'?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:46):** I was right.

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** A supplementary to the Minister for the Public Sector. Given the Ombudsman's finding that ministerial officers have asked for documents not to be released because the documents are 'embarrassing for the government', will the minister investigate ministerial interference in FOI applications?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:47):** I think it is appropriate for me to take this question as I currently have the delegation in respect of the FOI legislation and therefore—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —it is appropriate for me. I have, in fact, had it for the best part of 18 months if I remember correctly. In any event, can I say a few things about the Ombudsman's report. First of all, obviously it is a reasonably bulky piece of work and, having had insufficient time to study it fully, I do not find myself in a position where I can say anything in particular about the recommendations, findings or other remarks made by the Ombudsman, although I make it clear it is my intention obviously to read the report and form views about it.

I will make a few general points. First of all, my very preliminary view of the report suggests that there are no particular references made to particular instances, and I am aware of the fact that the Ombudsman has the remit to be able to, should he so wish, investigate any matters that he uncovered in the course of his inquiry which he deemed appropriate to do so, and to the best of my knowledge that has not occurred.

The second thing I would say is that FOI applications are processed by accredited FOI officers who have a statutory independence according to the act and so the individual officer is the person in charge of the matter. I would say—and I believe all of us in government would say—we defend their right to be an independent officer and we condemn anybody who would attempt to interfere with that, because that is not appropriate, and we would encourage those officers, if they feel in that position, to stand up for themselves because that is their job.

They are an independent officer. They have the power to make determinations free from interference and, of course, there is an appeal embedded in the system if somebody is disgruntled by whatever decision is made by the independent officer. That appeal goes either to the Ombudsman or it goes to the District Court, as members would be aware.

I think it is important, though, to make this point. Over recent years the number of applications received has dramatically increased and this is in spite of the fact that the government has been proactively disclosing material, which I believe is acknowledged by the Ombudsman. We are putting as much stuff out as we can, and in the last parliament pursuant to that the government brought forward legislation to enable us to put even more material out, and that did not pass during the term of the last parliament over some objections from those opposite. Anyway, that is a separate matter.

I do know this: whereas in the past members of parliament might habitually have made requests of the FOI officers for information about a particular matter, what they are now doing is something akin to what that large fishing trawler was attempting to do off Tasmania, which is to throw out a vast net and trawl a wall of death through departments. Can I give an example?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** They are not Plantagenet fish; it is something else—pelagic, yes. It is the equivalent of a pelagic wall of death. I will give you an example. I have in front of me a letter from the Leader of the Opposition dated 12 May 2014 to the Freedom of Information Officer as follows:

For the period 24 March 2014 to 1 April (inclusive), I request copies of all emails sent by the Minister's Chief of Staff, Ministerial Advisers, Media Advisers...

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Point of order, sir. The Attorney-General has just quoted from an FOI put in by the Leader of the Opposition. I am just wondering how the minister would have actually got access to it. Surely that is privy to the FOI officer.

**The SPEAKER:** We can't have FOIs about FOIs. The minister's time has expired, so we won't get to hear the rest of it, unless of course the deputy leader asks him a similar question.

### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52):** Yes, I have a supplementary: given the minister's answer about the report and not being examples, can the minister then explain why on page 86 at paragraph 329 the Ombudsman reports:

Another witness indicated that they had received phone calls from a Minister's office asking that certain documents not be released—not because an exemption applied, but because the documents were considered to be embarrassing to the government.

It makes the finding in relation to ministerial interference on page 88 of the report and, therefore, I ask the Attorney: is he going to investigate these allegations?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:52):** Can I make this point? First of all, I am looking at the passage to which the deputy leader has referred me at paragraph 329. Another unnamed witness indicated that they had received phone calls from an unnamed office asking that unnamed documents not be released and not because an exemption applied but because the unnamed documents were considered to be embarrassing by the unknown person to the government. I will make two points about this. Point number one is the FOI officers have an independent statutory role. It is their job to perform that role and they should perform that role.

**Mr Marshall:** Uninterrupted.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Indeed—but they have a job.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** They have a job to do. The second point I would make is that the Ombudsman in the conduct of this matter was in a position to explore the particulars of this matter—and I make the point that I have not read this whole thing in detail, but I look at 329. That does not give me much to go on. So I make the point that the Ombudsman is entitled to investigate misbehaviour, if I put it that way, on the part of public servants, inappropriate conduct on the part of people. He has extensive powers to do that. Whether he or his office, because I know he has now moved on, has chosen to take up any of these matters, I do not know.

I do not understand how it could be possible for me, based on those particulars, which are no particulars at all, to investigate anything. I make the point again: the government does not support people requesting FOI officers to do anything other than their statutory duty, and the officers should continue to do their statutory duty.

### INTERNATIONAL VISITORS

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister inform the house about recent international visitor statistics?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:55):** I thank the member for the question and for his strong interest in the tourism sector. Some great news was released today by the federal government on international tourism figures, showing that once again we have had huge growth: a 7.8 per cent increase on the previous

12 months for international visitors coming into South Australia. That follows on from the December quarter, when we had a 13.1 per cent increase. Quarter after quarter we are getting very good increases in the number of tourists coming into South Australia from overseas.

Of course, there is no better money for our economy in South Australia than the money that comes out of the wallets of people from interstate or overseas. One of the big increases we saw was a 68 per cent jump in visitors coming from Malaysia, no doubt off the back of AirAsia X flying directly into Adelaide since October last year. The government went out hard to get that airline here, the first low-cost international carrier to come into Adelaide. It is making a real difference with all the connections that they have throughout Asia via Kuala Lumpur and into Adelaide.

Of course, we attracted Emirates on 1 November 2012, and then they went daily from 1 February last year. They are having a huge impact on bringing people in not just from the Middle East but throughout their wider connections in Europe. In fact, the UK market is up 27.5 per cent in the figures to March—another big jump. We welcome all those visitors who are arriving. Many from the UK market come to visit friends and relatives, so for anyone who has got friends and relatives over there, make sure you encourage them to come here. They might want to check out our new Adelaide Oval and the great Riverbank Precinct in South Australia.

Canada led the North American recharge. We have had a 7.7 per cent increase from North America. We put a lot of that down to Greg Snell, who has done a wonderful job as our Best Jobs in the World winner. He has been blogging from Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula and right round South Australia after winning the job as animal carer. He has been cuddling koalas, swimming with sharks, tuna and sea lions, and everything else. There is no doubt that, in the youth market that he has been blogging to, we are seeing a fantastic turnaround. Greg finishes his six-month appointment in South Australia this weekend. I would like to thank him on behalf of all our tourism regions for the way that he has spread the word about South Australia right around the world. Social media is a very important tool to use right across all the demographics, and he has done a tremendous job with that 18 to 40 age group.

We do hear a lot of negative talk about how things are going with the economy in South Australia, and it is mainly from the opposition benches. However, we should get behind our tourism operators. We have 18,000 tourism business across the state. They employ 31,000 people right across this state. There is not an area in the million square kilometres of this state in which we cannot be running tourism operations. Whether it is Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, the Riverland, the Flinders, the Limestone Coast, Kangaroo Island, the Fleurieu—I'm going to leave someone out—the Barossa, it is really important that we get behind our tourism operators.

The government wants to work shoulder to shoulder and hand-in-hand with tourism operators to make sure that we are marketing our great state right around Australia and the world. It is worth \$5 billion a year to our economy. We want to grow that to \$8 billion a year by 2020. We are not going to do it on our own. The individual private sector is not going to do it on its own either, but we need to work together to attract more airlines into South Australia, like we have. Adelaide Airport is the fastest-growing international airport in the country for the second year running. These things do not happen by accident. It is about getting in and talking to people from the airline industry.

We are also seeing record cruise ship numbers this year. Up to 29 cruise ships will arrive this year, and we have got 37 coming in next year. They are going to ports like Penneshaw and Port Lincoln. We know that every time a cruise ship arrives in Kangaroo Island it drops \$200,000 into the local economy. That is fantastic for tourism operators there. We tried to get one into Robe this year. Unfortunately there were big swells, but we will be back having another go next season, because I know the people of Coonawarra and the people of Robe, Millicent and Kingston did a lot of work preparing to host the visitors who could not quite get there.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** My question is to the Premier. Was the letter received by the Premier in June last year from Adelaide Capital Partners in respect of the Gillman property an expression of interest or an unsolicited proposal?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:00):** I will take the question on notice. I don't know what letter to which the member is referring.

**GILLMAN LAND SALE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00):** Let's hope the memory improves. My question again is to the Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is on two warnings. The remark that she just made is entirely out of order.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I fall on your mercy, Mr Speaker, which might be dangerous.

**The SPEAKER:** Quite.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I humbly beg to have a supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Thank you. To the Premier: did the Premier receive a detailed proposal from Adelaide Capital Partners in June last year regarding the land at Gillman, or did he receive a letter that Fred Hansen has stated 'did not have substantial detail'?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:01):** Well, I will go through this again. I would have thought that those on the other side, after the evidence that Mr Hansen gave to the select committee that was made public the other day, would feel a little shame-faced about coming in here asking further questions about the Gillman land arrangements. Mr Hansen came before the committee and contradicted in every material respect all of the key contentions that were made by those opposite. I would have thought an apology rather than a series of searching questions would have been more appropriate, but nevertheless, keep going down this track.

I do urge you, once again, to conduct yourself in a way which does not jeopardise the opportunity which has been presented by this arrangement. We have just been told by Mr Hansen, as I understand it—I haven't read his transcript in detail, but I see the reported remarks, which are consistent with everything that he has said to me—that this is an arrangement which represents good value for money. It is not yet even a concluded arrangement—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** That's right.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —it is merely an option that they are exploring, and one hopes that the conduct of those opposite doesn't scare away the investors which are going to be essential to making this arrangement work. But I will take on notice all of the questions that the member asked, the detailed questions about this matter.

I have said before in this place that I had only an initial and limited association with this matter at the behest of the head of the Economic Development Board, Mr Raymond Spencer, who came to me warranting this very important proposal. I think I had one meeting (it may have been two, I can't recall) with the proponents. It was then given to the relevant minister and the relevant agency to carry out the relevant processes, which I think took over six months. I think there were probity officers involved—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** The whole time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —there were investigations as to the appropriate land use, and there was an assessment of the appropriate valuation. It ended up being a price which was many orders of magnitude beyond that which was either ever offered or valued. I just hope this isn't another one of those wild goose chases such as was served up to you from the member for Unley concerning the Debelle inquiry or the Criminon documents. I hope that this is not another—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, you wasted 18 months of the last government pursuing me with the most personal, disgraceful attacks on my credibility and then, of course, it all blew up in the campaign. So I hope the—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta has a point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** Under 98: I fear we have strayed from the question about Fred Hansen's words.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the point of order and I also warn the Treasurer for punctuating the Premier's answer with revivalist meeting type interjections.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04):** May I have a further supplementary?

**The SPEAKER:** Further supplementary.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** When Mr Fred Hansen gave his evidence and stated that, in July and August 2013, 'a series of discussions occurred that were really outlining what would need to be in a proposal to even be able to be considered by government', was the state government following its own unsolicited proposals policy?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:05):** I will take that question on notice and bring back an answer to the house but, just so you are aware of what the process was, we had the head of the EDB who was warranting the importance of this project as a significant project concerning the future economic development of this state. He brought that proposition to me with the proponent and then the matter was sent off to the relevant agency and the relevant minister who, I understood, undertook the investigations consistent with all of the relevant protocols.

That is my present advice and I have no reason to doubt it. Then it was presented to cabinet and the cabinet decision was made to give this company the option so that they could go away and spend very considerable amounts of money before they could put themselves in a position to actually commit to this arrangement. That is all that's happened, and I am sure you will spend the next few months pursuing, essentially, this false alley.

Just like the member for Unley led you up a false path in relation to the Church of Scientology, and just like the member for Unley led you up a false path in relation to your attacks on me in relation to the Debelle inquiry, you will waste more time and effort and you will continue to bog yourself down without addressing the real issues that confront this state, which are about creating jobs. Why do you think we would be actually pursuing this with as much vigour as we are if it was not directed solely and entirely about developing this state so that we can create jobs so that our kids can have a future?

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before the next question, I remind the Treasurer that he is on two warnings. Deputy leader.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:06):** My question is again to the Premier. During the two months that Renewal SA was discussing the purchase of land at Gillman with Adelaide Capital Partners without a detailed proposal existing, did Renewal SA provide Adelaide Capital Partners with any information that was not available publicly?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:07):** As the person responsible to the parliament for Renewal, I will seek information about that matter and get back to the house.

#### BRITANNIA ROUNDABOUT

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:07):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister please update the house about the recognition for the Britannia roundabout project?

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Treasurer!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:07):** I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this project. I was delighted to be advised that the Britannia roundabout project has been recognised by

the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australasia at their annual excellence awards held last Friday.

The award of excellence in design and/or construction of a public works project is a tribute to the innovation and hard work of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure project team. I know that the previous minister for transport and infrastructure is also very proud of the Britannia roundabout project and the project team's achievements.

The reconfiguration of the roundabout in November of last year at a cost of approximately \$3.2 million has allowed traffic to navigate this intersection with greater safety. What was previously a difficult intersection to traverse has become an intersection that South Australians increasingly find a lot easier to use. Members would be aware that the redevelopment turned the complex, five-way roundabout into a much simpler configuration using two smaller roundabouts.

Recent crash statistics indicate the project has been a success in reducing incidents at the intersection. Between November 2013 and March this year, we have seen a 36 per cent reduction in crashes, while also increasing traffic moving through the intersection by 10 per cent overall. The new design has given drivers more space and time, while also reducing the speed that vehicles enter the intersection.

The Britannia roundabout solution was developed through the use of new traffic modelling tools. The project team used new technology to reflect real-life circumstances which allowed the team to verify that the proposed modifications would not decrease travel times or efficiency of traffic movements.

I am pleased to report the accolades don't end there. The traffic modelling used in the design of the Britannia roundabout project is now being looked at by planning and engineering experts across the world. Indeed, it was recently discussed by DPTI representatives with much interest at the 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Roundabouts in Seattle, Washington. The conference explored innovative and effective uses of roundabouts to help enhance the safety and efficiency of intersections.

It also examined the international influences on North American roundabout design practices. Once again, I will ensure that I extend invitations to the member for Goyder and other interested members for the fifth international conference, I understand to be held next year. Once again, I would like to congratulate the department project team on receiving this international accolade and acclaim. It is well deserved, and I am sure that thousands of South Australian motorists would also agree.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley, who remarkably is still with us.

#### **GLYNDE SUBSTATION**

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:11):** My question is to the Premier: has the Premier committed to making government land available to ensure that a suitable alternative site for the Glynde substation is found?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:11):** The government took a detailed policy to the election about the Glynde substation, and that substation policy was very simple: we would do all we could to help SA Power Networks find an alternative site.

Luckily, SA Power Networks has advised the government that it is now working (I believe) with Renewal SA and the appropriate government bodies to find an alternative site. That doesn't rule out the site, but we will be doing everything we possibly can to try and minimise the impact if that site is chosen. But we are doing our damndest to make sure that an alternative site is found, because it is the right thing to do by those residents.

I also point out that substations is a very finely balanced argument. When members opposite privatised our electricity assets they also privatised the function of—as I understand it, so I am advised—development approvals. For things like substations in very controversial areas like residential areas where people don't want to have substations—quite rightly; no-one would want to live next to a substation—that power was taken away from government and given to a private company like SA Power Networks.



The government has owned that site for over 50 years for a substation so the people of Glynde would not be short of power. We are doing everything we can to try and find an alternative site, and we will continue to do everything we can to find an alternative site. But these problems exist all across metropolitan Adelaide, and I am sure there are many members who have substations in their electorate near residential areas where they would like to see them either moved or not developed.

It is a very difficult piece of public policy when we have something that is as important as electricity and we have development or power sitting and resting with a private company on the basis of a privatisation. I think that can cause a lot of angst amongst the public, and we are doing all we can. The local councils can do more—I would like to see them do more. I think the state government can do more, and SA Power Networks can do more. A cooperative approach to this is to work together to try and find an alternative site.

The part that concerns me as energy minister is that Glynde's power supply is becoming very close to the low peak, so we could see rolling stoppages if demand keeps on growing. Thus far we have seen demand not grow at that rate, so there shouldn't be an issue with the Glynde substation needing to be built any time soon. So that gives us plenty of time to go out and find an alternative site. This is a very good example of a local MP who worked exceptionally hard to try and get a good outcome for their constituents.

**Ms Redmond:** And now they've got a better MP!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Spoken like a true impartial judge, jury and executioner! Are you going to accuse someone of corruption again? Got a spare five minutes to accuse someone else of corruption? So we do what we can and I welcome a discussion with the member for Hartley about how we can find an alternative site nearby that will service his constituents, because I can tell you one thing that the constituents will not accept, and that is freezing to death in the dark.

#### OPEN DATA INITIATIVES

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:14):** My question is directed to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister inform the house about the action the government has taken since the Premier's launch of the Open Data Action Plan on 21 November 2013?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:15):** I thank the member for this question. I am pleased to inform honourable members that the Office for the Chief Information Officer has initiated regular open data forums with SA government and local councils, and released an open data toolkit designed to assist agencies to discover, classify and publish the data available to them. By supporting open data initiatives, this government provides opportunities for business, the community and entrepreneurs to collaborate, participate and use appropriate data in ways that help and benefit all South Australians.

The SA government data portal ([data.sa.gov.au](http://data.sa.gov.au)) was initially launched with 217 data sets, and now has 243 data sets available for use by business and the community, with agencies designating an open data advocate who is responsible for encouraging and facilitating the public release of data from within their agency. I can also inform the house that I am about to send an open invitation to the public sector at large to become further involved in this exciting initiative, and I will request CEs to again look at releasing even more data where it is appropriate to do so.

The South Australian government is also about to host the second Unleashed competition, which is the South Australian node of a national open data competition called GovHack, and it will be from 11 to 13 July. The Unleashed competition is an activity listed in the Open Data Action Plan, and will demonstrate: first, the possibilities when data is made available to creative entrepreneurs; second, how collaboration can bring new skills to create public benefit at minimal cost to government; and third, how we can stimulate small digital enterprise in South Australia. The competition will be hosted concurrently in Adelaide and Mount Gambier, and will assist our regions by supporting statewide development of our digital economy and entrepreneur communities.

The first Unleashed competition was a huge success, with over 100 participants, with 28 innovative digital ideas submitted. The Unleashed first-place prize, titled Unleashed 2013 Premier's Award, was co-sponsored by Deloitte Digital, Chiliad Consulting and the Office of the

Chief Information Officer. The award was designed to assist the winner to commercialise their innovation that used open data.

Social Active won the last Premier's prize, and this innovative app was launched in December 2013. Social Active is an exciting new social web application that facilitates fast and easy community interactions. In addition to Unleashed, the Machinery of Data competition, which aims to combine open data with hardware, artistic design or manufacturing, was launched on 23 May at Majoran Distillery to a full house of artists, makers and crafters, who have 11 weeks to build and make their entry.

The Machinery of Data competition is a collaborative project with the government, community and local industry, including partnerships with Fab Lab Adelaide and Hackerspace Adelaide, who are assisting to run a series of events related to Machinery of Data. The competitions provide opportunities for state and local government, industry, the community and entrepreneurs to collaborate, participate and build on shared knowledge and connections to improve open data and entrepreneurial outcomes across South Australia.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **OPERATION FLINDERS**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:18):** I rise today to speak about an absolutely outstanding program that operates in my electorate of Stuart, Operation Flinders, and to share with the house very concerning media reports this morning that the government is considering cutting its funding support to Operation Flinders in the upcoming budget. I urge the government not to do this. This will be an extremely small cost to the budget, but an incredibly important contribution to Operation Flinders.

Many members of parliament, from both sides of this house, are very familiar with Operation Flinders. Many members of Parliament have visited Operation Flinders at Yankaninna station. I believe this is a program that receives very genuine and broad bipartisan support and I think it would be a dreadful shame if this program were not to receive ongoing funding.

Yankaninna Station is in the Flinders Ranges, as you might know, in the electorate of Stuart. Many of the at-risk youth who participate in the Operation Flinders programs are from my electorate, but many of them are from Adelaide and many of them are from other places all around the state. I understand that Operation Flinders has received \$400,000 in the last four years from the government, so \$100,000 per year, on average. It actually costs \$100,000 per year, on average—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order: we have established over a number of years that photographs are not to be taken in the chamber. There was leeway given during the maiden speeches, but this is just getting ridiculous when government members continue to do this.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Picton):** I will take that on notice. I understand the minister is going to put it away. I will get some advice from the Speaker.

**Mr GARDNER:** Thank you, sir. A fine ruling.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** One hundred thousand dollars per year is also what it costs, on average, to keep a prisoner in prisons in South Australia. So, for exactly the same price that the government has been contributing to—and is considering taking away from—Operation Flinders, that is exactly the same cost to house one prisoner in our correctional services system for one year.

Last year, 400 people participated in Operation Flinders programs—400 at-risk youths participated in these programs. So, for the cost required to keep one person in prison for one year, the government contributes the same amount of money to help 400 young at-risk people participate in this very successful program—this program which helps keep people out of prison, with a proven track record, which gets people back onto the straight and narrow, and helps people turn their lives around in very important ways. It helps to keep them out of prison. If only one person out of the 400 who participated in that program last year was kept out of prison—and I am sure it was many more—it was a break even for the government. So, this really cannot be justified even on a cost-cutting exercise, even if the government was so heartless to do so.

I will share a few aspects of this program with the house. The exercises typically last eight days in duration at Yankaninna Station. The exercise route is spread over a 100 kilometre circuit

around Yankaninna Station and teams walk an average of 100 kilometres over those eight days. They participate in a range of activities which are deliberately there to test them. It is not meant to be easy. It is meant to be difficult. It is meant to make them confront themselves in difficult situations, such as abseiling down a 30-metre high cliff.

Cultural activities are very important in this part of the world. With two people from the local Adnyamathanha community, the traditional owners of this part of the northern Flinders, participants are exposed to Aboriginal culture and learn from Adnyamathanha dreaming. That is a very important part of the program, keeping in mind that many of the participants are Aboriginal people themselves.

Team challenges: one of them involves using ropes and equipment to transport themselves and their equipment safely over a designated 'poisoned' waterhole. Another challenge is to build a bridge across a designated 'flooded' creek. These are the sorts of challenges that people participate in. These are the sorts of activities that make them confront themselves. These are the sorts of activities which bring youths to face difficulties, to face themselves, to join together in teamwork successfully and to go on to better lives.

### PERFORMING ARTS

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24):** It is my pleasure to report to the house on two examples of how the performing arts contribute to the community. In the most recent case, it was a privilege to attend the penultimate performance of the most recent production of the Marie Clark Musical Theatre Company, last Saturday's matinee of Calamity Jane at the Arts Theatre in Angas Street, by arrangement with Josef Weinberger Ltd.

I am honoured to be co-patron, along with Peter Goers OAM, of this wonderful group now in its 40<sup>th</sup> year. Marie Clark was a highly-regarded teacher of singing and piano in the Tea Tree Gully area who established a concert party of her pupils and singers to entertain charity groups such as Legacy, the Red Cross and schools. The group presented its first major stage show in 1974 called Trial by Jury and have subsequently continued to perform shows each year.

My congratulations go to all involved this year: director Ben Stefanoff was ably complemented by musical director, his wife, Kristin Stefanoff and her 13 piece orchestra in their first husband and wife collaboration. Choreographer Rachel Dow rounds out the three principals in the creative team, assisted by superb individuals in each of their areas (too many to name here) in the wider creative team and, of course, a great technical crew.

The cast were, as Ben said in his director's notes, perfect in their roles. Leads Tegan Gully as Calamity and Andrew Crispe as Wild Bill were more than able to present the full depth of their characters with fine singing and acting and were ably supported by Leah Potter as Katie and Damien Quick as Danny, with an excellent support cast, including Mason Willis, Georgia Bolton, Doug Phillips, Sophia Dimopoulos, Tanya Grabis, Sean Hilton, Jamie Wright, Ashleigh McFadden, Buddy Dawson, and more than a dozen players in the ensemble.

Whether because of the fine performances by the Marie Clark Musical Theatre or the universal appeal of the Sammy Frain/Paul Francis Webster music and lyrics, this version of the perennial musical western adapted by Ronald Hamner and Phil Park from the stage play by Charles K. Freeman (after the Warner Bros film written by James O'Hanlon) was a fantastic performance enjoyed by all in attendance.

There were many highlights in the show and it was a tremendous credit to all involved. I hope the season was well supported by the many devoted fans of this wonderful company, enjoying a resurgence of vitality both on stage and behind the scenes. Many hands made light work of this polished performance and season. I draw everyone's attention to the next production of this fine theatre company: Young Frankenstein at the Goodwood Institute, with performances from 31 October to 8 November. Please refer to their website [www.marieclark.asn.au](http://www.marieclark.asn.au) for full details. I look forward to seeing everyone who enjoys musical theatre of a high standard at that time.

The other example is a cultural event that occupies a significant spot on the annual calendar of many young jazz devotees and instrumentalists from schools all over Australia who take part in Generations in Jazz, which takes over Mount Gambier each year in May.

Congratulations again go to Karen Roberts and the board of Generations in Jazz and everyone who makes this such a special event; the dozens of volunteers and service club personnel,

themselves volunteers, who make sure that the hundreds of visitors are well cared for at this three-day extravaganza. James Morrison is again to be congratulated for all he does, bringing along Gordon Goodwin and the Big Phat Band from the US, special guests Rai Thistlethwayte and Marian Petrescu, Idea of North and Ross Irwin. They all ensured that the standard was high again this year.

Thanks go to the sponsors: The Pat Corrigan Musicians and Arts Fund, along with a very big list, including the City of Mount Gambier, the District Council of Grant, the Scott Group of Companies, Stuckeys, OGR, the Australian Piano Warehouse, Winston Music, the Barn, ABC Jazz, James Morrison Enterprises, Schaefer Instruments and MGA Insurance Brokers. I note that the government of the United States of America was involved this year. There were many other dozens of local businesses involved in making it a great weekend.

There are now five divisions in the contests. Division 1 had 10 bands, and that was won by Blackburn High School from Victoria; Marryatville High came second, our own South Australian school; and Northcote High in Victoria came third. Division 2 had 27 bands: first place went to Caulfield Grammar in Victoria; second again to Marryatville High School from South Australia; and South Australia's Prince Alfred College came third. Division 3 has two sections. Section 1 had 21 bands, which was won by Prince Alfred College in South Australia, Marryatville High in South Australia came second and Eltham High in Victoria came third.

Division 3.2 had 23 bands, and that was won by Yarra Valley Grammar, Concordia in South Australia came second and Wilderness School came third. Division 4 had 25 bands: Prince Alfred College in South Australia won that, second place went to Eltham High in Victoria and third place went to Bendigo South East Secondary College.

My own interest on this weekend was Modbury High School, which was conducted by its musical director, Ms Rosie Carr, and they placed very well in division 3.1. I was accompanied down to Mount Gambier by their principal Martin Rumsby, several teaching staff and specialist music teachers. Our thanks must go to all the music teachers in the department, particularly the specialist teachers, for their dedication to our students.

### LOWER FIELD RIVER

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:29):** This week marks eight years since one of Hallett Cove's most successful environmental groups was formed. Meeting in the home of David and Linda Greenhough, a group of southern Hallett Cove residents came together to discuss the degraded Lower Field River and from that group of interested local residents emerged Friends of the Lower Field River.

For those who do not know the Field River, it sources up in the seat of Fisher at Chandlers Hill, makes its way through Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley, then into the seat of Mitchell, Trott Park and Sheidow Park, before entering Gulf St Vincent at Hallett Cove beach. It has been described by Professor Chris Daniels of Uni SA, a well-known South Australian ecologist, as one of the few largely intact natural rivers to be found today in metropolitan Adelaide.

The group of residents who came together to form Friends of the Lower Field River were not what you would call traditional greenies. They were a group of people who looked at a river and realised that the water quality was poor. Every time there was a flood down that river there was a large amount of rubbish—tyres, bicycles, shopping trolleys, graffiti cans, all the usual rubbish—heading down into the gulf, and they wanted to do something to stop that.

Not only was there a problem with rubbish in the river, there were also plenty of olive trees, castor oil plants, gazanias, pine trees, onion grass, and all manner of other non-native weeds choking the river and the parkland that surrounds the river. There was also a sewage spill in late 2006 from a water facility further upstream which caused a high level of nutrients in the river and caused all sorts of algae blooms and the like.

This group of residents who came together to begin some environmental action to transform the river and its environs started off with a regular series of working bees called Field Work in the Field River Days, held on Saturday mornings approximately once a month. Members who are worth recognising are as mentioned before David and Linda Greenhough (David Greenhough remains the chair of the group), Bob MacDonald, Ross and Debra Morriss, Ian Crossland, Barry and Sandy Wood, Damian Landrigan, Danny Wearing, and previous members, Dr David Squirrel, Colin Waterman, Wendy Hill and Allan Paris.

My early community work in Hallett Cove, as a relatively new resident in the area, was formed working with Friends of the Lower Field River. This group became much more than just an environmental group. Over the space of the last eight years it has been cause for a community to be strengthened. People know their neighbours in southern Hallett Cove who did not know each other before. People wave to each other when they pass in the street. It has really been a community capacity building exercise as well as a great environmental project.

Recent water testing has shown that the river's water quality has dramatically improved since the group formed. The non-native vegetation throughout the area has been cleared and replaced with native trees. These have now grown from saplings in 2006 and 2007 to gum trees which now tower above the heads of people who walk through that area. It really is an example of where a community can come together to make quite dramatic environmental change. In the days when we think that often environmental problems are far too big for individuals and groups to come together to change, I think this is a really powerful example at the local level where a group of interested locals came together, partnered with their local council, the City of Marion, partnered with Adelaide Metro who are owners of part of the land and partnered with local schools and other community groups to get this work done.

Much of the area is now looking after itself. The new vegetation has gotten to the point where there is not the same number of working bees required. Again, a great testament to what can happen when a community comes together for environmental good, but the side effects of that are a much stronger community and neighbours who know each other and that is a great thing.

#### NATIONAL COMMISSION OF AUDIT

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:34):** I have been interested in following some of the issues arising from the National Commission of Audit report, and following from that the federal budget. I know there has been a lot of discussion in this place about the effect of the federal budget but I was really shocked to hear that the Asbestos Safety and Eradication Agency is going to be scrapped. This organisation was set up last year, I understand, by the Labor government with the support of the Coalition to deliver on the national strategic plan on asbestos.

Although I would not always quote *The Sydney Morning Herald*, they say that Australia has the highest per capita rate of asbestos disease in the world, so that was a fairly dreadful statistic that they have raised. They also say that from their research 40,000 people are expected to die in the third wave of asbestos related diseases. We are not talking about something that just affects a few people in the building industry, for example. We are talking about a major crisis, in my view. The axing of this agency was identified by the National Commission of Audit as a cost-saving measure and then sadly taken up in the federal budget.

Because of my respect for the work that our many unions do in South Australia, I asked the Commonwealth Public Sector Union to tell me about what the effects of the budget were on their members in South Australia. What they have told me is that, over the past year (2013-14), 2,695 jobs have been cut, with a further 7,336 jobs to go in the 2014-15 year, equalling a 4.1 per cent cut. This includes 2,329 workers from the ATO, 535 from DFAT and 489 from the CSIRO. They say the government will cut 16,500 jobs from the Australian Public Service over the next three years.

This is added to the government's doubling of the efficiency dividend imposed on agencies from 1.25 per cent to 2.5 per cent. The Australian Research Council has also received a one-off 3.25 per cent efficiency dividend to be administered in the funding for 2015-16. The ABC will lose \$120 million, while \$8 million has been cut from SBS. The CSIRO will lose \$114.7 million and the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) will lose \$27.6 million. The Australian Institute of Marine Science will lose \$7.8 million.

As we have heard in this place, in addition to the already announced privatisation of Medibank Private, the budget announced scoping studies for putting Australian Hearing, Defence Housing Limited, the Royal Australian Mint and the registry function of Australian Securities and Investments on the privatisation list. I think there is some real concern there, not only for jobs but for the quality of the services that we have grown to appreciate and take for granted and what it will mean for South Australians on top of all the other issues that have been raised by my colleagues in this place.

### SCHUBERT ELECTORATE

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:38):** I rise today to speak about two parcels of land in the Schubert electorate that have been for sale for quite some time but still remain on the market. I have recently been involved with discussions with local community groups about the vacant land that are in two regional townships and the possibility of the ownership of that land being returned to the local community. As a new MP, I have had many constituents and people coming to me with proposals about spending government money. Some of them are ambit claims, some of them are much more thought through and have obvious benefits to the community.

It is often the case that people come expecting that government money is an endless pool, or government money is seen as an endless pool, and that is certainly very much not the case. Much of what we argue about here in this chamber is around the limited resources that government has.

I would contend that, in this case, for these two pieces of land it is entirely sensible—and it would not cost much for the state government—to remit these two parcels of land back to the community to create community spaces that help to bring those towns together. The first parcel of land is the area surrounding the Mannum primary school, which has been on the market for seven years, since the school was closed in 2005 and merged with the high school to become Mannum Community College in 2006.

The land around the old Mannum primary school consists of three allotments totalling 2.12 hectares. I understand that one of the three allotments is eminently saleable and there is interest in developing that one portion of the land; but because those three titles are encompassed together as one parcel the offer does not stand to purchase all three. Certainly, I would like to see, first off, the land split into three parts so that one parcel of land can be developed and the other two parcels of vacant land could then be gifted back to the community.

The Mid Murray Council purchased the old school building in 2010 at a cost of what I understand was about a quarter of a million dollars, and it has undertaken extensive works to turn it into a Mannum Community Hub opposite the Mannum Community College. I was pleased to attend the opening of the hub in April, and I was very glad to have my federal colleague, the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, there.

I was also extremely delighted to have there the Minister for Regional Development, the member for Frome, both opening a fantastic centre in which the local council had invested dollars on behalf of the community. It has been able to develop a hub that offers extensive services, whether it be administering services to elderly people, courses for improving IT skills for local residents, or offering other WEA classes and courses. It is a fantastic place. The community has taken a school that had closed down and brought it back to a point where is now a hub for the community to come together.

The second piece of land is the old Moculta primary school, which was closed at the end of 2010, and has now been on the market for some three years. The site comprises vacant land and an old school building. When I visited that school building earlier this year it was completely derelict. In the middle of a small town of only a couple of hundred people—I think there are about 70 or 80 houses—there is this one building which is a blight on that community space. The community wants to bring it back and revitalise it so that they can again be very proud of their town.

According to Renewal SA's fact sheet on the disposal of surplus government land, each government department is required to regularly review its landholdings to determine whether the land is being fully used in a sustainable way to achieve government objectives. I wrote a letter to the department asking about these parcels of land. In correspondence from Renewal SA dated 28 April 2014, they state that 'to date there has been very limited interest in either of these properties', which, to my mind, is a way of saying nobody really wants to buy them.

The Moculta community would potentially turn this into a multipurpose area for postal services, an art gallery, cafe and historical centre. The Mannum community, with their parcel of land, would like to activate this as an open space for community sport and recreation facilities. Local businesses are ready to support the development of a playground and amenities. I understand that this land is sitting on the balance sheet as part of the government's budget; but if no one is prepared to buy it what is it really worth? I would say that to the community it is worth a lot. I know that there are many ambit claims made around it, but surely—

Time expired.

### GREAT CYCLE CHALLENGE

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:44):** I rise today to inform the house briefly about an upcoming charity event called the 'Great Cycle Challenge, Riding to Fight Kids' Cancer', which is a fundraising initiative of the Children's Medical Research Institute. Having recently become a little obsessed with cycling myself—and, yes, I do now own lycra; I am one of those people—I was—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**Mr ODENWALDER:** You haven't seen it. I was interested to read about the Great Cycle Challenge online. The Great Cycle Challenge encourages participants to get on their bikes as often as possible during October and to clock as many kilometres as they can to raise much needed funds for research into childhood cancer. I will be one of those riders this year, and as well as asking for sponsorship for a good cause, I plan to talk to members about recommended rides in their own electorates to get my kilometres up.

I have been in training, as well as riding around my own electorate. I have already explored parts of the electorates of the members for Kaurua, Mawson, Lee and Adelaide by bike, and I look forward to also donning the lycra around parts of Frome and Schubert and visiting some wineries along the way—and perhaps Newland. Participants are connected to their personal online challenge page, making it easy for them to track their progress against other riders from all across Australia.

Last year was the first year of the challenge, and participants rode 1,061,415 kilometres and raised \$1,233,684 to fight kids' cancer. As I said, the challenge is an initiative of the Children's Medical Research Institute, who were behind the successful and well-known Jeans for Genes Day held in August each year. Over its 21 years, the campaign has raised more than \$60 million for research into genetic diseases, birth defects and cancers.

The institute was founded in 1958 with funds raised by Australia's very first telethon, and for its time a very large public campaign. It is a world-leading independent research institute dedicated to discovering how to prevent or treat birth defects and diseases such as cancer, epilepsy and a range of genetic disorders, and of course, as I said, a major focus of the institute is childhood cancer. The cancer unit was formed at the CMRI in 1988 and already has an impressive list of major achievements, which can all be found on the institute's website. However, there is much more to discover.

While I was reading more about the challenge, I was touched to read the personal stories of kids like Freddy, Ella and Zoe, who have all been diagnosed with cancer. As a dad, I cannot imagine the impact that it has, not only on these little people, but also on their families and friends. Sadly, around 600 Aussie kids are diagnosed with cancer every year, and this is why the Children's Medical Research Institute and other research organisations like them are so important and why their research is so vital.

So, for the 31 days of October, I will be riding as far and as often as possible to raise money to fight childhood cancer, and I would urge all members of the house to get involved with this fantastic event. If they are not willing to ride, they will be able to sponsor me via my personal fundraising page, or they can at least recommend wineries along the way.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

*Address in Reply*

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**The SPEAKER:** I have to inform the house that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the house for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 4pm. I ask the mover and seconder of the address and other members to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the address.

[Sitting suspended from 15:49 to 16:34]

**The SPEAKER:** I inform the house that accompanied by the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech, and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the address adopted by the house on 21 May to which His Excellency was pleased to make this reply:

Thank you for your Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the First Session of the Fifty-Third Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray that your deliberations will add meaning and value to the lives of our South Australian community.

His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce.

#### *Motions*

### **INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION**

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:36):** I move:

That pursuant to section 30 of the Fair Work Act 1994, the nominee of this house to the panel to consult with the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding the appointment to the position of Deputy Commissioner to the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia be the member for Little Para.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:37):** I would like to move an amendment to the motion. Do I need to have that in writing?

**The SPEAKER:** It would be handy.

**Mr GARDNER:** Do you want me to vamp for a moment while that is being brought down?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, do that.

**Mr GARDNER:** Well, I think that the tradition in this place is that matters such as this are in fact dealt with in consultation with a member of the government and a member of the opposition. It is my understanding that a member of the government has been appointed in the other place to be their representative in this matter, and I therefore would move that the member for Davenport, rather than the member for Little Para, be placed in this motion. I believe that we now have that in writing, and, therefore, I move:

That the words 'Little Para' be deleted and replaced with the word 'Davenport'.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (16:38):** The reason that the opposition has moved this amendment is that the government is about to go through a process of setting up a panel for appointment for the Deputy Commissioner position to the Industrial Relations Commission and, under the act, the lower house appoints one person, and the Legislative Council appoints another. It is a surprise to the opposition that the government is proposing to appoint a Labor member from the lower house and a Labor member from the upper house, which is against all traditions of this particular provision.

I have previously been a shadow minister for industrial relations when the former member for Lee, Michael Wright, was the minister and he made sure that there was one person from the other major party as part of the consultation process. What we have here is the minister suggesting that the Labor Minister for Industrial Relations is going to be consulting with a Labor backbencher from the lower house and a Labor backbencher from the upper house, and the opposition gets no say whatsoever to an appointment to the Industrial Relations Commission. That has never been the practice.

We say that the appropriate thing is that the member for Davenport happens to be the Shadow Minister for Industrial Relations and is the appropriate representative of this house, and the government can move their representative from another place. So this simple amendment reinstates what has been the practice in relation to these provisions for my 20 years in this place and that is that there be one person representative of each of the major parties in these sorts of appointments.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I do not wish to make any more of an issue of this matter than needs be the case. I have to say that this matter is something to which I have not spent a great deal of time attending. Indeed, I thought I was of the understanding this was a routine matter coming before the house. If it turns out that unexpectedly the upper house—which has a limited number of Labor members—has nominated one of those limited number to be on the committee and it is indeed not



the practice that there is one from each house from the same side of parliament, I would just like the opportunity to have a look at that. So I am happy for this to be adjourned while I have a talk with the member for Davenport and we will try and work it out.

**The SPEAKER:** You seek leave to continue your remarks?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I do indeed, yes.

Leave granted.

**The SPEAKER:** The adjourned debate be made an order for the day—on motion perhaps.

**Mr GARDNER:** On motion, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** And with the question of vamping, is that in the urban dictionary?

**Mr GARDNER:** Sir, I suggest that you google it.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Ms REDMOND:** Sir, I understand it is the equivalent of 'scat' in jazz.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you to the member for Heysen for her assistance.

Debate adjourned.

### *Bills*

## **PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (ELECTORAL LAWS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE) 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 Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:42):** Obtained leave to introduce a bill for an act to amend the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 to provide for the establishment of the Electoral Laws and Practices Committee.

**The SPEAKER:** Attorney, the long title of your bill does not correspond with the Notice of Motion because it adds a number of words after 'Parliamentary Committees Act 1991'.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Let me have a look. Mr Speaker. I gather that the original Notice of Motion has been, courtesy of the staff, enhanced with more language.

**The SPEAKER:** Enhanced, that is true.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** So in order to align myself with their enhanced wording, I seek leave to move it in a slightly amended form.

**The SPEAKER:** That would be good—and don't worry, in my time as attorney one of our bills from this house was refused the royal assent.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I think I remember. This is the amended form. I move:

That I have leave to introduce, in amended form, a bill for an act to amend the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 to provide for the establishment of the Electoral Laws and Practices Committee; and to make a related amendment to the Parliamentary Remuneration Act of 1990.

Leave granted.

Bill 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 Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:45):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 to establish the Electoral Laws and Practices Committee. In the last parliamentary term, the government was responsible for the

introduction of some significant reforms to South Australia's electoral laws, in an effort to strengthen our state's democracy and to restore public confidence in electoral processes.

To further the government's continued commitment to protecting the integrity of the electoral system and ensuring maximum participation in the democratic process, the government believes it is important to establish a nonpartisan parliamentary committee that can inquire into and report on matters relating to electoral laws and practices.

Electoral reform consistently raises significant interest and debate. Since polling day earlier this year, there has been considerable discussion about many aspects of our system and speculation about how improvements can be made. By establishing a standing committee, the government is creating a constructive forum to investigate and consider electoral matters. The federal parliament has a joint standing committee on electoral matters. This government considers that it has and will continue to undertake very valuable work. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The intended functions of the Electoral Laws and Practices Committee are outlined in clause 15R of the Bill and include the following:

- to inquire into, consider and report on:
  - the conduct of parliamentary elections and referendums in South Australia;
  - the administration and operation of, and practices associated with, the *Electoral Act 1985* and any other law relating to electoral matters;
  - any other matter referred to the Committee by the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Electoral Act 1985*; and
- to perform other functions assigned to the Committee under this or any other Act by resolution of either the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council.

The Committee will consist of eight members, four of which must be appointed by the House of Assembly and four by the Legislative Council. As provided in clause 15Q, the eight members will include appointments from both major parties, in addition to independents or members of minor parties.

This approach endeavours to ensure the work undertaken by the committee exceeds political interests, in contrast to other partisan committees formed, that are so obviously intent on political point scoring as opposed to genuine reform.

A Minister of the Crown is eligible for appointment and the Committee is to be a paid committee. To provide for the remuneration of members, the Bill amends the schedule in the *Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990*.

It is intended that once established, the Committee first inquire into all aspects of the conduct of the 2014 State election and matters related thereto.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*

###### 4—Insertion of Part 5F

This clause inserts new Part 5F:

###### Part 5F—Electoral Laws and Practices Committee

###### Division 1—Establishment and membership of Committee

###### 15P—Establishment of Committee

The Electoral Laws and Practices Committee is established.

###### 15Q—Membership of Committee

The Committee is to be comprised of 4 House of Assembly members and 4 Legislative Council members.

Division 2—Functions of Committee

15R—Functions of Committee

The functions of the Committee are to inquire into, consider and report on matters relating to electoral laws and practices (including the conduct of parliamentary elections and referendums in South Australia) and to perform other functions assigned to the Committee. The Minister responsible for the administration of the *Electoral Act 1985* may also refer matters to the Committee for it to inquire into, consider and report on.

Schedule 1—Related amendment to *Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990*

1—Amendment of Schedule—Additional salary

The Schedule is amended to provide for remuneration of the presiding member and other members of the Electoral Laws and Practices Committee.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

### **ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE OF ADELAIDE CHARITABLE TRUST (MEMBERSHIP OF TRUST) 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 Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:47):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide Charitable Trust Act 1981. 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 Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:48):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill amends the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide Charitable Trust Act 1981. The 1981 act was enacted to create the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide Charitable Trust as a corporation to take over and administer certain existing trusts and charitable undertakings within the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide.

Trust property vested in the trust by the act included charitable undertakings, purposes or trusts vested in the Catholic Church Endowment Society Incorporated, the Goodwood Orphanage, Largs Bay Orphanage and St John's Boys Home, as well as property held in trust for those institutions.

The primary objects of the trust are to take over and administer the existing trusts and charitable undertakings of those institutions as well as administer other charitable undertakings within the archdiocese. As well as vesting the above-mentioned properties in the trust, the act provides for the appointment of trustees to administer the trust and the powers and functions of the trust.

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

Leave granted.

The Act provides, at section 7, for the following trustees to administer the Trust:

- the Archbishop;
- a nominee of the Archbishop;
- the Provincial of the Sisters of Mercy Adelaide or her nominee;
- the Provincial of the Sisters of St Joseph or her nominee;
- the Provincial of the Salesians of St John Bosco or his nominee;
- such other member or members as are co-opted by the Trustees with the prior approval in writing of the Archbishop.

One of these entities, the Sisters of Mercy Adelaide, the Provincial of which is entitled, ex officio, to hold office as trustee, has restructured and merged into a new entity: the Institute of Sisters of Mercy of Australia and Papua New Guinea (the New Institute).

The New Institute and the Archdiocese want the New Institute to continue to participate through its Leader, ex officio, as trustee of the Trust.

There are two other ministry entities which, through their Provincials, are trustees of the Trust. One of those other entities has foreshadowed that it is also considering a similar restructure.

The Archdiocese requested that the Act be amended so as to accommodate any future restructures of any of the trustee entities, subject to the Archbishop certifying in writing that the restructured entity is the effective successor to the former entity, without the need for further amendments to the Act. This makes sense for efficiency.

The Bill amends the Act to provide that the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide Charitable Trust is to be administered by trustees that are the relevant heads of the ministry bodies that are 'designated ministries' under the Bill. 'Designated ministries' in the Bill are in turn defined to include the existing trustee ministries—the Salesians of Don Bosco, Sisters of St Joseph and the new Institute of Sisters of Mercy (to replace the existing reference to the Convent of Mercy (Adelaide) Incorporated)—as well as any ministry that the Archbishop determines to be the successor of an existing or future designated ministry, according to the principles of canon law, and declares as such.

The Bill provides that the Archbishop must cause a declaration to be published on the Archdiocese's website and in a newspaper. Therefore, it will be possible to determine who are trustees of the Trust at any relevant time.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal. There being no commencement clause, the measure will come into operation on receiving the Governor's assent.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide Charitable Trust Act 1981*

###### 3—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause proposes to substitute an obsolete definition with a current definition of the *Sisters of Mercy* and inserts a definition of *designated ministry* for the purposes of new section 4A (see clause 4).

###### 4—Insertion of section 4A

This amendment proposes to insert a new section 4A (Designated ministries). The new section declares each of the following ministries to be a *designated ministry* for the purposes of section 7(1):

- the Salesians of St John Bosco;
- the Sisters of Mercy;
- the Sisters of St Joseph.

The clause makes provision for future declarations to be made by the Archbishop declaring a successor ministry to be a designated ministry in substitution for the former ministry in the event that such a ministry should cease to exist in its current form. The Archbishop may also make a further declaration declaring a successor designated ministry to a substituted designated ministry should the need arise. The clause requires the Archbishop to have regard to the principles of canon law when making, varying or substituting a declaration under this section and sets out the requirements for publishing any such declaration.

###### 5—Amendment of section 5—Objects of Trust

This proposed amendment is consequential.

###### 6—Amendment of section 7—Membership of Trust

This proposed amendment is consequential.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Redmond.

### **SUCCESSION TO THE CROWN (REQUEST) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:50):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will allow the passage of commonwealth legislation to reform and modernise the rules of royal succession. It will ensure that males are no longer given precedence over females in the line of succession. It will also remove the current bar on those in line of succession from marrying a person of the Roman Catholic faith. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill will also allow the Commonwealth to legislate to repeal the *Royal Marriages Act 1772*. That Act provides that a marriage of a descendant of King George II that was not made with the monarch's permission is void.

Passage of the Commonwealth legislation is an important constitutional amendment as it will change the law relating to the effect of gender and marriage on royal succession consistently with changes made to the law in the United Kingdom and ensure that the Sovereign of Australia is the same person as the Sovereign of the United Kingdom. The changes will be retrospective. For example, the amendment in relation to succession to the Crown based on gender takes effect for any person born after 28 October 2011.

The Bill provides the mechanism for the South Australian Parliament to request and consent to the Commonwealth Parliament's enactment of legislation to change the rules of royal succession throughout Australia.

Section 51 (xxxviii) of the Australian Constitution gives the Commonwealth the power to pass legislation at the request of, or with the concurrence, of the Parliaments of all the States directly concerned.

The original proposal for these amendments arose at a Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Perth on 28 October 2011 where the leaders of the 16 realms who have Her Majesty the Queen as sovereign (including Australia) agreed to apply uniform changes to the rules of succession in each of their jurisdictions.

After the Perth decision, the matter was put to a meeting of the Council of Australian Governments. The Council agreed to introduce the reforms by a request and consent scheme relying on section 51 (xxxviii) of the Australian Constitution.

A request and consent Bill such as this does not allow the Commonwealth to change the rules of succession for Australia's sovereign in the future without further consultation. The Commonwealth Bill includes a provision (proposed section 12) to the effect that the Act can only be expressly or impliedly repealed or amended by an Act passed at the request or with the concurrence of the Parliaments of all the States.

The draft Commonwealth Bill is included as Schedule 1 of the South Australian Bill.

The Bill also makes consequential amendments to the *Treason Act 1351* passed by the Parliament of England (as it applies in South Australia) to remove references to eldest son and heir and replace them with references to eldest child and heir.

This is a significant reform as it will modernise the rules of royal succession and bring them more into line with the views of modern society.

I commend the Bill to Honourable Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

##### 1—Name of Act

This clause establishes the short title of the proposed Act.

##### 2—Commencement

This clause sets out the commencement of the Bill. Commencement occurs on the day of assent subject to the commencement of clauses 6, 7 and proposed Schedule 2. Clause 6 and proposed Schedule 2 come into operation on the day and time that section 6 of the Commonwealth Act commences and clause 7 comes into operation on the day and time that section 10 of the Commonwealth Act commences.

##### 3—Object of this Act

This clause sets out the object of the measure. The main object of the Bill is to facilitate the law relating to the effect of gender and marriage on royal succession being changed uniformly across Australia and consistently with changes made to that law in the United Kingdom. This is to ensure that the Sovereign of Australia is the same person as the Sovereign of the United Kingdom.

##### 4—Relationship with Sovereign not affected

Proposed section 4 makes it clear that it is not the intention of the Bill to affect the relationship between the Sovereign and the State as existing immediately before its enactment or that the relationship be in any way affected by the enactment by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of the Act requested by proposed section 5.

## Part 2—Request for Commonwealth legislation

## 5—Request for Commonwealth legislation

This clause states that the Parliament of the State requests the enactment by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of an Act in the terms, or substantially in the terms, set out in proposed Schedule 1.

## Part 3—General

## 6—Consequential amendment

This clause states that on the coming into operation of proposed Schedule 2, the Act specified in the heading to clause 1 of that Schedule is amended as set out in that clause.

## 7—References to Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement

Clause 7 provides that references in any law that is part of the law of the State, to the provisions of the Bill of Rights or the Act of Settlement relating to the succession to, or possession of, the Crown are to be read as including references to the provisions of this Act and of the Commonwealth Act the enactment of which is requested by section 5.

## Schedule 1—Requested Commonwealth Act

Proposed Schedule 1 sets out the *Succession to the Crown Act 2014* of the Commonwealth as requested by this Bill.

The Commonwealth Act makes various changes to the law relating to the effect of gender and marriage on royal succession.

## Schedule 2—Consequential amendment

1—Amendment of *Treason Act 1351* passed by the Parliament of England

Proposed Schedule 2 makes a consequential change to the *Treason Act 1351* passed by the Parliament of England (and this Act still forms part of the law of South Australia—see section 10 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

**SUPPLY BILL 2014***Supply Grievances*

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances (resumed on motion).

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:51):** Several hours ago, before this debate was adjourned, I briefly mentioned an accident that occurred at Port Elliot some time ago now and the ongoing grief of the family inasmuch as they cannot seem to get the department, the council or anybody else to listen to them about having a proper crossing put in to get across Port Elliot Road. I raise this matter here because it has been the subject of quite a bit of comment in *The Times* newspaper at Victor Harbor over the last couple of years.

It has raised its head again. I do not believe that it is going away, neither do I believe it should. I believe that it needs dealing with, and dealing with expeditiously. I ask, through the house, that the position is noted and picked up on by the minister and that he attempts to do something about that, to ease the minds of many people.

I intend to talk about health, but during the course of the day, when I was in my office, I happened to watch the *National Press Club* briefly. Former prime minister Bob Hawke was on and then former prime minister John Howard came on, but I did not catch all of that. I listened to Mr Hawke, who made a few interesting points.

One point that he reiterated several times was that, in his view, we need to get rid of the states and just have the federal institution only. I came to the view that it would probably be a good idea if he shared a bedroom with Malcolm Fraser from our side and that they both swap crazy ideas together. I think that history will judge Bob Hawke on some of his achievements, but my view is that he is significantly out of touch now, after so many years, on that particular issue.

I want to turn to health: it is a most critical issue across the nation, across the state and, more particularly, it is a critical issue in my electorate with only the two health services: the South Coast health service at Victor Harbor and the Kangaroo Island Health Service based at Kingscote. It worries me that there is a campaign of mistruths being put out by the state government. We witnessed the health minister today trying to beat his somewhat puny chest on health matters, trying to instil fear into the hearts of health workers and, more particularly, the general public.

I want to make sure that country people get everything they deserve by way of health facilities and health services. We have excellent health services at both Victor Harbor and Kingscote. I do not want to see them degraded but I do not trust this government one iota. Here is a challenge for the Minister for Regional Development. I do not know just how much power he has; it has been severely muted since last week, I would suggest—

**Ms Redmond:** When the quisling joined them.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Yes, that's right, as the member for Heysen said, 'When the quisling joined them.' The health services provide critical services to people across country South Australia, but they need to be maintained at the current levels or better. I look forward to seeing in the near future an increase in health funding to regional communities, rather than a decrease. It is about time regional communities got their fair share of the pathetically inadequate cake that has been left to the people of South Australia after 12 years of economic mismanagement by a government that is completely out of touch. With those remarks, I conclude my griève.

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (16:56):** I am delighted to have a further opportunity to make some comments in response to the Supply Bill. Yesterday, of course, I really only touched on matters relating to the economy. As it happens, over the last couple of days I have spent far more time than I normally would watching a bit of daytime TV and, like the member for Finnis, I happened upon the ABC's coverage of the National Press Club address which involved a conversation, I suppose you would say, with both former prime minister Hawke and former prime minister John Howard, both of whom I have met and had pleasant conversations with and both of whom I think are fairly sensible gentlemen.

One of the interesting things that former prime minister Hawke referred to in his speech when they were talking about the need for a social safety net—and former prime minister Howard reflected on the fact that although he is a great fan of America, America tends to be a bit too one-sided and does not actually capture enough people in their safety net but, on the other end, Europeans tend to be somewhat paternalistic and maybe a bit over the top. Australia, in general terms, with successive governments of either persuasion, have got the balance pretty right most of the time.

Former prime minister Hawke commented that the important thing that he saw in all of this debate was the need for educational opportunity. He said that if you put a grid over the whole of Australia, it is pretty clear that the youngsters who came from the higher socioeconomic groups tended to stay at school and youngsters who came from lower socioeconomic areas tended not to stay at school, and various governments, state and federal, Liberal and Labor, over a period of years, have been trying to address that problem.

He made the point fundamentally that if everyone gets equality of educational opportunity then that in the long term, and even in the medium and shorter term, helps us with this social underpinning, because if people are enabled—and education is the fundamental thing that enables people to make their way in the world—by getting an education, there is less need for the safety net; fewer people will fall through the cracks needing that safety net.

It is with that background in mind that I therefore want to make some comments about education in this state. Once upon a time South Australia was looked upon as the leading light in education. Around this nation, South Australia was truly looked upon as the place to go, the place other states looked to for our education system. Where are we now after 12 years of Labor? Now we are well below the national average in 19 out of the 20 areas tested nationally on the NAPLAN test system.

In 19 out of the 20 areas we are below the national average and in six of the 20 areas we have the worst results in the nation. Now, as it happens the young lady was not from South Australia, but I am just minded of the fact that the other night I happened upon one of those quiz shows that is on television just before the news, *Hot Seat*. A young lady came down, a very attractive young lady, and she said she was going to be going into teaching. Well, even Eddie Everywhere was absolutely stunned when the very first question—she is the first person up, the first contestant and the first question is usually pretty easy in that show—was a bird in the hand is worth two—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms REDMOND:** Well, no, this young lady, who wants to be one of our teachers—happily not in this state—had to pass on that question, so you can see from Eddie Everywhere's response that he was a little bit worried about the education system.

I noted yesterday that, in fact, in New South Wales they have just made an announcement that they are even going to put some very stringent testing on the youngsters who are currently in training to become teachers to make sure that they can indeed teach and that, if they are going to be left with the responsibility of teaching some spelling, grammar and numeracy and literacy and so on, they might at least know some basics themselves.

I know that that is sadly not the case, because that is what we get these NAPLAN results from. We have absolutely appalling NAPLAN results in this state compared to what they once were. Of course, this government plans to cut \$230 million from the education budget over the forward estimates. That is what their own budget papers tell us, that they are going to cut \$230 million out of their budget.

Then we get to the fact that this government, in order to try and increase the school retention rate—what they did when I first came into this place 12 years ago, and one of the first bits of legislation I had the delight of dealing with—simply passed a law telling them they are not allowed to leave school. So, we have increased our retention rates alright, but the reality is that 31 per cent of school leavers in this state are not engaged in full-time study, work or training. The national average is 27 per cent, which is bad enough, but of course we are 4 per cent higher in this state.

What is more damning, what is the bigger indictment, is that, for our Indigenous population, who are the most in need of attention in this area, that rate is more than double. Sixty-three per cent of our indigenous school leavers are not engaged in work or training or study when they leave school and, unless we actually address that, as well as addressing, of course, the health issues and so on, we are never going to close the gap.

I actually believe that both sides of this chamber are very keen to see real outcomes in terms of closing the gap between the outcomes for the Indigenous population in this state. Whether it be offending leading to prison, whether it be education, whether it be health, whether it be infant mortality—all of those things—we all need to focus on trying to redress what has been a terrible wrong, with 63 per cent of our Indigenous youth when they leave school not engaged in work or training.

I was pleased to hear on a radio on the way down here this morning that there has actually been a program running in the last little while which is expected to get a number of our Indigenous youth engaged in the military to improve the very low percentage of the Indigenous population who are engaged in military training and military service because they, first of all, had to do some literacy and numeracy and other life skills training in order to then qualify for the course. But, they have now completed the course and quite a number of them are actually seeking to enrol, so I was pleased to see that.

The commencement of apprenticeships and trainees likewise in this state fell. In the past quarter they fell by 16.1 per cent just in the last quarter, and that is the commencement of apprenticeships. The completion of apprenticeships fell by 61 per cent in the last quarter; 61 per cent is an appalling response, and this government always cites how much money they are spending. The problem is they never want to tell us about the outcomes, and I refer, for instance, to Skills for All. I made an inquiry about Skills for All because I could not figure out why we were spending all this money on setting up a big bureaucracy. I had a briefing about Skills for All, and there are basically four levels of bureaucracy which are supposedly going to identify where the needs are and train people in those particular needs.

I made a freedom of information request of the minister—the former minister; she is no longer in this house—because I wanted to know what success rate we had with this Skills for All if we were spending all this money, particularly for the Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island, which is the region in which my seat is located. What I got back had a lot of redacted information but it basically told me that they were spending \$750,000 in my region for Skills for All. I then said, 'Can you tell me how many people have actually undertaken a course, how many have completed a course, how many have got a job afterwards and how many are still employed six months later and 12 months later?'



The minister's office was unable to give me any information whatsoever. They could tell me how much money their target was, they could tell me how much money they were spending on setting up these levels of bureaucracy, but there was no information whatsoever available to say, 'And this is the outcome. This is how come we have got a good result. Our \$750,000 has employed 12 people,' or whatever it was going to be. Instead, they had targets, and that is the problem with this government.

It is one of the problems—there are many—but one of the problems with this government is that they keep talking about inputs instead of talking about outcomes. Governments are measured by their outcomes. As I draw my comments to a close, I apologise that I did not have time to get to the issues of health and obesity, which is an increasing problem in our community, but no doubt I will find another opportunity some time.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (17:06):** I have been really interested to listen to the supply speeches that have been carried out in this house and just recently going to see the Governor to deliver those speeches to him. It would be interesting to know if he actually reads them. I am sure he does. During some of the speeches I was interested to see that there were references to New Zealand legislation and New Zealand advances. I have to say that, having a number of New Zealand friends, I have always been slightly jealous of the fact that they seem to be able to get social legislation through their parliament, albeit a conservative government at the moment, headed by Prime Minister Key—no relation of mine.

There seems to be a different approach to social legislation in New Zealand. I guess when you look back at New Zealand's history, the fact that they had a treaty with their Indigenous people very early on with regard to their colonial situation and taking over land in New Zealand really set the scene for what is now a very strong Indigenous Maori culture in New Zealand, one that seems to be accepted by everybody as being an important culture.

As much as we are very proud of the fact—and we have our tapestries in this place to commemorate women being able to vote in South Australia and South Australia being the first place in Australia for that happen—New Zealand actually beat us, which I have always found very annoying. Whenever you go to New Zealand you are very much reminded of the fact: 'We know you come from South Australia, but that we were actually the first country to recognise that women should be able to vote.'

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the advances with regard to parental leave in New Zealand and it may be of some interest to members in this house that there have been maternity, paternity and adoption leave provisions in New Zealand for quite some time. The actual funding of parental leave has been a more recent initiative, and I think the point was being made in relation to the Prime Minister's move for funded parental leave. I have some interest in this area because, as a trade union official and along with many people on this side of the house, we have campaigned for parental leave—maternity leave in the early days and paternity leave a bit later on.

We were successful in South Australia. I was the advocate for this particular case, where we recognised that there were a number of people who were adopting. Sadly, that is not really available to people these days, but we did have adoption leave provisions. Certainly, a bit later on, as the status for women minister, I was very pleased to be one of the cabinet members who pushed for 16 weeks paid parental leave for state public sector workers and also making sure that there was more flexibility for both parents with regard to a new baby in their house.

So, I think South Australia has always been campaigning for those things. Whether we could afford to fund a parental scheme Tony Abbott-style is another debate, but certainly that philosophy has always been part of South Australia and has always been part of the Labor movement's agenda.

Of course, we know that in 2003 in New Zealand the sex work industry was decriminalised. I have made many speeches about that issue in this place, but it is interesting when you actually look at the research that came out I think about eight years after that legislation was enacted. Really, the end of New Zealand did not happen because the sex work industry was decriminalised.

In fact, for the sex workers that I met, when I went on a trip to Wellington a couple of years ago with the Hon. Tammy Franks from the other place, we found that there were as a lot of cooperation between the equivalent of the department for labour or our SafeWork department here and the police. The industry was a much safer industry than it had ever been before it was

decriminalised. A lot of the issues that people were frightened about seemed to be very much under control with that legislation.

Last year in particular, many of us were very, very pleased to see that New Zealand yet again had found a way to acknowledge equal marriage. On 19 August 2013, there was the proclamation of that particular legislation, and two—this is sort of sad in a way—Australian men, Paul McCarthy and Trent Kandler, were the first people to be married under that equal marriage legislation in New Zealand. It is interesting, when we talk about New Zealand, that some of the things that they seem to get under control we are still struggling with.

I was also interested in—and I think there has been a lot said about it—the federal budget and whether it is mask for what is going to happen in the state budget. That debate I am sure will go on for quite some time, particularly after the state budget is handed down. I am sure we will hear a lot of speeches and, presumably, in estimates there will be a discussion about whether the chicken or the egg came first and what the relationship is. But I think everyone would have to recognise that there is a relationship between funding in the federal budget. If services are cut, if jobs are cut, it is obviously going to have an effect on what happens in South Australia.

In my grievance today I outline some of the issues that the commonwealth public sector union have raised as concerns for their members and the fact that a number of their members basically will not have jobs and a lot of services will not exist anymore.

Obviously, one of the ones that is very dear to my heart is the Environmental Defenders Office. I understand that the funding from the federal government is not going to continue. As much as I have used the Environmental Defenders Office in my work as a local member, and had some disagreements with them about the way forward on a number of issues, I consider that to be an absolutely excellent organisation. I just hope that there will be a reconsideration about funding that particular office.

I also understand that Aboriginal Legal Services are under threat as well. Again, I have real concerns about constituents and people in South Australia generally being able to get advice without having to put up money, without having to be a rich person to get that advice.

So, I think that we really do need to look at the whole legal support system and certainly where there is funding, both on a state and federal level, make sure that those services continue and are accessible to our constituents and to particular interest groups in our community.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (17:15):** This afternoon I would like to talk a little bit about the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme and just inform the house a little bit about that and talk about a couple of issues related to it. For those who are unaware, and I am sure most people are, the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme is a subsidy funded by the government of South Australia to assist people travelling more than 100 kilometres each way to receive approved medical services.

There are a number of criteria around the PAT Scheme—and I will refer to it as the PAT Scheme as it is commonly known—but it is really important that people from metropolitan areas understand and value the importance of this scheme. It provides a minimal type of reimbursement. In fact, I ended up doing a graph comparing South Australia to the rest of Australia and where we sit in terms of reimbursements for patient assistance transport.

It might surprise some to know that we actually rank last, not just in mainland Australia but in all of Australia. No. 1 is Queensland, and the subsidies are normally broken down into three or four categories, that being cents per kilometre for travel, reimbursement for a car (normally), nights accommodation in terms of reimbursement, and the distance that you need to travel before the scheme will even come into play.

It might surprise some to know that Queensland is by far the most generous, and when I say 'most generous', I do that a bit tongue-in-cheek, because the reimbursement goes nowhere near covering even basic costs. Queensland, for instance, gives 30¢ to the kilometre as a reimbursement. Compare that to South Australia, ranked last: 16¢ per kilometre. Nights accommodation—\$60 a night in Queensland, and no surprise where South Australia ranks: last, at \$30 a night. Distance before it comes into play—in Queensland it is 50 kilometres and in South Australia it is 100 kilometres each way.

The Patient Assistance Transport Scheme is not designed to fully reimburse patients who need to travel for treatment, but we need to go a lot further than what we are. You need to realise that the people who access the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme are normally our most vulnerable. It is designed to provide some assistance where medical treatments at a base location, such as Mount Gambier or other country and rural areas, are not provided. So, nobody is choosing to use the PATS scheme to make money or to travel just for the sake of travelling. They are normally travelling for major medical treatments, such as cancer treatments, specialist appointments and treatments where those facilities (in some instances quite rightly) cannot be offered in rural and regional areas.

But what we are finding is a number of people who are either refusing treatment or the out-of-pocket expense is so great that they cannot take up treatments in a metropolitan area. That is something that is close to my heart and we need to look at. I have had an 80-year-old lady come into my office. Her husband is dying of cancer and they just cannot make the trip up to Adelaide from Mount Gambier due to out-of-pocket expenses (they are both on the pension). They are not progressing with that treatment so unfortunately he will die sooner rather than if he was living in the metropolitan area where he could access those treatments a lot quicker and a lot easier.

I will commend the government, and this might surprise some. During the election campaign, the government committed \$2.5 million extra to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme and that is something that needs to be commended. I will be making sure that that extra money will remain in the budget which will be handed down on the 19<sup>th</sup> because that \$2.5 million extra will still take us from being ranked last in Australia to sixth in Australia.

The only state that we will surpass in only two of those categories will be Victoria. The cents per kilometre will stay the same but the government has made some improvements through the Dr David Filby review and implemented a couple of improvements. The two that I would like to point out (and these are probably the two important ones) are the \$30 per night reimbursement for accommodation that will be increased to \$40 per night and the \$30 co-contribution, which is also in play at the moment, will be removed.

I commend the government on those two improvements; however, I think we can go further. The cents per kilometre certainly needs to be increased. I do not know which car you could ever run for 16 cents per kilometre, when even the ATO's own estimates are around 70 cents per kilometre. We are a long way off the pace there.

I would like to talk about two cases which have come to me quite recently and which I will be endeavouring to sort out. One is a single mother. Her name is Tammy Gale. She came to me because her three-year-old son needed all his teeth removed. That procedure could not be done in Mount Gambier and he was required, through the local doctor, to be recommended to a specialist in Adelaide. The specialist wrote on the form that this procedure needed to occur at the Women's and Children's Hospital and could not be offered in Mount Gambier.

So, a single mother with three young children, and one of them needed major dental work under an anaesthetic to have their teeth removed. PATS will not cover any travel and will not cover any accommodation reimbursement because, under the very strict guidelines of the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, dental is not included. I find it unbelievable that, in a situation where a young child needed to go under anaesthetic for a major operation which could only be done in the Women's and Children's Hospital, some compassion could not be shown to a single mother who is at least \$700 out of pocket and very stressed about that situation.

The second one relates to a lady who came into my office just last week. Her husband is dying of cancer and needed to come to Adelaide for chemotherapy. Unfortunately, even though the husband is in hospital, the PATS will not allocate that \$30 reimbursement to this lady who is on a pension and, under the guidelines of the PATS, would expect that she would drop him off at the hospital, turn around and drive back to Mount Gambier only to return in three or four days' time to pick him up.

What the system fails to realise is that it is at least a five-hour journey from Mount Gambier to Adelaide. By the time you have done the admission into hospital and all the rest of the procedures, it would total six or seven hours. Under both of those circumstances I find it displeasing that there can be no flexibility. We are talking about people who are travelling for a genuine reason and who are on an extremely limited income, yet the system allows absolutely no compassion whatsoever.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (17:25):** The issue of WorkCover has been raised in this house for many years. I remember moving a vote of no confidence in 2007 about the appalling performance of WorkCover then. Of course it has worsened since then and there is no more important matter for the small business community than proper WorkCover reform.

The government went to the election with a workers compensation plan that it claimed would save employers around \$180 million a year in premium savings. If you look at that figure and times it by the 12 years that the government has been in power, they are effectively admitting that the WorkCover scheme and the way it has been structured for the last 12 years has cost the South Australian business community over \$2 billion in premiums they never needed to pay. That is because they have been held to ransom internally by the strength of the union movement that has opposed changes to the scheme for many years.

I remember when the last range of WorkCover reforms were put through that were going to fix the problem, there was all sorts of skulduggery out of cabinet to try to make the left wing members of the government look good and the right wing members of the government look awful in regard to WorkCover reform and the reality is those changes did not fix the scheme.

What we have now is a small business community in South Australia that is suffering not only under the highest taxes but also the highest WorkCover premium in Australia. It has the worst return-to-work rate for employees—so it is bad for employers and employees—and the government has basically sat on its hands for many years letting it just drift along. According to the minister's various media statements, the government is proposing to throw everyone off the scheme as at 1 July 2017 who has been on the scheme for more than two years.

The new scheme will start on 1 July 2015. They will have two years maximum on the scheme and everyone who has been on the scheme for a two-year period from 1 July 2017 is going to be taken off the scheme unless of course they are catastrophically injured with quadriplegia or paraplegia. There will be a mechanism and a scheme to protect those people with that level of injury.

It is interesting that that dynamic is coming from a Labor government and I will be interested to consult with the unions in due course about how they see that particular principle. I sense that if a Liberal government had suggested such an idea there might have been more than 200 people out the front of parliament house. In fact, I remember in the early 1990s, there were a lot of people trying to protest about WorkCover, but of course, under that scheme, when it finally went through in the amended form under the former Liberal government, it drove the premium down and it was a well-funded scheme. From memory, it was unfunded to the tune of about \$63 million when we left government in 2002. The scheme is now unfunded to something like \$1,300 million.

This is a scheme that has cost the South Australian business community billions of dollars it should not have. It is a scheme that has been poor for employees, because once injured they have had an appalling return-to-work rate. It will be interesting to finally see exactly what the government's proposals are in regards to WorkCover.

I just want to touch a little bit on the broad dynamic of the state of the budget. The government, particularly the Premier, have been running the line that the AAA credit rating does not matter; we can trash the AAA and it has no effect. But, in actual fact, it has a significant effect, because once you lose the financial discipline required to maintain or achieve a AAA credit rating, then spending becomes less disciplined within the whole network of government.

The CEOs are not held to account as much and the cabinet is not held to account as much, because you have already lost the AAA credit rating, so what does it matter? What it matters is this: in South Australia, we are now faced with a government that is laying the groundwork to make massive cuts in its budget: over \$1,000 million in health, \$230 million to \$250 million in education, and around \$150 million in police.

The reality is that having gone out and continued to spend, losing the AAA credit rating and running deficits, the budget really has no capacity to cater for shocks, whether that be on the expenditure side or the revenue side. So, what you actually have is a budget that has less capacity to cater for shocks. The government should have been aware of this. The Auditor-General has been warning them time and time again that their expenses were too high and were based on revenue streams that might have been unsustainable.

We heard today about the state final demand being 0.4 per cent when they budgeted in the Mid-Year Budget Review, or the budget update, for 2.25 per cent. We heard from the Treasurer I think in a media statement that the revenues from state-sourced revenue were down to around \$300 million across the forward estimates; that is land tax, payroll tax, etc. That is a sign the economy is not going as well as predicted. What the government did in previous budgets was to budget for very high revenue growth figures—something like 7 per cent for some tax streams up to a 12 per cent increase for some tax streams—then after the election, of course, those revenues are not being sourced. So, there is an adjustment to the budget, and that will feed into lower surpluses or bigger deficits in the budget.

The point I simply make is this: by going out and trashing the AAA credit rating and not having the financial discipline to make tough decisions back in past budgets, the government has slowly but surely walked itself into a corner so that, if it got any sort of shock to its budget, it had nowhere to go to make further cuts because it had built up no surplus capacity. It has already run up the biggest debt in the state's history—it has already done that. It has already run up the biggest deficit in the state's history—we are already in that position. We have already got the highest taxes in Australia—we are in that position. If you get a shock at that point, where does the government go?

Where this government is going is to cut health by \$1,000 million, and cut education and police, and they are going to try and lay as much blame as they can on the federal government. The reality is that the state government will be cutting more out of the health budget than any other impact on the health budget.

Even if you take the health minister's figure as accurate—\$600 million over the forward estimates through Abbott government decisions—the state government announced before the elections a \$1,000 million cut to health before the federal budget was even brought down. So, you have federal decisions impacting \$600 million and state government decisions impacting \$1,000 million.

Out there this afternoon, there was a protest about health cuts. Was there a banner saying, 'Shame on Labor for cutting \$1,000 million out of health'? No; it was all just focused ultimately at the federal government. I think people can see through the issue that, if there was to be a protest, it could at least have been even-handed and complain about the level that the state government are going to cut, because in actual fact they are cutting significantly more out of health than what is being suggested is the impact of the federal government. With those few comments, I conclude my grievance.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:35):** I would like to put on the record some of the testimonials that I have been receiving from residents, business owners and people throughout the city who are affected by the proposed car parking tax. The first resident lives at the UNO apartments and does not have a car. The UNO apartments were approved and built with only 36 car parks for 146 apartments. As she does not have street frontage, she is not entitled to a parking permit from council.

This lady requires a car due to her disability, which makes walking difficult. Public transport is not available on her street and she needs a car to get to appointments. Due to her only income being the disability pension, she is already having difficulty paying for parking in the city and feels the extra \$750 will make it impossible, and thus make her feel even more isolated. We have another city resident who has lived in apartments on North Terrace for some 10 years who writes:

...please oppose the car park tax legislation.

As my apartment does not have a designated car park I have to lease on adjacent in the Terrace Car Park with monthly rate.

Why should I be subject to the tax when I live here and furthermore when friends come to visit and they park in the adjacent multilevel car park they will also be subject to pay extra for the privilege of visiting me.

City businesses will also suffer.

Another female resident, also on North Terrace:

Hi Rachel...I'm very concerned about the proposed new car park taxes. I am a city resident, and I have heard that residents could be exempt, however my permanent carpark for which I already pay \$270.00 a month is in a public carpark adjacent to my building (when I bought my apartment there was no carpark with it).

Another letter that came through today:

I am both a CBD resident and run a retail luggage business...in the CBD.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Car Parking Tax proposed by the Labour Government. This bizarre tax will make it more expensive to live, to work, to shop and to experience the night-life in the CBD.

It is a nonsense, illogical, for government to be claiming that it is trying to revitalise the CBD and, at the same time, making it more expensive to participate in the life of the city.

The Labour Government cannot claim that it has a mandate for this tax because it is a minority government and it is only propped up by two independents. One is a genuine...Independent and another...was elected as a Liberal. It has been Liberal Policy from prior to the election that the Car Parking Tax would not be introduced. Hamilton-Smith, if he has even a faint wisp of integrity left in his bones, could not support such a tax.

If it is a constitutional crisis that is the outcome of the Liberal Party standing its ground on this issue, then so be it. Stand firm, be strong.

Kind regards.

A CBD supermarket owner, an owner of a family-run small business that has leased parking spaces outside of his shop so that customers can park there for free, states that the business will have the \$750 per annum levy passed onto it by the owner of the car parks for every one of those spaces. The owner explained that the levy will be added to the cost to his business and will ultimately mean that he will have to work longer hours or probably not employ at least one other staff member. Another CBD business owner states:

Dear Rachel,

We are small building commercial property owners in the city that contain small basement car parks that are used by our tenants.

We oppose the introduction of the proposed car parking tax on the following basis:

1) We offer affordable office space to small businesses which includes basement car parks. The Levy will greatly affect small business and encourage them to move out of the city. We may then be faced with higher vacancy rates in the city.

2) Carparks that form part of an existing office space lease are locked in for years and there is no avenue to recover the Levy from the tenant (small tenants generally do not pay outgoings as part of their lease). Basically the Land lord is stuck with paying the Levy with no avenue for recovery. This is unfair.

3) Some of our car parks are tandem, that is two parks one behind the other. These are hard to lease. We discount the inferior park 50% in these circumstance. It would be unfair for the levy to apply equally to both parks.

4) Some of our car parks are inferior, that is, small parks that fits small cars only, [or are] difficult to get into due to column, wall and height restrictions. Again we discount these parks up to 50% to accommodate the inconvenience as they are difficult to lease. It would be unfair for the levy to apply in full to these parks.

5) Some of our properties are heritage listed and therefore we cannot change the layout of the building and no opportunity to change the car parking layout to minimise the levy.

6) Where possible we will convert the basement car parks into storage areas to avoid the tax. This will deny the government of the tax and decrease the parks in the city and monopolise parking to the major car parking stations. If many other property owners do the same the impact could be dramatic.

Another CBD business owner writes:

Dear Rachel,

I am writing to you re the parking tax that the Labor government is intending to introduce...in July of this year. We have been established in the city for over 30 years and have parking on our premises. We are in a group of five and our levy alone will be over \$3,000 per year. It's challenging enough running a small business today in this state without adding extra fees on top. As a business we see this as a deterrent for the following reasons:

-Retail traders are going to see a decrease in business as shoppers will object to paying higher parking fees and therefore will lose revenue as these clients will go to suburban shopping centres

-Reduced business growth as businesses will not want to move in to the City of Adelaide as rents will increase due to parking levy

-Business owners who own their own buildings will see a decrease in the value of their buildings

-Investment in our state will deteriorate as this will deter new growth in our state which we desperately need.

Another business owner writes:

I feel [motivated] to write to you to express my concerns with regard to the introduction of a parking tax for the City of Adelaide. My objections lie in the effect it will have on my business.

For 8 years I have run a small business in the City of Adelaide. We specifically chose this location to be amongst the vibe of the city, experience its colour and energy and connect with the people who will be on the receiving end of our marketing efforts.

Over the years we've been here I've seen gradual change in the energy of Rundle Street. And that change is downward. It is hard to get people to come to the city to shop. The redevelopment of the Rundle Mall is one factor. But the cost of parking is always cited as a major drawback. And this tax will be passed on by car park owners to the end user. The cost of parking will go up! Less people will come. That is a fact you can't get around. And less people shopping will see more businesses go broke. We have recently returned from 5 weeks absence and came back to 3 more businesses closing down in this area. This tax will be the death of more.

It is also a crucial factor in my business attracting staff to work in the CBD. Public transport is irregular and unreliable. My staff try and find alternatives but most, for convenience, choose to park in the city. This tax WILL add to their cost and make working here far less attractive. If I can't get good staff, for the sake of my business I would be forced to move to the near suburbs.

We as a business provide some parking for senior staff. As a business we are already taxed at one of the highest rates in Australia. And frankly at times struggle to see the benefit in the efforts we go to when confronted with an outrageous tax burden. This tax is just another weight small business will have to contend with. Some won't survive. Currently the city seems to be doing its best to kill itself off as a destination.

I will leave that one there. Another business owner says:

Tell them to go away or I will move my business away from the CBD go to the burbs and if this is still a problem I will move offshore away from penny-pinching inefficient parasitical local government agencies looking for a bailout!

I am no longer keen on funding lazy self entitled public servants. I am happy to be quoted publicly that I am not a leaner but a serious lifter for this state, until it offends me with such menial policy decisions which are personally offensive to every working member of the community.

There are loads and loads of very angry people in the city and I do not have time to actually read all their letters out. Here is another one:

This insidious tax will only HARM the city—I have tenants who run businesses in the city and MUST park nearby so they can service the shop or business...Customers complain now at the cost of parking; the loss of on-street parking... Surely if we had a world-class transport system then this tax...[would not be needed] as a deterrent to come to town in your vehicle...[Perhaps it will] in 30-50 years...[but] not now.

Residents have been encouraged by the Labor government to move into the city and are rightly angry that they are now going to be hit by this \$750 tax per year, which could even have GST included on top; that we could not identify. While the Weatherill government is spruiking a vibrant city on the one hand, it is introducing a toxic car park tax which will have the exact opposite effect. South Australians are already struggling under ever increasing cost-of-living pressures and the highest taxes in the nation. The last thing businesses and households need in this state is another tax. I call on the new members to prove that they really have South Australia's best interests at heart and block Jay Weatherill's car parking tax.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:45):** I have listened carefully to the contributions on the Supply Bill and believe many to be examples of the old saying that the first casualty is usually the truth. It is up to each and every person here to work on building confidence in this state and its future and working to deliver what can surely be a period of stability and growth.

Despite difficult times, Australia is in an enviable position and South Australia, under careful stewardship, can share in a prosperous future. As the member for Ashford noted in her excellent contribution, federal and state government budgets are inextricably linked. No matter your position on the political spectrum, it is beholden on all of us to give our best to make parliament's time productive.

Employment rates are a concern to all, but if the federal government is to be believed people just have to try a little bit harder to find a job. To that end, they are going to pull the safety net out from under the very people seeking work, often way beyond their home areas, keen to work at anything but not able to find a job, who will be forced to move to other parts of the state or nation. For that is the key difference between this state government and the federal government—we want everyone to come with us.

For instance, we would have pursued keeping Holden's as an operational concern to ensure an orderly transition, not to dare them to leave the state and then stand by as a closure was announced, and now a scaling down that may well see a closure date sooner rather than later. The

Holden announcement allowed a flow-on, seeing other major manufacturers restructure or downsize or worse. This means the period of time we have to reorganise manufacturing in this state has retracted and will feed into the situation that we are now facing.

There can be no doubt that when the language of the federal budget is translated it means that a shift is now on in both our education and health systems and how they are funded, and therefore how their services are going to be delivered. No-one expected such great changes. Indeed, we were actually told at the federal election that there would be no surprises and this has deeply offended many electors in Florey and all over Australia. It has actually scared people, and I find that really unforgivable. It has united state premiers and territory ministers because they know the difficulties that they will be facing with their own budgets, and needing to rework them at such short notice will be a great problem for all of them.

Language is a very important and essential part of what we do, just as there was no budget emergency federally demanding what seems major ideologically driven and fundamental changes, particularly to vital institutions such as Medicare.

Here in South Australia, while much more will always need to be done I, for one, still choose to see the glass half full. This does not mean I am ready to throw up my hands and say things are all too hard and stand by and do nothing but carp or complain. Just as the rust bucket state was a tag that South Australia had for many years, and shook, so too now will the negative comparisons I have heard also in the chamber in the past few days.

All of us find other states and commentators slinging off about us in Adelaide quite offensive, or is it just that some here see it as a cynical way to gain some sort of ground and take pleasure and delight in seeing the moral confidence and the downturn that this leads to in our state. We have much to work for and much to work with and while many young people try their luck in other states and travel the world, their experiences and networks are valuable. In the end their international connections pay off and the things they bring back to South Australia are just as valuable.

One of the other things that has bothered me most about the contributions is the way we have been speaking negatively about Tasmania. Tasmania is a beautiful state and has much going for it as well, and its economic position has been fed into by many more things than having a Labor government. Again, in another contribution the way the member was talking about Kangaroo Island was as though there was nothing happening on the island and everyone was planning to leave it. I do not believe that to be the case at all. Kangaroo Island is world renowned as a tourist attraction and I think there are many good reasons to be talking up the economy of Kangaroo Island rather than down.

The other thing that has been very difficult to listen to over and over again has been the election result. I do not know how people can keep thinking that if the people of South Australia wanted such a change that there were not convinced to vote emphatically Liberal everywhere. I think it is something that we need to move on from and as quickly as possible. I do not want to blame the electors and I do not want to blame the Electoral Commissioner and I do not want anyone to blame the Boundaries Reform Commission. Just as they cannot predict how people are going to vote in four years at the next election, they are not responsible for the policies or the campaigns that are either run by the government or the opposition.

In Florey we have local issues that were campaigned on in the election, things like public transport, with the O-Bahn park-and-ride. We campaigned for many years, the member for Newland and I, to get this park-and-ride built. It has been an absolute success.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Hear, hear!

**Ms BEDFORD:** We couldn't have done it without the then transport minister who, as I recall on the day of announcing the funding, remembered that I was actually happy that day, until I pointed out that we needed more seats on the concourse, but he has made sure that was looked after.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** It was a brief moment of happiness.

**Ms BEDFORD:** That was a brief moment of happiness. Another thing is that we are beholden to the Minister for Health who put in such a huge effort to make sure that the emergency department of the Modbury Hospital was reformed. Admittedly, we had to see changes made, the rationalisation of how services were provided, but we have been really thrilled with the results. The



community has been thrilled, the staff up there are saying it is working really, really well. There is much to be said about the good things that are going on, particularly in our schools where lots has been done.

I omitted to say that the Minister for Health has ensured that we will have a Parkinson's nurse in the north-east, and that will bring up to three in this state. Obviously we want as many as we can have, but three is much better than the one we had to start with. Even in these difficult economic times he has given us the undertaking that that will happen.

Based on the cost of running our hospitals, I understand that the cut of \$600 million that is going to come from the federal budget is like closing Modbury Hospital for almost four years, or you could say closing Modbury Hospital and the Women's and Children's Hospital for two years apiece.

The cuts to health also extend to making medicines cost more and increasing the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) co-payments by \$5 and the concession payments by 80¢. In 2015 the PBS safety net thresholds will also increase by 10 per cent a year, and this is going to impact a great deal on our older citizens who are taking large amounts of medication for all sorts of conditions. They are actually worried, afraid and scared, and I do not see why we should be enforcing this sort of scare campaign on them which has been brought about by this sudden announcement about what is going to happen at the federal end.

The South Australian government has worked very hard to make South Australia's health system the best in the nation. The waiting times in accident and emergency, particularly in the Modbury Hospital, we know have been reduced. I commend the doctors and nurses for all their work. I notice that we have more doctors and nurses per head of population than any other state. Clearly that is going to have to change.

The cuts to health funding threaten all the gains we have made here in the South Australian system and the quality of care will also be threatened. The cuts will mean fewer nurses, fewer doctors and fewer hospital beds, and I think that is a real tragedy.

The other thing I would like to speak about is goodwill. Goodwill is a really important part of what goes on in the state and how the house operates, how the government works with the opposition, how businesses work with the government. Without goodwill the chances we have of delivering good results are really reduced. As I said earlier, the onus is on all of us to work with goodwill together to make sure that we go forward in the best possible way. We could spend all of our time in here saying that things aren't working, don't work and why they don't work, but let's be more positive and work on the better outcomes that we can achieve for South Australia.

This state is a great state. Our people are our greatest assets. It is our job to look after our people, and I know that the people in Florey expect us to do that here, and I will be working as hard as I possibly can with the government in the difficult times that are no doubt ahead of us in the next budgetary period. But we will come through all of this, and I want to be part of the 53<sup>rd</sup> Parliament that sees us through that and coming out the other side with a better South Australia.

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:54):** I would like to use this grievance debate to put on record the saga of the Labor Party election promises to open Millswood station in my electorate. I will start with a letter that was sent to my constituents in Millswood from the former transport minister, the member for West Torrens, who referred to an email that was sent to the Hon. Chloe Fox, minister for transport services, about reopening the Millswood Railway Station. He is responding to it, he explains in the letter, because it falls within his portfolio responsibilities and not the minister for transport services' portfolio. He goes on to explain:

The Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure advised in 1995 that one track of the double main line from Adelaide to Belair was converted from broad to standard gauge as part of the standardisation of the Australian Rail Track Corporation Adelaide to Melbourne line. This resulted in the broad gauge passenger service being restricted to a single track with crossing loops located at Mitcham station, Blackwood station, Eden Hills, and Sleeps Hill. Standardisation also considerably reduced the operational capacity of the Belair passenger line. As a result, the three stations at Millswood, Hawthorn and Clapham had the lowest patronage and they were closed.

Of course, that is the truth, we know that that is exactly what happened. Of course, in 1995, when the station was closed, the member for Croydon was the then opposition transport spokesperson. He put out a media release and said that Labor would promise, if they were returned to office, to reopen the three stations. He then went on to say that the closure of the stations had nothing to do

with the conversion of the standard gauge western track. It was in complete contrast, of course, to what the member for West Torrens, the then transport minister, told constituents in my electorate just in June 2013. That was 18 years ago.

We then also received a press release from the minister for transport services, Chloe Fox, but the transport minister just a few months earlier said the opening of the Millswood station was his responsibility. She went on to say that the Belair rail services would return to Millswood station from 1 July 2014 for a 12-month trial. She then went on to say that the Millswood station was closed by the former Liberal government as part of rationalisation of services, not the standardisation of the track, which reduced the capacity of the rail service. However, the standardisation was part of a national program, federally funded by Labor and the Keating government because it was a nation building project to standardise all the interconnecting railways between cities.

The minister got it right when he wrote to people on 7 June 2013, but then the transport services minister said that for different purposes it was closed. She then went on to say that the Belair timetable, which was being revised to schedule the recently completed showground station, would be upgraded from July to take into account departures from Millswood. However, what did the new transport minister write to me and tell me was happening with the station? He said:

The safety of rail customers, staff and the public is the highest priority and this important work must be undertaken prior to commencement of regular rail services from Millswood station.

He was referring to feasibility studies that were required before the station could open. He goes on:

It will take time to scope the necessary works and to ensure the station is fit for use again. This commencement date of the trial will be determined by the commencement of these works.

So, there you are. There is a quick summary of Labor's broken promises.

[Sitting suspended from 18.00 to 19.30]

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (19:30):** I am very pleased to be able to identify in this grievance debate the winners of the 2013 Morialta Citizenship Awards. The Morialta Citizenship Award is a prize that I have been sponsoring since I was elected to the parliament in 2010. I think the first one was awarded in 2011—the first one to all schools was in 2011. Previously, members for Morialta had identified the two local public high schools in which one award was made of \$100 each or a book voucher for a student who had demonstrated above and beyond citizenship behaviours, setting an example to their peers through works that were assisting others, whether in their school community, their local community or the broader community. I thought this was the sort of good behaviour role-modelling that was worth spreading throughout all of the local schools: primary, independent and Catholic as well.

We have had some tremendous awardees of the Morialta Citizenship Award over the last few years. The students are presented with a certificate. Their works are acknowledged in front of their school communities and I am very pleased to always be able to identify those students in the parliament so that their achievements and their endeavour may be recorded in the permanent *Hansard* record. The winners in 2013:

- Athelstone Schools—Isabelle Bury
- Charles Campbell College (Senior)—Claire Coleman
- Charles Campbell College (Middle)—Tayla Skipworth
- Charles Campbell College (Junior)—Jasmin Wurfel
- Norwood Morialta High School—Gianluca Noble
- Norwood Morialta Middle School—Quang-Huy Nguyen
- Paradise Primary School had joint winners—Blake Rander and Jazmine Dawson
- Rostrevor College—Hamish Massie
- St Francis of Assisi school at Newton—Kate Roocke
- St Ignatius—Jack Gransbury

- Stradbroke Christian School again had joint winners—Marcello Morena, Charlotte Noll and Bethany Jackel
- Sunrise Christian School (Paradise campus)—Valeria Flores Farrera
- Thorndon Park Primary School—Kayla Haack and Alexander Dichiera

I will just touch briefly on the achievements of each of these individual students. Isabelle Bury from the Athelstone School: Isabelle was heavily involved with extracurricular activities in 2013. She was elected house captain, she was a member of the inaugural school climate leadership team, which was elected by her peers. She performed flute and piano and she was involved in the school choir and band, performing at the Festival Theatre and Gala night. She represented her school in a number of SAPSASA teams, including tennis, rugby, netball and indoor volleyball, and while maintaining that incredible extracurricular load, Isabelle also experienced excellent academic results.

Charles Campbell College is a very large school in the Morialta electorate. It used to be the Charles Campbell Secondary School and Campbelltown Primary School, which have now merged, and they have the senior, middle and junior campuses, so we had one prize for each. Claire Coleman from the senior campus, the winner, was a year 11 student last year, so in year 12 this year. She was part of the student leadership team and is this year a school captain. She is an active member of the Youth Advisory Committee, has fantastic grades and is respected by her peers and staff alike.

Tayla Skipworth was a year 9 student last year. She was an international buddy—Charles Campbell College is an international college with a significant multicultural community, and that is a very prestigious role. She was involved in sports, has excellent grades and is active in all aspects of school life.

Charles Campbell College junior campus, which would have formerly been the Campbelltown Primary School, was won by Jasmin Wurfel. She was a year 6 student, so she has gone up to the year 7 campus this year. She represented the school in a number of extracurricular activities, including performing at the Adelaide Fringe Festival, the Come Out Festival, SAPSASA, primary school choir and she is also an older buddy in the school with a strong sense of community and is very much appreciated by her peers in the school.

Gianluca Noble is from the Norwood Morialta High School. The last time I saw Gianluca I think he was sitting in front in the Leader of the Opposition's seat at one of the various mock parliaments that take place in this building, when the school students set a good example for all of us to follow. I heard the Deputy Speaker's words before dinner, calling on all of us to set a better example, and I think at those mock parliaments that some of these students have won they do set such an example. I am sure the Deputy Speaker would have been proud of the way Gianluca conducted himself on that occasion.

He was an active member of the student representative council on both the middle and senior campuses, elected in 2012 and 2013 to be a male vice-president. He was also dedicated to all the school musicals, roles that my wife and I have seen him in. Last year, Gianluca was nominated for the Order of Australia Student Citizenship Award and Student Citizen of the Year. He was one of 10 state winners and was awarded his prize by the Governor at Government House.

Quang-Huy Nguyen was a year 10 student at Norwood Morialta middle school last year. He was involved in a range of extracurricular activities, including embarking on the World Challenge trip with a group of year 9 and 10 students from the school. He supports his peers whenever required. He is always very supportive of them academically and he has been an active contributor to all parts of the school community.

At Paradise Primary School there were two winners. Blake Rander was a year 7 student who organised and helped prepare school sports teams for sports day and SAPSASA inter-school competitions. He trained as a media operator so that he could operate the audiovisual system at assemblies and events. He is a member of the band and the representative council, and is a very worthy winner.

Jazmine Dawson, whose mother I ran into the other day, was a year 7 last year and is now, I think, at Kildare College. She was a leader of the energy student action team, often giving up time to assist in organising activities and events, particularly for younger students. She represented the school in sporting activities, and has been an ambassador for the school on a number of occasions

by welcoming parents and showing people around the school. I remember the Paradise Primary School carols service, at which these were awarded, was a tremendous night indeed, with the principal leading the school band in some fantastic carols.

Rostrevor College has a fantastic awards ceremony every year and I am very pleased that the Morialta Citizenship Award has been allowed to become part of that presentation. Hamish Massie was a year 12 last year. He was a college prefect and also a representative on the Campbelltown council.

Kate Roocke was a year 6 student at the St Francis of Assisi school. She raised over \$800 to enable the purchase of desks and uniforms for a school in Cambodia and continues to do more to raise money to build accommodation so students are safer from slavery.

Jack Gransbury from St Ignatius' College was a year 8 student who participated in sport, music, debating and Tournament of Minds. He was involved in Live Below the Line, living on \$2 for five days, and the 40 Hour Famine, raising a total of \$300. He was also a volunteer collector for the National Heart Foundation and performed community service at an old folks' home.

Stradbroke Primary School always has a fantastic year 7 presentation. The three awardees included Marcello Morena, who has written for the children's section of the *Sunday Mail*, devoted time to the year 7 stall for the Stradbroke 50<sup>th</sup> birthday celebration, and assisted with monitor jobs, traffic crossings, sports shed, canteen and library.

Charlotte Noll was a Joey at the Magill Scout Club for five years. After graduating from Joeys, she joined the Stradbroke Scout group and has been committed to being an outstanding volunteer in her community there for the last two years. She raised money for the Scouts through sausage sizzles and mentors younger children at camps, developing skills for use in the community.

Bethany Jackel was the other awardee from Stradbroke. She was house captain and a sound engineer at junior primary assemblies. She assisted in the library and the canteen, as a traffic and sports monitor, and was an active contributor to the community.

There are three to go. Valeria Flores Farrera was a year 7 student last year at Sunrise Christian School. She was awarded the Morialta Citizenship Award for exhibiting to all her peacemaking skills and her initiative in the schoolyard, and for setting a good example for others.

At Thorndon Park Primary School we awarded two last year. Kayla Haack led by example and has always demonstrated consistently responsible behaviour. She is considerate towards others, a peer mediator, and very well known at the school for helping those in need and as a leader in school activities.

Finally, Alexander Dichiera, from the Thorndon Park Primary School, was, again, a peer mediator. He volunteered for far more than his fair share of traffic duties, which at Thorndon Park Primary School can be a challenging and sometimes life-threatening experience, so I commend him for that work. It is very important, and I hope the government is going to do something about that school crossing. Alexander regularly volunteered for roles which enabled events to run smoothly.

Presenting these events at all my local schools is one of my favourite parts of this job. It is a privilege to meet these fine young men and women, and I look forward to seeing them progress in the years ahead to be significant leaders in our communities as they continue to be excellent role models for their peers. I commend their efforts to the house.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (19:40):** Timed beautifully, member for Morialta—well done. I might talk about responsibility tonight, and I have three different areas that I want to focus on. I am grateful that the member for Waite is in the chamber because I think I will talk about the actions of the last eight days.

The member for Waite and I are friends, and I do not retract from that. Indeed, I have said that to my colleagues and the people I have spoken to over the last eight days. I am grateful for the closeness the member for Waite and I have shared in past years, and I am also grateful for the fact that the member for Waite rang me to talk about the actions of the last week. We have talked about futures, frustrations, anger and all the emotions that are actually involved in the decision that was made.

I can understand why he as a person has made the decision that he has. Am I accepting of it? No, I am not. Do I wish it had never occurred? Yes. Would I have tried to talk him out of it? Absolutely. Would I have been successful? No. Am I grateful, indeed, that the member for Waite did not speak to me about it beforehand? Yes, because then it would have put me in a very difficult situation between the personal friendship and a responsibility that I feel.

The member for Waite will, I think, improve the government by virtue of being associated with you as a minister. I think the capacity he brings is immense, and that is why I have been a friend for a long time of the member for Waite. I wish the portfolio responsibilities that he holds well because they are key ones, and there is absolutely no doubt about that. The relationships he has will be of assistance, most certainly.

The challenges that the actions of last week represent will be there also, and there have been some words said by those in other places and federally about what the treatment of them might be. I am very disappointed, personally. I am saddened that the relationship we have had for probably 7½ years will not be there anymore because of the inability to see each other in the same sort of way and to speak to each other in the same way.

I will pay him a level of respect, as I do any member of parliament. Indeed, I always refer to the Premier as the Premier. I do not agree with the principles and decisions made all the time, or very often, but I respect the position that is held. The member for Waite will face a very serious challenge over the next three years and 9½ months as a minister of the Crown. I wish he had not done it. I hope he succeeds from the personal level because the state needs him to be successful, but I feel exceptionally disappointed by it, and I thought it was appropriate that I actually take the time in this chamber to express some of the thoughts and emotions I have gone through.

Others were approached in a variety of different ways about an opportunity to do some things, and there might be questions put about the validity of some of those approaches. I know the way in which suggestions were made that came to me, based on the person who said them, in my mind offers significant validity to the approach having been made, because of the involvement that person had in another movement that occurred two years ago.

These are interesting times for the state to see the member for Waite as an Independent Liberal in a Labor ministry and how it will go, but I can give an absolute assurance that there will be a very significant effort to hold the minister to account and to ensure that the actions and the outcomes are what South Australians need. From an opposition perspective, it is not necessarily an easy ride. There will be some challenging times. There will be some times when some people might say things that, in the fullness of time, they might choose to regret having said, but I have no doubt they will be said.

There have been a lot of words said in some confidence, I think, by members on this side about what they felt about the decision, and I completely understand the emotion attached to that, absolutely, because the actions have created an opportunity for the member for Waite but have severely dented any opportunity that would have presented itself either in the short term or the medium term to the Liberal Party, so it will be interesting to see how things go on.

For the remainder of my contribution, I also wish to talk about responsibility, but as I feel it represented in the hands of ministers. I have been a person who has lived where there are budget controls in place, particularly where the public purse provides those funds to actually undertake that expenditure, with the necessity for controls to be there to ensure budget responsibilities, which are very hard choices to actually make.

I have dealt in lesser sums than the Treasurer does in my life before I came into this place, but the principles are still the same: priority choices, responsibility within departments, personal accountability, ensuring that the budget is the tightest process it can be, about revenues and expenditure, and delivering upon the outcomes that are set. I think it is fair to say that what frustrated the life out of me, in the eight and a bit years that I have been here, is the inability to actually ensure that a budget, when in place, is met.

I can think of so many instances. Indeed, if I go back five or six years ago when, as part of a Mid-Year Budget Review, across the forward estimates (so, there were 3½ years left) there was a revision of, for example, wage costs. The total additional liability attached across the forward estimates for wage costs was \$500 million. I am flabbergasted that within a six-month period, post

the budget being declared, that in such a short time in a projection for the next 3½ years, an additional \$500 million that had to be found in the forward estimates to fund all those additional costs.

I offer no criticism at all of the people who are employed in these projects or these programs; they are deemed to be important at the time, there is no doubt about that. But, to me, it comes down to a level of individual control that rests with ministers and, via them, their chiefs of staff, chief executives and senior managers, to ensure that they actually deliver upon budgets.

I have been around here long enough to see an enormous number of reviews that have taken place—efficiency dividend requirements, productivity improvements, all level of saving costs—but they still failed to deliver efficiency in budgeting and efficiency in committing and then adhering to budgets that are actually put in place. It has disappointed me immensely. There are some people who stand up here and talk about that with absolute sincerity about the frustrations that they feel.

The people who come into this place from a private enterprise background know that success for their personal business, their family business, or the business they worked for, depends on adhering to the budgets that are in place and trying not only to maximise revenue opportunities—absolutely no doubt about that—but also to ensure that expenditure, which is an absolute key area, is kept to what is agreed upon, either in its original form or revised, but where informed decisions are made.

I have seen so many examples in this place where hundreds of millions of dollars suddenly accrue into costs, with seemingly no responsibility being tied back to the person in charge. In my eyes, under the Westminster system it clearly sits with ministers; they are 13, 14, 15 people, or whatever number it is, but they are the ones chosen by the people of South Australia, put in place (albeit in a minority situation this year) and who have the responsibility to adhere to it, to stick to it, to deliver upon it, and to ensure that the financial situation of the state does not suffer from it.

I think the member for Davenport, in his previous contribution, talked about where the difference between projected surpluses and delivered deficits over a six or seven-year period was actually \$5.5 billion—a frightening figure, absolutely frightening. To me, it signifies, more than just about anything I have ever heard, a long-term, systemic inability to actually deliver upon commitments that they put in place, and I think that is a disgrace.

Any person who aspires to come into this place—yes, they want to achieve great things in their community; yes, they want to have the opportunity to serve as a minister—has to deliver upon the commitments they make. It is not just a policy direction, and it is not just the words they say to people; it is about the budgets they are involved in setting with the Treasurer (and we are going to hear the next one on 19 June) that are so key to the future of this state, but they have to be kept, and my frustration is that they have not been. I have not seen a demonstration of that in my time in this place, for eight years, and that is the absolute frustration the whole of society should actually feel about trying to improve it because, under the Westminster system, it comes down to the responsibility of the ministers and, indeed, of the parliament holding them into account.

Some will argue that the estimates process is a bit of a waste of time. For me, I think it is great. It provides an opportunity for not only the minister to know probably more about their budget lines, their staff and the policies they are going roll out but from an opposition perspective to be able to scrutinise it, understand it, question it and put it out in the public space. There might be a lot people who might not read it, understand it or even try to, but the fact is that politics impacts every person in South Australia in some way every day of their life. What we talk about in this place is not just rhetoric; it is gospel truth that has to be adhered to.

I look forward to the contributions by other members. I know that my frustrations are causing my blood pressure to rise a little bit. All of us in this place get a bit like that, although not as much as the previous member for Elder, who used to get very red in the face when he fired up a little bit. We are a special place, and we have to ensure that we work as diligently as we can, and that means members from both sides of the house.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Schubert, I acknowledge the former member for Schubert, who has joined us this evening. The member for Schubert.

*Bills***SUPPLY BILL 2014***Supply Grievances*

Debate resumed.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (19:50):** It is serendipity perfected that I rise at this moment, after going into the Speaker's dining room and seeing the former member for Schubert, my great friend Ivan Venning, sitting there at dinner. I said, 'Ivan, it's great that you're here, because I was about to give you a great plug in my Supply Bill grievance speech.'

What I would like to use my 10 minutes this evening to talk about is an issue that has long been held in the heart of Ivan Venning. My contribution tonight will be a bit more modest because I do not have the background the former member for Schubert has. I remember driving up and down Gomersal Road a number of times and seeing the silver Prado with the 'I support a Barossa Hospital' sticker on the back, and I would always know that it was Ivan patrolling his electorate.

As much as I want to talk up the former member's commitment to getting a new hospital for the Barossa, regardless of whether it is the former or the current member, the member for Schubert's commitment to getting a hospital for the Barossa has not wavered, has not changed. I stand here to continue the legacy, and I would like to use my contribution tonight to go through a little bit of history that for the last 20 years the people of the Barossa have been waiting patiently for a new hospital facility.

I have visited these facilities as a patient or as the father of a patient, and I have met a lot of great people—great doctors, great nurses—who do a lot for their community but, at the same time, people who are working in a very substandard facility. For the Barossa, being one of the premier regional areas in South Australia, the fact that the facilities we have are in the state they are in is a real travesty, and the people of the Barossa, the people of Schubert, deserve better.

I would like to take you back to 1910. In 1910, the population of Angaston would have been 100 or 200 people; it now has a population of 2,000. In 1910, before both world wars, before Korea, before Vietnam, before we had our adult franchise in the upper house, before we had single member electorates, the Angaston District Hospital was built.

In 1953, a little bit later, a little before my parents came to this country, though, the Tanunda Hospital was built. I would like to ask: since 1910 and 1953 and the fact that there have not been any significant improvements to either hospital 1950s, what has happened to the population of the Barossa? It has doubled, it has tripled. More than that, what is the future population growth of the Barossa, which sits at about 1.75 per cent per annum and, at 1.75 per cent per annum, sits at the top end of growth projections for population across South Australia? These two separate facilities operated as they did for a long time and, in fact, unfortunately still operate as single facilities today.

I would like to bring the house to December 1994 and refer to the Angaston and Tanunda boards—and can I say that there is feeling between Angaston and Tanunda, as two rival towns in the Barossa; like the Gawler Football League, there is angst between the two towns. In 1994, the two towns decided to work together to bring about a better health service for the Barossa.

In January 1995, the boards and the SA Health Commission agreed to undertake a joint review of future health services in the Barossa. In April 1995, KPMG Peat Marwick presented their report, and option No. 2, which is the option which the boards, as they were at that time, committed to, was the consolidation of all acute services plus community services in a new hospital and health service at Nuriootpa.

In June 1995, both boards agreed to accept the KPMG recommendations. In July 1995, the SAHC CEO agrees to accept the KPMG recommendations. In October 1995, the AGMs at both hospitals agree to dissolve and form a new organisation called the Barossa Area Health Service. There are many other milestones as we go along but I go forward to October 1997, two years after those recommendations have been adopted, and concern is expressed at the lack of progress of a new facility.

In 1999, health minister Brown—yes: under a Liberal government at that time—announces a new health facility will be built and located at Reusch Park in Nuriootpa in 1999. In February 2001,

community concern is again expressed at the state of the facilities in Angaston and Tanunda because the hospital still had not been built. In June 2001, minister Brown announces that the new facility will commence in 2004-05 and \$12 million is committed. I remind the house that there is seven years' lead time—seven years between 1994 and 2001—when this issue progressed to a point when, finally, the community had in their sights the new facility that they had been wanting over that seven years.

Unfortunately, there was a pesky thing called a state election and, history in this place being what it is, there was a change of government. In October 2002, minister Stevens visits the facilities and confirms that there is no money for a new hospital. The people of the Barossa at that point would have been heartbroken, absolutely heartbroken. In December 2003, minister Stevens says (and I love this) that 'the Barossa Area Health Service will continue to receive consideration in relation to a new health facility'.

Well, it is now 2014, Deputy Speaker, and we are still waiting. The people of the Barossa are still waiting. They are a beautiful, patient group of people who just get on with life, but I am afraid that their patience is starting to wear thin, and so it should. In 2008, there is a slight glimmer of hope because the SA government state budget pledges \$70,000 for a business case into the new health facility. In 2008-09, the Barossa and Districts Health Advisory Council (as the name had been changed to then) was scathing of the current facilities, stating that the current facilities in the Barossa Valley lacked flexibility to meet current and future service demands.

In 2010, after lobbying by the former member for Schubert for a great many years, the Liberals committed, again, to a Barossa hospital, this time to be built on Magnolia Road in Tanunda, at an estimated cost of \$35 million. The people of the Barossa rejoiced. They returned the member for Schubert in 2010 with an absolutely fantastic majority, which was due in no small part to the fact that they agreed that it was time for a new hospital in the Barossa. It was time for a new hospital in the Barossa. Here we are again, Deputy Speaker—

*There being a disturbance in the Speaker's gallery:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before you continue, it has come to the chair's attention that a former member of this house is not observing what would normally be standing orders, and we are just going to give him a moment to reflect on that and allow the new member for Schubert to continue.

**Mr KNOLL:** He just can't help himself, Deputy Speaker. This commitment by the Liberals in 2010 was for a \$35 million 55-bed hospital, with an emergency department, operating theatres and a maternity ward. It was going to be located, as I said, on Magnolia Road in Tanunda adjoining the 'Recs', which is our local recreational facility that encompasses a swimming pool and great gym facilities. When I am out in my electorate, I am there two to three times a week. It would have been fantastic as a hub for health and wellness in the Barossa. The people of Schubert rejoiced and then were very, very disappointed when the Labor government was returned.

The 2010 business case that was handed down had in it some things that I think need to be stated in this house, and probably more often than just tonight, because it shows that there is a true economic basis for why we should have a new health facility in the Barossa, bar the fact that it is going to be necessary to meet the future needs of the population growth in the valley.

There is a potential benefit to offset the capital cost of a new hospital with the sale of the existing land from the two sites. It was estimated in 2010 that that could net \$1.85 million and the proceeds could have been applied to the new facility. Those two facilities then could have been re-purposed as aged-care facilities or other facilities, or could have been turned into accommodation facilities, and certainly would not have stayed derelict because the industrious people of the Barossa would have found good uses for that land and those buildings.

The real kicker for me is the fact that there are and there was at that time, and inflation being what it is, I am sure well over \$1 million now of annual savings that would have been gotten by the combining of the two hospitals into one facility. Over \$1 million worth of savings in today's dollars would have been able to be returned on an annual basis to the state government. Here tonight I would like to say that that is my contribution to the June 19 budget: if you want to save \$1 million invest in a new hospital for the Barossa and it is yours for the taking.



The risk analysis of the project has identified—and keep in mind that this is a business case that was conducted by Country Health SA themselves; this is the state government's department themselves saying this:

The Barossa Health Service will be unable to achieve its full role as a country community hospital. The cost of sustaining ageing and unsuitable health facilities in the Barossa will not be mitigated.

I think if that is not an indictment on where the current facilities are at the moment, then I do not know what is. This is an issue that has sat and been talked about in this parliament for way too long and, again, it is another example of regional South Australia being ignored by this state government and I ask the state government to please deliver after 20 years for the people of Schubert.

Time expired.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (20:00):** I too rise to talk just a little bit about power prices and, in particular, what the electorate of Chaffey is going through at the moment being quite high power users. Irrigation, pumping water, pressurising water, and lifting water from the river into properties are very expensive exercises, particularly pressurising water. In my electorate I have two large irrigation trusts that are really feeling the power pinch at the moment.

The Central Irrigation Trust in particular has 12 districts that it supplies water to, and of those districts there are about 15,500 hectares of irrigated horticulture, and it also supplies nearly 3,000 households with domestic water. In most of the areas it is high pressure water that is delivered to those properties, but in a lot of the other areas it is low pressure, so the multiplier is that the irrigation trust is taking water out of the river, lifting it up onto properties, and then it has to be repressurised into the pipes.

Sadly, South Australia has claimed to be the leader in efficiencies when it comes to the Murray-Darling Basin and we are now paying the price for those water efficiencies. Once upon a time we would throw sticks and rocks at our Eastern State counterparts saying that they have open channels, they have flood irrigation and they are inefficient, but today they are looking at us and they are laughing, because they are using that gravity free of charge. They are putting water down those channels through gravity feed free of charge, and they are not paying the exorbitant power prices that are now threatening the viability of a lot of businesses.

I did meet with the CEO of the Central Irrigation Trust on a number of occasions about his concern with the increased power cost, and he tells me that over the last year his power bills have increased from \$2 million to \$4 million; they have doubled, and they are having a lot of trouble passing that cost on to growers that are dealing with the Australian dollar and commodity prices. Again, it is something that needs to be looked at.

I am calling on this government to look at whether ESCOSA or some other regulatory body can actually put a cap on these spiralling out of control power prices that are crippling the viability that we once enjoyed with our water efficiencies that we are now losing, because we had the water efficiency, but we are high power users.

In saying that, we deal with the Central Irrigation Trust (CIT), and we deal with the Renmark Irrigation Trust. Just as a note, the Renmark Irrigation Trust is the oldest large irrigation trust in Australia, and it has a proud history, but at the moment it is under siege with these crippling power prices as well.

Again, what I am told is that in South Australia usage is down, particularly in the Riverland. We are now exporting power out of the state into Victoria, but we are exporting the power at the Riverland's cost because the transmission losses through the wires and the poles is about 5.2 per cent. The forecast power cost increase is about 11 per cent but with that loss factor it is about a 16 per cent increase in power forecast for the upcoming year, let alone the doubling in the costs of power.

A lot of those increased costs have come about because power is now on standby. When an irrigator or a trust decides that they need to irrigate their crops, they need that power to be there when they start up their pumps. They have spent in excess of \$5 million in upgrading the drives in their pump motors, but still that is not delivering the efficiencies they need to run an efficient water delivery operation that has real impact.

There is a Riverland Energy Association made up of 14 large power consumers in the Riverland, chaired by wine group director, Trevor Davidson. Their charter is to cooperatively work together, reduce energy costs and improve the business sustainability. Sadly, these businesses have all invested heavily in the power users, the motors that they use to drive their pumps, and they have got to a point now where those power prices are driving that business out of viability.

Passing on power costs is becoming almost unsustainable. Ironically, when South Australians lose their water as a contribution to the sustainable diversion limits in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, those efficiencies that we have gained over time to give water back to the environment are now being eaten up by the cost of their power. It is an ongoing concern. I call on the energy minister to look at ways that we can regulate or cap these spiralling power costs.

Now that we are exporting power, there must be a mechanism that we can use that is not going to encumber power users in the Riverland in particular with the cost of exporting power through transmission losses. Again, that consultation needs to be had. I know that business leaders in the region are meeting with power providers, and there does not seem to be any answer or any willingness, particularly with the power providers. I think there needs to be some form of a heavy hand with recommendations from government to cap or regulate these power prices that continue to spiral out of control.

I also want to talk about the government having said that they are now going to support regions. They have imported an Independent member of this place to be their regional voice for South Australia. I really think it is about priorities that the government ironically are saying, 'Now we are going to give the regions some notice or some priority.' Well, we are waiting.

I note with interest that the government is coming up to the Riverland on the 22<sup>nd</sup> to the 24<sup>th</sup> with their country cabinet, so my invitation is open far and wide to all the ministers. If there is something they would like to see, I would be more than happy to show them, knowing that most of the ministers I can trust. There are some I do not trust, in particular one of their new ministers, because he has shown that his trustworthiness has been left wanting, particularly with the way he has undermined and moved across to the other side, to the government.

It is not about him going over there for the greatness of South Australia. It is about him going over there and fulfilling his wish, that he is going to make a difference for South Australia. I think it is a sad day for people who judge their politicians, who reflect on their politicians. The way the media reflect on our behaviour, the way we conduct ourselves, is making people lose their faith and trust in the political process. It is a sad indictment on politics. Again I digress.

Regarding regional South Australia, when ministers do come up to Chaffey what they will look at is something that is sustainable. Agriculture has been sustainable forever. We continue to plant our crops. We grow our crops in the land that we look after, that we mentor, that we manage, unlike manufacturing. I have worked in the manufacturing sector, as I have said in this place many times, working at GM Holden and, sadly, the day has come when we are not competitive any more, so we have to look at better ways. Look at mining. Mining is not sustainable. Once you dig the resource out of the ground and that resource is exhausted, that resource is gone, that resource is not to be put back there. So, again, when we look at the sustainable economy here in South Australia, it is agriculture, horticulture, food production. It is what my electorate represents to this state's economy.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (20:11):** I rise to speak this evening on my beautiful electorate of Bragg and some of the issues that will be important to it that I would ask the government to consider in the forthcoming budget. My electorate comprises of the vast area of the eastern suburbs, which is largely residential retail, and what I call the three Rs. Repromed is probably our biggest industry on the plains for the production of healthy babies in South Australia. Going further east, to the horticultural and viticultural areas of Uraidla, Summertown and the whole of the Piccadilly Valley, it is a beautiful electorate to represent.

As far as state services go, we do not have many. We pretty much look after ourselves. We have five public schools; four Country Fire Services; one Metropolitan Fire Service, which very much is responsible for looking after the freeway; and a number of major parks, including the world renowned Cleland Park, which has recently donated eight koalas to Hong Kong. We have no SES services, no public hospitals, no police stations and we have the Britannia roundabout, the beautiful Britannia roundabout.

I just want to put on the record that I appreciate what the government did a year or so ago to upgrade the Britannia roundabout. The problem was not the design or anything else, because I think the Hon. Trish White, the former transport minister, had come up with a pretty good design a few years ago, until minister Conlon axed it. However, as an interim measure it is not a bad idea. I travel through it three or four times a day and it is quite a good improvement. The problem is, as has been acknowledged by the Department of Transport, that it cannot accommodate future growth.

Minister Rau's plan is that we have five or six-storey buildings all the way along Fullarton Road and that we increase the inner metropolitan growth area with the intensification of urban infill. I do not even have a problem with that. The problem is that we do not have the infrastructure to go with it. So we do have some major concerns as to how we are going to deal with road and energy, that is, the power requirements and so on with the government's urban infill agenda. Without that infrastructure, including public transport and other things, we are going to have some difficulties.

However, the most important, significant and pressing issue for my electorate as we speak is water. There are two problems. If I go to Uraidla—this is a township of about 800—they are provided water by a private bore from a local family who provide water pretty much at cost, otherwise they have the natural catchment, which they drink. Piccadilly water is abundant in the whole valley and it is even provided as bottled water to be sold. So, they are doing okay.

However, when the family who had the bore decided that they wanted to close down, I put to the government that they should think about getting SA Water to buy the property, buy the water system, to provide security of water and ensure that we had safe water access when fires came, particularly as it was an important location for people to congregate in the event of a major fire in the hills, but there was no help whatsoever. More recently the area of Skye, where there are about 120 houses, came back into my electorate.

This is a geographical area that was well looked after for the previous four years by the member for Morialta. However, members might be aware that Skye sits in an area along the Hills Face Zone where Thomas Playford (God rest his soul), when he was premier in this place, actually made provision for water and power services for the urbanisation of Adelaide, and he did a great job. What he said was 'I'm not going to send water uphill; it's too expensive. If you want to build up on the hill you have to pay for your own water and provide for your own water services.' This was not uncommon in those days, and it was accepted by those who developed and put their family homes up there.

There are about 120 dwellings in this particular location, and they rely on a combination of services from about five private company operators. Some of them are a bit of a cooperative, and they work on a cost basis for the providing of service. They occasionally have to pump up the hill from the supply that comes via SA Water, under mains supply, as it is known, but largely they look after themselves. One of the entities has given notice that as of August it will close down; it will no longer make provision for that service.

The infrastructure that goes with this is tired—I think that is the best description of it—and clearly we need to consider what is going to happen. This is an area in residential Adelaide that is less than 10 kilometres from the GPO. There are areas nearby—for example, in Teringie—that have had connections to mains water supply at a reasonable cost, to make it affordable and accessible for a reliable water supply, to ensure that they have safe, clean and reliable water. Further out, way further out, they have provided sewerage and water up in Waterfall Gully, which happens to have some very important Labor leaders, I note, up that street. However, the people of Skye are left alone.

I called a public meeting recently after the election, when this area came back into my electorate. I would say that about 200 people turned up, more than the number of dwellings in the subject area that is adversely affected, and they called upon me to write to the minister and try to get this issue sorted out. In 2008, when I last had responsibility for this area, I wrote to the then minister and SA Water came out and said 'Look, we can provide a service to here. It will cost about \$4 million, and that's about \$26,000 per household, to be connected up. But at a capital cost contribution of that order we will put provision in.'

Not everybody wanted it, and that often happens in an existing township. They say 'We're not keen to line up. We've got adequate other services and we do not need to have it.' However, if you have a family, in fact if you have human habitation generally, a clean, reliable water supply is critical to live in a civilised manner in a household. So it is important for the safety and well being of

our children, for safety and well being with fire protection, that we have a good water supply. It is not unreasonable for these people to accept that, at a reasonable cost, they be connected.

It is weeks ago now that I wrote to the minister, and I am disappointed to note that I have not had any response. This is pressing. This water supply will be cut off, and it will be a dangerous situation at a health level to have stagnant water, to be in a situation where households do not have access to a reliable water supply. Some will be able to afford to truck in water and fill up rainwater tanks, even install rainwater tanks. Burnside council has agreed to do whatever it can to abridge the times for applications to enable bigger tanks to be brought into these properties so that we might facilitate them having at least some interim supply.

This is unacceptable. We are in 2014, and we have people living within kilometres of the GPO who have no access to mains water. It is a disgrace. SA Water saw fit to pay for a \$403 million pipeline connection system through a north-eastern connector to ensure that the Happy Valley and Hope Reservoir areas and pumping stations in between could be imposed. They said that was necessary because we were going to have a desal plant, we were going to have a doubling of the provision of water, we were going to need to be able to connect north with south, we were going to have all this development in the north. Most of that has evaporated. Nevertheless, in the meantime they have put this expensive pipeline system in.

It is magnificent infrastructure, I might say. Whether we need it or not is another matter, but we have got it now. Our local people have had the inconvenience of having their streets dug up, their trees chopped down, and all sorts of other interruptions to their normal living and business operations; nevertheless, it has happened.

I ask the government to consider a reasonable price—we are not expecting something to be given free—and listen to the fact that we now have a critical situation and we need some assistance here. The monopoly instrumentality in charge of water in South Australia is SA Water. It is, of course, a nonsense to say that you can bring in other private operators. The regulatory regime that we have is quite prohibitive, I think, for any other smaller traders coming in. Some of the bigger councils may take up that option to provide water supplies and ultimately come into that market, but at the moment SA Water is the monopoly in charge. It earns hundreds of millions of dollars that it provides interstate revenue. I am not even asking them to interrupt that, but I am asking them to at least answer my letters and let these people have a fair go.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (20:21):** I rise this evening to continue my remarks from late last night; at twenty past eleven, in fact, I rose to speak. I will take note from the member for Bragg and talk a little bit about my electorate. She and I have one thing in common: we both have wonderful electorates and we know that.

**Mr Gardner:** You have many things in common.

**Mr TRELOAR:** We have many things in common, true, member for Morialta. Before I get back to my notes, I will talk a little bit about the electorate of Flinders. It is quite the opposite to Bragg in that it is has an area of around about 58,000 square kilometres. We have nine district councils, a city council, an out of districts area, some 24 schools (at my best reckoning at least), and nine hospitals, and half the population of the entire electorate is contained within the town of Port Lincoln. There are other smaller service centres scattered throughout. Our single biggest challenge in the years ahead is, as it is in Bragg, the supply of water. It is something that I will get back to a little bit later in this contribution.

I was highlighting the shortcomings of the current government's economic settings when my time expired last night. I would just like to get back to those points and continue. In fact, we are coming up to the budget; 19 June is budget day for the Labor government in South Australia. Sadly for them—and the people of South Australia I am sure recognise this—they have managed to deliver six deficits in the last seven years, which is a sad indictment of their fiscal management and fiscal responsibility. Of course the promise always is far better than what is delivered.

From time to time they have forecast a surplus; it never arrives. From time to time they have forecast a small deficit, and invariably it is a large one. The interesting thing about all of this, of course, is that governments talk about surpluses and deficits, and we hear those words a lot in this place. Businesses and households talk about profit and loss. They are in essence the same thing; in

fact you cannot as a business continue to run at a loss because your debt will climb and eventually you will become unsustainable.

In the sphere of government, you cannot continue to run deficits because your debt will climb and in the end it will become unsustainable. We have not quite reached that point in South Australia but, of course, we have lost our AAA credit rating. If we continue to run our deficits then we are in serious risk of getting into an economic situation from where it will be hard to claw back. A lot of the problem results from the fact this government has borrowed money to spend money. To keep the population happy they have been quite intent on borrowing and giving it away.

Certainly there have been some big infrastructure spends, but I have to say all of this has been undertaken with borrowed money. They are not insignificant infrastructure projects—granted. The new Royal Adelaide Hospital is about to cost about \$2.8 billion plus the interest on that. The footbridge, the much talked about footbridge, that was placed across the Torrens in between two other bridges: I went to walk across it one night and could not get across it, so I walked down King William Street and crossed the Torrens there. It cost \$40 million—it is extraordinary. We could build two Barossa hospitals, member for Schubert, for that money!

The desalination plant is the biggest white elephant of all, in my opinion: \$1.7 billion to build, plus the interconnector, comes to a total figure of \$2.2 billion. Do you know what? It has not been used yet! It is extraordinary. That amount of money for nothing!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TRELOAR:** I do not.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much information floating backwards and forwards across the chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I will invoke those numbers—142, 131. I ask members to not interject and not respond to interjections. Back on topic, member for Flinders.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The list goes on and on: we sold the forests, as has been talked about today; and \$650 million for the Adelaide Oval. It is lovely, of course, but most people in South Australia never get the chance to go there and watch either cricket or football. So we have seen from this a \$14 billion debt—\$2 million a day in interest—and an extraordinary burden on the people of South Australia. The litany is long. We are the highest taxed state in the nation. We have the highest capital city water charges in the nation, in no small regard as a result of the desal plant that I was talking about.

Water is an ongoing issue. We have high water charges in the country too. We have sheep producers and wine producers who are battling with the price of water and struggling to stay viable, just for the fact that this government has chosen—not needed to, but chosen—to put up the price of water to a point where it is almost unaffordable. Education is shown to be below average in all of the NAPLAN results, and the list goes on and on.

There was a demonstration out the front of Parliament House today against the budget cuts by the Abbott government, to health in particular. Let us wait and see what this government delivers in the way of health cuts on 19 June. I suggest that it will be rather scary. Primary health care is something on which we will have to concentrate, and that is a solution to much of our health costs blowing out.

We need to concentrate on what we are good at as a state. We have to work out what our assets are. We have to ensure the government actually gets out of the way of business. Unfortunately, the tentacles of government have extended right throughout our everyday life. Good government is like a good umpire in a football match: you do not notice they are there. Unfortunately, with this government, they are everywhere.

Like most local members I find that a big part of my day is assisting constituents, dealing with government departments. It would seem to be a simple task to go to a government department and seek assistance with whatever problem they have, but this government has made their departmental assistance so difficult that the general population simply cannot manage it.

In my closing minutes I wish to talk about an issue that has arisen in Port Lincoln in recent weeks and months, namely, the issue of treating wastewater. SA Water has a responsibility to treat the wastewater in Port Lincoln. It is not just household waste or run-off from the streets and rainfall but also the outflow from the seafood processors in Port Lincoln. The seafood processors in Port Lincoln have approached us and indicated that they could face financial ruin in some cases under new requirements imposed on them by SA Water. It is in relation to saline waste.

It has been alleged by these processors that SA Water does not have the capacity to treat saline water at the treatment plant in Port Lincoln, and as such effectively has asked the industry to foot the bill for this activity. This is a cost and a burden to these processors many of whom have been in business for 20 years or more. They are simply going about doing what they have always done. It is a fishing town, for goodness sake. Of course they are going to process fish; of course there is going to be saline water in the system.

It is really beholden on SA Water and the government to not stand in the way of these businesses but actually accommodate them. Surely that is a responsibility of a government department. Surely it is a responsibility of SA Water to accommodate and understand its obligations with regard to service and the need to support industry in this state. If they do not then, once again, some of these businesses are going to close down and jobs are going to be lost.

Sadly, if a solution is not found very soon—in the next few weeks in fact—some of these businesses are going to be up for costs in the vicinity of \$30,000 to \$100,000 to install monitoring equipment which really, in turn, gives SA Water information which ultimately, if they breach their discharge requirements, could mean that these businesses are charged extra costs. It is a serious situation. As the local member I have been working with the government to try to seek a solution but we have not managed to do that yet.

Time expired.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (20:31):** I rise to make comments regarding the Supply Bill response grievance debate and talk about some of the local issues affecting my electorate and surrounding areas. I share some of the concerns of the member for Finniss regarding crime on the Fleurieu Peninsula as we obviously share the area. It was a disgraceful thing to see today that two police were injured by a letter sent to the Victor Harbor station.

On my side of the Fleurieu, regarding crime in the local area, the local police have managed to get three extra police officers working out of the Goolwa station. This support has been long overdue. I know that they have been trying to work out ways internally to manage situations in the area and I congratulate the local police for taking this initiative. It has also given the ability for more accessibility for the station at Goolwa.

With regard to policing I also want to talk about what I think is revenue raising. There are a couple of fixed-speed cameras on the South Eastern Freeway and they have been budgeted to generate almost \$3 million a year in fines, according to the government's own documents. One camera is adjacent to the Crafers on-ramp at Crafers West and the second is at the Mount Osmond overpass. I am getting more and more complaints from heavy vehicle owners. I have taken up the issue with the Minister for Road Safety.

The truck drivers are telling me that the issue with the Crafers camera is that the truck drivers thought it was a point-to-point camera between there and Mount Osmond and because it is part way up the slope they are still accelerating to get to the top of the rise before they take their trucks back to about 35 or 40 km/h to go down the hill into Adelaide, so obviously some of them have strayed over the 60 km/h.

Because of the slowness in getting the fines out, before they know it they have four fines and there are drivers or owners who cannot drive. I have had a chat to the road safety minister to see what signage can be better put and whether the camera can be moved to the top of the hill because it does affect a lot of freight coming in from my area.

I also want to talk about regional education. Recently I received a response from the Minister for Education about requests to assist the Coomandook Area School. The minister's response was quite scathing about my intent to assist the Coomandook Area School and she labelled my intent to help as scaremongering and labelled my efforts as far from constructive. If I had not made those efforts the minister and the Department for Education and Child Development would have continued

to ignore the needs and requests of this school. I first raised this issue in this place in November 2013, and I believe that DECD was made aware of the issue long before that. However, it took the minister six months to provide a response to these concerns.

We have also had the state government bang on in here about federal budget savings measures. They will not tell us about the good things in the federal budget, but they forget to back up comments with their own plans to cut \$230 million from education over the forward estimates, as well as \$1,000 million out of health, I should say. What I will say about regional education, not just in my electorate but right across the state, is that it must become a priority of the state government, and I will continue to raise concerns in this house without fear or concern of how my intentions are perceived or how it reflects on the minister responsible for this important portfolio.

I also welcome news today that South Australia will receive \$5.8 million worth of federal blackspot funding. A number of the projects are in and around the Hammond electorate, definitely providing safety and benefit to my constituents. Projects include upgrades to the Mount Compass and Goolwa Road, which will receive \$345,000; the Callington to Goolwa Road, \$630,000; the Mannum Road, Pallamana, \$427,000; and safety upgrades on the South-East Freeway at Callington, \$530,000.

Some of these upgrades are wire rope barriers, a bit of delineation, some tree removal I note on one road (that will get the Native Vegetation Council rocking and rolling), but I think there needs to be some serious work on the Callington to Goolwa Road and certainly on the section between Strathalbyn and Goolwa. It is a road I actually try to avoid and go other ways to get to Goolwa, because you get a lot of people (and I cannot blame them) who want to do a bit of sightseeing on this road and might get down to 60 km/h or 80 km/h, and it causes a lot of stress for people who want to get somewhere in a hurry. So, I think there needs to be some straightening out of this road and also some overtaking lanes put in in either direction.

I note in the member for Frome and the Minister for Regional Development's regional development fund announcement just yesterday that there will supposedly be \$150,000 spent yearly on projects associated with regional areas that host the country cabinet meetings. From what the government is telling us, there will be three country cabinet meetings per year, and if the government sticks to that proposal that equates to \$50,000 for a regional project in the area being visited by the Premier. I believe this is nothing more than a headline grabber and something that allows the Premier to walk into a regional community—and these regional communities have been neglected for the last 12 years—and say, 'Hey, look: here's \$50,000 for having me. Thank you very much.' It is almost tokenistic if it wasn't so laughable. So, I hope that this money—if it goes into regional communities—does go to good projects that are worthwhile, but we will have to wait and see.

I also note in *The Advertiser* today reports about the member for Frome, in making his announcement yesterday for the copied Liberal policy of \$15 million per year in a regional development fund—

**Mr Gardner:** A pale imitation.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes—the minister admitted that the Liberals offered more for the regions before the election. As I have stated previously in this place, the Minister for Regional Development, the member for Frome, could have gotten whatever he wanted in the deal from the Premier, and he has fallen outrageously short in his quest to be the regions' saviour. Including in this he could have won support for our CFS and his beloved recommendations made by the Select Committee on the Grain Handling Industry, and they were excellent recommendations because I was part of that committee.

All of these issues impact regional South Australia and regional South Australians. The Minister for Regional Development has made comments in the past regarding many of these issues; however, he now chooses to refrain from comment, especially when asked questions in this house. It seems the Minister for Regional Development is willing to say anything and do anything to further his political career.

Just in closing, this is just like his new friend the member for Waite. I have had a lot of things said to me in the last eight days about the actions of the member for Waite, so I have not had to say these things. It has been the people involved, the returned men, the RSL, the returned soldiers who have served this country, as the member for Waite has. I will not decry his service to this country;

23 years he was in the SAS, a lieutenant colonel. He knows all about honour and integrity and loyalty because that is what you expect in the military, and it is at the highest level. My brother, who also served for 23 years, but not in the SAS, says they are the 'SAS cats', they are the hot guys, they know what is going on.

Sadly, the member for Waite has crossed the floor so that he can take the 30 pieces of silver, and these are some of the reactions from people in the community I have talked to. One returned man said, 'I was going to send Martin,' the member for Waite, 'a white feather, but, no, I will send him the whole chicken'. Another said, 'We should invoke rule .303.' At another RSL function I attended recently, in the apologies announcement it was mentioned that the member for Waite, Martin Hamilton-Smith, would not be attending because he is not going to blue ribbon seats.

I hope the member for Waite has thought hard about the decisions he has made in this last week or so because they are going to tarnish his memory, and for his good name of all those soldiering years this will be his epitaph.

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (20:41):** I rise today to speak about a number of key issues in the electorate of Mitchell. We have talked recently about all the facts. We know the facts, and we know the numbers associated with the state's economy. We know the state's debt has grown from just over \$3 billion 12 years ago to almost \$14 billion now—a blowout of \$12 million. Of the past seven budgets, six were in deficit and only one was in surplus. Surplus budgets were promised at every one of those.

I preface the next comments with that because in that time nothing has been done about the Oaklands crossing, a piece of infrastructure very dear to my heart and very dear to the hearts of the people of Mitchell. I mentioned the \$11 billion of debt that has been racked up in that 12 years. I understand you have to spend money at times to make things happen, but with that \$11 billion debt (not the \$100 million or thereabouts, as is claimed by the previous transport minister) about \$100 million, maybe \$120 million, is needed for this project. Of that \$11 billion debt, that figure could not be put aside, and I find that very discouraging.

A total of \$6.8 million was spent on upgrading the station, and \$12.6 million was promised but pulled out back in 2001 in the 2001 state budget because of another blowout. It cost \$6.8 million to move the station, and \$12.6 million was promised to help renovate the area but was then pulled out of the budget. More recently, \$2 million was spent on a study. So, in 12 years \$11 billion has been spent in excess by this government and they could not find the money to fix this very important piece of infrastructure. I hope the Premier and Treasurer are away planning as we speak to make this happen. There was \$2 million dollars spent on the study; perhaps that will come to fruition when the budget is handed down. Here's hoping for a very key piece of infrastructure for the electorate of Mitchell.

This takes me to the car park tax, which has been talked about as well, I know, and again the people of Mitchell have raised this with me. They see it as a very slippery slope. We talk about having a car park tax in the city, and that has been the suggestion to date. Again, we wait for the budget to be handed down. As the Treasurer keeps telling us, that is where the facts and figures will be, but the people of Mitchell see this as a very slippery slope. We have it starting in the city, but where it will end is their concern.

I have had residents come and talk to me and they are very concerned. We have the biggest shopping precinct in the state in the electorate of Mitchell, the Westfield shopping precinct. It is getting bigger, it seems, by the minute. The Westfield Marion shopping complex has a lot of car parks, and I fear, and the residents of Mitchell fear, if we have a car park tax in the city, how long will it take before it evolves to the regions, before it evolves to Westfield Marion, before it perhaps heads down to the Hallett Cove shopping centre? Will it make its way to Colonnades? Will it make its way to the SA Aquatic Centre, the local library, maybe parks and even the beach? Who knows where this car park tax will end? That is the concern of a lot of people in the electorate of Mitchell.

I cannot speak on behalf of the mayor of the City of Marion or the mayor of the Onkaparinga council (both fit into my electorate), but I would be flabbergasted if they would condone a car park tax that could make its way into the suburbs and into shopping centres, as I said, like the Marion shopping centre and Colonnades. That is a great fear of the people of Mitchell. So, I suggest to the Treasurer: remove the car park tax altogether and allay the fears of the people of South Australia. It



is a grave concern, and it is one that sits with the people in my electorate, and they are very worried about it.

There are a couple of other things that had been promised during the election. I really hope we can get these locked away and, again, I hope the Treasurer and the Premier are away considering these right at the minute. Both sides of this house committed at the election to providing a toilet block at the Southbank reserve in Sheidow Park. I did a lot of doorknocking in this area, and I met a lot of people in Sheidow Park. It is a wonderful suburb. Perhaps, when you come for a schnitzel with me at the Crown Inn—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am waiting for the invite.

**Mr WINGARD:** It is still coming, I know. The invite is coming. We will pick a night that suits us both. When we go up to Reynella, we can cut through Sheidow Park because there is a little back way through, and it is a nice little journey, too. It is a great suburban part of Adelaide. There are a lot of houses there and a lot of supermarkets, as I talked about in my maiden speech. A lot of facilities and supermarkets fall out of that region.

The suburban homes have a very nice park there. Again, both sides of the house promised at the last election that they would get a toilet block for that reserve. It is very difficult when a lot of families come to this venue where there are parks, as I say, playgrounds and the like. They come to meet at this venue and, as you would imagine with children under the age of four or five, if you have a little walk to get to this park from the moment you get there, if you take two or three kids with you, Murphy's Law says that as soon as you get there one of them has to go to the toilet.

There is no toilet block there. It is something that this area, this region of the state, this great suburb, has called for for a long, long time. It was with great pleasure that we committed to it. I know that it was committed to on the other side as well, so I really look forward to having the Premier and also the Treasurer let us know when it will go ahead and when it will be happening because the people of Sheidow Park are really looking forward to that commitment which was made, as I said, by both sides.

There was another amenity around Sheidow Park, in the adjacent suburb of Trott Park. We will do a tour, you and I. We are going to have a great time, I tell you. We will just travel around and check it out, Deputy Speaker. I can take you to Trott Park as well because there they promised a dog—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sounds like a week of my life!

**Mr WINGARD:** You are looking forward to that, aren't you? I can see.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It's a week of my life!

**Mr WINGARD:** A dog-friendly park was promised as well, and that is something the people of Trott Park have been looking for. They do not ask for a lot, but that is something they are after. Again, both sides of the house promised it at the last election.

It is a great facility. They do not call them dog parks anymore, I am told. They are called 'dog-friendly' parks because they are open to everyone, but there are facilities there for dogs to run around and do their bits and pieces without getting in anyone's way. They are very popular right throughout my electorate, where there are a number of them, and people love them dearly; up in Trott Park I am sure they will really appreciate this. Again, it was committed to by both sides, so I look forward to hearing when we will get that done.

I did talk about the infrastructure at Oaklands Park train station, and it was remiss of me not to say that we have put a request in to speak to and speak with the transport minister. We are just waiting for the transport minister to get back to us to find out more about what is happening and when it will happen, so we look forward to hearing from the transport minister as far as the Oaklands Park station and crossover are concerned, at the intersection there.

The other one that was spoken about very much in my electorate is in Reynella, too, not far from the Crown Inn hotel—that is, the sporting complex there. It is a great community complex that houses a number of different sporting teams who all work very well together. It was a great experience during the election campaign to work with so many of these organisations. The bowls club does a marvellous job, as do the tennis club, the cricket club and the football club.

There is also a pistol and rifle shooting club there which, incidentally, has a couple of young athletes, who I will talk about later in this house when I have the time, who are off to the Commonwealth Games. They are a couple of young stars in the making from down Reynella way, and they will be people to watch out for when the Commonwealth Games roll around in Glasgow a little later this year.

The facility is down there as well. They are a great group of people who go about doing their own thing and do not create much of a fuss, but they did look at and did ask for bituminising around the edge of their facility. As I said, it takes in all those clubs that I just mentioned. In the summertime, when you go there and play cricket, people drive around the edge of the oval to get to their different venues. Dust blows up and blows right across the oval. You end up choking, and it makes the sausages taste terrible. The dust that blows through is quite confronting.

Likewise, in the wintertime, as the winter sports are played—I did not mention the netball club that is down there as well—they drive around to get to the netball club and they drive through mud and slush. You get out of your car and you are stepping in mud. It is a dust bowl in the summertime, it is mud and slush in the wintertime, and we are looking at getting some bituminising around there.

That was something that we did commit to during the election campaign. The other side did not commit to that, unfortunately, but we are hoping that in the spirit of goodwill they will come and have a look at this project. We will invite the Minister for Transport to come and have a look as well, and perhaps while we are doing the Southern Expressway we could get around to getting a little bit of that extra bitumen that might be left over at some stage and getting it around the edge of this great community facility.

It has got a lot of sporting clubs, as I mentioned, but there are also other community facilities that it is used for. There is a good community club there, and it is used by the seniors as well. It is a great area and a great part of the electorate of Mitchell, which hopefully, as they sit down and do the budget, the Premier and Treasurer will be able to find some money in their budget to make that happen.

They are a couple of the things that are important to the people of Mitchell—just a couple of small projects. There are some bigger projects that we can talk about later, such as the Southern Expressway that has been done. The people of Sheidow Park and Trott Park have had that go through their backyard during the months that it has taken to build—just over 12 months, I think, heading towards 18 months.

It has been a long project, and runs right through the heartland of Sheidow Park and Trott Park, but unfortunately for them they were ignored in the duplication and there is no on-off ramp at this part of the Southern Expressway. They have had all the building go on, and they have had it go through their backyard—the dust storms—and they have lived through the mess, but they will get no benefit from it.

That is another issue that I would like to take up with the transport minister when we do get that opportunity, because the Southern Expressway is great for the people of my region, but not being able to access it or use it is a great concern. With that, Madam Deputy Speaker, again I invite you down to the electorate of Mitchell. We will take you on a wonderful tour; the \$7 schnitzel is coming your way, and I look forward to it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member's time has expired. The only sport he did not mention during his contribution was calisthenics and, if he does not know, he should know that will be the lure to Mitchell.

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (20:51):** I rise to continue my remarks on the Supply Bill, which is currently before the house. In particular, I would like to draw the house's attention to the comments that have been made in the media today by both the Treasurer and I regarding the car park tax, which the government continues to call a transport development levy, but we all know exactly and precisely what this transport development levy is: it is a tax. It is all designed to raise money for this cash-strapped government which has led our state into this desperate position in terms of the budget.

We have been out there for an extended period of time—in fact, ever since the government raised the prospect of this hideous additional tax here in South Australia—on the record, saying that

we do not support a car park tax. You will recall, Deputy Speaker, that the first person to speak about this was three treasurers ago. When the member for Playford was the treasurer, he announced in the Mid-Year Budget Review in December that they would be introducing a transport development levy (or a car park tax) to hit the people of South Australia. This was continued by the next treasurer of South Australia, the Premier (the member for Cheltenham).

All the way through last year, it was the Liberal Party, Her Majesty's loyal opposition, which was asking important questions in this house about the implementation of this new tax. Right from day one, we have been asking questions about the implementation of this new tax. Well, guess what? We have actually got a new Treasurer, so this is the third treasurer (currently the member for West Torrens) that we have been asking questions about this implementation. Guess what? Still no answers.

Let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, this new car park tax comes into account in a few days time. It comes into effect on 1 July, yet today in the house, when we were asking questions of the Treasurer, of the previous treasurer (the now Premier) and of the treasurer before that (the Minister for Health), asking about what the GST implications of this new car park tax would be, none of them had any idea.

I asked this question of the Premier in November last year, and he said, 'I'll take that question on notice.' Well, call me crazy, but I would have expected—and I think most reasonable people would have expected—that the treasurer taking a question on notice about a tax which is going to come into effect by 1 July, would have got around to it some time before that tax was implemented. We know that we are now only days away from the implementation of this tax and there are no answers whatsoever from those opposite because they are not taking this seriously. They are not dealing with the parliament in a respectful way and they are not dealing with the public in a respectful way.

Well, let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, there is absolutely no chance whatsoever—and I think you would appreciate this—that the government's transport levy can be in place by 1 July, yet people in South Australia have been told that this tax will come into effect on 1 July, but no enabling legislation has been presented to this house to date. Even if the Treasurer came into this place tomorrow and put the draft bill on the table and he started the negotiations, there is no chance that it would be in place before 1 July.

What are people who have a car park meant to be doing on 1 July? Are they meant to be putting up their prices to accommodate this car park tax? How is it going to be levied? Is GST payable on this? Is this what they are to do? Let's say that they put that in place and the car park tax does not get through, do they have to refund that money to the people they have inadvertently charged a tax that never came into law? Or, alternatively, if they leave the rate at the current level, they do not charge the levy, what happens if the law comes in to place and it is retrospective to 1 July, what are they meant to do—pay it out of their own pocket? It is a mess, and it has been a mess for an extended period time, and that is why those people on this side of the house have been making it very clear that we need some answers.

Last night, in frustration, I announced in this house that, regardless of what happens with the introduction of this car park tax, the Liberal Party will not be supporting it, and I outlined the reasons to this house why we will not be supporting the car park tax. So, it was to my shock and amazement today that the Treasurer went on radio and started to say, 'This is disgraceful! We can't believe the Liberal Party would be doing this. This is a break of convention.' In fact, yesterday in the house—and I have been handed this document from our very efficient whip on this side of the house—he said:

The Transport Development Levy will be a budget measure and I expect, in the traditions of this house, that it will be a bipartisan measure.

Well, let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, it will not be a bipartisan measure. We spoke about this all the way through the election campaign. The people of South Australia do not want another tax here in South Australia. We are already the highest business taxed state in the nation. Our economy in South Australia has ground to a halt, and we do not believe that we are going to have a taxation-led recovery in South Australia. New taxes are not going to grow the prosperity of our state, and that is why we say that it is not going to happen.

The Treasurer says, 'This is going to cause a constitutional crisis.' Well, it is not, and I will explain to the house, and I will lay it down so that it is permanently in *Hansard*, why it is not going to cause a constitutional crisis. We are going to pass the Supply Bill. The bill that is currently before the house to guarantee the supply will be passed. I am the lead speaker on this bill, and I have already indicated to the house that we will be passing it.

The Appropriation Bill is normally in the same format as the Supply Bill, Yes, there can be some budget measure bills which sit alongside this Appropriation Bill, and we will vote against it. I believe that we will have the numbers in the Legislative Council to block that tax because the Hon. John Darley and also the Family First Party have said that they will vote against the car park tax. If it is introduced as a separate budget measures bill, it can be voted down without in any way touching the appropriation or the supply of money to keep our state operating.

So, why is the Treasurer so concerned? I put it to you that he wants to create a sense of crisis regarding this. He wants to see the Liberal Party back down from its position. Well, we will not; I can guarantee you that we will not. The only possible way he believes he will force us to back down is if he imbeds the transport development levy into the Appropriation Bill. This is completely unorthodox.

I say to the Treasurer: do not call our bluff, because we are not deviating. We are not changing our position. We are going to hold fast to the position that we took to the election—the position which is good for the people of South Australia and small businesses, the people who shop in the CBD, the people who live in the CBD and the people who work in the CBD. They do not want this tax. It is quite clear they do not want this tax, and that is our position.

There is no crisis whatsoever. Introduce it as a budget measures bill. We will defeat it. We will see what happens on the vote on the day, but we will certainly be voting against it and we have every indication others in the Legislative Council will be voting with the Liberal Party to defeat this tax, because we do not need it here in South Australia.

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (21:00):** Can I firstly begin by also echoing the sentiments of our leader that we in Hartley, representing many people who travel to the city for work, education and recreational activities, are also against this toxic car park tax, and we will certainly be opposing this tax when it is voted on.

Tonight, I wish to allude to three community projects. There is an array of projects that I could draw the attention of the house to, some of which I have touched on in previous speeches, but tonight I wish to speak on three community projects in the Hartley area, and I implore and ask the government to support these. The three projects are, first, the Campbelltown Leisure Centre, secondly, the Hectorville Sports and Community Club upgrade and, thirdly, the Felixstow master plan.

Beginning with the Campbelltown Leisure Centre, the centre is a fantastic facility. However, it requires substantial upgrade and there are, currently, plans to redevelop it. For those in the house who are unaware, it is actually the signature sporting and community redevelopment project being undertaken in the north-eastern suburbs. Both sides of politics had the opportunity before the March state election to put their case forward for an upgrade. Unlike those opposite me, it was only the Liberal Party that had the courage and the conviction to commit more funds to this project to ensure that an eight-lane FINA-qualified swimming pool would be featured in this upgrade.

As well, we are going to make sure there is a cafe in the upgraded leisure centre. We are going to make sure that children in Hartley will have the opportunity to learn to swim in the heart of Hartley, in Campbelltown. When the local government, the Campbelltown City Council, went to those opposite a second time and asked them to provide some money, the previous member for Hartley was unable to deliver that.

But I am here and I am proud to say that, because of the state Liberals' lobbying, there will be an upgrade of the Campbelltown Leisure Centre. It is going to be over \$22 million. It will include \$7.5 million being contributed by the local federal member for Sturt's government and \$3.6 million contributed by the state government, and the rest will be contributed by local government and organisations.

It is, obviously, a facility that is used by thousands of visitors, sporting users and recreational users every month, and I am proud to say, Deputy Speaker, that calisthenics will be conducted at

the centre and you are more than welcome. Once the ribbon is cut and it is opened, I will buy the Deputy Speaker a coffee and I will take you through the—

**Mr Gardner:** A cup of tea.

**Mr TARZIA:** Yes, a cup of tea, perhaps. I will take you through the facility, and let's work out a way that calisthenics can play a major part in the north-eastern suburbs. We would be happy to accommodate that in Hartley.

Obviously, there are a number of benefits of this leisure centre. There are the recreational and amenities aspects and, also, the fact that it will employ dozens of local people in the area. Obviously, there are many benefits in sport. Sport teaches you how to win, which is what we did in Hartley—we won. It teaches you how to lose as well, which sometimes is part of life, as we all know. It teaches you about being disciplined and being healthy.

I would certainly encourage the Treasurer, if he is listening at home (and I know he listens at home at times to these debates), since he does write the cheques, to please dig deep and put some money aside for the Campbelltown Leisure Centre, the Hectorville Sports and Community Club and the Felixstow master plan.

This leads on to my second project, the Hectorville Sports and Community Club, a fantastic local sporting club; a club which has over 700 members, I am led to believe, and it features many sports. It is actually in its 50<sup>th</sup> year, and what better way to help that club than by providing some funds to this great organisation? Of course, again, both sides of politics had the opportunity to make a pledge to this sports and community club. The Liberal candidate for Hartley—who is now myself as the member—pledged \$57,000 to the Hectorville Sports and Community Club. Unfortunately, the previous member for Hartley short-changed the club and only committed \$43,000. What an absolute shame that was.

The club is a great club, but the facilities are quite ageing in some areas, and I would encourage the current government and the Treasurer, if he is listening, to help these people out at the Hectorville Sports and Community Club. It is a fantastic club. Hundreds of volunteers go week in and week out. They cook the sausages at the sausage sizzles; they sell the scones during the week; they do all kinds of things to make this club run financially.

They have a big wish list that they wish to expand on, including greater disability access in terms of a ramp, an extended balcony, a new members area, a general clubroom upgrade, as well as a kitchen and bar area refurbishment, and improved lightning. It is a great club, but it could be much better, and I would encourage the current government to dig deep and help the Hectorville Sports and Community Club in the upcoming budget.

I want to talk a little bit about the notable recent achievements of the club. Firstly, in 2009 Hectorville were premiers in division 6 A grade premiers; in cricket most recently they were the B grade premiers of the B3 competition in 2002 and 2003; in netball they have also a wide range of achievements, including in 2013 being the sub 4 junior premiers; and in tennis, they were division 3 girls winter premiers in 2013. It is a fantastic club, but it could be much better if this government took them seriously and gave them a bit more money than \$43,000.

My final point, because I know it is getting late at night, is the Felixstow Reserve Master Plan. This is a great example of different tiers of government working together for a great cause. We all know that water is a very scarce resource, especially in the north-eastern and eastern suburbs. We have had some dry spells over the years, and what is a more precious resource than our water?

I am pleased to say that the Norwood, Payneham & St Peters Council, the council that I was a part of for almost four years as a local councillor, has taken the lead role, and it is a commendable role, to make sure that they develop the Felixstow Reserve Master Plan. It is about 1.5 hectares to two hectares and it is likely to be turned into a wetland as part of a \$28 million Waterproofing the East project which was announced last year. I am proud to say as a local councillor I was part of the council which approved the planning process for this.

The council has currently pledged to spend \$85,000 developing a master plan for the Langman Grove Reserve in conjunction with plans to harvest stormwater at the reserve. Now, this is obviously in addition to the \$9.5 million promised by the federal government. It is a great example, I

am led to believe through speaking to His Worship the Mayor this morning, of five council areas working together for a fantastic cause.

Other works suggested for part of the reserve include viewing platforms for the wetland, some artwork, some walkways, and other new and exciting facilities for the whole community to enjoy. I am certainly looking forward to updating the house over the coming months and the coming years as to how this development has affected and improved the local area.

I am hopeful that this is a successful project, unlike the Rann government project in Lochiel Park which to this day continues to have a failed gross pollutant trap (GPT), and those poor residents in Lochiel Park in Campbelltown have not been able to access recycled water since the inception of the development. Shame on this government. While I am at it, I also implore the government to dedicate funds to make sure that the GPT in Lochiel Park in Campbelltown is fixed.

This is a great sustainable project. It is a fantastic opportunity. It will allow people and our local council area to be self-sufficient, you could say. I call on the government to contribute not only to this project but the three projects that I have mentioned tonight. As I said, I hope the Treasurer is listening and writes these projects, with due respect, with some money in the upcoming budget.

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (21:10):** Tonight I rise to speak about a couple of projects that are very important to my community that I represent in the electorate of Bright. First up, I want to talk about the Brighton Rugby Union Football Club. This is a really interesting and important club in the community of Bright, one of the most successful rugby clubs in South Australia, and in fact in Australia's history with many back-to-back championships to its name.

I have a bit of a story here, Deputy Speaker, so please humour me. I was called to a meeting two days before the state election at the Brighton Rugby Union Football Club and at that meeting I found my main opponent in that election, the former member for Bright (Hon. Chloe Fox), with whom, as I have mentioned, I have had a very good relationship over the years and a very amiable election campaign. She was in attendance and it was an opportunity for the club to show us their very downtrodden facilities that had not been invested in since the 1970s. It has fallen short of disability access requirements and really did not meet the needs of a rapidly expanding club like the rugby club is.

I sympathised with the club but obviously two days before the state election I was not in a position to make any commitment to help that club apart from promising to form a strong relationship with them and to advocate on their behalf no matter what the outcome of the election would be two days later. The election came and went and I was obviously successfully elected to represent that area, and a great privilege that is. What subsequently turned up, though, was a letter which was presented to me by the Brighton Rugby Union Football Club board. They presented me with the letter because a Labor government unfortunately had been re-elected and they were in possession of a promise—something I see as a contract between a Labor government and that club—a funding promise. I quote one of the paragraphs in that letter, written by the former member for Bright to the rugby club, and remember that this was hand delivered to them the day before the election:

Upon careful examination of your community facilities upgrade proposal, I would like to propose that a Labor government would commit to a funding model wherein \$1 million would be provided by a combination of the club and the council (according to a ratio to be decided by those parties). That sum would then be matched by the State Government.

Clearly this pledge was made in contemplation that not only the local member would be defeated the following day but also that the Labor government would be defeated the following day because, when asked in this house about this matter, the Minister for Recreation and Sport threw his hands up in the air and knew nothing of it. He claimed that the government would not be providing any funds towards Brighton Rugby Union Football Club and instead this club would be left high and dry.

But they have a letter. This is in writing, a promise that a state Labor government will commit \$1 million if elected, and they were, sad to say in some places but not sad for Brighton Rugby Union Football Club, re-elected.

This leaves us with a tricky situation. However, I was heartened when the Treasurer stepped in to save the Minister for Recreation and Sport saying, 'We're going to look at and consider every promise that was made as we move towards the budget.' So really what I am saying tonight is that there is an opportunity for the Treasurer and the state government, as they formulate the state budget

to be handed down later this month, to restore faith in our democratic system and among the good members of the Brighton Rugby Union Football Club and to actually commit and fulfil that promise of \$1 million as proposed and promised by the previous member for Bright.

I guess the disappointment and disbelief that this club is experiencing leaves me to worry about another promise that was made by the government, a matched promise in the lead-up to the state election. Back in November 2013 the member for Mitchell and myself, when we were candidates for neighbouring seats down in the south, made a pledge that, if elected, we would provide \$500,000 to another great club down in the southern suburbs, and that is the Cove Sports and Community Club.

**Mr Gardner:** If a Liberal government was elected.

**Mr SPEIRS:** If a Liberal government was elected. The Cove Sports and Community Club is right down in the south of my electorate. It is pretty much at the most southerly point. They actually had not been blessed with the presence of either the former member for Bright or the former member for Mitchell for many, many years. In fact, they did not even know who the former member for Mitchell was. As soon as the current member for Mitchell and myself made this promise I had this picture in my head of phone calls between the former members, 'Where's the Cove Sports and Community Club?' and then getting out a GPS, plugging it into their car and making their way down to Oval Road at Hallett Cove and finding this place in their electorate that they had never been to before. It is a sure way to lose votes—you could actually hear the votes tumbling into the ballot box for the current member for Mitchell and myself.

Turning up at a club that you have not been to during your entire term in office and making a pledge plays directly into the cynicism. That is why people in South Australia are so sick of politics—politicians only turn up at election time and wave their hands and say, 'I'll get you something because it's election time and I want your vote.' Well, that does not work. In the Cove Sports and Community Club they have a corner with a varnished wooden sign which says 'Grumpy Old Men's Corner'. That corner is where the gospel is laid out in that club. They told the former member for Bright and the former member for Mitchell where to go with their promised \$453,000 grant.

However, we have a situation where the Labor government has made this promise and a club that is crying out for the investment which will provide new change rooms and new lighting, support the BMX club and the soccer club and provide other benefits for the netball club, the cricket club and the football club. Sorry, no calisthenics though at that site, but I do have calisthenics at the Seacliff Calisthenics Club just down the road, so we are catering for it in the wider community.

The Cove Sports and Community Club led by Keith Noble as the manager—and Keith is a fellow Scotsman—is in a fabulous financial situation. I cannot help but wonder whether that is because they have a Scot in charge of their finances and how the state government might benefit from more Scots involved in their fiscal ways.

Keith Noble is someone who is to be hugely applauded for the way he has managed that club and been able to create a surplus in that club's finances—something that not a lot of community clubs can actually say they have—to be able to contribute towards this upgrade, which includes money from the City of Marion council and also a state government pledge, and we hope it is a pledge. We know it is in writing, not that that seems to make a great deal of difference in my community with this government.

However, we are really hopeful that the government, when it comes to providing the funds that have been promised to the Cove Sports and Community Club, does follow through with that and is able to create an improved suite of facilities in one of the key clubs in my community, the largest club in the community and a club that has a huge benefit for the member for Mitchell's electorate as well.

It is a club that was long ignored by the state government, but I am glad that we have been able to bring the government along on the journey with the Cove Sports and Community Club. Hopefully this will lead to an honouring of the funding that was pledged by the government, and it will be provided in the new financial year. I, along with Keith Noble, the manager, and Andy Fry, the head of the soccer club there, will be greatly encouraged by the state government's support.

Motion carried.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (21:21):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 21:22 the house adjourned until Thursday 5 June 2014 at 10:30.