

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 3 July 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LADY KINTORE COTTAGES (TRUST PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (10:31): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Bills

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (SIMPLE POSSESSION OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

We have a situation in our state whereby offenders who are caught with small quantities of controlled or prescribed substances in non-commercial and non-trafficable quantities can elect not to go to court but to take a drug diversion program instead.

I think, in general terms, that is a positive opportunity for somebody who essentially has been caught with a small non-trafficable quantity of drugs—for example, somebody in a nightclub with a couple of pills or whatever. I do not condone that at all; in fact, I think it is absolutely disgraceful, but I think it is a positive thing that that person should have the opportunity to take what is essentially an educational program rather than go through the court system.

What I do not support, what I object to and what I want to change through this bill is that currently that person could elect to make that choice an unlimited number of times. So you get caught doing the wrong thing and say, 'Look, I'm terribly sorry, don't send me to court. I will take my drug diversion, I will take my re-education opportunity, and I will be a good boy or a good girl,' then get caught again and make the same choice, get caught again and make the same choice—perpetually making the same choice and avoiding genuine justice. I think it is a good idea that people who would take advantage of that kind opportunity that the law currently offers them get to do that but certainly not an unlimited number of times, which is what happens at the moment.

We need to change this, and it is a very simple change. What I am proposing is that the person could make the election once or twice, but on the third time that they are caught doing the wrong thing they go to court. They do not get to make that choice anymore themselves. Very importantly, when they go to court, a magistrate could make that choice. A magistrate would still have the right to allow that person a third go or a fourth go if they really thought that it was warranted, if they really thought that it was not going to be a waste of time, but the offender does not get to make that choice.

Let me give you some real life examples. In the 2011-12 financial year, 339 offenders were diverted to the program on three occasions; so 339 separate people took up this option three times. A total of 137 people took up this option four or more times, and one person took up this option 14 separate times—so one person on 14 separate occasions was caught with illegal drugs and 14 times said, 'I'm terribly sorry. I'll sort myself out. Just give me one more chance. I see the error of

my ways. Just send me off to the drug diversion program again and I promise you this time it will work.'

What rubbish, what absolute rubbish. Sure, once; sure, twice, but when you have had two go's and you get caught again, 'Off to court,' is my very strong view. Then the court can decide what is the best way to deal with this person, what is the best way to help this person. As I said, it may well be a third opportunity, but the magistrate will decide that, not the offender.

I mentioned some 2011-12 figures before. Unfortunately, they are the latest I have. I got those through FOI and they were provided to me through FOI, but then when I asked for the 2012-13 and the 2013-14 figures my request was rejected. I was told, 'I'm really sorry, the police can't provide those figures for you. You actually have to go to the health department for those.' I put an application in to the health department and was told, 'Actually, no, we're not going to release that information.'

For some reason it was okay to give me the 2011-12 figures, but the relevant FOI officers denied me the 2012-13 and the 2013-14 figures. I do not know why that is. I cannot think of any plausible reason why it would have been even more sensitive information. It might have been difficult or damaging to the government or something like that. I cannot imagine why it was okay initially, but not for the subsequent two years, unless perhaps of course the situation is getting worse. My fears that the situation is getting worse seem to be supported by an article in *The Advertiser* newspaper on 19 November last year by journalist Doug Robertson. I will quote a short passage from that article:

Drug users are abusing the system by repeatedly using the government diversion program to avoid the courts and criminal convictions, experts have warned, including one person who has completed it 32 times.

My 2011-12 figures highlighted a person who had gone through it 14 times, but this article, written in November last year, says that there is a person who has actually done it 32 times. How ridiculous! There would not be a member in this place, regardless of whether Liberal or Labor, who thinks that that is sensible. I urge the government to support this bill. I continue reading from that same article:

Several police officers, a top Adelaide psychologist—who all wish to remain anonymous—and Liberal police spokesman Dan van Holst Pellekaan told *The Advertiser* many repeat offenders had no intention of quitting illegal drugs and were manipulating the system.

So it is not just me; there are many other people out there who think this change is a good idea, and I will come back to that shortly. The quote continues:

Another user went on the program 14 times, while 27 per cent of all participants had repeated the program at least once in its 12-year history.

Five per cent of the more than 16,000 participants had tried three times to end their illegal drug-taking without success, and 5 per cent were diverted more than four times.

Those lost numbers are so important, apart from the concern that, in 2011-12, somebody took this option 14 times and subsequent to that it seems. I do not know where Doug Robertson got that information; he may have a more lenient FOI officer than I have, but he has certainly reported another person for accepting the opportunity 32 times. What is really important here is that 5 per cent have taken the option more than four times and 5 per cent have taken it more than three times. To me that does crystallise the size of the problem.

In broad terms, it seems that 10 per cent of the people who have this option—10 per cent of the offenders—are actually abusing the privilege, and that is very important because 90 per cent of the offenders, in rough terms, are actually taking advantage of the opportunity, are using the privilege granted to them and using it responsibly, and I do not want them to be penalised. I want the people who take that opportunity and who use it responsibly to be able to continue to do so into the future—different people of course, not the same individuals, but other people who find themselves, for whatever reason I cannot imagine, to be carrying illegal drugs. Ninety per cent of those people can continue to responsibly take up this diversion option that is available to them.

But, let's crack down on the 10 per cent. Let's change this law so that seemingly the 10 per cent, in rough terms, of the people who are not taking proper advantage of this opportunity, the 10 per cent of the 16,000 who find themselves in this situation get back on track, because clearly giving them repeated opportunities time after time, up to 32 times in one instance, is doing no-one any good whatsoever. We need to crack down on the recalcitrants who are laughing at the system and actually taking no penalty whatsoever for repeatedly being caught with illegal drugs.

One of the reasons this is so important is it takes up an enormous amount of police resources to allow people to take up this drug diversion program option. It is actually a police officer who has to do the admin, the leg work and the paperwork to book and enrol the person in. It is actually the police officer who has to follow up and see whether he or she have attended, a police officer who has to arrange it for them and, essentially, hold their hand all the way through the process. So, it is a complete waste of police resources over and over again.

On top of that, it is demoralising for police. Police are good people out there working really hard to prevent crime in our society and to catch people who commit crime in our society. It is quite natural that they get terribly demoralised if they keep catching the same people and they keep getting let off. It is absolutely ridiculous, absolutely preposterous. That is one of the good reasons that this suggestion was actually proposed in the '10 Years of the South Australian Police Drug Diversion Initiative' report that came out in May 2012. I quote from page 33 of the report, under the heading 'Discussion':

Compliance with diversions is generally very good, with an overall compliance level of 81 per cent. Nevertheless, another important finding is that compliance with diversion tends to decrease the more times an individual is diverted. This indicates that it may be necessary to re-visit the PDDI model and once again consider capping the number of times an individual can be diverted.

This is a recommendation made to the government by the police a couple of years ago. I could not imagine why the government would not choose to support this private member's bill. The police think it is a good idea, the public think it is a good idea, professionals who work in this area think it is a good idea, the opposition thinks it is a good idea, and I bet my life that the majority of members opposite would think that this is a good idea.

It is only about cracking down on the people who abuse the privilege. It is not about removing the privilege. It is about supporting the people who take the privilege and use it responsibly and do find the error of their ways and do get back on track and do not fall into the same traps again. It is trying to get at those people who typically take up the option and laugh at the police, laugh at the courts and laugh at everybody who is trying to help them. Those people have to go to court.

Those repeat offenders, on the third time they are caught with illegal drugs on their person, need to go to court—and give the magistrate the right to choose what the appropriate penalty should be, whatever that might be, and it could still be, if the magistrate (he or she) decided, a third opportunity; it does not rule that out. What it does do is it takes away the right for the offender to choose.

I do not accept an argument that this is going to clog up the courts, that this is going to make our already overcrowded court system fall over. If the courts cannot deal with repeat drug offenders, who can they deal with? If the courts cannot take on that responsibility, what responsibility will they take on? It is only the people who are not taking proper advantage of their right to elect the diversion program themselves who need to be dealt with in this way.

This private member's bill will improve people's behaviour after they have been caught, it will make our police and our legal system far more efficient, it will improve the efficiency of and save the cost to our police, and it will improve police morale. Many police officers come to me and say, 'This is devastating stuff. You catch people repeatedly. They laugh at you, they do a program and, guess what, as a police officer, I'm the one who has to plan it all for them, I am the one who has to do it for them.' I very earnestly call on the government to support this private member's bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON ELECTORAL REFORM BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (10:47): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for a commission of inquiry into electoral reform; to provide evidentiary powers and immunities in connection with the inquiries; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (10:47): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is my great pleasure today to move in this house, on behalf of the Liberal Party, this bill which is before the house, a commission of inquiry on electoral reform, and that is precisely what we need here in South Australia. We have a very proud history in this state of democracy. In fact, South Australia was, if you like, established as an experimental colony, as an act of the British parliament, in 1834, and our highest ideals were those of democracy, enterprise, freedom of expression and equality. Unfortunately for us here in South Australia, we have not lived up to those lofty ideals established when our colony was first envisaged as an act of the British parliament in 1834.

White settlers arrived here in 1836. We were granted, again by the British parliament, our own self-government in 1855, and we held our first general election here in South Australia in 1857. I am very proud to be living in this state, and I am very proud to be a member of a parliament which had a very advanced form of democracy right from day one. All Indigenous South Australians have had the same voting rights, commensurate with the white settlers, from the very first general election in 1857.

There were no restrictions in terms of real property assets or private wealth for members who were standing for the House of Assembly elections in 1857. I am very proud to be a member of a parliament which in 1894 was the very first place in the entire world that allowed women to run for parliament and the second place in the world to allow women to vote in parliament. What a proud record that is.

The first women were only granted the right to vote in England in 1918 and, in fact, all women were not allowed to vote in England until 1928, and we did it in South Australia in this very chamber in 1894, and that is something that every South Australian should be extremely proud of. Unfortunately, we cannot say that our democracy here in South Australia is currently at the cutting edge. We cannot say that democracy is being well served in South Australia, especially when we look at the election results in South Australia since 1989.

I refer more particularly to the complete disregard of the current system to the will of the people of South Australia. In the past seven elections, from 1989 onwards, the Australian Labor Party has only won the popular vote in South Australia once. They have only won the popular vote in South Australia since 1989 once in seven elections, yet they have formed government five times out of those seven elections. Of course the most recent election results are a continuation of this situation where the will of the people in South Australia, the very clear will of the people for change, has been completely ignored.

The position of the South Australian constitution is extraordinarily clear. Section 83 of the Constitution Act states:

...if candidates of a particular group attract more than 50 per cent of the popular vote [after the allocation of preferences] they will be elected in sufficient numbers to enable a government to be formed.

This is a consequence of the reforms proposed and put in place following on from the 1989 result in South Australia, yet in the most recent elections in South Australia—in fact, three out of the last four elections—we had this continuation where the Australian Labor Party has not won the popular vote yet it has been able to form government in four out of those four elections.

The most recent general election is a very stark situation for democracy in South Australia. The Liberal Party in that election won more than 45 per cent of the primary vote in this state, and the Australian Labor Party won less than 36 per cent of the primary vote in South Australia. There was a clear vote for change in the election when people went to the ballot box. Unfortunately, their will was completely denied with the result that has been effected thereafter.

This is something that we really need to take a very close look at. So, today, it is with great pleasure that I move this bill to establish a commission of inquiry into electoral reform in South Australia. The terms of reference are very clear. The term of reference of the inquiry is to inquire into and report on electoral reform that would ensure that the political party that receives the majority of the statewide vote at a general election of the members of the House of Assembly is elected in sufficient numbers to enable that party to form a government. It is very clear.

We would like that commission of inquiry to be established as soon as possible. We would like it to report to this parliament by 1 July 2015. This bill provides for three commissioners to be appointed by the Governor of South Australia on the recommendation of an appointment committee,

and we think that this appointment committee should be truly representative of the Parliament in South Australia.

We believe that this appointment committee should consist of one member of either house of parliament nominated by the Premier; one member of either house of parliament nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly; the leader of the South Australian Greens in the Legislative Council or another South Australian Greens member of the Legislative Council nominated by the leader of the South Australian Greens in the Legislative Council; the leader of the South Australian Family First party in the Legislative Council or another South Australian Family First member of the Legislative Council nominated by the leader of the South Australian Family First party in the Legislative Council; and, the Hon. John Darley MLC, the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC, the Hon. Bob Such MP and the Hon. Geoff Brock MP.

We would like the appointment of the committee to truly reflect the entire parliament. We need an independent inquiry because we need independent advice to this parliament on how we can best serve the will of the people in South Australia. We do not want the Labor Party designing an electoral system which suits the Labor Party—or the Liberal Party, for that matter, designing a system which suits the Liberal Party. We want an independent inquiry which is going to give the people of South Australia the democratic outcome that they wish for.

This inquiry will give the parliament a clear explanation of why the people's will is not being served in our state. The expert panel will give recommendations as to how the expectations of the constitution and those wanting to live in a true democracy can be fulfilled, and parliament will be provided with a road map for electoral reform that is informed by impartial advice that will allow us to correct the flaws that have led to the people being saddled with governments that they simply did not vote for. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we continue, the group leaving the gallery is, I believe, from TAFE, guests of the member for Adelaide, and we hope they enjoyed their time with us this morning.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ELECTIONS) (VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June 2014.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (10:57): I am pleased to speak in support of the bill the member for Goyder has brought to the house because I had some involvement in this particular issue several years ago when I was shadow minister for local government and the piece of legislation was brought to the parliament to change the act to put in place the voluntary registration of what you could regard as non-resident ratepayers.

If my memory serves me correctly, and I think it does in this regard, one of the reasons for this provision being included in the legislation back in 2009 when the act was changed was a review had been undertaken and one of the recommendations from that review was that nonresident ratepayers not be automatically included on the roll. From my recollection, that was supported by the local government sector, particularly the Local Government Association.

I also recall (being the shadow minister for local government at that time, I had responsibility for the carriage of that legislation in the house) that some amendments were moved on this side of the house not to include that provision in the act, namely, not excluding the automatic enrolment of nonresident ratepayers. However, that amendment was lost, as was the will of the parliament. I do not think it was supported: I cannot recall—obviously, it was five years ago—but it did not win the day, so it fell away. Before that part of the time line we obviously supported the automatic registration

of non-resident ratepayers and we took it to the March 2010 election as part of our local government election policy.

What eventuated in subsequent local government elections in the latter part of 2010 was a significant decline in voter participation concerning non-resident ratepayers. It was not only non-resident ratepayers but I think participation right across local government elections was reasonably poor.

Subsequent to that, I became aware that the local government sector, and particularly the Local Government Association, appeared to change its position in relation to its view on enrolment of non-resident ratepayers, to the point where I recall hearing in a media interview where it was said that they had not supported the exclusion of non-resident ratepayers from being automatically enrolled.

I may be mistaken, and I am happy to come back to the house to correct the record if I am, but I think my memory serves me correctly. I might not be everything to everybody but I think I have a reasonably good memory for things that have transpired where I may have had some responsibility and involvement in over the years. Be that as it may, it appears—

An honourable member: Always got your ouija board!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I'm not going to respond to that; that was part of yesterday's speeches. I am pleased that the Local Government Association has revised its situation and is supportive of the member for Goyder's proposition in relation to the bill. The Liberal Party maintained that policy position right through the preceding four years to the March 2014 election and it was part of our local government policy position at the most recent election. As I said, the member for Goyder is looking to implement our policy position in relation to this matter in bringing this bill to the house.

In my understanding, it has quite strong support from the Local Government Association and from a number of individual councils that have contacted the member for Goyder in relation to his consultation process. The reason that was given five years ago (or even before that when the review was being done) was that it was overly administrative; it was administratively burdensome for local government to collate a non-resident ratepayer roll.

I questioned that at the time because councils have a number of databases. They obviously have their ratepayer database and they have the House of Assembly roll database and I did not think it would be terribly difficult to overlay the two. However, the reasons given were that it was too time-consuming, too costly and basically just too much hassle for them to get around to collating a roll of that nature. However, because the vote was so dismal in 2010 they obviously did have a change of view about it.

Notwithstanding all that, we fast-forward some five or so years and we are now in the house debating this. I strongly urge the government to get behind this piece of legislation and support it. Obviously we are all looking significantly to the independent members of the house to support it because it is a common-sense approach.

It is a sensible thing to put in place. People who own businesses and own homes in council areas pay their rates and contribute to the local economies with their businesses and the like, so I think they have every right to be automatically included on the roll and be able to vote at council elections. That is the proposal before the parliament and I urge every member of the place to support it.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:05): I rise today to support the bill from the member for Goyder which seeks to reinstate automatic re-enrolment on the voters roll for all eligible South Australian businesses and property owners. Currently, in South Australia, if you are already on the state electoral roll to vote in the state election, or federal election for that matter, you will be automatically included on the council voters roll and will receive voting papers by post; that is if you are an individual.

Following legislative changes in 2009, if you are a landlord, a business lessee, a non-resident property owner or resident non-Australian citizen, you are no longer automatically included on the council voters roll, so unfortunately we are in a situation where a good proportion of our ratepayers are in fact not eligible to vote in local government elections unless, of course, they register. We have local government elections coming up later this year in November 2014—they have four-year fixed

terms as we do in this state parliament—so I think the bill is very timely. It will allow those who probably would not otherwise take the opportunity to vote to make the most of that opportunity.

Reinstating automatic re-enrolment will make it easier for South Australians to exercise their democratic right to vote. Historically, local government has had relatively low—quite low, in fact—participation rates and, indeed, the government had a target to increase voter participation rates in local government elections to 50 per cent by 2014. Certainly, at the moment, it does not look like being anywhere near that and, in fact, historically, a lot of local government elections have had participation rates of around 30 per cent. Probably the only time it ever gets above that is if there is an interesting mayoral contest, which does happen from time to time, or if there is a particular issue that voters view as important. Involvement is all important; participation is all important.

For a lot of South Australians, most of the interaction they have with any tier of government is with local government. For better or worse, we have three tiers of government here in Australia. We have a federal government, a state government and local governments and it is the local government—the local council—that is responsible for the really important things in people's lives. They are responsible for roads, rates and rubbish. It is an old cliché, I know, but the reality is that that is what is important to people, and often, the further we travel away from metropolitan areas, the more important local government becomes and the bigger is its role in people's lives.

I have nine local government areas in my one electorate of Flinders spreading across Eyre Peninsula. Just outside that area, included in the seat of Giles, are the District Council of Kimba and also the city of Whyalla, giving a collection of 11 local government areas which are all members of the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association—a very responsible, diligent and important organisation that brings all these far-flung local government areas together on a monthly basis.

My opinion is that strong and active local government is vital. As I said, it is one of the three tiers of government and, more often than not, it is the one interface that people have. Strong local government will result from having strong local involvement. That means all ratepayers should have the opportunity to exercise their right to vote and, for that reason, I support the bill and I urge the government to consider this very carefully and look to support it. Obviously it has been floating around as topical for a number of years and I commend the member for Goyder for his work on this and wish him well with this bill.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:10): The government does not support the bill at this time, I think for some very logical reasons that will be explained in due course. Given that the intention of the bill is to include a measure that would not be implemented until the 2018 local government elections, it is premature for the parliament to consider making a decision on this proposal before a thorough analysis is undertaken of the forthcoming local government elections, which conclude in November this year.

The Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 was amended in December 2009 to remove the automatic enrolment of property owners to be included on the voters roll for council elections, with the exception of the City Of Adelaide. The provision was passed by parliament based on the recommendation of an independent review of local government elections in 2008, and I recall it was supported by the Local Government Association (which had been involved in the review) at the time.

Until the 2010 government elections, those entitled to the property franchise did not need to be enrolled to vote, and their entitlement existed whether or not they chose to exercise it. It is certainly the case that, historically, relatively few property owners choose to exercise their property franchise right to vote in local government elections as opposed to their rights as residents.

Under section 13A(2) of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999, councils have the responsibility to inform potential electors—except for those electors already on the House of Assembly roll—of the requirement to apply to be enrolled on the voters roll in order to be entitled to vote. For the 2010 local government elections the Electoral Commissioner provided all councils with various materials to send to property franchisees notifying them of enrolment provisions and inviting them to enrol to vote. I am advised that while most councils sent out the relevant material and promoted this, it appeared this was not uniformly the case. I am further advised that relevant business and property bodies did not uniformly provide information to their members.

I acknowledge that there have been calls from some quarters, including from some councils, to reinstate the automatic enrolment of property franchisees to vote in local government elections.

This is in spite of the 2008 independent review finding, based on feedback and information from councils, that:

...councils incur significant expense in compiling and maintaining a separate voters' roll for local government elections...in most cases, the vast majority of this effort is wasted in respect of the 82.8 per cent of property franchisees who choose not to vote.

The Local Government Association has canvassed this with its member councils. As a result of this consultation the LGA board has decided to support the proposed amendment bill in principle and to consult further with councils on the cost and resource implications of the proposed change. At this stage—and I emphasise at this stage—the government considers it is more practical to encourage councils to promote voter enrolment to the eligible voters for the forthcoming November elections, to carefully monitor the results of the elections with regard to this issue, and then to include this issue in the review of the 2014 local government elections that will be undertaken.

The bill proposes that the automatic enrolment would not come into effect until 1 January 2015, as it is widely recognised that it is not practically possible to reintroduce this measure in time for the November elections. Indeed, I am advised that councils have already sent out information to property owners not on the roll inviting them to enrol to vote if they wish to do so. The government believes it is sensible to review the outcome of the 2014 local government elections first before the parliament is asked to make a decision about this proposal, which could not be put into full effect anyway until preparations begin for the 2018 local government elections.

The member for Goyder, in his second reading explanation in support of the bill, acknowledged that the amendment was 'relatively minor', but he did go on to qualify that claim and, in the interest of fairness and context, the full quote is: 'The amendment, while relatively minor, is important.' The change to the act in 2009 generated little interest at a local government level. I was a council member at the time and it did not come on the radar as an issue of significant concern.

I note that the member for Goyder endeavoured to seek the views of councils throughout the state, and all credit to him for making that effort. The interesting thing about the exercise is that most councils did not respond, and various peak organisations also failed to respond. Of the 68 councils in South Australia, only 19 provided a response. I am not in a position to say what the views of the councils that did not respond are but, as someone who was heavily involved in local government for over two decades, I think I can reasonably claim that the issue does not rank highly when it comes to the diverse priorities facing councils.

My comments do not reflect on the substance of the bill put by the member for Goyder, but they do reflect on the importance and the timing of the bill. There is no urgency, so I repeat that the issue can be reviewed after the local government elections in November, and can be reviewed in a broader context. What is now a priority for local councils and the communities that they represent is the Abbott government cuts to a range of programs and funding sources that directly impact on local councils. As an indication of the deep concern expressed by councils, I will quote a letter from the City of Whyalla. The letter states:

At its meeting held on Monday 19 May 2014, Whyalla City Council discussed the removal of the Federal Government's South Australian Road Funding Program.

From these discussions, and as a result of the impact across local governments in South Australia, Council resolved to:

- Express dismay and a strong objection to the Federal Budget decision to cut funding to South Australia for local roads, noting South Australia is the only state to receive such a cut.
- Make the Whyalla community aware of the impact of the cuts such as:
 - Removal of OPAL (Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle) program

Preventive health is always the easy target. It is always the easy target for governments—and I have to say governments of all persuasions—because it represents a long-term program that generates significant savings and significant improvement to quality of life. However, unfortunately, preventive health in the health field is nearly always the first to be hit. I can indicate that, in my region, OPAL was an incredibly successful grassroots preventive health program and, across the state, I think it was a very effective program that has now been totally destroyed.

The second point about the cuts the council letter makes is that those cuts will reduce their infrastructure spending and cause the possible future removal of their rate concessions to seniors

because of the complete walking away from a partnership agreement with respect to concessions for seniors. So, that is something that is exercising the minds of councils at the moment.

Time expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Speirs.

CITY OF ADELAIDE (CAPITAL CITY COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June 2014.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:21): The government opposes this bill. We have had this debate before in this place and, surprise, surprise, we oppose it for exactly the same reasons we opposed it the last time the member for Adelaide proposed something similar. I am not going to go over that whole debate today. The member for Taylor, the member for Croydon and others put this argument succinctly on that previous occasion in the last parliament.

Just to reiterate very briefly, the City of Adelaide Act was passed in 1998, and the Capital City Committee was established as a vehicle for the Adelaide City Council and the state government to come together to talk about issues of strategic importance to the city of Adelaide. It was established to provide a forum for consultation and discussion, and the sharing of ideas between the Adelaide City Council and the state government.

Let me emphasise that that is the state government, not the state parliament. While I am sure the member for Adelaide is a hardworking and well-respected member of parliament, she is not a member of the executive government. You need to win a few more seats for that.

Mr Pengilly: Neither are you, Lee.

Mr ODENWALDER: You need to win a few more seats for that.

Mr Pengilly: Neither am I.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, that's right.

Members interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Member for Finniss, I don't want to be a member of the Capital City Committee, by any stretch of the imagination—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: —neither does the member for Ashford.

Members interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: I will go further.

Mr Knoll: You can lead the charge—the revolution.

Mr ODENWALDER: I seek your protection, Deputy Speaker, from the rowdy member for Schubert.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are seeking protection from the Chair, are you? I will leave a note for the Speaker, member for Schubert. You will start off with a call to order, I think, at question time.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you. I appreciate your protection, Deputy Speaker. So, she is not a member of the executive government, sadly.

Members interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, that's right; sorry. It is difficult for *Hansard* to recognise the irony. Perhaps those little stars—

An honourable member: Italicise.

Mr ODENWALDER: Italicise. Even if the member for Adelaide was a member of the executive government, that still does not give her entree to the Capital City Committee. The Capital City Committee, as the member for Taylor pointed out last time, was established by the Liberal government in 1998 and, from that point until 2002, the Hon. Michael Armitage, the then member for Adelaide, was not a member of this committee, so the argument remains the same. Until the member for Adelaide is part of the executive government, and can make the argument in her own party room that she should, by virtue of being a member of the executive government and being a member for Adelaide, be part of the Capital City Committee, the government opposes this on logical grounds.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (11:24): I too will speak on this matter. I think many of the arguments were put quite clearly by the member for Adelaide when she opened debate on this item a few weeks ago and really made it very clear that she believes she brings that local grassroots approach to representing the City of Adelaide's residents, who she feels have, from time to time, been overlooked by the involvement of the government and the Adelaide City Council.

As the member for Adelaide has emphasised time and time again to members of the house, she feels that she is able to bring a creative and imaginative approach to representing the local residents and to advocate on their behalf. She feels that over time the Adelaide City Council has had difficulties in representing the wider interests of the residents of the city and has also struggled to have an effective working relationship, historically, with the government. I think that the member for Adelaide's desire to be part of this committee is something we should support in the house and try to make happen.

If we looked at this in relation to other cities in South Australia, I am sure that if we were to have a committee on the City of Adelaide or on Kangaroo Island, or somewhere like that, we would certainly look at having the local member heavily involved in that committee. So, there should be no reason why the member for Adelaide should not be heavily involved in a committee which represents the people by whom she was elected—not on one occasion, but on two occasions, and two occasions which were very much against the odds.

We have to remember that this is a member of parliament who was elected with a swing of almost 15 per cent in 2010 and only saw a swing of 1 per cent against her in 2014. She is an excellent local member who has just arrived in the chamber—it is great to see her come down—and she should be on this committee.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (FIREFIGHTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June 2014.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:27): I want to continue on from the comments I was making a number of weeks ago on this bill. I sought leave to continue my remarks because, obviously, the time slot for this Thursday morning—

An honourable member: You may get another chance to do it again!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I might, too. I only have a couple of minutes to go. We push on, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr Gardner: It is as if nothing has happened in between.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That's right—there has been a big void. I think where I left off from previously was confirming what the member for Stuart said: that the electorate of Kavel was the centre of the universe. I recall my comments were that pretty much every town in the electorate of Kavel has a CFS brigade; some of the small villages and hamlets do not, but the bigger towns—pretty well every large town in Kavel—has a CFS brigade. Over the 12 years that I have been in this place, I have been actively involved in their activity and concerned and interested in supporting them in their role of providing security and safety to the community.

We all know the valuable contribution that CFS volunteers make to our community. They go out any time of the day or night, rain, hail or shine. Their commitment to the community in their

volunteering is absolutely outstanding, and I made the point previously that society would be in chaos if it were not for our CFS volunteers and, more broadly, our volunteers right around South Australia. I need to seek leave again to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:30): I move:

That this house—

(a) notes—

- (i) that although nearly 70 years have passed since the end of World War II and the Holocaust, anti-Semitism still exists;
- (ii) the work of the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism and its purpose in drawing global attention to the resurgence of anti-Semitism, in old and new forms, in politics, international affairs and society; and
- (iii) that the declaration has been signed by parliamentarians in Australia and abroad;

(b) recognises the vast contributions made by the Jewish people to South Australian society;

(c) condemns any form of racial discrimination and anti-Semitism; and

(d) encourages all members of this house, regardless of party or politics, to sign the declaration and so assist to combat anti-Semitism across the globe.

Today I speak on a joint motion that the member for Morialta and I put before this 53rd Parliament. It is a motion I first raised in late 2013 and that fell off the *Notice Paper* at the end of the last parliament due to timing.

Jointly, the member for Morialta and I are founding the South Australian Parliamentary Friends of Israel, with the kind assistance of Mr Norman Schueler, who is in the gallery today. We will shortly host a function with members of the South Australian Jewish community and our parliamentary colleagues to mark our commitment to fight against anti-Semitism in our state and our nation by signing the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism.

Today's motion asks the parliament to note: that although nearly 70 years have passed since the end of World War II and the Holocaust, anti-Semitism still exists; the work of the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism and its purpose in drawing global attention to the resurgence of anti-Semitism, in old and new forms, in politics, international affairs and society; that the declaration has been signed by parliamentarians in Australia and abroad and recognises the vast contribution made by the Jewish community to South Australian society; condemns any form of racial discrimination and anti-Semitism; and encourages all members of this house, regardless of their party or politics, to sign the declaration and so assist to combat anti-Semitism across the globe.

Since 2009, leading parliamentarians from around the world have signed the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism and I look forward to signing this document in the coming weeks, signifying my own deep personal commitment to the cause. Anti-Semitism did not end at the conclusion of the Second World War. Indeed, the hated seeds of anti-Semitism were sown centuries earlier in the bloody pogroms and the libels against the Jewish people long before the formation of the modern nation of Israel. It is as real today as it was 70 years ago in the dreadful gas chambers in the Holocaust.

Only last October in Bondi, Sydney, a Jewish family was walking home from their Sabbath dinner and they were assaulted by eight young males. The family assaulted included four men—66, 48, 39, 27—and a 62-year-old woman. The men were wearing skull caps and the attackers yelled anti-Semitic insults during the assault. After their release from St Vincent's Hospital, a hospital spokesman said, 'You certainly don't come to Bondi and expect that. Maybe in Germany in the 1930s and Russia in the 1970s, but certainly not Sydney Australia.' That was in 2013.

The victims later released a statement saying, 'We are concerned about the need for education of future generations about the importance of goodwill and tolerance and the need for society to embrace these concepts.' This attack united 20 unlikely groups such as United Muslim

Women Association, Lebanese Muslim Association, groups from the Indian, Italian, Greek and Chinese communities, Cricket Australia and the Australian Rugby League to produce a joint message of solidarity and support for the victims of this hate crime. They wrote:

It attacks our overall way of life. Therefore such incidents, while generally isolated in our society, need to be taken very seriously and need to be used by all of us to demonstrate a commitment to Australia's generally successful multicultural model.

Mostly, Australian society has been a welcoming country for Jewish immigrants and whilst anti-Semitism has always existed, it has only occasionally been aggressive and acidic to the foundation of a truly harmonious tolerant multicultural Australian community where freedom to practice one's faith freely is paramount.

Australia's first convicted terrorist, Jack Roche, was gaoled for conspiring to bomb the Israeli Embassy in Canberra in 2000, and in 1975 ASIO documents revealed a terrorist plan to kill high-profile Jewish figures, including the Israeli ambassador Michael Elizur and Zionist spokesmen Isi Leibler and Sam Lipski. Former prime minister Bob Hawke was also considered for the attack. In the early 1990s in Adelaide I attended a rally against the racist group National Action that were active in promoting anti-Semitism at the time, and it was a frightening day on Prospect Road. I know the member for Torrens' husband was there, as a councillor at the time.

The contribution the Jewish community has made to our state and nation is well established. We have had many influential Jewish contributors to our nation's public life, such as General Sir John Monash GCMG KCB VD, a civil engineer who became the Australian military commander in the First World War; and governor-general Sir Isaac Isaacs. Notable for their successes in business and philanthropy are Sidney Myer, John Gandel, Peter Abeles, the Smorgon family, Marcus Besen, Frank Lowy, Richard Pratt and Joseph Gutnick.

We have only recently heard of the outstanding contribution of our own Mr Allen Bolaffi in this chamber with his untimely and sudden death. As the Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce director Rilka Warbanoff said, Mr Bolaffi was a compassionate friend and family man committed to the state and, 'Nothing compared to his qualities as a human being, he was involved in the community and passionate about South Australia.' Members, anti-Semitism cannot be tolerated in a modern multicultural nation such as ours. Our role as leaders and citizens must compel us to act against it, naming it for what it is: hateful, ignorant, divisive, insidious and unjust. This is why the London Declaration is so important.

Together, we can clearly say 'never again' by signing it; that we do not forget; that we will teach our children not to forget or deny a historical fact, or stand by as mute witnesses as the plague of hatred grows again, via the anonymity of the internet with putrid words or the violence of the October night in Bondi in 2013; that South Australia values the fight against discrimination in its laws and public discourse; and that as a parliament we actively stand side by side against the insidious nature of discrimination and the hatred that is anti-Semitism. Once, in the 1930s, other leaders were tested and failed; let that not be our fate.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:37): I am very grateful to the member for Taylor for moving this motion, and it gives me great honour to be able to second the motion. The member for Taylor and I worked together to get this motion drafted last year and I am pleased that we are able to approach it now. We are looking forward to the opportunity to have a function in this building to acknowledge the introduction of the Parliamentary Friends of Israel in the coming weeks and months, and I hope all members will take the opportunity to consider signing the London Declaration at that event, at which we will also further honour the life and work of Mr Allen Bolaffi, which has already attracted some comment in this parliament and in this debate this morning.

The member for Taylor has already, in a well-articulated fashion, described the motion. I will go through it step by step. To begin with, the motion notes:

- (i) that although nearly 70 years have passed since the end of World War II and the Holocaust, anti-Semitism still exists;
- (ii) the work of the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism and its purpose in drawing global attention to the resurgence of anti-Semitism, in old and new forms, in politics, international affairs and society; and
- (iii) that the declaration has been signed by parliamentarians in Australia and abroad;

The motion also states:

- (b) recognises the vast contributions made by the Jewish people to South Australian society;

The member for Taylor has identified some of those contributions already. Can I say that the South Australian Jewish community has made an enormous contribution, going right back to the beginning of the establishment of South Australia as a colony, particularly in the areas of politics, philanthropy, commerce and entertainment.

We note prominent early members of the Jewish community, such as Emmanuel Solomon, who opened the colony's first theatre; Vaiben Louis Solomon, briefly Premier of the State of South Australia, who contributed to our constitutional convention and played a part in Australia's federation and served in the federal parliament; and Daniel Baruh, who arrived in Adelaide in 1849 and was Australia's first Jewish surgeon. There have been eight mayors and lord mayors of Adelaide who have been of Jewish heritage.

The member for Taylor identified Sir John Monash, who I note that a number of military historians have identified as somebody who probably, if they had been in America, would have been remembered in such terms alongside people like Dwight D. Eisenhower and other great generals of modern history. There is Isaac Isaacs, the former governor-general, and I also want to acknowledge the work of Norman Schueler, who has contributed so much to the South Australian community and continues to do so through a range of roles, including on the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. It is a privilege, Norman, to have you with us in the gallery today. The Jewish community's contribution to South Australia and Australia's life and culture is significant.

The motion goes on to condemn any form of racial discrimination and anti-Semitism. One would have thought that today, in the 21st century in the year of 2014, this should not be necessary, but it so clearly is. The member for Taylor identified some examples and across the world this is a significant problem, and it is not just confined to examples where some leaders of countries have said that they want to push Israel into the sea. It is not confined just to that; it is also in the Western World. The *Washington Post* earlier this month reported that French Jewish leaders were feeling:

...the worst climate of anti-Semitism in decades...Among the multiple attacks reported this month include a June 23 incident in which 20 assailants beat up Jewish students wearing yarmulkes at a Paris library...two of the Jewish students were stabbed as they fled...On June 19, a rally in support of the three kidnapped Israeli teenagers came under attack by protesters who threw at least one flare or Molotov cocktail at the marches...Stars of David [have been] spray-painted on houses belonging to Jews in Gradignan in south-western France.

In Paris on 26 January, when we were celebrating Australia Day this year, thousands of Parisians took to the streets in a 'Day of Anger', when the slogan was shouted, 'Jews, France is not for you.'

In Greece, in recent weeks the Holocaust memorial in Athens has been sprayed with anti-Semitic graffiti including threats against the Jewish community. In Thessaloniki, just in the last month vandals desecrated the Jewish cemetery. The people have been staying up to watch the World Cup, and it is a great shame that SBS reported on 26 June that there was a Neo-Nazi pitch invasion during the Ghana versus Germany match. There are other reports of groups of spectators with anti-Semitic and Neo-Nazi symbols in the stands during some games.

This is not just happening around the world; it is happening in Australia as well. The 'Report on Anti-Semitism in Australia' last year reported that the total number of reported anti-Semitic incidents in Australia last year was the second highest on record—a 21 per cent increase over the previous 12-month period. The situation is also concerning in South Australia, and I have been provided with recent examples in Adelaide. A Star of David was pulled off the neck of an individual in Adelaide very recently, swastikas were painted on the fences at the Hackney synagogue, and hateful and threatening messages have been left on answering machines of people identified as being part of Adelaide's Jewish community.

At Adelaide University, it was reported in March that the campus sign was vandalised with a crudely-drawn Star of David with the number 666 and the words 'No Jew world order'. In recent years, 20 textbooks on Israeli law in the Barr-Smith Library were defaced with anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli slogans. Just in the last month, there was an auction in Adelaide of Nazi memorabilia—people making money from Holocaust survivors' misery, including a gas cannister, Nazi flags, swastika-embazoned SS officer swords and Nazi volunteers' badges.

I note that Norman Schueler, the president of the Jewish Community Council of South Australia at the time, identified it very well. He said:

I would not like to think that people are trying to profit by trading on other people's misery. These articles are a manifestation of what is an abhorrent part of history and will cause to those people who are affected—

Of course, we are talking about Holocaust survivors here—

many sleepless nights. We must continue in schools and universities to make people aware of the worst crime perpetuated on man ever and not allow its memory to be dulled by time.

I note that the firm involved has identified that it is unlikely that they would ever sell items like this again, given the strong reaction it has provoked, but how extraordinary it is that they had to see a reaction before it occurred to them that that was abhorrent behaviour. How extraordinary!

That is why this motion is important because it is important that we as parliamentarians and community leaders continue to make this point, to lead the debate and lead the community reaction to this because, frankly, I am sure that many people would not have expected that such an idea would have happened in the first place.

One of the manifestations in the 1930s of the Nazi takeover in Germany was the boycotts. I note that in April 1933 when the Nazis took power Joseph Goebbels delivered a speech in the Lustgarten urging Germans to boycott Jewish owned businesses. He described it as a legitimate response to the anti-German 'atrocities propaganda' being spread abroad by international Jews. The boycott was followed by anti-Semitic laws, followed by deportation, work camps and the Holocaust.

Some people in this day and age still call for boycotts. Some may have high-minded motives and I urge them to look at who your fellow travellers are, contemplate history and ask whether there is a more suitable way to air your political views. Anti-Semitism did not begin or end with World War II. As the member for Taylor identified, the issues are as real today as they were 70 years ago, which brings us to the fourth part of the motion that this house:

...encourages all members of this house, regardless of party or politics, to sign the declaration—

the London declaration—

and so assist to combat anti-Semitism across the globe.

I will conclude by reading some notes which I think summarise what the declaration stands for. In the preamble the declaration describes that:

We note the dramatic increase in recorded anti-Semitic hate crimes and attacks targeting Jewish persons and property, and Jewish religious, educational and communal institutions. We are alarmed at the resurrection of the old language of prejudice and its modern manifestations in rhetoric and political actions against Jews, Jewish belief and practice and the State of Israel.

The declaration is much broader, though, than just the State of Israel and, in fact, item 2 defines that:

Parliamentarians should speak out against anti-Semitism and discrimination directed against any minority, and guard against equivocation, hesitation and justification in the face of expressions of hatred;

The preamble concludes by stating:

We call upon national governments, parliaments, international institutions, political and civic leaders, NGOs, and civil society to affirm democratic and human values, build societies based on respect and citizenship and combat any manifestations of anti-Semitism and discrimination.

I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:47): I commend the member for bringing this motion to the house and I congratulate other speakers. I completely agree with the motion and observe that it was not until I went to live in the Middle East in 1993 that I came to fully understand the depths of discrimination, the damage it can do and the very personal context of it. I think the spirit of the motion is to condemn discrimination based on race wherever it may be, but with a particular focus on anti-Semitism which is an aspect of discrimination that has been with us, particularly those of us of European origin, for centuries.

It is a hard thing communicating with Jewish families when you visit them because you do not quite understand, because you are not part of their suffering, the stories that they have been

brought up on. It is a hard thing to imagine being a young person in Israel, or anywhere for that matter, knowing that your parent was probably the child of a Holocaust victim and had been brought up in that context, that your grandparent may well have had a number tattooed on their arm as a survivor, that you may have a family history where you have lost most of your extended family through what can only be described as an inhumane genocide, and then there are the deeper discriminations that went back long before World War II; in fact they go back centuries.

You have been brought up in a culture where you have this sense that at any time you could be purged or expelled. History is full of examples of Jewish peoples being expelled from their villages, expelled from their towns, moved from one place to another, not accepted, denied freedoms, and abused; it is just an endless story of discrimination.

It is hard to pin back in time exactly when it started. Everyone has a different point of view on that; some base it on religious texts, some base it on social and cultural origins. It is a mysterious thing, but it has hardened the hearts of many, because there is this sense that you are here today but you could be gone tomorrow. That discrimination does colour the flavour of the nation of Israel, in that there is this sense that it could all be gone in a moment because of this history of discrimination.

It hardens hearts. Of course, that is what discrimination and racial vilification does: it hardens hearts. People who would otherwise be free to live a happy and joyful life like most of us find themselves living under this dark grey cloud of racial discrimination and vilification. It is an awful thing. That is why I think this motion correctly observes that this is something that all parliamentarians should condemn.

The motion rises above politics. This is really about human values. People listening to this debate will have different views on the politics of the Middle East. They might have views on the policies of many of the nations in the Middle East, including the state of Israel, but those are political views. They are views of differences of opinion and of politics between nations. That should never transform itself into racial vilification.

One might take exception with the policies of the state of Israel. That should never be reinvented as hatred of Jewish people, any more than one might take exception with any country in the Middle East, be it any of the Middle Eastern nations, and suddenly start to discriminate against people of Arab origin or of Muslim faith or of any particular ethnicity in the region purely because of that ethnicity.

I think this is the great evil that this motion seeks to identify and condemn, that people can vilify someone purely on the basis of race. I think that is where the politics and the culture of history need to be separated from the racial issues and we all need to stand together, to rise above this great evil of racial vilification.

I support the comments made by the mover of the motion and by the member for Morialta about the wonderful work done by the South Australian Jewish community. We have all learned of the sad loss of Allen Bolaffi. Norman Schueler and many others in the Jewish community have made fantastic contributions to our state and to this nation. They are fantastic South Australians and for that reason alone shine as representatives of the South Australian Jewish community, of whom we can all be proud.

I think the London declaration was a great step forward. It called on parliamentarians to do certain things. It called on governments to do certain things. It called on the UN, the European Union, and leaders of all religious faiths to do certain things, as indeed they are. Members may not know that there is a law in Israel that prevents the destruction of any place of worship, and when you go there you will find mosques, Christian churches and synagogues everywhere, unable to be destroyed.

I saw an amazing example of that when I was taken to a remote settlement in the middle of the Sinai called Yamit. The township of Yamit is in a DMZ. Most members of the public will never go there. I remember Palestinians and Egyptians saying to me, 'Martin, you are the deputy chief of staff of the peacekeepers. You are the number three, you are a senior person, you must come to Yamit. You must see,' the Palestinians and the Arabs would say, 'what the Israelis did at Yamit.'

I would go to meetings. I got in a helicopter and I flew down to Yamit. Yamit was a town that had been settled during the occupation by Israel and they had turned a desert into a wonderland.

They grew some of the biggest fruits and vegetables and they took them off to Europe. They presented them and they won awards. It is just a brilliant settlement.

After the Camp David accords, when there was the withdrawal from the Sinai, a decision was taken that these towns would be destroyed and settled as the Jewish communities left. The only building still standing in the township was the synagogue, which could never be destroyed. The point the Palestinians were making was: 'Well, why did the Israelis destroy this town? We could have moved there, we could have had settlements there, we could put families there.'

It was only when you talked to the Israelis that you got the other side of the story, which was, essentially, that if they had left the town there it would have become a refugee camp, it would have been used as a base to attack across borders, and people would have lost their lives. You realise the complexity of the political issues. They had to destroy the town or it would have become a thorn in the side of peace in the region, and so on.

There is no right or wrong answer with any of this; these are complex issues, they are political issues, and should never be confused with the ultimate truth, and any discrimination based on race is to be condemned. We should rise above the politics of whatever is going on in the world and never let it devolve down into a hatred of anyone based on their faith, their ethnicity or race.

That is a message for us all, not only in regard to anti-Semitism but to any form of racial discrimination wherever it may come from, because proponents of it do not necessarily confine themselves to anti-Semite discrimination. They have a habit of spreading it to others, and it is a great evil that must be combated by all good men and women. This is a wonderful motion and I commend it to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:56): Unfortunately, I have to be more brief than I would choose to be because I have to get to a commitment in a few minutes. Compared with the rest of the world, we are relatively fortunate with regard to dealing with these issues. That is not to say that we do not have discrimination in our nation—we do and it is disgraceful. There are other racial discriminations that take place in South Australia and Australia more frequently than anti-Semitism, and I am pleased to say that all of it, I think, is improving in South Australia.

I particularly want to make a contribution to this motion and thank the member for Taylor for bringing it forward and thank the member for Morialta for his support on this as well and in working with this. I am the great grandson of a Holocaust victim, and one of my very strong family memories is hearing from my grandmother some of her memories about her family. I take this very strongly, but I would also like to add that any member's support for this motion in this chamber is in no way an effort for any of us to buy into the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and I know that the member for Taylor is not involved in that or suggesting that in any way. I know that from the bottom of my heart and I know that no other members are either.

Because a motion supports one particular group of people and stands up against discrimination against them does not put you on one side of an argument. I would—and I know that every other member of parliament here would—support just as passionately this principle if it had been brought on behalf of any other group that is unfairly vilified. I will always fight against discrimination based on race, based on age, based on sex or based on any other unacceptable descriptor whatsoever. I thank the member for Taylor for bringing this forward. I thank all members in this chamber for their support of this motion, and I commend it to the house.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:59): I am very happy to be able to support this motion today, and I am very much looking forward to being able to sign the declaration at the appropriate time, when arrangements are made to bring it into Parliament House. I think they are doing it in a ceremony, and I would encourage all members to be present at that ceremony and to put their name on that bit of paper because it is tremendously important.

Anti-Semitism is never acceptable, and that is why that declaration is important. Just because the Holocaust happened more than 70 years ago does not mean that we can now forget it because it was a long time ago and that was that. The reason the Holocaust occurred is because of anti-Semitism, which was ingrained over centuries, and there was a period of time in the history of Germany which allowed that anti-Semitism to be really concentrated and to become the horrible thing the Holocaust was.

But the precursor to it, the thing that allowed it to happen and allowed it to gain that foothold, apart from the conditions in Germany at the time, was the prevailing anti-Semitism that singled out one group of people simply because of their religion. That is not acceptable, and that is also the reason we cannot allow anti-Semitism to go unchallenged, to be allowed to become part of the background noise. It was a part of the background noise for centuries, and then when the conditions arrived, it blew up and became the Holocaust, and that cannot be allowed to happen again, that tragic, disgraceful event that besmirches us all, really. Let's not gild the lily here, the West largely turned a blind eye to the Holocaust until the liberation of Germany from the Nazi Party.

There is a saying that bad things happen when good people stay silent, and that is why things such as the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism must be encouraged because we cannot remain silent. Remaining silent allows those conditions that brought on the Holocaust to be recreated, to regenerate, waiting only for the opportunity to rear its head to become the ugly event the Holocaust was.

We should not allow anti-Semitism to continue, and that is why we should sign the London declaration. We also have to be careful in this place and others to be very clear that we cannot allow the other conditions that allowed anti-Semitism to blow up into a Holocaust to happen. We cannot allow totalitarian states to rise, we cannot allow totalitarian states to do whatever they want. We should speak out against that, we should take action against that sort of behaviour.

We have an obligation as human beings to act to protect fellow human beings, and that means that there are actions we can take in this parliament and in our society to make sure that we do not become a totalitarian state ourselves, that we protect and value our democracy and that we value our respect for each other and our tolerance of each other and our differences, our different religions, histories and cultures. That is an important part of ensuring that totalitarian states do not rise and allow latent anti-Semitism to explode into something far more terrible than that.

It is not just about getting on top of anti-Semitism; it is about playing a more active role in our world to make sure that we do what we reasonably can to prevent the rise, and to encourage the prevention of the rise, of totalitarian states that allow the terrors of the Holocaust and like events to occur. The document has my complete support, and I look forward to signing it. I will be lining up with great eagerness to sign that document when it comes to the house, and I encourage all members to do so.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:04): It gives me great pleasure to be able to stand today to speak on the motion the member for Taylor has brought to the house. I thank the member for Taylor for taking the time to put this motion together, a motion which is of incredible importance not only to Jewish people living in South Australia and Australia but, really, to what I believe Australia stands for, the freedom for people to be able to practise one's beliefs, religion and lifestyle in whatever way they want to without fear of being discriminated against or having violent acts committed against them.

As part of preparing to speak on this item this morning, I undertook some research into the background to the London declaration and into anti-Semitism in Australia, and I was taken aback by the level of anti-Semitism that still exists here. In fact, the very concerning thing is that this is not something that is diminishing and disappearing into the history of the Western world but rather something that has grown in recent years.

Having done that research and looked at the latest report by the Executive Council of Australian Jewry Incorporated, there were 657 recorded incidents defined by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (known as the Australian Human Rights Commission) as 'racist violence' against Jewish Australians in 2012-13. So, 657 racist acts against Jewish Australians. These included incidents such as physical assaults, vandalism to their property, threatening phone calls, hate mail, graffiti, threatening leaflets, posters and abusive and intimidating electronic mail.

This was 69 per cent greater than the average over the previous 23 years leading up to 2012-13 and the second highest recorded tally in the history of keeping those records. This is not something that we can archive away into our country or the world's history; it is actually something which seems to have almost come back into fashion in recent years. The most disturbing thing about this is that while it is incredibly important to have something like the London declaration and have the opportunity for parliamentarians across the world to be able to sign a declaration like this, it is

with huge sadness that we need to be in a position to do something like this and to bring the London declaration to the fore in the modern age.

The London declaration, by way of background—its full title is the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism—was signed on 17 February 2009 during an annual conference of the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Anti-Semitism. That conference brought together over 100 parliamentarians and NGO representatives from 35 different countries to discuss the uprising of contemporary anti-Semitism around the world; the uprising I have just outlined by way of statistics that we have also been experiencing here in Australia.

This is a worldwide problem and something that is growing in significance and we certainly need to work together at the international level, the national level and the local level to stamp it out. The group that came together for that inaugural conference noted the dramatic increase in recorded anti-Semitic hate crimes and attacks targeting Jewish people, property and institutions and proposed that the establishment of an international coalition was needed to confront and combat this issue.

The parliamentarians at this conference shared their knowledge, experience and recommendations and concluded with signing the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism. That declaration consists of 34 resolutions which are structured around six fundamental issues and I will just briefly run through them. The first is the concept of challenging anti-Semitism, which outlines that governments and the UN should resolve that never again will institutions of the international community and the dialogue of nation states be abused to try to establish any legitimacy for anti-Semitism, including the singling out of Israel for discriminatory treatment in the international arena.

The second of the fundamental issues looked to establish prohibitions against anti-Semitism. The third key issue looked at identifying the threat and sought that parliamentarians and leaders should return to their jurisdictions and establish inquiries that were tasked with determining the existing nature and the state of anti-Semitism in their countries, and develop recommendations for government and civil society action.

The fourth fundamental issue looked at working to increase education awareness and training in areas such as police, prosecutors and judges so that they had the instruments and the capacity to tackle the perpetrators of anti-Semitic hate crime and ensure that they are successfully apprehended, prosecuted, convicted and sentenced. The fifth fundamental issue looked at community support and sought that there should be a public notification of communities when anti-Semitic hate crimes occur in those communities, to build community confidence in reporting and pursuing convictions through the criminal justice system.

The sixth of those fundamental issues, and one that I think is very important in this modern age, was the media and the internet and the keenness of those signing the declaration that an international task force of internet specialists comprised of parliamentarians and experts should be established to create common metrics to measure anti-Semitism and other manifestations of hate online, and to develop policy recommendations and practical instruments for governments and international frameworks to tackle these problems.

That really outlines what the London declaration is all about, and I think it gives us that very clear framework through which we can look as a parliament, as a state and as a nation at tackling anti-Semitic behaviour. The status of the London declaration around Australia is growing. In New South Wales and Victoria, large numbers of parliamentarians have been involved in signing the declaration, and the parliament of Queensland has also shown a great interest in it. Federally, our former prime minister and a constituent of mine (Hon. Julia Gillard) was the fourth prime minister in the world to sign the declaration, after Britain's Gordon Brown and David Cameron and Canada's prime minister Stephen Harper.

We have at a federal level as well that recognition that this is something we need to be looking to, tackling and bringing to the public attention. As I said earlier, and as the members for Taylor, Morialta and Newland have repeated, this is not something that is consigned to our nation's history or the world's history. It is something that has relevance, unfortunately, in the world today and something that parliamentarians, given our privileged position as community leaders, should be standing up and speaking about.

For me, it is incredibly troubling that any form of racism would be on the rise in Australia or in the world, but I think, given the huge impact that the Jewish people have had and their history of

discrimination, hate and pain inflicted on their society and religion, it is something we need to be incredibly vigilant about. We need to be on the lookout for this in our society and continually look for ways to tackle it. I will be very keen to be one of the parliamentarians in this place who signs up to the London declaration when it is brought into the parliament for that to occur, and I will be happy to become a proud member of the Parliamentary Friends of Israel when the opportunity arises to do so.

I want to commend the members for Taylor and Morialta for bringing this to the house today and thank them for the opportunity for parliamentarians in this place to put on the record that we will not accept anti-Semitic behaviour and discrimination in this country or this state, and we will work together as leaders in our community to tackle that.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:14): I rise to support the motion put in front of the house today and I support the comments made by all colleagues in this place. I refer to the member for Bright, the youngest member in this chamber, I believe, and me as, I think, the oldest member in this chamber.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Why I say that—and this is not about me—but I am a child born five years after World War II finished. I have had—

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: If you don't mind, I am serious about this.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Finniss would like to be heard in silence.

Mr PENGILLY: As a result of that, I have had a lifetime of the Jewish faith and things like that forever in the back of my mind. I was sent to an Anglican boarding school when I was 12½ and there were a couple of lads there who did not go to chapel and were not required to. I asked them one day why not and they said that they were Jewish. I went home and talked to my mother about it and she said, 'Somewhere in our past we have Jewish blood.' I do not know where; do not ask me and it is irrelevant in the scheme of things. I then took to reading about things to do with the Jewish faith and I read a number of books by Leon Uris (*Exodus* and others) which I found fascinating.

Then, during my time at boarding school, the Six-Day War happened, which was a unanimous success for the State of Israel. That got me to looking even further and I discovered—and members may or may not be aware of this—that after World War I the League of Nations was going to create the State of Israel in north-west Australia. It was actually going to happen there; not many people know that and I think it is something that we can be proud of even though, unfortunately, it did not happen. The League of Nations was designed to end all wars and it failed dismally and the Jewish state was never created.

I am an unabashed supporter of Israel and of all things Jewish. I can remember watching this amazing little country of Israel during the Six-Day War and what came out of it and I became an even greater fan. I am saying 'I', but it is my history following these particular issues and the fact that six million European Jews were slaughtered during World War II during the Holocaust.

This motion is very timely; it is most appropriate and if I need to remind myself from time to time about what has happened in the past and still continues to happen, as has been brought up by several members today, I read *The Diary of Anne Frank*. That is good reading for anybody. I suggest that everyone should read it. Then you can go on to read about Raoul Wallenberg, whose name came up again the other day, and what he did to support Jewish people during World War II.

I cannot for the life of me comprehend why anti-Semitism even exists (or anti-anyone else for that matter) but there is something seriously wrong with the human race having this craziness about people, in some areas. Look at the United States of America and what has happened over there, look at the music that Jewish people have created—the Gershwins, the Irving Berlins and whatnot—and what they have achieved in the arts and medicine, it goes on and on. If you look at the history of persecution suffered by the Jewish people over hundreds of years it makes the mind boggle.

I refer now to the input of Jewish people in South Australia since it started. If you research the name Benjamin Mendes da Costa (I am sure I am right but I stand to be corrected if not), he was a great Jewish philanthropist who settled in South Australia. Da Costa Arcade and whatnot were all

named after Benjamin Mendes da Costa. More than that, look at Sir John Monash, an absolutely phenomenal great general from World War I who led Australian forces so brilliantly. He was taken to task for his military attributes because he was Jewish. It was ridiculous, crazy stuff, but he shone above it.

I could go on and on, but I do not need to. There may be others who need to speak. I am very happy to support the motion and sign the declaration when it arrives. Someone better remind me because I am getting old and I forget things. Quite aside from that, I applaud the motion and the support from both sides of the house and I look forward to it going through without any hesitation whatsoever.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:20): I would like to thank all members present in the chamber and those who were here before for their contributions this morning to this important motion. It recognises that anti-Semitism is not acceptable in our state or our nation and recognises the contribution of our local Jewish community and our national Jewish community, with some of the leading Jewish people mentioned before in some of the speeches. I commend the motion to the house and look forward to having members join us to sign this important declaration shortly.

Motion carried.

COUNTRY ROADS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:20): I move:

That this house—

- (a) opposes mandatory maximum speed limit reductions on country roads when there is no safety-based evidence to support the change, and
- (b) calls on the state government to—
 - (i) make public its review into maximum speed limits on regional roads in South Australia;
 - (ii) undertake a comprehensive safety audit of all country roads where the speed limit has been reduced from 110 km/h to 100 km/h in the past three years and, where there is no evidence to support improved road safety outcomes, immediately change the speed limit back;
 - (iii) commit funding to upgrade regional council and arterial roads currently posted at 110 km/h rather than further reduce speed limits; and
 - (iv) prioritise regional road maintenance when addressing the \$400 million on road maintenance backlog.

It seems to me that it is the desire of the government to continually make life more difficult for those living in regional areas. For years now, this government has been trying to reduce the speed limit in country areas and last year they announced a review of around 200 regional roads to see whether they should be reduced from 110 km/h to 100 km/h. I also note that roads within 100 kilometres of Adelaide have already been reduced to 100 km/h, many in my electorate and many in the member for Goyder's electorate and other surrounding electorates.

The government has had more than enough time to finalise this review, and I call on the government to make its review public. Let the evidence speak for itself. If the review finds that there is no evidence, the government must back down and scrap any proposed changes to speed limits. Make no mistake: the opposition supports any measure to make our roads safer, but we do not support arbitrary measures that target the wrong people in the wrong areas and which will not serve the purpose that it set out to do—namely, to reduce the road toll on our country roads.

This review, I believe, is a complete overreaction and will do very little to reduce the road toll in this state. Instead, people in country areas will be forced to travel for longer periods of time to get home, to work, to shop, to do business and to visit friends and family. These reductions will increase fatigue, frustration and keep people on our roads for longer.

For example, a 20-kilometre trip to work, which is quite common in the country, would normally take 11 minutes at 110 km/h and at 100 km/h the same trip would take 12 minutes. If that is extrapolated across only 5,000 people in the state, it means that country residents are on the road for a combined 83 hours extra per day across the state, 83 hours where fatigue from a hard day's work can set in, 83 hours where a drunk driver has the opportunity to swerve into oncoming traffic,

83 hours where someone high on drugs has the opportunity to total their vehicle and possibly take innocent lives with them.

If you want to take it even further, if a family takes a holiday to the city and has to drive 300 kilometres to Adelaide along country roads, then that trip will take at least an extra 15 minutes. How can this government possibly believe that in order to make our regional roads safer, we need to keep people behind the wheel for longer? Quite frankly, it is ridiculous. In short, such a measure will only cause our country roads to be busier, potentially increasing the possibility of serious accidents.

What the Labor government needs to realise is that it is not the people who are travelling at 110 km/h who are a danger on our roads but those who exceed the speed limit, those who are under the influence of alcohol or drugs, those who drive in a dangerous or erratic manner, and those who refuse to wear a seatbelt. These are the people the government should be targeting, not those travelling within a speed limit agreed by all to be a safe and responsible speed to travel.

Furthermore, some of the roads that have been earmarked for restrictions have had no deaths, no serious injuries and no minor injuries on them in the past five years. If these roads are already safe, under what possible logic can such restrictions be implemented? I can understand what the government is trying to do here, but taking a scattergun approach to such an important issue means those who have done no wrong will be the most affected. Unless there is substantial safety-based evidence that supports the change, there is no logical reason for the change to go ahead.

We also make mention that the Minister for Regional Development must step in here; he must, and I do not believe that he has no choice. He would understand that changing the speed limit of country roads would do nothing to improve road safety and instead would inconvenience country people and force them to spend more time behind the wheel. I call on the Minister for Regional Development to oppose the government's policy.

There are a number of roads in my electorate that will be affected if the changes come into effect. I particularly want to speak about the Mallee Highway, the Karoonda Highway that goes out from Murray Bridge, as well as the Mallee Highway that extends up through the Mallee from Taillem Bend through to Lameroo and Pinnaroo. I mention the Karoonda and Mallee Highways in particular because of what is happening with the negotiations between Viterra and Genesee & Wyoming.

These roads do need a lot of work done on them, especially with regard to the Mallee Highway. There are a lot of corners on that road (and there are all sorts of rumours about why there are so many, one theory being that when they were built there were bonuses paid to put the corners in). Be that as it may, if this state loses the ability to transport grain on rail, especially in the Mallee area, and in regard to my electorate and the member for Chaffey's electorate, this will just put far more traffic on our roads and cause far more issues on our roads than worrying about whether the speed limit is 110 or 100 km/h. It will have a massive impost on our communities.

Already, for the last couple of years roads like those on each side of the river from Murray Bridge through to Mannum, or if you want to go from Wellington through to Goolwa, or the freeway through Strathalbyn to Goolwa in my electorate, are back to 100 km/h, where there could be money better spent on road infrastructure upgrades, overtaking lanes, some straightening out of sections of road. But, no; the government says, 'Let's take the easy option and just bring the speed limit back to 100 km/h.'

Many constituents come to me and just shake their head, saying 'Why is this happening?' I say 'I'll tell you why. It's because you have a state Labor government that doesn't understand regional South Australia, doesn't understand the time lines and the distances that people have to drive on these roads, and the impact that has on people with fatigue and inattention that can come in after having to spend so much extra time travelling to their destinations.' It certainly needs to be addressed.

I note that all the local councils in my electorate—and I wrote to them all—explained their position to me, and they oppose any changes to the speed limit on roads that are already safe. My local councils were unanimous in their correspondence back to me in regard to decisions by the state government to have roads that are either already back to 100 km/h or seeing future limitations put on highways back from 110 km/h to 100 km/h.

Minister Brock would have heard similar views from his own councils, so he would be well aware of the arguments against such changes. Councils, police and constituents all agree that imposing a 100 km/h speed limit will do little to improve road safety on our country roads, but obviously this state Labor government believes it knows better.

Many of the roads that this government wishes to impose these measures upon are safe, visible and in respectable shape. I was provided with a report by the Murray Bridge council which stated that failing to look properly, failing to judge a vehicle's path or speed, and careless or reckless driving were the biggest contributors to road accidents, not speed. Country roads can be perfectly safe when travelling at 110 km/h. In the Northern Territory they have a speed limit of 130 km/h in quite a few areas, yet we do not see them imposing a 100 km/h limit. In fact, in February this year they opened up a 200 km/h section in the Northern Territory to trial the open speed limit, which they had for many years in the NT. They are trialling that for 12 months because of the safety record on that section of road.

Most of the time the safety of the road comes down to its condition, and then it gets down to people driving to the weather conditions at the time, and other conditions that impact on driving. We have seen a trend here, though: instead of maintaining and upgrading our country roads, this Labor government neglects them and lets them fall into disrepair. Then, instead of spending money to upgrade these roads, the government lowers the speed limit.

The government does not have the money to repair our country roads, they keep telling us, so they let them deteriorate and drop the speed limit to cover their backs. What we need is better country roads, not shoddy roads with artificial speed restrictions prompted by kneejerk reactions. This government needs to invest in making our roads safer to drive upon, repair damaged roads, improve road infrastructure and install more overtaking lanes, rumble strips and guardrails where appropriate. This is how you make our roads safer; not by letting them fall apart, dropping the speed limit and hoping for the best. That is a short-sighted and lazy way of governing but, then again, what else do we expect?

The government must instead commit funding to upgrade our regional council and arterial roads rather than further reduce speed limits. We have a \$400 million backlog of road maintenance in this state, which needs to be addressed immediately. I also call on the government to undertake a comprehensive audit of all the country roads where the speed limit has been reduced from 110 km/h to 100 km/h in the past three years. If there is no evidence that the measures have supported improved road safety then the speed limit should immediately be changed back.

In regard to the country roads that are applicable to the Minister for Regional Development (the member for Frome), he has the following roads under review in his electorate: Farrell Flat Road, between Clare and Hanson; the Barrier Highway, Manoora and Saddleworth; the Barrier Highway, Burra and Manoora. These are just a some of the 200 roads under review. We also have: the Horrocks Highway, between Stone Hut and Laura; the Horrocks Highway, between Laura and Gladstone; the Horrocks Highway, between Gladstone and Georgetown; the Horrocks Highway, between Georgetown and Yacka; the Possum Park Road, between Laura and Hughes Gap; and the Wilkins Highway, between Gladstone and Caltowie.

We have the Hughes Gap Road between Hughes Gap and Crystal Brook; the Goyder Highway at Crystal Brook access north; Venning Road—I am sure named after a very popular man—at Crystal Brook access south; the Spencer Highway between Port Pirie and Port Broughton; and Clements Road between Merriton and Clements Gap. We also have the Wilkins Highway between Warnertown and Gladstone; the Goyder Highway between Crystal Brook and Gulnare; the Marrabel-Waterloo Old Burra Road/Main Road 45; the Hill River Road to Andrews, northbound; and the Abattoirs Road at Port Pirie, eastbound.

Those are just the roads that I could find out of the 200 that are linked to the member for Frome's (the Minister for Regional Development) own electorate. These are roads that affect every regional member in this parliament. It is absolutely ridiculous to think that a speed limit change of 10 km/h will achieve what the government thinks it can achieve. The government needs to have a real rethink, and get out and drive around these regional roads to see how much extra time people have to spend on the roads, if that 10 km/h speed limit goes missing.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

SCHOOL FUNDING

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:37): I move:

That this house—

- (a) condemns the Abbott government for cuts to South Australian public, Catholic and independent school funding under South Australia's bilateral Gonski agreement with the Australian government;
- (b) notes the cut to the indexation rate by the Abbott government from an agreed 4.7 per cent to CPI, currently estimated at 2.5 per cent, and the freeze to the additional contribution which is estimated to reduce federal funding for South Australian public, Catholic and independent schools by \$335 million over 2018 and 2019; and
- (c) calls on the Abbott government to honour South Australian public, Catholic and independent school funding arrangements in full under the National Education Reform Agreement between the Australian government and the government of South Australia.

Education is the most powerful tool we can use to give every South Australian child the best possible start in life. As education reformer John Dewey said:

Education is a social process. Education is growth. Education is not a preparation for life; education is life itself.

For some of us in this place and for thousands of South Australian children, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, high-quality and accessible education is a key—a key that unlocks the door to a decent and secure job or paves the way to accessing higher education, sometimes as the first member of a family to do so, or simply provides a platform for improved self-esteem and confidence to fully participate in our community.

A key and enduring value of the South Australian Labor Party is to ensure that no South Australian is left behind, and this value was articulated as one of the key tenets of our election platform. Education was therefore at the heart of that platform:

- a platform which provided additional support to students by expanding counselling services to every single primary school—every single one;
- a platform to provide more opportunities for students to excel in their area of interest; and
- crucially, a platform to deliver on our full six-year commitment to the Gonski agreement.

I think it is important that this house reflects on the Gonski school funding agreement:

- an historic school funding agreement between two governments;
- an agreement to ensure that students who need extra help get it;
- an agreement which would provide an extra \$1.1 billion in funding for South Australian schools between 2014 and 2019;
- an agreement that would ensure a fairer and more consistent model of school funding with greater equity, transparency and accountability; and
- an agreement that would make a real difference to children in every suburb and every region of our state no matter what background they come from nor which school they go to.

Members may recall that the federal Tony Abbott Liberal government went to the last federal election, just 9½ months ago, saying they were on a unity ticket with Labor on school funding. Specifically, Mr Abbott said, 'There is no difference between Kevin Rudd and myself when it comes to school funding.' I am not sure that Tony Abbott understands what 'unity' means. What a betrayal of the South Australian community that, once elected, we see the federal Liberal government renege on their commitment to South Australian children through the Gonski agreement.

In the 2014 federal budget, the Abbott government announced that school funding from 2018 onwards would be indexed at CPI and enrolments. The same budget papers estimate CPI at 2.5 per cent—about half of the 4.7 per cent indexation rate in the agreed Gonski agreement. Indexing school funding to CPI and freezing the additional contribution under the Gonski agreement amounts to a \$335 million cut from years 5 and 6 of our signed agreement for South Australian public,

independent and Catholic schools. Tony Abbott and Christopher Pyne have effectively torn up our Gonski agreement. They have callously torn up a contract with the people of South Australia, a contract with parents, a commitment to our students.

I know that these cuts will be devastating to our schools. They amount to roughly \$1,280 per student. In my electorate of Reynell this means a loss of \$5.6 million in federal funding, resources and support—\$5.6 million. That is the equivalent of 50 teachers, or 65 student support officers. At Christies Beach High School and Southern Vocational College, it means a cut of \$1,462,000. At Wirreanda High School, it means a cut of \$1,103,000. At Christies Beach Primary School, it means a cut of \$468,000.

At Pimpala Primary School, a cut of \$457,000; at Flaxmill School, \$404,000; at Morphett Vale East School, \$394,000. At Christie Downs Primary School, it means a cut of \$348,000. At Morphett Vale Primary School, it means a cut of \$340,000; at Coorara Primary School, a cut of \$303,000. At O'Sullivan Beach Primary School, it means a cut of \$256,000. At Lonsdale Heights Primary School, it means a cut of \$124,000. Again, a total of \$5,659,000 cut from schools in Reynell—50 teachers and 65 student support officers. That is extra support that students in my local community will no longer have.

The federal Liberal government has broken its promise to South Australians on school funding, but I am proud that we are keeping ours. Over the next four years, our Treasurer and minister Rankine have confirmed that the state government is committed to our share of the bargain: an additional \$72.3 million under the Gonski agreement for all South Australian schools increasing to \$229.9 million over the full six years. I am proud to be part of a government that puts students and their education first and keeps its promise to ensure that no South Australian is left behind.

I will continue to campaign against the federal Liberal Abbott government cuts to education. We on this side of the chamber stand shoulder to shoulder with both government and non-government schools and, importantly, our communities in this fight. And fight we will for every child to access high quality education so that they, too, can find their pathway and they, too, can feel confident to participate in our community.

What remains to be seen is whether those opposite will join us in this fight. Will, for example, the member for Bright, whose electorate neighbours Reynell, stand up for schools in his area? I would be really happy to fight alongside him for the \$797,000 cut to Brighton Primary School, for the \$1,808,000 cut to Brighton Secondary School, for the \$462,000 cut from Hallett Cove East Primary School, for the \$1,633,000 cut from Hallett Cove School, for the \$209,000 cut from Hallett Cove South Primary School, for the \$28,000 cut from the Kilparrin Teaching and Assessment School and Services, for the \$564,000 cut from the Paringa Park Primary School, and for the \$512,000 cut from the Seacliff Primary School.

I look forward to working with him and all of those opposite, anyone who is committed to supporting South Australian students.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:46): I rise today to speak in favour of the motion moved by the member for Reynell, which among other things calls on the house to condemn the Abbott government for cuts to South Australian public, Catholic and independent school funding under South Australia's bilateral Gonski agreement with the Australian government and calls on the Abbott government to honour South Australian public, Catholic and independent school funding arrangements in full under the National Education Reform Agreement between the Australian government and the South Australian government.

I think it is fair to say that we all want our education system, our schools and our teachers to be the best they can be and that we all want our children to have the best chance to build a fulfilling future on the foundation of a strong education in well-resourced schools. We all want our schoolchildren to have the greatest opportunities they can. Continuing to invest in our schools, in our teachers and school support officers, and in our children is a way to ensure those opportunities are met.

The member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, and the Liberals campaigned on a unity ticket at the last election, so they said. We were led to believe in the end that we were all on the same page when, after more backflips I have to say than a gymnastics championship, the federal Liberals said that they would honour the Gonski pact; they would honour the funding already committed to our

schools. But now the member for Sturt and the federal Liberals describe our agreement as a 'bonus or blue sky promise'.

If those opposite will not stand with the Weatherill Labor government and, most tellingly, with the many members of the community from around Australia against the federal Liberal cuts, if they will not protest the trashing of the historic Gonski agreement, we can only take their silence, their inaction, to mean that they agree with the member for Sturt and Prime Minister Abbott.

The state Labor government has always put education first. Funding per student has doubled since Labor came to government in this state. We, on this side, care that children in South Australian schools have the best schools in the nation. We want them to have the best opportunities. We are now led to believe that the member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, the federal education minister, does not place the same importance on our schools as we on this side do.

As education minister, not only is he supporting the withdrawal from the full commitment to the Gonski schools funding agreement, but he is leading the charge. The actions of the federal government will result in South Australian schools receiving less federal funding than schools in other states. The 2014-15 Abbott government budget cuts will cut \$335 million from South Australian school funding across 2018-19. This equates to an average of \$1,280 per student or around 3,000 teachers across the state.

The state Weatherill government wants the federal Abbott government to reverse its decision, and I know that schools in my electorate of Torrens and I am sure schools in the member for Sturt's electorate do too. In the case of just the six public primary schools and one state secondary school in my electorate of Torrens, the member for Sturt's cuts will mean approximately \$2.4 million left for the education of local schoolchildren. Under these cuts by the federal Liberal government:

- Athelstone School, in the member for Sturt's electorate and state electorate of Morialta, will be \$421,000 worse off;
- Burnside Primary School, in the electorate of Bragg, will be \$954,000 worse off;
- Charles Campbell College, in the state electorate of Morialta, will be \$1,421,000 worse off;
- Dernancourt School in my electorate of Torrens, \$403,000;
- East Marden Primary School, in the state electorate of Hartley, will be \$714,000 worse off;
- East Torrens Primary School in Hartley, \$402,000;
- Felixstow Community School, again in Hartley, \$87,000;
- Gilles Plains Primary School, again in the electorate of Torrens, \$143,000;
- Glenunga International High School, for the member for Unley, \$1,956,000 is what Glenunga International High School will be missing out on;
- Highbury Primary School, in the member for Newland's electorate, \$737,000;
- Linden Park Primary School in Bragg, \$1,041,000;
- Magill School, again in Hartley, \$1,043,000;
- Marden Senior College in the Leader of the Opposition's seat of Dunstan, \$1,571,000;
- Marryatville Primary School, again in Dunstan, \$628,000;
- Norwood Morialta High School in Hartley, \$1,906,000;
- Open Access College in Dunstan, \$1,101,000;
- Paradise Primary School in Morialta, \$262,000;
- Stradbroke School, again in Morialta, \$959,000;
- Thorndon Park Primary School in Morialta, \$284,000;

- Trinity Gardens Primary School in Dunstan, \$851,000;
- Vale Park Primary School in Dunstan, \$462,000;
- Wandana Primary School in Florey, \$257,000; and
- Windsor Gardens Vocational College in Torrens, \$674,000

The Weatherill government is delivering on our commitment to Gonski. The 2014 state budget includes the fully agreed Gonski funding commitment of an extra \$72.3 million over the forward estimates for all South Australian schools. This increases to an extra \$229.9 million over the full six years of our agreement.

The government has worked with representatives of principals, teachers and school communities to distribute Gonski funding for 2014. Under the 2014 distribution, all schools received additional funding. Funding under our six-year agreement with the commonwealth grows each year, with the majority of additional funding in years five and six of our agreement. This increases to an extra \$229.9 million over the full six years of our agreement.

As minister Rankine has already stated, we want to see Christopher Pyne's cuts reversed. We will continue to campaign against the Abbott government's brutal cuts to education, which will result in poorer education outcomes in South Australian schools. I think it is fair to call upon those opposite to stand up to their Liberal colleagues in the federal parliament, stand up for South Australia, stand up for South Australian schools, South Australian schoolchildren and South Australian families. That is what their job in here is to do.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (12:55): I thank the member for Reynell for bringing this motion to the house and thank her for her words and for those of the member for Torrens, and I thank both of them their very strong support of their local schools. I know that they are incredibly concerned about these Gonski cuts.

I reiterate what both members have said: we are looking for bipartisan support from the elected members of this parliament to stand up for their schools. They have many schools in their electorates and they are going to suffer considerably. We really want this to be a united voice. We have the support of Liberal governments and Liberal ministers in other states that are prepared to stand up to Christopher Pyne and Tony Abbott. It appears all we are getting from the opposition in this place is silence. The Leader of the Opposition has said publicly that they oppose some of the health and education cuts. Let's hear what they are. Please stand up.

Last week I was in the Riverland, Jamestown and Port Pirie, and I visited a number of schools, including Renmark North Primary School, Gladstone High and Risdon Park Primary School. It was an opportunity to officially open millions of dollars of new facilities, including the new Riverland Special School (and the member for Chaffey joined me), new children's centres in Port Pirie and Jamestown, and a new administration building for the John Pirie Secondary School.

At each school, I experienced warmth and enthusiasm and had the privilege of watching students' performances and viewing their work, chatting to staff and to parents. It was wonderful to get a glimpse of the teaching and learning that takes place in each school and to see strong community involvement and support. It was heartbreaking, however, to see this work undermined by the millions of dollars of cuts by the Abbott government.

In failing to honour the last two years of our signed Gonski agreement, Tony Abbott and Christopher Pyne are cutting \$335 million out of schools in South Australia, and as we have heard, roughly \$1,280 per student. It equates to an additional 3,000 teachers in our schools. In the seat of Chaffey schools will lose \$6.97 million. For the Riverland Special School, that is \$78,000 taken out of their budget; for Renmark North Primary School, \$244,000. I visited Cobdogla Primary School, a small school—\$101,000 would make a big difference to that school. This is a cruel blow for these schools and their local communities.

In this house on Tuesday, the member for Chaffey made comment about my visit to the Riverland. He said, 'I had the education minister detailing that I had no concept of regional education.' Deputy Speaker, can I correct that record: I never said that at all. What I did say was the member for Chaffey, Tim Whetstone, along with his colleague David Pisoni, remained silent on this issue.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Families in the Riverland in the towns of Renmark—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have a point of order.

Mr PENGILLY: It is inappropriate to refer to the names of members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: She's reading from a press release and used their seats as well.

Mr PENGILLY: Well, I seek your—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. Minister.

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, the minister is going to seek leave to continue her remarks and then we will worry about it when that starts.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: the Speaker has already ruled that you cannot read from your own press release to include people's names in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I will have to confer with the Speaker and we will get back to you later. Minister, would you like to seek leave to continue your remarks?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I will seek leave.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

South Australian Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report 30 June 2013
Super SA Triple S Insurance Review—Report 30 June 2013

Ministerial Statement

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Following reports yesterday regarding contamination affecting some residential properties in Clovelly Park, I have sought advice from the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation to provide to the house. I understand the minister will provide a ministerial statement in another place, but he has advised me of the following. On the evening of 2 July 2014—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: it is customary that these be circulated.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is customary. Is there a printed statement?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: They will be here within minutes. I apologise for the delay. On the evening of 2 July 2014, residents of 40 properties in Clovelly Park were doorknocked by officers of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA), Housing SA and SA Health to provide an update regarding ongoing investigations into site contamination in the area.

These issues have been actively regulated by the EPA since October 2008, when site contamination was first identified. The contaminant detected at the affected residential area is trichloroethene (TCE), a colourless liquid chemical that is widely used in industrial applications, particularly for metal cleaning and degreasing, and is known to have been used in the Clovelly Park area.

TCE is a volatile chemical, meaning it readily evaporates and forms vapour, and it is now known to last in the environment for hundreds of years. It is suspected that these substances entered the groundwater from previous landowners through historical practices involving waste handling, storage and disposal. The World Health Organization and US EPA recommend further investigation at concentration levels of above two micrograms per cubic metre.

The TCE at the levels seen here does not indicate an immediate health risk to residents. However, in line with international standards, it is prudent to investigate concentration levels above two micrograms per cubic metre to mitigate or rule out any risk of long-term exposure. The EPA has required Monroe to effectively engage with residents in a timely manner. The EPA site contamination hotline has been provided on all written correspondence by Monroe to the residents.

In September 2012, a letter was sent to approximately 43 residents summarising the results of soil vapour and groundwater sampling and advising of the need for indoor air testing at selected residential properties. In December 2012, correspondence advising of an initial indoor air sampling event was sent to seven Housing SA properties, requesting samples be obtained from inside the properties, in addition to a letter to the wider community (approximately 43 residents).

In January 2013, advice was provided to the seven Housing SA properties and an additional 43 residents advising of the results of the first round of indoor air sampling and that a follow-up round was required. In April 2013, Monroe, URS Australia (the site contamination consultant), Housing SA and the EPA visited residents to advise of indoor air and soil vapour sampling. During late 2013, URS Australia undertook further indoor air and soil vapour sampling as part of the ongoing assessment work being undertaken within the residential area at Clovelly Park.

In October 2013, further letters were sent to approximately six targeted residents, in addition to a letter to approximately 43 residential properties, advising that further work was required involving indoor air testing. In December 2013, residents were advised by Monroe and URS Australia via a letter drop and direct discussion that the results of the indoor air sampling would be used to prepare a detailed site investigation report and committed to ongoing communication with the residents this year.

On 16 May 2014, the draft Vapour Intrusion Risk Assessment (VIRA) report was provided to the EPA, SA Health and Housing SA by consultants engaged by Monroe which indicated levels of TCE were higher than previously measured. After the draft VIRA report had been received on 16 May 2014, it was reviewed by an independent accredited auditor engaged by the EPA in accordance with best practice. In addition, the report was reviewed by the EPA and SA Health.

On 6 June 2014, a meeting was held between executives of SA Health, EPA, Housing SA and Renewal SA to discuss the VIRA report. In response to the assessment of the draft report, an interagency task force has been established, including representatives from the EPA, SA Health and Housing SA, to coordinate the government's response. On 25 June 2014, this task force proposed to government that, as a precautionary measure, residents of 31 properties be relocated over a period of six months while further investigation work is carried out. The task force proposed communication and engagement be undertaken in a coordinated and orderly fashion on 3 July 2014.

As a result of statements made in parliament on 2 July 2014, this communication and engagement was brought forward to ensure residents were fully informed of the situation by experts who could take them through the matter in detail and answer any immediate questions they may have. Housing SA has implemented a relocation plan for residents of 23 properties that will take place over a six-month period, commencing in the coming weeks.

Discussions have commenced with residents of two private properties in the investigation area to seek their input on a range of options for relocation or vapour intrusion mitigation. Further investigations are to be undertaken to determine the nature and extent of site contamination in the Clovelly Park area, and remediation options will also be investigated.

When a further investigation area has been identified, communication with residents in a wider area will occur to advise them of work being undertaken and to provide them with information on the nature of the investigation. Residents will also be invited to attend community open-house sessions, where they will have the opportunity to ask questions with EPA and SA Health specialists on the matter.

I advise that Monroe has been cooperating fully with the EPA and undertaking work and liaising with the residents, as required. The EPA will provide monthly updates to residents within the investigation area, and I encourage anyone seeking further information to contact the EPA on the hotline number 1800 770 174.

Question Time

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the State Emergency Management Committee met on Thursday last week, at one day's notice, to discuss issues of escalated air contamination at Clovelly Park?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:10): No, we are not going into cabinet processes, except to say that the matters about the way in which the matter has been dealt with have been adequately and, I believe, fully explained in the ministerial statement that has just been made.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the leader goes to a supplementary, I know that the opposition queried the degree to which the government could refuse to answer questions based on cabinet confidentiality. I have had a look at *House of Representatives Practice* and, indeed, I should actually be ruling those questions out of order; they shouldn't even get to the government. So, I would appreciate it if the opposition could frame its questions on this without reference to cabinet deliberations. The leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Supplementary, sir. Why is the Premier claiming cabinet confidentiality for the State Emergency Management Committee, given that it is not a cabinet committee and was created under section 6 of the Emergency Services Act 2014?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:12): It amounts to a committee of our cabinet. It is a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, it is. It amounts to a committee of our cabinet, and the processes of our cabinet are not those that are disclosed in this place. Can I say that all of the relevant information that has been disclosed to this place in the ministerial statement of the minister gives you the complete picture—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know that those opposite are drowning, but please do not seize upon this issue to seek to recover your position. We have set out to the house fully and completely all of the deliberations that have occurred over an extended period between 2008 and this time, including all of the advice that we have received, on which we have acted carefully and assiduously, and then brought all of that material to this place and explained it.

Mr MARSHALL: Sir—

The SPEAKER: I presume that you would like another supplementary?

Mr MARSHALL: I would like to ask you a question, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, normally questions to the Speaker occur at the end of question time.

Mr MARSHALL: To seek a clarification to your previous ruling, because the Premier has just stood up in the house and said that the State Emergency Management Committee is a subcommittee of cabinet, whereas, clearly, it is our understanding that that has been established under section 6 of the Emergency Management Act.

The SPEAKER: So, it's a point of order, and the point of order is that EMC is not part of cabinet and therefore does not attract the cabinet confidentiality?

Mr MARSHALL: Absolutely, sir, and we seek a ruling.

The SPEAKER: Alright. Well, I—

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: My remarks are directed at the Emergency Management Committee of parliament. If there are other processes—

An honourable member: Of cabinet.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Of cabinet. If there are other processes which have been—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am speaking about the Emergency Management Committee of cabinet. That is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If your question is about another committee, we will make sure that the relevant material is provided to you.

The SPEAKER: Leader, could I just say, from my memory of being in the ministry, there was an emergency management committee of cabinet which, being a cabinet committee, attracts cabinet confidentiality.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Then there was the emergency management council, which included representatives of the various emergency services sitting together with ministers, which may or may not attract confidentiality. That is really what I have got to rule on. You are asking me: is the emergency management council subject to cabinet confidentiality?

Mr MARSHALL: Correct, sir.

The SPEAKER: I will take that question on notice. But before I deal with that, I call to order the members for Morialta, Unley and the deputy leader. Leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. In relation to escalated air contamination at Clovelly Park, why did the government spend 48 days developing a public relations strategy when there is a standard EPA protocol for advising the public?

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finnis is called to order for that involuntary ejaculation. The Minister for Manufacturing.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:15): As the member of this house who represents the Minister for Environment in the other place, I have endeavoured to familiarise myself with some of the information that the opposition may be asking about today. My understanding is that the period of time—as I believe I referred to in the ministerial statement—between the receiving of the report that came from Monroe and its consultants and the time when people were going to be informed about the implications for themselves, was taken to have an auditor confirm the report and understand those implications, to confer between the relevant agencies to determine the appropriate reaction, and then to go out and speak to the residents.

I understand that the reason for the need for that discussion is, first of all, of course, to determine whether the data that is provided is accurate and sufficient to draw a conclusion and,

secondly, to make sure that there are not unnecessarily alarming messages sent, that are not accurate, to people about the implications for them. The EPA and SA Health, in particular, are the experts in that field and, of course, Housing SA was involved in that task force also, given that the vast majority of people are tenants.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Supplementary, sir. My supplementary is: why didn't the government follow the standard EPA protocol on their website, which states:

The EPA's first steps are to place notification on the EPA public register, the EPA website and a public notice in the local media.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is called to order. Minister for Manufacturing.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:18): I believe, simply by my own observation, there is information on the EPA website, because I had a look at it earlier today. What I am uncertain about in terms of what the leader is quoting to me is whether, when it states 'first steps', that would, on my understanding of how these things work, come after due diligence has been done on the data and a determination of what the accurate information would be. Today, as I say, I have looked on the EPA website and there is material there. So it would seem to me, on the face of it, that they have fulfilled that. In terms of an advertisement in the local paper, I am uncertain about that.

The SPEAKER: A second question.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Did the government reject a request from the Local Government Association representative on the State Emergency Management Committee to inform the City of Marion, when such advice is already part of the EPA protocol?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:19): I haven't got that information here for the leader but I will get an answer and bring it back to the house. I am sorry, I haven't got that information.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Further supplementary.

The SPEAKER: First supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. Supplementary to the Minister for Local Government. When was local government notified of air contamination rising above acceptable levels at Clovelly Park?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:19): I did start to stand up previously but I wasn't quite quick enough. I think what is important is that we get the full details of the information and how it has been communicated to the public. I will come back with an answer about the communication with local government, but what we know is that the people affected have been doorknocked and visited personally. We also know that an information session will be held, as was in the ministerial statement. In terms of direct communication with the council, I will endeavour to get an answer for you.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Supplementary: is the minister aware why the government rejected a request from the Local Government Association representative on the State Emergency Management Committee —

The SPEAKER: Committee, yes.

Mr MARSHALL: Committee—so, we were correct in the first place, that means, sir, I believe, possibly—to inform the City of Marion.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:20): I have no information that indicates to me that your supposition is correct, but we will find out.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Further supplementary: when was the local member, the member for Elder, advised of this escalated air contamination in the Clovelly Park area?

The SPEAKER: That isn't a supplementary because it doesn't arise out of the previous question or the previous answer.

Mr MARSHALL: She said she is waiting for this information: it is supplementary to that information.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't think it is cognate because the minister said she would get further information, so that is a separate question. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:21): Clearly, the member is now aware. I have not been briefed about when she was first made aware.

Ms Chapman: Ask her.

Mr Marshall: The Premier couldn't answer yesterday, and you can't answer today.

The SPEAKER: I call the leader to order and I warn the deputy leader for the first time. The member for Newland.

SAAB ADVANCED MARITIME SYSTEMS CENTRE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the opening of Saab's Advanced Maritime Systems Centre in Adelaide's north and what it says about the future of our local defence industry?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for his question. It was my great pleasure to attend at the opening of the new Advanced Maritime Systems Centre down at Mawson Lakes together with the Hon. David Johnston, local Leader of the Opposition and member for Dunstan, and a number of federal MPs. This purpose-built centre is really a demonstration of the strength with which the South Australian defence state ambition has been realised.

It will bring Saab's naval combat systems resources, skills and expertise into a single location. It has brought people from interstate and overseas to be part of that. It will also ensure the continued growth of local skills and expertise in the Royal Australian Navy's combat systems. They have ambitions to grow 100 new jobs in this particular area over the next few years which is a very exciting development here in South Australia, because these are the sorts of high-end jobs that have a massive future for our advanced manufacturing capability and our systems development capability.

They are selling these products overseas, so it has a long-term capacity to grow, and I was thrilled to be at this event. Senator Johnston and I had the opportunity to see the new centre used for a training simulation and it was quite exciting to see the way in which these naval combat systems, in a simulated process, were able to see off a threat off the coast of South Australia and through a very—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right—it's not identified what the threat was, but the particular attack was to send off a missile to intercept an incoming missile. These automated systems, which I think have to respond within seven seconds, are an extraordinary indication of the power of that particular technology. In addition to serving the Royal Australian Navy, the Advanced Maritime Service Centre will provide Saab with the opportunity to grow its capability and serve developing markets in areas such as Canada and India.

Based in Mawson Lakes, the Advanced Maritime Systems Centre is located next to other key defence research and development hubs and helps to further strengthen the area's maritime credentials. This is particularly helpful as the South Australian government works to secure the future of our nation's indigenous defence capability.

They also have ambitions to be deeply involved in relation to the Future Submarines project. They have acquired Kockums in Sweden, which of course was the precursor to the arrangements which led to our Future Submarines. It was very gratifying to see the way the Minister for Defence was fully supportive of this investment. It augurs very well for the future and this is a great new initiative for South Australia.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Health. Did the minister refuse the request of the Minister for Environment to co-sign a report in relation to escalated air contamination at Clovelly Park?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:25): As far as I am aware, no request was made to me. What I can inform the house, though, is what health's involvement in this process has been. There is an MOU that exists between the Department of Health and the EPA which enables the EPA to get advice directly from public health, to access the expertise of public health, about these issues when it comes to matters of contamination, and that is exactly what has happened in that process.

The process with public health is that they communicate directly with the EPA and provide them with the expertise they require. That is not done through me, through my office or, indeed, through the chief executive of the department; it is done directly between public health and the EPA, and that has been the process in this matter.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): When was the Minister for Health first made aware of the escalated air contamination levels at Clovelly Park, and what action did he take upon becoming made aware?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:26): To my knowledge, I have never been formally briefed by my department on this issue because the public health branch of my department have been communicating directly with the EPA, so they haven't had to communicate or brief me.

My understanding is that the former minister for health may have received a formal briefing some time ago about this matter in its early stages, but I have not been advised formally, or briefed formally, because the MOU provides for my department or public health to communicate directly with the EPA to provide them with the expertise they need.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Why was a Clovelly Park resident of 25 years told one year ago that he would be relocated but nothing happened?

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) (14:27): I thank the leader for the question. I have no understanding of people being directed to be relocated a year ago. We do know that there has been continual engagement with the community, as detailed in the ministerial statement. We know that in September 2010 a letter was sent to about 43 residents summarising the results. In December 2012, there was correspondence advising of an initial indoor air sampling event and sent to seven Housing SA properties requesting samples.

In January 2013, advice was provided to seven Housing SA properties. An additional 43 residents provided the results of the first round. In October 2013, further letters were sent to six targeted residents, and an additional letter to approximately 43 residential properties advising that further work was required. In December 2013, residents were advised by Monroe and URS Australia via a letter drop and direct discussion that the results of the indoor air sampling would be used to prepare a detailed site investigation report and committed to ongoing communications with the residents.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary. The leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Given that the government has been made aware of dangerous contamination in the Clovelly Park area for six years, why was no relocation strategy put in place for residents in that area?

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) (14:28): I am advised that the EPA, after extensive testing, has determined that a public health risk to residents exists from the site contamination. The risk has been identified following an investigation that commenced in 2008. As a government, we are guided by the expert advice of the EPA and the Department of Health and Ageing in assessing the public risk to residents.

I understand that the EPA and the Department of Health and Ageing have reached the conclusion that the elevated levels of TCE in the residential vapour investigation area warrant intervention, as indicated in the ministerial statement, and warrant intervention given the nature of the properties constructed in the area.

Housing SA has received advice from the EPA that residents from this area should be relocated as a precaution, and we take this advice seriously. Now, we will be working with residents to identify a suitable alternative property.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the first time and so is the member for Morialta. Leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Have any Housing Trust homes in Clovelly Park been transferred to the non-government sector since 2008?

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) (14:30): No.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Okay. When was the Minister for Social Housing first made aware of air contamination rising above acceptable levels in Clovelly Park?

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) (14:30): As I advised, the EPA has determined that this is the risk. Housing SA has received advice from the EPA that there should be relocation as a precaution, and we take this seriously. On 6 June 2014, Housing SA was advised by the EPA that there was sufficient evidence to indicate a public health risk exists in relation to the area and that residents from this area should be relocated as a precaution.

On 11 June 2014, I was notified of this advice by the executive director of Housing SA. On 16 June 2014, I received a verbal briefing on this matter by the department, noting that the lead

agency on this matter was the EPA. On 30 June 2014, I was advised by the department on how Housing SA was implementing the advice received from the EPA.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary, sir. Given that the minister has just made it clear that she has known about the potential need for relocation for the last three weeks, why has she only turned her mind to the relocation planning now?

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) (14:31): It was clearly indicated from the EPA that this is a precaution: it is not an emergency. We are doing a suitable process of engaging with our tenants, and we will be relocating them over the next six months.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Further supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: When were non-government organisations undertaking social housing works in the Clovelly Park area, their workers and their unions notified of air contamination issues rising above acceptable levels?

The SPEAKER: That's not a supplementary because it doesn't arise out of the last question or the last answer; it's just a separate question. Minister.

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) (14:32): I understand that, to the south of the current investigation area, a not-for-profit housing provider has undertaken a 12-unit affordable housing redevelopment that is currently under construction. The executive director of Housing SA has spoken with the chief executive of that not-for-profit housing provider on 2 July.

I understand that this redevelopment was specifically designed with input from the EPA to address any issues associated with vapours. This includes measures such as ventilation and modern membranes under the slab. This development will assist in understanding what remediation measures are required for the long-term remediation of the Housing SA properties.

I want to make it clear: Housing SA will be guided by the expert advice of the EPA and, as further advice becomes available, we will take further action required, as advised by the EPA. Housing SA has no regulatory relationship with the not-for-profit housing provider and, as such, any further questions about potential contamination at this site should be directed to the EPA.

WOOMERA PROHIBITED AREA

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy explain to the house the recent developments with regard to the Woomera Prohibited Area?

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): I thank the member for his question and his keen interest in expanding our mineral resource wealth, unlike some members who leave little notes for me on my desk.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Just trying to inform you, Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Don't worry. I have already told Santos and Beach you have done this. They are all very excited about your enthusiasm. I welcome the important step in the passage of legislation to unlock potential mineral resource discoveries and developments in the region of the Woomera Prohibited Area. The Defence Legislation Amendment (Woomera Prohibited Area) Bill 2014 passed the Senate last week which will create a regulatory framework for access to the WPA, including rules for explorers wanting to develop the significant mineral resources in the area.

This is a significant milestone for the advancement of South Australia's expanding resources sector. These new rules will free up access to an estimated \$35 billion worth of gold, uranium, copper and iron ore that lie beneath the surface of the WPA. The region already hosts Challenger gold mine, Prominent Hill gold mine, Peculiar Knob, high-grade iron ore mine and, of course, it used to hold Olympic Dam until Olympic Dam was excised from the area.

A new access regime will allow the development of multiple mineral deposits across the breadth of the Woomera Prohibited Area, potentially transforming it into one of the country's most significant resource provinces. That means millions of dollars in further investment and hundreds of jobs for South Australians. Stretching over 127,000 square kilometres—roughly equivalent to the land mass of England—the WPA potentially contains some of the richest mineral and petroleum resources in the world.

While defence will remain the primary user of the area for testing and evaluation for now, the legislation sets out user access rights, an access permit scheme, compensation and cost recovery arrangements, enforcement provisions and of course, importantly, an appeals process. This is a win-win for the important principles of Multiple Land Use and coexistence between the vital industry sectors of resources and defence which will drive economic growth and prosperity into the next decade. I commend members opposite to reading and understanding more about Multiple Land Use principles.

I would like to thank the defence minister, Mr Johnston, for his support on this matter, and I would also like to thank former senator Donald Farrell who was instrumental in ensuring—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the federal government—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —instrumental in introducing this legislation as a matter of high priority, a wonderful legacy for the people of South Australia. This vital legislation represents a whole world of opportunity to develop mineralisation in the north of South Australia. I call on all South Australian members of the House of Representatives to ensure the smooth passage of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER: Arising out of that answer, I call to order the member for MacKillop and the member for Heysen. I warn the deputy leader for the second and final time, and I call to order the member for Hammond, and I warn the member for Morialta for the second and final time. The leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Why was the government aware for 48 days of dangerous levels of air contamination for Clovelly Park residents considering that in February 2011 the then minister for the environment, the member for Colton, advised parliament of contamination in Edwardstown within six days of becoming aware?

Members interjecting:

Mr Whetstone: And you sacked him!

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

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:38): The Leader of the Opposition has been asserting that there are dangerous levels of air contamination. Can I put heed to that: the two micrograms per square cubic metre of air is not, of itself, a dangerous level of air contamination. It is the level at which warrants—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is the level—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Either you are interested in getting a proper answer or you just want to try and scream me down—but I will make sure the South Australian people are properly informed. I know you would love for nothing more than to run around trying to create panic for your own base political purposes. But the simple fact is that the two micrograms per square cubic metre of air is not in and of itself a dangerous level; it is the level at which warrants further investigation, and that is exactly what the government is doing.

To put it in context, what is considered a dangerous level is what the occupational limits are for exposure to trichloroethylene, and that is not two micrograms per square cubic metre of air, it is 54,000—54,000 micrograms per square cubic metre. That is 27,000 times more than the two micrograms which the government has decided to take this action on. Of course, we always act with an abundance of caution, particularly when you are talking about people's residences, but it is very important that it is understood that the Leader of the Opposition trying to peddle that this a danger to people is absolutely mischievous.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order is?

Mr GARDNER: The minister has descended into debate: 98.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the Minister for Health has descended into debate. I uphold the point of order. I call to order the member for Stuart, the member for Kavel, who—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier says yes, and I am coming around to the Deputy Premier's point of view that he is the éminence grise behind all disruption. The member for Hartley is called to order and warned for the first time. The member for Heysen is warned for the first time and the member for Hammond is warned for the first time. Leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Premier. Can the government explain the information dated July 2014 that has been recently put on the EPA website which indicates that contamination testing is required in areas adjacent to Clovelly Park?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:41): As I understand it, the contamination arises from contamination from industrial land use into the water underneath, the underground water. What is occurring is that in some places that chemical interaction and the proximity to certain soil types has meant that the material is moving up through the soil, in some places, and therefore, in parts, into people's houses. The way in which that underground watercourse is moving and the way in which it may or may not interact in other places is something that has been studied for some period of time and continues to be of concern to the EPA.

I believe it was in the statement that they are going to continue to monitor on the outer edges to see if there has been any movement and I imagine that they will continue to be doing this for a long time to come. As we know, site contamination is a legacy that we bear of past industrial practices. We can't wish it away and we can't ignore it. What we need to do is make sure that we consistently monitor, track, and then act in a sensible way, a rational way, to the risks as identified jointly by the EPA and the public health area.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary, sir. How many properties are affected in this new area?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:42): I, at this point, have no information that any houses or any properties are affected. The question is: may they be in the future? So, that's why the continual research is being undertaken.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary, sir. Given that the government has known about the contamination in this area for six years, why is it only now that the government is appointing a contamination consultant to undertake further investigative work in suburbs adjacent to Clovelly Park?

The SPEAKER: Well, again, that's not a supplementary because it doesn't arise out of the previous question or the previous answer; it's just a separate question. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:43): So, the question is about the fact that the government has now hired, or will hire, a consultant. I am happy to be corrected if I have misunderstood this but it seems to me that what has occurred is that there has now been a trigger reached in some houses which is an international trigger for further investigation and that's what has been acted upon.

The trigger has caused the various experts within the government to get together to work out what the implications are for those immediate houses. What that trigger has also done, as I understand it, is lead to the EPA deciding that they need to test the areas adjacent to ensure where that watercourse is moving and whether that has interacted with the soil.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Supplementary, sir. Can the minister explain to the house what is the trigger and when was it first breached?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:44): As I think has been explained a few times, although I accept it is quite arcane science knowledge required, the trigger is the two micrograms per cubic metre, as explained by the Minister for Health.

Mr Marshall: I thought that was the airborne—

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That is the trigger.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Patience, dear boy! The minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I wish I had watched *The Curiosity Show* with more attention when I was a child so that I can better understand the science. As I understand it, what we are dealing with is the legacy of industrial practices where chemicals that were used pretty freely in our industrial past were often simply thrown away, dumped, put down pugholes. This is a general issue that we have.

Some of that material has gone into underground watercourses and some of that will—and I do not know what the triggers are for that to occur or the mechanisms for that to occur—come up through the soil and become airborne. The point at which it becomes an airborne vapour at a greater concentration inside a house than two micrograms per cubic metre is the point that triggers investigation, and that is what has caused now the correct people to get together to make a determination and then to advise the residents.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): A supplementary, sir. Are there other areas in South Australia that breach this trigger that you have referenced today for the first time in parliament and, if so, can you explain to us which suburbs they are if they remain unreported to the parliament or local residents?

The SPEAKER: It's tenuously a supplementary. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:46): I am unaware of any and I will endeavour to have an answer brought back to you, but I would say in saying that that I have no reason to think that the EPA and the Department of Health do not always act in a careful and considered way when they receive the information and, therefore—

Members interjecting:

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

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the recent milestone achieved at the Adelaide Oval?

The SPEAKER: Minister, if it is just another Port Adelaide defeat at Adelaide Oval, that information is readily available from easily accessible sources.

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) (14:47): Thank you, Mr Speaker. As painful as it is to discuss the events at Adelaide Oval the most recent Sunday, amongst the misery there was also a significant milestone. The redeveloped Adelaide Oval welcomed its one millionth patron last weekend. Since the redeveloped Oval opened, South Australians have been streaming through the gates. It was initially predicted annual attendances at the Oval would increase from about 400,000 a year to 1.37 million. This figure will surely be eclipsed with one million already having visited the Oval and more AFL and international cricket to be played before the first anniversary.

In addition, AFL attendances were predicted to grow to 802,000 throughout the home and away season—107,000 more than AAMI Stadium—but if current averages continue attendances could reach as high as one million for this year's home and away season, particularly given one team will be playing finals. But it is not only crowds for major events that are big, it is also the sheer number of people attending the Oval for functions, events and tours. The state government's intervention at Adelaide Oval—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have to say I do enjoy the interjections from the member for Hartley, sitting up the back there like Statler and Waldorf from *The Muppets*—nothing to contribute to the show but lots of commentary about it.

The state government's investment in the Adelaide Oval redevelopment was always about creating an economic driver for the city. Job creation on our infrastructure projects extends, of course, beyond the construction phase. With an average of 45,000 people streaming into the stadium each weekend, many of them across our new footbridge, it means more jobs catering for these big crowds as well as more opportunities for cafes, bars and restaurants in the CBD.

The success of Adelaide Oval has seen an additional 265 casual jobs created in the lead-up to the start of the 2014 AFL season. This is on top of approximately 1,200 positions that were advertised and filled ahead of last December's Ashes Test. We saw more than 150,000 people attend the Ashes Test, a remarkable figure given the redeveloped Oval's full capacity was not yet available. In addition, average attendances for the Big Bash Twenty20 games at the Oval were over 23,000, with total attendances of over 94,000 across the four fixtures.

Overall, there have been substantial tourism benefits flowing from the redeveloped Adelaide Oval. Intercontinental Adelaide advise that there has been an increase in overnight stays compared to the same period last year. They estimate there has been a 12 per cent business uplift compared to 2013. In addition, the hotel has experienced an increase in traffic into their all-day dining restaurant and lobby bar.

This is just one snapshot of the benefit hotels and other accommodation providers are experiencing from the influx of tourists into our state from fixtures at the redeveloped Adelaide Oval. The economic benefits of the redevelopment are clear. A report by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies—

Mr Pengilly: Come back, Kevin. All is forgiven.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Was that another unplanned eructation by the member for Finnis? I'm sure it happens to the best of you. A report by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies estimates that the Adelaide Oval redevelopment will generate upwards of \$111 million in economic activity yearly in the City of Adelaide. That's an extra \$72 million a year in spending and

\$39 million in flow-on expenditure. Given the redeveloped Adelaide Oval has only been in operation for less than a year, it's well on its way to achieving these economic benefits while contributing to a renewed sense of momentum and vibrancy in the city.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Now that the minister has had 24 hours, has she asked why Ms Ranieri told staff of the Office of Public Employment and Review and the Public Sector Workforce Relations Agency prior to the convening of the senior management council's selection panel that she would be taking over as the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment from 1 July 2014?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:51): As I said yesterday, I have absolutely no evidence that what you are saying is correct. I asked if the Leader of the Opposition had such evidence if he could furnish it. I do not believe that there is any.

The SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition vouch to the house that such evidence exists?

Mr MARSHALL: We are asking the minister to clarify. This is a person who reports to the minister.

The SPEAKER: The practice of the house is that if a conjectural fact is used in a question, the questioner must vouch to the house for its accuracy. Does the leader so vouch?

Mr MARSHALL: That's certainly the information that we have received, from multiple sources, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Well, I'm just asking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm asking the leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the leader vouch to the house for the accuracy of the assumption on which the question is based?

Mr MARSHALL: We certainly believe it to be true and we're asking the minister to clarify. We asked the minister yesterday. She's had 24 hours and she should be able to provide this house with an update.

The SPEAKER: All I am saying is, if the leader proves to be wrong, there are procedural consequences.

Mr MARSHALL: We are asking a question for the minister to clarify.

The SPEAKER: Well, no; you're asking a question on an assertion of fact.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, it's on an assertion that information has been provided to the opposition, from multiple sources, and we're asking the minister to clarify whether it's correct or not.

The SPEAKER: I'm afraid information 'provided from multiple sources' isn't good enough. You've asked a question based on—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Are you about to move a substantive motion?

The SPEAKER: No, I'm not, but—

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: What I'm doing—I'll answer the point of order, on what the point of order is: that where a question contains an assertion of fact the practice and procedure of houses of British origin is that the questioner vouches to the house for the accuracy of the fact. So you can't say, 'A little bird told me.'

Members interjecting:

Mr Williams: What about a flock of little birds, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Neither a flock. And before the leader resumes questioning, I warn the member for Hammond for the second time, and I call the member for Adelaide to order. Leader. I am taking it that the leader is now vouching for the accuracy of the fact.

Mr MARSHALL: I am happy to rephrase the question, sir. I will rephrase the question if that helps, sir: will the minister undertake to find out whether or not Ms Ranieri was telling people, in multiple agencies of this government, prior to her appointment, that she had been promised that job?

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned for the first time. I am going to rule the question out of order because it is customarily out of order for a question to be: can the minister comment on the accuracy of a rumour? You just can't do it. The member for Torrens.

ADELAIDE FRINGE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Minister, what were the economic outcomes of the 2014 Fringe festival?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:56): Big issues, yes. Obviously—

The SPEAKER: The minister for high culture.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, sir. Cultural Attaché to the Court of St James. As members are no doubt aware, the Adelaide Fringe Festival took place from 14 February to 16 March this year.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Mr Speaker, I understand that it is out of order to ask questions seeking information that is readily available in a public arena. The minister has said, 'As members would no be doubt aware,' and, indeed, I understand that the agency responsible for the event he is about to refer to has already published all of this information and it is freely available.

The SPEAKER: My understanding is that the question was about economic outcomes.

Mr WILLIAMS: Certainly, sir, and that is in the publication which is freely available on the internet, and, I understand, in printed copy.

The SPEAKER: Well if you bring it to the Chair, I will—

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The internet, sir, is everywhere.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: You may well indeed be sitting on it, sir!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will call on another question. I will invite the member for Mackillop to bring the information to the Chair, since 'the internet is everywhere', including on his desk, and I will call the member for Napier.

CLIPSAL 500

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:57): My question is for the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister inform the house about the economic benefit of the 2014 Clipsal 500?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister.

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) (14:58): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Napier for this question and acknowledge his close association with General Motors-Holden. What a great year it was for Holden cars at this year's Clipsal, particularly Craig Lowndes, who finished with a first and two seconds. It was good to see the Volvos in their first year getting second place in the second race on the Saturday, the 125 kilometres.

The economic impact for this year's Clipsal 500 is a record \$59 million for the South Australian economy. It is a terrific event that injects so much money into our economy. It is also an event that fills every hotel room in Adelaide. I was at a hotel this morning, the Ibis; they have 330 rooms coming online in about two or three weeks' time, one of three hotels that will bring an extra 600 rooms into the Adelaide tourism market—and perfect timing too as we see record crowds coming from interstate to watch football at the Adelaide Oval.

I was talking to the manager at the Ibis. He has backed up what we thought would happen with the India versus Pakistan cricket match. They have had a number of six-day bookings for the India-Pakistan game. We have had the tickets sold out in a matter of minutes; 70 per cent of the tickets were sold to people interstate and overseas.

That means there will be 35,000 people coming into Adelaide bringing money into our South Australian economy. They will be here for six to seven days, making sure that we get them out into the regions. The economic benefit of those visitors to our state should be about \$35 million. That is another terrific event that we have coming up in February next year with the Cricket World Cup.

I want to congratulate the Motor Sport Board, who do a tremendous job putting on the Clipsal 500 each year. They are always trying to tweak it a little bit and come up with new initiatives. This time, we had two races on the Saturday. One was a twilight race, which was a 125-kilometre race followed by a bit of a break and then another 125-kilometre race, with a 250-kilometre race the following day. Keith Urban was among the entertainers. He was the Treasurer's first choice, wasn't he, Keith Urban? I want to thank the Treasurer for his input into the choice of acts. Already, the team at the Motor Sport Board is working on next year's Clipsal to make it even better than this year's.

We are seeing the Supercars series change as well. Last year, we had the introduction of Mercedes and Nissans and, as I mentioned, this year we had the Volvos. It is perfect for twilight racing: the lights are always on. As I said, Scott McLaughlin finished second, so did a whole lot better than the Mercs and Nissans did last year.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, I said he is a Volvo driver, and I said he finished second in the opening race of the V8 Supercars series. I think the Volvo people should be pretty happy with that. Their first podium was right here in Adelaide, the capital of motor sport in Australia. It is a terrific place and a terrific race, and I congratulate everyone involved on achieving a sensational economic impact.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I rise on a point of order: I am just wondering whether it is orderly for the member for Schubert to be continually showing other members the internet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That was an entirely bogus point of order and I not only call the Deputy Premier to order, I warn him for the first and second time. The member for Mount Gambier.

SOUTH EAST FORESTRY PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Forests. Can the minister inform the house when the remaining \$10.5 million from the South East Forestry Partnerships Program will be allocated, considering the fund was announced on 15 November 2012?

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) (15:02): Yes, it will be allocated when we have all the applications and we have gone through them and decided which applicants will be funded.

The SPEAKER: Before we come to the member for Unley, in *House of Representatives Practice* at page 558, it says:

Questions based on rumour, that is, unsubstantiated statements, are not permissible.

The footnote goes to *House of Representatives Debates* of 19 September 1978 at page 1105, and Erskine May also deals with the point and says at page 359 of the 24th Edition:

Where the facts are of sufficient moment—

and I would have thought the head of this agency saying that she has got the job before the process has started would have been of sufficient moment—

the Speaker has required prima facie proof of their authenticity.

So if the leader can give me prima facie proof, I'll—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, the leader has got the cart before the horse. Since I have received no evidence that the economic outcomes—Member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: I do indeed have—

The SPEAKER: You could show me.

Mr KNOLL: We can rectify this in about 20 seconds.

The SPEAKER: Pending the resolution of this exciting search, I will call the member for Unley.

MEMBER FOR REYNELL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Did the now member for Reynell, prior to entering this parliament, play any role in the government grant process with Community Centres SA's Together SA project?

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) (15:05): I thank the member for Unley for his question. Your accusations about the member for Reynell and Together SA are baseless. With almost 20 years' experience, the member for Reynell is widely respected in the community sector and that is why she was chosen by the board.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: the minister is entering debate. I have asked a question about whether the member for Reynell, prior to entering the parliament, played any role in the grant process for Community Centres SA.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to the minister. Minister.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As the member for Reynell was the CE of Together SA for seven months, and they received an establishment grant in June 2013 to support the advancement of collective impact, perhaps I can talk a little bit about the board and the involvement. We can see that the founding partners of the board include Anglicare SA, the Community Business Bureau, Community Centres SA, Junction Australia, Lutheran Community Care, SA Unions, UnitingCare Wesley Bowden, UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide, Uniting Communities, Volunteering SA&NT and the Wyatt foundation.

The collective impact brings together community and other partners such as government, non-government and philanthropic organisations to develop a joint approach to solving a problem through agreed actions. The partners in the collective impact project start with a common understanding about the problem and a shared vision for change. Together SA instigated a 90-day project, *Joining Together to Improve Social Wellbeing for Young Children*, based on the state government's *Every Chance for Every Child* process. The project identified ways to support and strengthen families and children and inform the government's understanding of how agents can better participate in collective impact processes.

Together SA founding partners established a working group and are now overseen by acting CEO, Kate Simpson. In relation to the member for Reynell, she was the CE of Together SA for six months as a six-month contract. Together SA emerged from the work of Community Centres SA, which was a peak body for 107 community centres, and over the past three years they have been introducing Results Based Accountability to the sector—namely, the collective impact process.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Treasurer to order.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In regard to any specific grants that were given out at that time, I do not have those details.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Unley.

MEMBER FOR REYNELL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:08): Has the minister inquired as to how the member for Reynell was appointed to the position of CEO after she was preselected for a safe Labor seat when the position was not advertised?

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) (15:08): I was not part of that process and that is a question for the board of Together SA.

The SPEAKER: Further supplementary, if it be a supplementary.

MEMBER FOR REYNELL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:08): When did Community Centres SA receive the grants from the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion for the establishment of Together SA?

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) (15:08): Community Centres SA received an establishment grant in June 2013 to support the advancement of collective impact in South Australia through Together SA. This grant, along with contributions from the founding partners enabled the board of Community Centres SA to engage Katrine Hildyard as the founding CEO.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MEMBER FOR REYNELL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:09): What were the terms and conditions of the grant to Community Centres SA, and have those terms and conditions been met?

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) (15:09): I do not have the details of those terms and conditions. I was not the minister at the time. I have no reason to understand that they were not met.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Taylor, the member for Schubert has provided me with the Adelaide Fringe Annual Review 2014, '2014 Facts & Figures', and I must rule that the economic benefits are clearly stated in that publication, so the question to the Cultural Attaché to the Court of St James is ruled out of order. The member for Taylor.

COUNTRY SCHOOLS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house about the new education facilities in country SA which the state government has invested in?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education, who is on one warning.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:10): During the week of country cabinet I had the honour of officially opening four new educational facilities, spanning early childhood to high school, in the Riverland, Jamestown and Port Pirie. Collectively, this represented an investment of over \$15 million in our regions.

My first stop was the new Riverland Special School, relocated to Glossop High's Berri campus under the \$49.5 million Special School Renewal Program. This \$7.3 million investment is one of six schools to be rebuilt and has delivered new, modern, purpose-built facilities so students' needs are better met. The school is bright and spacious, with open spaces and a terrific outdoor area, including beautifully landscaped grounds and a huge covered space.

Being side by side with a mainstream school brings students greater opportunity for collaboration, access to broader curriculum and for sharing facilities. It promotes links with peers and greater understanding of disability issues. It was very clear to me that the students and staff are all very proud of their new school, and I was given a delightful booklet, put together by students to commemorate this event.

I also visited Jamestown for the opening of their \$2.4 million Community Children's Centre, co-located with the Jamestown Community School. Again, it is a bright, purpose-built centre with room for child care and preschool groups, and a fantastic outdoor area. So, Jamestown Community School now truly is a birth to year 12 facility. The centre provides support for children with physical, behavioural, speech and language needs.

I was also very pleased to visit John Pirie Secondary School for the opening of their \$3.9 million administration centre. I had the great pleasure of officially opening the new Port Pirie West Children's Centre. The state government invested \$1.2 million to refurbish the building, to give it the space to cater for families as a children's centre. We are also providing an additional \$670,000 for extra space for the provision of child care. The centre is a lovely place. It is light and bright, warm and welcoming; a place where parents and children feel at home, where they can access the education, parenting and health services they need, all in the same spot.

Port Pirie West Children's Centre is one of 41 children's centres around the state supporting children's development, learning, health and wellbeing. They also support the most important people in children's lives: their parents and carers. Time and again I am hearing positive stories about parents' experiences at the children's centres, and Port Pirie West was no exception. I met and spoke with a young woman who as a young single mother, had never imagined being employed. Now she is an early childhood worker at the centre.

I take the opportunity to recognise all those involved with these wonderful facilities: the architects and builders behind these new facilities. I would also like to acknowledge and thank staff, parents and other members of the communities I visited who contribute so much to the day-to-day running of their schools and children's centres and, importantly, contribute on a daily basis to the development and education of young people in our country regions.

Grievance Debate

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:14): The government and, in particular, the Premier have heralded this government as one which is to be open and transparent. There had been a commitment by this government, confirmed again late last year, that they would publish ministerial credit card statements and information about members of parliament. This was going to be a new era of open, transparent, accountable government. What has happened since that time?

Just today, we have had the further chapter in a shameful part of the government's mismanagement of the Clovelly Park water contamination issue. This groundwater contamination

has been known to this government for years, and yet again today we hear all the excuses and all of the deflections of answers to any reasonable questions about what the government did, what they have failed to do and why they have decided that it is necessary to have precautionary measures to deal with those people who are living in parts of Clovelly Park that are 'not dangerous'. We are just taking precautionary measures, but we are going to evict them from their houses.

That is a completely unacceptable response the parliament has received. The public, the people of Clovelly Park and now those in nearby areas need to have that information. It is not acceptable that the government, when caught out, then simply hide behind ministerial statements that, in this case, leave a six-month hole in the action or failure to act of the government, and then expect the community to believe that they can be responsible and that the public can have some confidence that they are being given the truth, sufficient to be able to take action themselves to protect, in this case, against the harmful effects of the contamination of water.

We have that situation repeating. We have had a number of these instances when the government gets caught out when information, not rumours, is provided to the opposition and questions are asked about that in respect of the government's response. What do we have again today? We have another area of questioning, where the government, and particularly the minister, has hidden behind the Speaker's determination that, if information received is a rumour, it is not acceptable.

It has not been identified to the parliament as to whether or not there had been a rumour. If information is received by the opposition, it does not mean that it has been picked up as some kind of rumour. If information has been received, and it is confirmed that that information is to be made available, then that is acceptable, it can reasonably be relied upon, and this government needs to answer. Already, since this government came in, they have refused to answer questions in respect of the Gillman option to sell property. We are still being kept in the dark. The minister responsible for the ongoing management of this, the Deputy Premier, again declines to answer questions. We are being kept in the dark.

We have had the Ombudsman's report since coming back to the parliament, which reported to us in May this year that he found that ministerial officers had interfered with the freedom of information process and tried to prevent information getting out that could embarrass the government. That is a damning report that has been tabled in this parliament. We still have not heard from the government about whether they are going to accept the recommendations to introduce penalties to ensure that this conduct ceases and that the public are entitled to have that information. We have had the announcement that the State Records office now has to be accessed by application and the alienation of the general public, just from the state records, by this newly introduced procedure of restricting the capacity to go down and inspect those records.

All these actions of the government just confirm how secretive they are. They have shut down or are attempting to shut down freedom of the press—our last bastion of opportunity to have some confidence that the public will know about what is happening within government. Even the press freedoms are being shut down under legislation that is being currently debated in this house, but also legislation has been foreshadowed to protect the press in the provision of sources of information that they rely on for the material they publish.

We are again, as a general community, being isolated from that information. We have had allegations in respect of the state government using the office of probity and the ICAC structures to intimidate public servants.

Time expired.

YOUTH SECTOR

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:19): I rise to speak about young people in our South Australian communities and how the federal Tony Abbott Liberal government has disregarded them through their cruel budget cuts. In the face of these cuts, I fear for the health, wellbeing and morale of every young South Australian, including the approximately 5,500 between the ages of 18 and 30 who live in the electorate of Reynell.

I have spoken in this place before about how the federal Liberal government has let down families, women, pensioners, those who are sick, those who need X-rays or prescriptions, low-income earners, workers, people with a disability, people with mental illness, people who need to

use child care, people who access the family tax benefit, and people with a low superannuation balance. Unfortunately, the extensive list goes on. It seems that the list of who they support is a much shorter one, although I cannot quite seem to identify who might make it onto that list—themselves, the extraordinarily wealthy, perhaps?

I value an Australia that thinks the best of its youth and treats them with dignity and respect. I value an Australia that recognises that youth are our community's future leaders and enables their voice. I value an Australia that is tender to its youth, that supports them and empowers them as they embark on their life's journey. It is clear that the federal Liberal government does not value a similar Australia but, rather, one that takes away our youth voice, creates a 'do not enter' sign on the pathway to education and employment and takes away an income altogether for young people looking for work. This is not an Australia that reflects the values of giving people a go and supporting them when things are tough.

On the morning following the federal budget, the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia reflected that the 'budget was a devastating blow for young people and people working in the youth sector'. Rightly, the council is deeply concerned about how this budget has targeted young people and how it will impact them. The council is part of an extensive coalition that has provided a strong national voice for young Australians for decades. Unfortunately, the body at the heart of their coalition, the Australian Youth Affairs Coalition, has been entirely defunded and will no longer exist post 31 December.

There is now no national voice representing young people and their issues. Shamefully, young people have lost an advocate at a time when they need the strongest possible collective voice to combat the attacks against them by a federal government that fails to recognise how important it is for us to listen to young people and ask them to help shape our policies in a way that makes a difference for them.

There is also no federal minister for youth for young people to engage with. Perhaps Prime Minister Abbott could add a 'status of young people' portfolio alongside his Status of Women portfolio. Perhaps he could purport to represent young people as he purports to represent women. Perhaps the Prime Minister could become the minister for those whom he sees as easy targets. The federal Liberal government's new mantra seems to be 'learn or earn' which in itself is not necessarily negative should that learning and earning be supported.

Cutting funding to programs such as Youth Connections (which young people in Reynell have been able to access at Noarlunga and Marion), designed to directly address barriers to education and employment, closing VET programs and thereby reducing the number of training places by 20,000 and changing the way apprenticeships are paid for, does not provide support: it does quite the opposite.

At a time of rising youth unemployment, cutting significant federal youth unemployment prevention programs is bewildering, deeply concerning, and astoundingly short-sighted. Many young people face barriers to securing employment, and for some a straightforward path from education to employment is out of reach. Programs like Youth Connections help get young people who are in danger of falling through the cracks into work.

Those who do fall through the cracks or take a bit more time to successfully secure a job and who do not have friends or family to support them are almost certain to be forced into extreme poverty. Such poverty is brought about through the eligibility age for Newstart being raised from 22 to 25; through school leavers or newly-unemployed people having to wait six months before being eligible for Newstart or Youth Allowance; through benefits only being paid for six months before they are cut off again for a further six months should a young person not secure a job.

What on earth does the federal Liberal government think young people will do? How do they think young people will eat, pay their rent, keep a car running, or catch public transport to get to a job interview? Shamefully, they just do not care. Perhaps a young person could get support from one of the many capable and committed community sector professionals but, with \$400 million of cuts planned for the sector, access to such support will be more difficult.

Access to education and training at university or TAFE that enables skill development is one way to help get young people ready for work but, with the looming deregulation of universities and TAFE colleges, fees will dramatically increase.

Time expired.

SPEED LIMITS

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:24): I rise to speak on an issue that is hugely important to my electorate, indeed it is one of those bugbears that a number of people contact me about on a regular basis, and that issue is rural speed limits. I have spoken often on this topic in my community. As a rural community, we rely much more heavily on our roads than our city cousins. Public transport in the regions is never going to be an adequate solution to provide mass transit options for rural cities and for regional areas more broadly. For that reason, we rely on our road transport very heavily. So, this issue of speed limits is one that is very dear to our hearts, and I will go through and talk about some of the issues around our road network, because of, in some cases, our almost absolute reliance on it.

It is very much a mark of a city-centric government that it would seek to make decisions on speed limits and the conditions of rural roads from here in Adelaide without understanding the true consequences of what happens in the country. Fatalities within our rural communities are something that we take very seriously. I have seen too often where fatalities happen in the country and local communities are rocked and they are affected by these things very deeply. This is not an issue that we take flippantly. It is one that we are very measured and very considered on. Having said that, we still expect a little bit of common sense to prevail.

The overwhelming view, of my electorate certainly, is that we need to look at speed limits, especially the ones that have been lowered. There are three specific roads in my electorate that have had no fatalities that have recently had their speed limits lowered from 110 km/h to 100 km/h. But it is not only those three roads, it is the inconsistency in speed limits across my electorate. I will give an example that I have given a couple of times before.

There is a beautiful road that is 10 years old that the previous member for Schubert—he has left the gallery—helped to put in place in my electorate which was rated as a 100 km/h speed limit road and it has now been put down to a 90 km/h speed limit road. We have a comparable road which is older but in the same sort of condition, a single lane road, the Angaston to Eden Valley road, and it is set at 100 km/h. There does seem to be a huge inconsistency in that judgement.

There are three roads that are parallel with each other: one of them is 80 km/h, one is 60 km/h and one of them is 50 km/h. For tourists especially coming to my region to try to understand rural speed limits is quite a difficult task, especially when we often have governments out there trying to make sure that those people are punished for their ignorance. There is a review that has happened into rural speed limits that we have been unable to see, but I do have some comment from a couple of eminent organisations, in this case, firstly, the Local Government Association when they were talking about their submission to the rural speed limit review.

In the written submission to the transport department the LGA says that decreasing speeds will keep road users on the road longer and that it is unlikely that a 10 km/h reduction will prevent crashes. They said that regional councils are particularly concerned that the state is seeking to deal with poor road conditions by downgrading the speed limits on the road rather than investing in upgraded roads. Can I say that, as a member of a rural community, that is an issue so very close to our hearts. I have a list of 20 or 30 roads that need some urgent attention and cutting the speed limit seems to be the blunt instrument used by this government to get around it.

The LGA argues that sealing road shoulders can reduce crash risk by up to 40 per cent. That seems like a pretty good use of money. The RAA senior manager on road safety, Charles Mountain, said that he had written to the state government to call for a working group to be established to discuss the issue. His comment was, 'We agree that key connector roads should be kept at 110 km/h where possible.'

I would like to make a few comments on the Mid Murray Council's submission, where they said:

It is strongly considered that information on the contributory factors to the casualties including fatal, serious injuries or minor injuries on all roads listed in the Mid Murray Council for review of speed limits, should be provided prior to any decision on the application of the default speed limit of 100 km/h on such roads.

What they are saying is that we should look at all of the factors. Speed is one but I would contend that speeding, drugs and driver inattention are things that need to be brought alongside what has

otherwise been used as a very simple blunt instrument to overcome a lack of funding in our regional areas.

Time expired.

INDIGENOUS SCHOOLING

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:30): I was interested to note the federal government's announcement yesterday in NAIDOC Week of a \$22 million grant for what is titled a 'direct instruction' program. I understand this follows the Cape York model. This is described as a direct method of teaching using lectures and demonstrations to improve literacy outcomes for remote Indigenous children. While I am a great supporter of literacy and numeracy programs, I am reminded of the findings and strategy that were laid out in the colloquially known Gonski funding agreement. I am told that the federal government's dismissal of the Gonski report has meant a funding cut of \$534 million for Indigenous community health and education programs.

In investigating this further, Dr Stewart Riddle from Literacies Education of the University of Southern Queensland says that the OECD's latest Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) results show that there is about a 2½ year gap between non-Indigenous and Indigenous literacy rates in Australia. He says there is also a persistent gap in the NAPLAN results.

I thought I would follow this further to find out what the possible cuts might be to South Australia's remote schools. I was provided with the following details. I am also advised that this information needs to be qualified as it is the best estimate that could be given to me at the time and there are a number of variables, so this is a fluid situation but certainly one of concern, and obviously fluid students numbers are a factor in that.

I am told that at the Carlton School at Port Augusta, which is in the electorate of Stuart, there will be an estimated \$76,000 cut. In the Kaurna Plains School, which is in Elizabeth in the electorate of Little Para, there could be an \$88,000 cut. In the Koonibba Aboriginal School, which is in the electorate of Flinders, there is an estimated \$46,000 cut. At Marree Aboriginal School, which is in the electorate of Stuart, it is estimated be a \$24,000 cut.

At the Point Pearce Aboriginal School, which is in the electorate of Goyder, it is estimated to be a \$15,000 cut. There is also Yalata Anangu School, which is in the electorate of Flinders again, with a \$74,000 cut. We also have the Raukkan Aboriginal School in the electorate of MacKillop with an estimated \$23,000 cut. All of these areas in addition to a total cut to Indigenous education, as I said, of \$534 million is really concerning.

In doing a little bit of research, I noticed a pre-federal election article by Patricia Karvelas from *The Australian*, who regularly writes on education, in which she identified that when the Gonski funding agreement was laid out, the funding if realised would support 31,900 Indigenous students, 3,650 schools and 69 per cent of government schools, 20 per cent of Catholic schools and 11 per cent of Independent schools with extra eligible money for education programs.

As I said, the state information needs to be qualified, but it is really concerning to me that in NAIDOC Week we are not only celebrating NAIDOC Week but we are also acknowledging the fact that there are going to be huge cuts. I do not know what other people think but literacy and numeracy and having effective programs that are supported by people in the education sector are of absolute importance.

RATHJEN, DR TONY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:34): I rise today to pay tribute to a great South Australian who died last week. His is a name that is probably not widely known outside of agricultural circles, but Professor Tony Rathjen spent a lifetime and a career contributing to the grain industry here in South Australia. Tony was born in 1940 at Birdwood in the Adelaide Hills and remained his whole life living and working in South Australia. He was appointed as a wheat breeder at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute in Adelaide in 1965, where he spent his entire career.

In the early 1960s, wheat was considered as the most risky and poorly adapted of the cultivated crop species in Australia. That is a quote that comes from a book by Lynette Zeitz called *The Waite*, which documents in part the work of Tony Rathjen at that place. She goes on to say that:

...by the beginning of the twenty-first century, bread wheat was regarded as the best adapted of local crops, and despite some problems with stem, stripe and leaf rusts, the crop least vulnerable to pests and diseases.

All of Australia's major wheat breeding contributed to this transformation but the contribution made by the Waite's wheat breeding program led by Rathjen was disproportionately high.

At the same time as much of that great work was going on at the Waite, there was also a wheat breeding program going on at Roseworthy, and I am sure there was a lot of friendly rivalry between the two institutions as they competed for market share and for acreage across South Australia and indeed right across southern Australia. Gil Hollamby, who was the wheat breeder at Roseworthy at the time and worked in conjunction and in competition with Tony Rathjen, has said that he 'was the greatest lateral thinker that I've ever known'.

In fact, one of Professor Hollamby's daughters and grandchildren live in my home town of Cummins, so I do get to see Gil from time to time. I also had the opportunity of meeting Tony Rathjen on a couple of occasions. He was a lecturer as well as a wheat breeder. He was a lecturer at the Adelaide University Waite campus, and I met him.

Dr McFetridge: He was one of my lecturers.

Mr TRELOAR: Yes. The member for Morphett said that he was one of his lecturers. He was not one of my lecturers, but I met him from time to time on farmer field days and crop walks.

Over his career, Tony Rathjen released more than 20 wheat varieties. You have to remember right through that time and still today wheat is such a significant crop in South Australia. His first major bread wheat release was a variety known as Warigal in the late 1970s. I am old enough to remember that growing the variety Warigal. Each and every variety that Tony released was an improvement on the last and brought agronomic qualities that improved the yield and durability and adaptability of the wheats.

During the 1980s, he worked on soft wheats, releasing Molineaux, which was the first cereal-cyst nematode resistant wheat. This was a significant development, because CCN (or eelworm, as it was known) was widespread across particularly the alkaline soils of South Australia, and to have a wheat that was tolerant to this nematode was a real boon to wheat growers. Yitpi was another variety that Tony released in the late 1990s. It had the combination of being eelworm resistant (or CCN resistant) and also boron tolerant and was very popular, particularly in our Mallee soils.

He did a lot of good work. He developed durum varieties that took off during the 1990s and early 2000s and really had such a significant impact. Very rarely do we have an individual such as Tony making such a unique and overarching contribution to an entire industry. I wish Tony and his family well, and we as wheat growers right across South Australia thank him for his life's work and his contribution.

MEMBER FOR UNLEY

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:39): It has been about 15 days since I last stood up for a grievance, but it is very important, I think, that I already need to provide an addendum to the list of gaffes that have been committed by the hapless member for Unley over the past six weeks. When I last spoke on this topic those 15 days ago, I recapped what had truly been a horror month of May for the shadow minister.

It began with a ludicrous claim that the government was forcing students to study retail in the hope that they would eventually join the SDA. Of course, the member for Unley squirmed his way out of that one by saying that it was tongue-in-cheek. It might seem obvious, but it seemed a little bit more foot-in-mouth than tongue-in-cheek to me. I think I heard a little bit of a denial today, so I might stand corrected, but I understood that it was written in a press release, so it was not something he could hide.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: He claims it wasn't.

The Hon. P. CAICA: He claims it wasn't, that's right. Then came the rehashed media release calling on the government to recommit to a new CBD high school. It was a case of (and it is a tried and true practice but it does not always work), 'If at first you don't succeed, try, try and try again.' The

member for Unley took this advice very literally and, after he failed to sell his snake oil to the South Australian public the first time round, he elected to simply reissue the same release.

Again, I will stand corrected, but I think that it was Albert Einstein who said, 'The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and expecting different results.' The result was, of course, the same on this occasion: the government remained committed, and remains committed, to building a brand-new high school at the site of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Then three weeks ago, we saw an ever desperate member for Unley make the astonishing claim that Labor had increased school fees to fund the education budget. I am sure members got a few phone calls in their electorate office from people concerned about this claim. It is embarrassing that after so many years as the shadow education spokesperson he still does not understand how the school fee system works. But if he does understand it, it is even more alarming because that means that he chooses to deliberately mislead families.

On Friday of last week, it was reported that an after-hours sports coach from a western suburbs school had been charged with possessing child pornography. The media was alerted to the letter that was sent to parents by—guess who—the member for Unley, up to his old tricks politicising child sexual abuse. Sadly, there is nothing new about this kind of behaviour from the shadow minister, but what was most galling was the comment he made in an article marking a year since the release of the DeBelle report. *The Advertiser* reported the honourable member as saying that he felt academic standards had suffered as the department tried to get on top of child protection issues. This is coming from the very person who has made it his mission to turn child sexual abuse into a political pointscore exercise.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, if you thought that this was a new low for the member for Unley, you must have missed the coup de grâce last Friday afternoon. I am reliably informed that the shadow ministers for education and child protection were very keen to be briefed on the government's Child Development and Wellbeing Bill, which includes a commissioner for children and young people, so keen, in fact, that they insisted that it must take place before this sitting week, so it was organised for Friday afternoon. But, lo and behold, the member for Unley was a no-show.

But, of course, we did not have to look far to find him. The radio bulletins that afternoon show that he had chosen yet again to chase a headline about child sexual abuse instead of honouring his commitment to a briefing about a bill and commissioner that would actually do something to prevent that despicable abuse from occurring. If there was ever any doubt about where the member for Unley's priorities lie, the last six weeks have erased all doubt whatsoever.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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) (15:44): On behalf of the Minister for Health, I move:

That the standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to provide that government business has precedence over private members' business, bills and other motions, on Thursday 24 July, and private members' business, bills and motions, set down for that day be set down for consideration on Thursday 7 August.

Motion carried.

Bills

LADY KINTORE COTTAGES (TRUST PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Referred to Select Committee

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) (15:45): In accordance with standing order 325, I bring up the final report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings.

Report received.

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) (15:45): I move:

That the report be noted.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:45): The opposition members on the committee, the member for Adelaide and I, were very pleased to be participants in this committee. We resisted the temptation to travel to the Vatican to verify the history of the legislation, but we are very satisfied that it was a thorough investigation, with the advertising of the committee's proceedings being put out there and no submissions being received. We are more than satisfied that this is a piece of legislation that will benefit the people of South Australia.

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) (15:46): I thank the member for Morphett for his kind words and great efforts, along with the member for Adelaide, on the committee. The committee did not meet for a long time but, my goodness, those times were memorable. We had a good time—we had a very good time.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: A sweet time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It was a sweet time.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: A short time but a sweet time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, a short time but a very sweet time. It was great.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Are you misleading the house?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I'm not. In fact, we met for such a short time because of the thorough way in which the members had prepared themselves that we did not even finish all the biscuits. But it was good, it was great, and I do thank the member for Morphett.

Motion carried.

Third 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) (15:47): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BUDGET MEASURES BILL 2014

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June 2014.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:47): I rise to speak to the Budget Measures Bill 2014, and I indicate to the Deputy Speaker that I am definitely not the lead speaker on this bill.

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I know that's sad, but we will keep struggling on. This is a bill that coincides with the Appropriation Bill which we have just been debating in this place, and this is the bill which brings in some insidious taxes to our state to prop up the Labor government's failed budgetary measures and outcomes, especially after the preceding 12 years of economic mismanagement.

One of the main factors in this Budget Measures Bill is what the government is calling the transport development levy, but in plain English (and it is a lot easier for Hansard to write down) it is 'car park tax'. The car park tax is going to inflict on our car parks in the City of Adelaide an annual fee of \$750 which then will be indexed at the consumer price index for the ongoing future, if it manages to get past this house and if it goes through another place.

I sincerely hope this tax does not go through. We have been loud and vocal in our opposition on this side of the house to the car park tax. It is a disgraceful tax and it will be very destructive to business opportunities in the city. In fact, I am sure that there are many business owners who are just absolutely petrified of this tax coming in. There has already been, I think, a KPMG report that indicates that it will have an economic downturn impact of \$12 million on the local economy in the City of Adelaide.

The reason for that is that people find a way not to park at places that are expensive. That has already been proven when parking fees were introduced down at West Lakes. I know that for a fact because I have family who live down on the Lefevre Peninsula and they will drive to the other side of Adelaide to go shopping because they do not want to pay a car park fee. This will have the same impact in the city as happened down at West Lakes. People will refuse to come into the city. It is just a simple fact that the Labor Party has not worked out.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: They already pay parking.

Mr PEDERICK: The member for Newland indicates that they already pay parking. I can assure the member for Newland that they already hate the amount they are paying for parking. The people from the good areas of the regions, including the seat of Hammond, are already paying very large parking fees, and if you do not pay them and you get caught parking on the street, you pay quite significant parking fines.

The issue is that people are finding a way to do their business and do their shopping anywhere but Adelaide. People are already doing that, and now, with this extra impost, people will just vacate and I fear that it will put businesses out of business especially in the Rundle Mall area. Business is already struggling in this state. We know that we are the state with the highest fees and charges and yet, here we go again. We will find a way to tax the poor citizens of the state. It is another measure to extract tax from the overtaxed public of South Australia.

We are seeing regional areas get more services; there are already a lot more services that people can access in Murray Bridge. A lot more shopping has opened up and there are a lot of small businesses that people can deal with locally and if they cannot access the exact services they want there, they can travel to Mount Barker and get a lot of their shopping or business needs attended to. This is just another tax to keep people out of the city.

The government will not get it because it thinks that the way out of a budget is to tax, tax, tax. That coincides with another part of the Budget Measures Bill, which is the fun tax. It is the special events tax which the transport minister is putting in place. It is for events where an event manager might decide that he thinks there are 5,000 people coming along and he has to notify the minister, I think, within as close as possible to a six-month time frame, and if he cannot do that, he has to do it as soon as he can.

Here we have a tax to tax the people to drive into the city and then if you want to get on public transport—which this government has been advocating for long and hard, but it does not realise the shortcomings of public transport in this state—the government is going to tax that as well. So, what do you want? Perhaps Stephen Yarwood will realise his vision and have everyone on bikes. I certainly cannot see the good people of Hammond riding all the way into Adelaide on their pushbikes, but that is where we are heading to. This is just crazy stuff.

This events tax is the fun tax. I was at the Adelaide Oval on Sunday, sadly to see, as I mentioned in the house the other day, the Power lose. Events like the football, concerts or the cricket in Adelaide—the supposition behind bringing all the sport into one venue was so that people could enjoy themselves and enjoy the so-called vibrancy of Adelaide.

We have already learned, through what happens on game days, that a lot of businesses do not even open up for meals because of penalty rates and other costs inflicted on them for running a business. Business owners cannot seem to get the message through to the Labor Party that it is just unviable for their businesses to open, whether it is for breakfast, brunch, lunch or dinner, on a game day on a public holiday. There are plenty of business owners who are saying, 'If we open up and we only manage to get \$300 return, it's not worth opening the door.'

Especially with regard to the Adelaide Oval, we have a venue that can seat over 50,000 people, yet we are going to tax everyone to come in and park. If you come in on public transport, you get taxed anyway. As I said, if you happen to ride a bike, I do not anticipate you are

going to come from any further than a few kilometres. This will have a great effect, especially on regional people in this state. These are draconian measures. The car park tax, combined with the fun tax, will just be another turn-off for people attending events.

It is no secret that the AFL, with regard to football, is promoting football for as many nights or days as they can over an extended weekend. They want to have football played on Thursday nights through to Monday nights. That is because it seems that the emphasis is not so much on filling grounds—I am sure they would still like to see grounds filled, and there has been a bit of backlash, especially against Monday night games, some Sunday night games and even Thursday night games. It is still the Friday night and Saturday games that I think are the most well attended. However, the AFL is into the billions with its TV rights.

It is not very hard to make an excuse to sit at home and say, 'I am just getting taxed if I get in my car. I am getting taxed if I go on the bus, the train or the tram. I can just stay home, have the fire going'—next to the fridge if you want a light refreshment, and enjoy the football in the ambience of your lounge room.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: What?

Mr PEDERICK: That's the option, member for Newland. He may laugh, but it is pretty easy for people to vote with their feet with something like this. In regard to other matters in the Budget Measures Bill, it also talks about the royalty rates on extractive minerals. This is essentially rubble pits and the like. This is going up from 35¢ a tonne to 55¢ a tonne. After talking to a couple of people in the local community at the football over the last couple of weeks, they are already getting the notices and it is causing quite an impact. It is a huge increase on their extractive royalty and now they have to factor that in for the rates that they charge for those metals when they leave the property. Once again, it is a greater tax burden on the good people of our community.

We have a lot of problems with the Budget Measures Bill. I will be very interested to see whether it does get out of this place. It will be interesting to see how the member for Waite and the member for Frome vote in regards to this bill. I assume they will run with the government because it is a money bill, and they will be firmly wedded to the government, as they now are.

When I think it will get interesting is when this bill gets debated in the other place. Quite frankly, I think the government will have difficulties at least getting some of these measures through the parliament because they are draconian, they are retrograde and all they are doing is impacting on the good citizens of this state who already, as part of the Appropriation Bill, are being belted with an emergency services levy rise that, over four years, will raise over \$330 million extra for the state coffers.

As mentioned earlier in this place, this is going to have a huge impact on our regional communities, with it essentially being a land tax on farmers. We will see some people, because they have quite successful operations and have been operating for generations, all of a sudden having emergency services levy accounts of over \$1,000.

For that, what do we get? We get the bodies of fire vehicles put together on Isuzu trucks in New Zealand. We have a government that, with these extra hundreds of millions of dollars that they will be raking in from the emergency services levy, cannot even support local business. It is outrageous that they have to bring in vehicles from New Zealand when we have perfectly good fire truck-body builders in this state and in my electorate.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: What are defence doing?

Mr PEDERICK: This is a state issue.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: The defence industry?

Mr PEDERICK: Alright; okay.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: What are defence doing?

Mr PEDERICK: The member for Wright is challenging me on what the defence industry is doing. I will refer to the defence industry for a little while, if I may. My brother works in the defence industry. He was a warrant officer in the Army. He served for 23 years and is a loyal man, unlike some. He served in Iraq and served in Rwanda. Since leaving the industry, he has joined up with General Dynamics in the north of Adelaide, and he rebuilds ASLAV armoured vehicles. These are

eight-wheeled armoured vehicles that are sometimes repatriated from either Afghanistan, at the moment, or Iraq. They have got plenty of work with these defence vehicles.

There are opportunities for defence, and I implore the state government to explore these opportunities in the future as potential options for the Holden plant. I think there are some great options there for defence into the future.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I note the interjection, 'There are great options for Holden.'

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: There were great options for Holden.

Mr PEDERICK: 'There were great options for Holden.' Thank you, Minister for Transport. There were great options for Holden. Holdens are great vehicles. I have a 1989 model V8 ute sitting in my shed at home that does not come out often enough. Be that as it may, Detroit made a decision, and when they made the decision, the Labor Party needed to understand that what they said was, 'It would not have mattered how much money was thrown'—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: —this is a fact, so don't mislead the house—'we were going to leave the state'.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind members that it is out of order to interject and that it is also out of order to respond to interjections.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for your protection. People really need to check the facts on what is happening because, when you have a multinational company that says it does not matter how many billions are put into an operation, it is just not going to happen, I think you need to listen to the chiefs in Detroit to see what is really happening.

I have digressed, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I thank you for that. Getting back to the Budget Measures Bill in the little bit of time I have left, these are regressive measures. The car park tax is an absolutely disgraceful measure which will put a lot of people out of business, and I say that sincerely. People will find a way not to use those parks and, as I said earlier, people are already doing it at shopping centres in the urban suburbs. They drive 20 or 30 kilometres to shop elsewhere because it is just too hard. If you go to a movie and you overstay the time, you are instantly paying for high-parking fees, so the government needs to have a look at that.

Then there is the fun tax. We have a government that carries on about public transport, forgetting that 97 per cent of the state does not have public transport and access into the city—and it is probably higher than that. I would love to have public transport out to Murray Bridge and Goolwa in my electorate but it is not Metro-funded public-ticketed transport. People in my electorate do not get the benefits of getting on heavily subsidised Metro-ticketed public transport, and that is a fact, and people in my electorate are crying out for that access. I know that the Minister for Transport, on the radio—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Madam Deputy Speaker!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have asked the minister to refrain from interjecting and you just need to ignore him completely.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already done it once—just ignore him.

Mr PEDERICK: The transport minister was on the radio the other day claiming that the fun tax had to be implemented in order to make public transport viable. It has never been viable as it is subsidised at about 85 per cent from public funding. To say that you could put on a tax to make it viable—well, I am not going to wish them to tax it to make it viable, because that would need a ridiculous amount of funding.

The Minister also talked about the LinkSA services. Yes, they do have services out in my electorate, but they are not at Metro-ticketed rates. I want to see proper public transport reach further out into my electorate so that some of the ministers in the Labor government can see the full effect of what it really costs to get proper Metro-ticketed services to the regions so that people can access the city, whether it be for education, work, their pleasure or leisure.

Time expired.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:08): I rise to speak on the Budget Measures Bill before the house at the moment. I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and it is with some pleasure that I lay out some of our concerns on this side of the house regarding the Budget Measures Bill which is currently before us.

Of course, the state budget is in a complete and utter shambles after 12 years of mismanagement by those opposite. Every single year we get this fanciful projection of how this government is going to return our state budget finances to surplus. Unfortunately, those promises, those commitments that are made to the people of South Australia, are never actually realised.

If we look at the last seven years, the years since the global financial crisis—a term which is often used by those opposite as an excuse for their poor performance over an extended period of time—if we look at the budget forecasts that this party has laid before the people of South Australia regarding our projections, we see \$2.6 billion worth of surpluses which have been promised by this government—\$2.6 billion worth of promises.

If we then fast forward to what this government has delivered over that time, it is a very sad tale of \$3 billion worth of deficit. So, there has been a \$5.6 billion underperformance by this government against their own budget—the budget that they set themselves in this house every year when they bring down their budget.

This year that we are currently in, the government originally promised that we were going to have a surplus of \$840 million. We support that. We would love to see a return to surplus for this state. The government promised an \$840 million surplus. Yet, when we got around to the budget, when we finally got around to the budget this year, that was revised down ever so slightly to a loss of \$479 million. I mean, what is the reason for this massive turnaround in the projection? I put it to you, Deputy Speaker, that it is the chronic mismanagement of this government's budget by those people opposite in the Australian Labor Party.

Each and every successive update to this house has seen an increase in the deficit projected by this government. Every time we see that we find it more and more unrealistic to believe anything they have to say. The major reason, of course, for the blowout in the budget position has been this government's inability to stick to a budget. Every single year we have seen a massive blowout in unbudgeted expenditure; last year alone, it was \$311 million. That is \$311 million worth of unbudgeted expenditure by this government in a single year. The year before it was \$356 million worth of unbudgeted expenditure in a single year.

Nearly \$4 billion worth of unbudgeted expenditure this government has had in place since it came to government in 2002. That is a massive sum and that is the reason why we find ourselves in the perilous situation that we do as a state at the moment. So, it is no surprise to us that in this most recent budget, again, we see the government introducing a whole pile of budget measures which are going to result in further anxiety for those people already struggling with our extraordinarily high cost of living, cost of doing business and taxes in South Australia.

Rather than take some of the pain themselves, rather than deliver a budget that they promise, they would rather stick their hand in the pocket of the taxpayer in South Australia. We are already the highest taxed state in the nation. Read it for yourself: it is on page 54 of Budget Paper 3. We are the highest taxed jurisdiction in the nation and we have been in that position for an extended period of time. The government does not care about that and that is why, when it brought down this budget two weeks ago, it increased the state taxation revenue forecast for this state by 10 per cent—10 per cent in a single year—and somehow, magically, those opposite believe that by increasing taxes they are going to stimulate activity in South Australia.

It has never worked before and it is not going to work now. It has not worked in the past. We have been the highest taxed jurisdiction in Australia for an extended period of time. We have had that mantle, that unenviable mantle, for an extended period of time and, guess what, our economy

has been contracting. Our state domestic economy has contracted for the previous two quarters: the December quarter and the March quarter. When the June quarter results come out I bet we will have a further contraction of our state domestic economy, and that is because people are giving up, they are giving up in South Australia. The tax burden is too high, the regulatory burden is too high and they have a government which just does not understand.

The government has to get off the back of the small business sector so that they can go out and create jobs in this state and keep our next generation, our young South Australians, with some hope for a future of living here in South Australia. I speak to many young people and they love this place, they think South Australia is the best place in the world and I agree with them. This is a fantastic state.

We have so much going for us, but young people are leaving the state, not because they do not like living in this state but because they have given up, they have completely and utterly given up hope of finding a decent job in this state so they are moving to Melbourne, they are moving to Sydney, they are moving to Brisbane, they are moving to Hong Kong, they are moving to London, they are moving to a jurisdiction which has set itself up to favour the productive component of the economy, that component of the economy which creates jobs and keeps young people in the state.

It was a great pleasure for me to spend some time with Denis Napthine last week. He told me that he had created 18,000 jobs in the 12 months to the end of May. What an outstanding performance. Their economy is very similar to ours. They have a heavy reliance on the manufacturing sector. They do not have a significantly large mining sector, so their economy is very similar to ours, but in Victoria in their budget they are reducing taxes—they are reducing payroll tax, they are reducing stamp duties—and they are creating jobs in that jurisdiction.

I also spent some time with the Premier of Queensland. Let me tell you that it is an even more impressive turnaround scenario in that state. Campbell Newman has done a marvellous job at creating jobs, and I have had a look at the ABS statistics for Queensland. They have created 60,000 jobs in the 12 months to the end of May and, not only that, Campbell Newman has underpromised in his budget and overdelivered when his actuals come in. In fact, there is a \$1.5 billion turnaround in the promises he made in his budget in June 2013 as to what he reported in June 2014—a \$1.5 billion turnaround. We can only dream about those sorts of situations in South Australia.

We always have a \$1 billion or \$1.5 billion turnaround, but it is not in the positive direction: it always in the negative direction here in South Australia. We have a government which is addicted to spin, a government which overpromises and underdelivers, and who are the people who are suffering because of this? It is the people of South Australia. It is the people of South Australia who have put so much into this state in the past, but they are giving up hope under this tired, divided, dysfunctional, incompetent state Labor government.

Of course, there are some aspects of this Budget Measures Bill which we have publicly stated we are at odds with on this side of the house. We give notice now that we will be seeking to amend the bill as it stands before the house. This is not an issue we take lightly. It is an extraordinary decision, in fact, by the Liberal Party in South Australia to amend a budget measures bill, but we do it after careful consideration and we do it specifically in relation to the car park tax in South Australia.

The government first told the people of South Australia that they would be introducing a car park tax or, as they like to call it at the moment, the transport development levy. They first talked about this in December 2012 which, Deputy Speaker, as you would appreciate, was a very long time ago. We have been asking questions in this place during question time—which is aptly referenced as question time because that is what happens in question time: we ask questions. It is not referred to as 'question and answer time' because there are no answers. You never get a straight answer from those opposite, and we have been seeking to clarify the situation regarding the introduction of the transport development levy for an extended period of time.

Many people are very anxious about this new budget measure, but the government has not seen fit to come clean with the people of South Australia until we received this Budget Measures Bill on budget day. It was appalling that they left so many people out there hanging and that they still do, and I will tell you why they do. We have indicated that we will not be supporting this measure, so we have no idea whether or not this will pass into legislation, so people out there who own car parks

quite rightly have no idea whether they should be putting their prices up, keeping them down or whether it is going to go through.

If the bill goes through and they have not put up their prices, is it going to be retrospective to 1 July and would they be out of pocket? Alternatively, if they put their prices up anticipating what the government has in its Budget Measures Bill and it does not pass, what is the situation then? Are they to pass that money back to consumers? It is a mess. The government has had plenty of time to make it clear to the people of South Australia how this is going to operate, but they have not sought to do this.

It is a very unpopular tax. Nobody likes a new tax, I grant you that, but this one is particularly unpalatable. I will tell you the reason why. The government has been out there talking about the need to improve CBD vibrancy, and we support them on that. I think that it is a good objective. The government thinks that CBD vibrancy is all about painting some blue lines on Bank Street. As attractive as those blue lines look, I am not sure anybody is going to say, 'You've got me! I am going to come into the CBD every single day because those blue lines are very attractive.' As attractive as the new trees on Leigh Street are, nobody is going to say, 'That's the reason I am going to stay in South Australia. Forget about the job offer in Victoria or Sydney; I am going to stay here; there are blue lines on Bank Street.'

Let me tell you that this CBD tax, the car park tax, is completely at odds with the shared objective we have in this parliament, both sides of parliament, to increase city vibrancy. It is putting a penalty on everybody who comes into the CBD and uses a car park. This has been tried in plenty of other jurisdictions around Australia, and let me tell you how this sorry tale goes. They introduce a tax. It is usually quite a nominal tax, but look at how it grows, year in, year out.

In New South Wales, in Sydney, in 1992 they introduced a car park tax at \$200 per space per annum. It was doubled in 1997 and today it stands at \$2,210 per space in the CBD. This is how it happens: it starts off quite small, but where does it end up? The car park tax introduced in Perth has grown tenfold—10 times the original introduced amount—since 1999. Are we going to have that in South Australia? Are we going to have a \$7,500 plus GST CBD tax in place? We say we are not in favour of that whatsoever. It is a similar situation in Melbourne, and it is completely unpalatable.

This has very little support. We know that the Property Council is against it. We know that Business SA, the Rundle Mall Management Authority, the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, the Urban Development Institute of Australia and the Local Government Association are against it. We know that the Adelaide City Council is against this. Even the Premier's own Citizens' Jury is against it. He did not think it was enough to just go out and speak to people. We had this extraordinarily expensive Citizens' Jury, which cost \$150,000 of taxpayers' dollars. They walked out and asked them: do you want a car park tax? Answer is no.

I did the same survey that the Premier's Citizens' Jury did. It did not cost \$150,000: it cost nothing. I was happy to do it. That is the sort of guy I am—I am happy to walk out and speak to people on the street, get a bit of vitamin D, shake some hands, give them a smile; it costs nothing. Oh, no, that is not good enough for this Premier. He wants to convene a Citizens' Jury, where people are hand-picked, and some of them are exceptional people.

Mr Williams: You might even know one of them.

Mr MARSHALL: I might even know one of them—and what a fine contribution he made to the Citizens' Jury. I think what really upsets us so much on this side of the house when we spend money on these sorts of follies the Premier embarks on is that when the results do not come in as the Premier likes he completely ignores them. The people who sat on the Citizens' Jury, the people who gave their time to make a contribution to try to improve the vibrancy of city were ignored—ignored by this government, by those opposite, who simply do not care.

We know that the imposition of this tax is not supported. We know that the imposition of this tax is likely to increase on an ongoing basis. If you need any proof of that, you need only take a look at the solid waste levy in South Australia which, as you would know, started off at a very small amount. Look at it now—it is more than \$50 per tonne. It was a few dollars when it started out, but now it is more than \$50 per tonne. It is a massive cost to every household, every business, every council right across South Australia. What do they do with the money? It sitting in the bank. They are not even deploying it in the way in which the act provides.

That is another speech for another day, but I make the point that when these levies come into place they start at one point and they end up at a completely different point. We are all about supporting small business here in South Australia. We do not want to create any further burden for those people coming into the CBD. We canvassed, we spoke to a lot of people, and we made it very clear to all South Australians in the lead-up to the election that we did not support the car park tax. The government made it very clear that they did support the car park tax, and we went to the poll.

Let me tell you what happened in that poll: the Liberal Party won 53 per cent of the two-party preferred vote and the Labor Party won 47 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. The Labor Party's primary vote was at a staggeringly low 36 per cent. In fact, less than 36 per cent of the primary vote went to the South Australian Labor Party, which was out there advocating, day in, day out, to impose the transport development levy.

As I said, we do not arrive at this position lightly. It is an extraordinary decision for us to vote against the budget measure, but we are going to do it in this instance because this was an issue which received a lot of debate in the lead-up to the election, and the people of South Australia voted. If we did not follow through with this, I think we would be letting down the enormous number of people who voted for us. In fact, the Liberal Party, at the state election, had in excess of 92,000 additional votes over those opposite. It is an incredible increase in the number they had, and we want to honour those people who did not want a car park tax.

Those people want to grow the size of the South Australian economy. They favour small business, they favour economic growth, they favour jobs for the next generation, and that is why they do not want to support a car park tax, and that is why we will not be supporting a car park tax. As I have said, when we get to the committee stage of this debate, we will be moving amendments to that effect.

The government, of course, made an enormous promise to the people of South Australia. They said in February 2010 that they wanted to create 100,000 new jobs for South Australia and, again, we agree with the government on this measure. It is important to create hope for the next generation, it is important to create jobs, but nearly 4½ years into the government's six-year time frame for this promise, it is extremely sad to note that we are further behind; in fact, we have lost jobs. We have fewer people employed in South Australia now than when the government first made that promise.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier needs to be his seat so that I can call him to order. I remind him that the Speaker's scoreboard doesn't have his name here, so I am calling him to order.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But he is now, and I am calling him to order now.

Mr MARSHALL: The member for Mount Gambier, Deputy Speaker, you have reminded me, is an outstanding member of this chamber. He, like all of us on this side, understands the importance of jobs for the South Australian economy and, in particular, jobs in regional South Australia, and when we look at those job statistics, they are absolutely going backwards in South Australia because this is a government that does not have any interest or any confidence in people in the regions growing our economy in South Australia. He is going to be here working as hard as he possibly can for the people of Mount Gambier, for the people of regional South Australia, to create jobs and to grow jobs, and it is a great pleasure and privilege for me to be working with him in this chamber.

We have been asking the government consistently whether it absolutely and unequivocally stands by its commitment to create 100,000 jobs by February 2016, and for many, many months now the government has been saying yes. Well, 'see you later' to that promise because the budget came down and there is now no hope whatsoever that those 100,000 jobs can be created, and that is a real problem for us here in South Australia.

This is really why, when the Sensis Small Business Index was published the week before last, small business had plummeted further in South Australia. One of the interesting things about the Sensis Small Business Index is that it allows the respondents to this survey to rate their state or territory government, how helpful they are to the small business sector. Well, we were rated lowest

in Australia: the small business sector in South Australia rated our government lowest in Australia. What did they say in that survey? They said in South Australia we had too much bureaucracy, lacked incentives for small business and taxation was too high—especially payroll tax, this is absolutely too high. It is a sad state of affairs.

I also read with interest the week before last in the Tasmanian *Mercury* about their government, the new Liberal reformist government led by that wonderful premier, Will Hodgman. He has only been in place for the same time that Jay Weatherill has been back since our election, and guess where Tasmania was in that confidence survey? It was No. 1 because Will Hodgman is implementing a Liberal reformist agenda to reduce taxes, reduce red tape and invest in productive infrastructure that is going to support exports from Tasmania, and the small business sector. The small business sector in that state, the SME sector, has responded. They have more confidence in that state government than any other state government in Australia, and I think that is a wonderful fillip for the Tasmanian economy, and I am sure we are going to see Tasmania do extraordinarily well going forward.

One of the biggest problems for us, of course, in this budget is wrong priorities. I have talked in this house already about the wrong priorities the government has in regard to agricultural expenditure. We have seen that cut down to just below \$60 million per year. It is a third of where it was five years ago. I must commend the member for Hammond, whose contribution in this house was outstanding. He is a passionate man for the agricultural sector. We are passionate on this side about the importance of this sector going forward.

We have also spoken at length about the need to grow the size of our exports in South Australia. When this government initiated its State's Strategic Plan, the government said it had a goal to create \$25 billion worth of exports from our states—\$25 billion. Guess what we said on this side of the chamber? We said, 'Hear, hear! We strongly support that.' The government said it would facilitate \$25 billion worth of exports by 2013.

Well, 2013 has come and gone. Did we achieve \$25 billion? Did we get to half? We were already at 10, but did we get to 12½? No, we did not. We did not get anywhere near it, so what did the government do? I will tell you what the government did. The government said, 'What we are going to do is push out the time frame slightly to 2014.' Here we are, in 2014. This financial year is also completed, and did we achieve the \$25 billion by this year? No. Did we get to half? No. What did the government do? It pushed out the time frame. Call me cynical, but it pushed out the time frame to 2020. It was originally going to be delivered by 2013 and it is now promised for 2020. I have absolutely no confidence that this government has any chance whatsoever of achieving that promise to the people of South Australia.

Another very wonky priority of this government is its expenditure in the Environment Protection Authority of South Australia. This is an agency that has received quite a lot of scrutiny in recent days when it was revealed that the government has known for an extended period of time about soil and groundwater contamination in the Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park areas. In fact, we are getting more and more information dripped out from the government. We have had to grab this information. It is like getting blood out of a stone. We are getting bits and pieces of information.

We now know that the government has been aware of significant contamination concerns in this area for years. We know for a fact that it has certainly been going back to 2008. I think the most important thing which came out today was the fact that the government has made it clear that, in fact, there is a trigger point. In fact, the minister in this house representing the Minister for the Environment made it clear that there is a trigger point at which people should be evacuated from their homes. This trigger point is two—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Somethings.

Mr MARSHALL: I think, milligrams per cubic metre.

Honourable members: Micrograms.

Mr MARSHALL: Micrograms—two micrograms per—

Ms Digance: Very minuscule—small.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, the member for Elder, whose electorate we are talking about—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: —wants to laugh.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: She will not even answer the question when she knew about it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. It is not in order to interject. It is not in order to respond to interjections. I am calling the member for Elder to order, and I am asking the leader to continue with his debate.

Mr MARSHALL: The new trigger point was established today in this house. It begs the question: why is it that prior to the election, three houses were identified by the Minister for the Environment in the other place as being above that trigger point threshold as far back as February and March 2013, before the election? After the election, I will tell you what happens. After the election, they say that that is the trigger point at which people need to be evacuated. Before the election: 'Fine, stay there.' After the election: 'You need to be evacuated.'

What has changed? I will tell you what has changed. There was an election. It begs the question: why do we have a situation where the minister has not taken action when that World Health Organisation threshold was breached before the election? I think this minister has a lot of questions to answer. I think this government has a lot of questions to answer but, again I make the point that we get very few answers here. We have been stonewalled by this government for the last two days.

We know for a fact that they have known that three properties in Clovelly Park have had air contamination levels above the World Health Organisation safety threshold since February/March 2012. We know that there was a further consideration of this and the department was informed in October last year. We know for a fact that an independent report was received by the government in May this year. We know that the Minister for Social Housing has known since 11 June this year. She at least answered a question. We could not get anything out of the Premier. She at least answered a question: she has known since 11 June.

We know that the State Emergency Management Committee—yes, that is what it is called, Premier. It is incredible: he sits on it and he did not know what it was called. He thought it was a subcommittee of cabinet earlier today. That is the level of incompetence we have, but we know that an Emergency Management Committee meeting was hastily convened last week. Why was it hastily convened last week? To consider the evacuation of people living in these houses where the threshold is above this World Health Organisation trigger point in South Australia.

We know that cabinet considered this issue on Monday of this week and we also know that there was no action in accordance with the EPA protocols until the Liberal opposition raised this issue in the parliament yesterday. Let me tell you that we are not going to let this issue go. We have not been able to get any decent, sensible answers from this government. You ask a question of the Premier: 'When was the member for Elder informed?' He was unaware. She sits two seats behind him; he did not know.

We asked the same question a day later. You might have thought the government would have got around to speaking to each other. No way! Today we asked the question. 'I don't know.' Well, I think it is about time that the member for Elder stood up and gave a personal explanation and made it clear to the people of her electorate exactly and precisely when she did find out that there were dangerous situations in her electorate, and I would be very interested to find out when she knew. I would also be very interested to know why the Minister for Local Government was not aware of why the government stopped the Local Government Association from informing local government about these houses. There are plenty of questions on this, but I digress slightly.

I make the point that we have wrong priorities with this government and, in particular, the EPA. I was flicking through the EPA agency statement in this year's budget, handed down by the Treasurer only a few weeks ago. The thing that jumps out at you when you look at the EPA budget—because when anybody thinks of an environment protection agency, you think that their primary

responsibility is to protect the environment. I do not think any of us would think that there is another reason for it.

Let me tell you that I was flabbergasted when I took a look at the situation with the Environment Protection Authority. This is now a profit centre for this government. This was always an agency which cost money; this is now projecting, in the most recent budget, to actually make almost an \$8 million surplus this year. Who has actually heard of an environmental protection agency with a responsibility to return money to other agencies—significant money going out to other agencies—and a massive return of money to the Treasury? That just shows the degree of wrong priorities which sit within this government.

I think it is about time that we had an environmental protection agency which existed for one reason and one reason only, that is, to protect the environment. They have not done it in this case. There are serious questions which now need to be answered, not only by the minister but by the chairperson, Mia Handshin, the person who was appointed. She was hand-picked by this government. She was selected as a worthy person to head up the Environment Protection Authority.

We asked questions at the time about her suitability to chair the state's peak environmental protection agency in South Australia because she did not come to the role with academic credentials in this area. She did not come with a CV which made it abundantly clear to any of us what her particular credibility in the environmental area was. She was not a scientist; she is not a scientist. She made some flippant comments that she understood the importance of the environment.

Let me tell you that there are very serious questions which need to go to Mia Handshin, the chairperson. I see that the chief executive of the Environment Protection Authority has resigned since the election. I do not know the status of this appointment. In recent times, the government has not seen fit to advertise senior appointments. In fact, we will probably just get a memo fairly soon that people have been wandering the corridors of the Environment Protection Authority telling people, 'I have been promised the job.'

This seems to be the way that it operates here. We get no answers to any questions we ask in this area about very senior appointments by this government. They are a tired government and they have started to absolutely flout many of the protocols and conventions that have served South Australia well in terms of prudential appointments to senior roles in South Australia. We have plenty of questions regarding this.

I think that the minister has proved to be completely and utterly incompetent. On this side of the house, we have asked for him to resign. If he refuses to resign, we have asked for the Premier to sack him. We do not think that he is worthy to be the Minister for Environment. Yesterday, when he was asked a series of questions, no answers. He did not want to give any answers whatsoever. He has known about this contamination issue. He has known about the government's plan to evacuate people from their residence for an extended period of time and he has not taken action. That is in complete contravention from the EPA's own policy in this area.

I make the point that the previous minister for environment (the member for Colton) acted with far greater alacrity than the current minister has. He would come into the parliament and announce to the parliament the situation before the need to tell the residents. Here we just have the government sitting on their hands. We have the Minister for Social Housing telling us today that she knew since June 2011. Let me tell you that the residents affected by this contamination were not told until last night at 6 o'clock, and they were not told until the Liberal opposition raised this in question time.

I am reaching the conclusion of my contribution on the Budget Measures Bill before the house. We are in a perilous situation here in South Australia. The great state of South Australia has now become completely and utterly welfare dependent on other states through the unequal GST distribution we receive. We do not stand on our own two feet anymore. It is a sad state of affairs for South Australia. Even with this unequal distribution of GST to our state, we seem to be getting further and further behind the Liberal reformist governments that exist right around the rest of the nation. They are underpromising and overdelivering; we are doing exactly the opposite here in South Australia: we are overpromising and underdelivering.

The bulk of the budget measures contained in this bill will hurt South Australian households. This is a budget of broken promises and cost of living increases to households in South Australia.

We see a whole pile of broken promises in regard to health projects right across the state and, as you would be more than aware, Deputy Speaker, a massive broken promise to the people of Florey and Newland who rely on the excellent Modbury Hospital. The postponement or cancellation of the upgrade to Modbury Hospital, in the vicinity of \$27.5 million, is absolutely shameful.

The people of South Australia relied on promises made by the Australian Labor Party before the election which were broken in the budget afterwards. The people of Noarlunga feel very let down, the people at the Flinders Medical Centre feel very let down and the people at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital feel very let down. But it is not just the broken promises; it is the massive increase in costs that will be felt right across the state. Whether you be a small business, whether you be a household or whether you be an individual in this state, you are going to be doing it even tougher going forward.

We have the unenviable situation of being the highest taxed state in Australia, and we have the highest electricity prices in Australia, we have the highest water prices of any capital city in Australia, we have just had a massive increase in the emergency services levy here in South Australia, we have a WorkCover rate that is approximately double the national average—all these things create an environment in which our economy in South Australia is going backwards. It is going backwards because of the failed policy settings this government has put in place, and this budget has made it even that much harder.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:47): It is with great pleasure that I get to stand today to speak on the Budget Measures Bill. I must agree with what the member for Hammond and also our leader have said before me. As I look at the bill, I will start with the car park tax because for me that is something that really needs to be drilled down into.

There are a number of points with the car park tax: for a start, there is the fact that we want to call it a transport development levy. Please, give me a break. Let's call a spade a spade, and a spade a shovel. Call it what you like, but call it what it is; that is, it is a car park tax. That is what we have seen over time, that is what it is known as, that is what it is, but we want to give it these fancy names as we roll up to the election.

One of the things I thought was very interesting in the lead-up to the election was that there were a number of times when those opposite could have put this through the parliament, but they chose not to. They chose to hold off and wait and wait because they did not want to be the party that had put forward a car park tax. Now they are, and they are taking money again from the hip pockets of South Australians.

I think of the member for Hammond and his constituents. I have a lot to do with a lot of people in the country regions around South Australia, and my father lives in the South-East. I am thinking of the Saturday when he will drive to the city to go to the footy. He will try to make an appointment while he is here in the city. He might go to see his accountant or his doctor or something like that, and he will drive into the city because he cannot get public transport from Kingston in the South-East, as you would understand.

He will drive into the city and pay his car park tax when he goes to see the doctor on one side of the city, then he will drive over to the footy and pay the car park tax again. He will go to the footy with his ticket and there he will be hit by the fun tax, or the public transport tax, or an events levy, as I am sure it is going to be called, but it is a tax. Again, let's be honest, it is another tax.

You can get the gist of the story here: clearly, it is a government that has lost control of their spending and they have to reap it back anyway they can. Those opposite might laugh about the name they call these things, but the spin is phenomenal. I have worked in the media environment for a long time, and it is very obvious and very evident when you see this spin rolling out. Here are two classic cases in point: try to give it a different name, try and paint it with a different brush but, let's be honest, it is all a tax.

As I stressed, it is do with the fact that the overspending has gone on for so long. The budget is out of control and the debt is getting out of control. No-one on the other side seems to be able to take control of the spending, reign it in and get a handle on what is actually going on with the finances. When you cannot get control of expenditure and the money that is going out, and it is just overspend after overspend, deficit after deficit, blowout after blowout, what do you need to do? Get your hands

on some revenue and increase taxes. As was pointed out, taxes are up 10 per cent in South Australia from this year to the next, and it is quite phenomenal.

In regard to payroll tax, again we go into an election and those opposite try to put a bit of a turn on things and say, 'We are going to reduce payroll tax for 12 months. That's all we're going to do to help businesses out and help them grow.' There is no surety or solidity for businesses to be able to grow and bring in more people. They will reduce payroll tax for 12 months. Again, it is just a little carrot but nothing that will incentivise business to grow. Then after 12 months, bang, payroll tax is back on and we going to keep hitting businesses and keep reaping in money from everywhere we can.

On land tax, South Australia is the worst of all the states in this country. It is quite phenomenal when people find out the amount of land tax paid here. Again, this is a state that needs to be bringing people in, getting investment going and getting people to spend their money in South Australia. When you look at the fees on land tax, why would you invest in a property here in South Australia when you could potentially do so interstate at a far cheaper rate? The list goes on.

Another matter that concerns me is that with the sale of MAC no longer will the government collect CTP; that will go to a private entity. We are still trying to find out where the money will come from to fund the Motor Accident Commission's programs and its education programs it does so successfully. Where is the money going to come from? I would lay London to a brick a levy is going to be put on those new CTP operators who provide private insurance. Again, be ready for another levy on your rego.

I did note that just before the election the registration fees went down a little bit in lieu of bringing in another scheme after the election. So, after the election, again regos go up. Just before they go down, just after they go up—a bit of a shuffling of the books they claim, but again it is notably a good bit of spin for the people out there in voter land during the election. It is quite phenomenal how this goes on.

We talk about the car park tax and the way that people are going to get hit with it. The member for Hammond talked about bike riders; he was hoping that people from Murray Bridge might ride their bike down and he talked about how they would get taxed. If they did ride their bike down and went to the city, they would still be taxed because they would get hit with the public transport tax as well, the events tax, or the fun tax, call it what you will. There is no way of avoiding any of these taxes that are being brought in by this government. It is quite phenomenal.

We then roll into the emergency services levy—again, another tax. You can call it a levy, call it a tax, but that is what it is: \$150 to \$190 for each household every year. It is as good as land tax on the family home. That is what it is, another \$150 to \$190 being hit on every household each year. It is quite phenomenal. People ask, 'Why are all these taxes going on?' Everyone starts blaming the federal government, and that is all we ever hear from the other side. What I have noticed is this is the state budget, the Budget Measures Bill for the state budget. At no stage has anyone taken responsibility for the poor shape and form of this state budget. It fascinates me.

I was amazed to hear the Treasurer speaking on the radio the other day about the debt and deficit and the \$1.2 billion deficit that turned out in last year's budget. When he was quizzed on this topic, he had to come through with the truth. He had to come clean and explain to the people of South Australia that that \$1.2 billion deficit he returned in the last budget this state Labor government brought down had absolutely nothing to do with the federal government. As much as they try to push the blame, as much as they try to pass the buck, they have to take responsibility for their budget. I stress again: it is the Budget Measures Bill for this state government. Those on the other side should take some responsibility. They have had 12 years of mismanagement, and that is the reason we are in this position.

We look forward to the state health figures too, and again it makes me laugh when we hear those on the other side keep talking about the federal cuts. If we look at the state health cuts, \$1 billion going out of state health thanks to the state Labor government. The Treasurer is cutting \$1 billion out of state health and there is also a significant amount of money coming out of state education as well—\$223 million.

I find it really funny that we are in here talking about state politics and the state budget measures, but never do those on the other side point out the fact that they have cut \$1 billion out of

state health and \$223 million out of the state education system. It is a little bit hypocritical that they sit there passing the buck and take no responsibility for what they are doing or how they are doing it. It is quite phenomenal.

I also refer to the credit rating. We had a AAA credit rating a number of years ago, and the Premier at his own behest said, 'We will downgrade that to grow jobs.' Well, there has been next to no jobs growth in that time. We have heard about the 100,000 jobs that were coming, but we have not even got close. I think it is going to be nearly 5,000 jobs a month for the remaining months to try to reach that target—something astronomical.

We dropped down to a AA+ credit rating, again to grow jobs which never happened, but the drop in that credit rating (and now we are down to a AA credit rating) means we pay more on our borrowings. I am not sure how much the people out there understand that, and perhaps it is my job to explain it a little bit simpler and easier to them, but the drop in this credit rating means that the interest we pay on our loans is far greater as a state, and that is hitting everyone. So, mismanagement of the economy brings down the credit rating, or some might do it on purpose for whatever reason, I do not know. We are bringing down the credit rating and then we are paying more on our borrowings—and we are happy to see it keep going down—all to create jobs which are not there. It is quite phenomenal.

As we said, South Australia is now the highest taxed jurisdiction in the country. It is absolutely unbelievable how we think we are going to get ahead when we keep taxing. I do not know any place which has taxed its way to prosperity; it just does not happen. We keep putting imposts and restrictions on business, they do not grow and they do not want to be here. People do not want to be here when they have those imposts on them. Why would you set up a business in a state that has such high taxes and is holding you back? Why not go somewhere else? Plenty of other states are calling for people to come over there and set up business in their jurisdictions and in their area.

This government is making it hard for South Australians to get ahead and it is making it hard for businesses to grow. I have not met a business yet that says, 'You know what, I want to go to work today and lay people off.' Businesses do not say that. Businesses do not say, 'You know what, I don't want to go well. I want to go backwards so that I have to lay people off and I have to close my business.' Businesses want to grow. They want to employ more people, be more prosperous and increase the economy. That is what business wants to do, so why you would sit there and restrict them and stop them and hinder them from employing people has absolutely got me whacked. I really cannot understand why that would be the case.

From where I sit, I think this government should be doing everything it can to help grow business, to help small business get moving and employ more people, to pick up more apprentices and give more people opportunity. That is what young people say to me when I speak to them when I am out at supermarkets or doorknocking or whatever in my electorate. They say they want more opportunity, and that is what we have to try to create for these people: we need to create more opportunity. I think the restrictions that we put on business and people in South Australia—I will talk about the cost of living in a moment—just drag people down and make it harder and harder for people to get ahead and for this state to grow, and it is seen in the statistics.

I point out that the budget tax revenue will increase by 10 per cent in South Australia from 2013-14 to 2014-15—10 per cent; it is quite phenomenal. I cannot see, again, when you look at those numbers and those restrictions that we are putting on people, how you think things are going to grow, how people are going to get ahead, how people are going to go out there and say, 'You know what, it's getting tougher, it's getting harder. I'm going to put my hard-earned money into a business and try to employ someone.' Again, it just does not make any sense.

We look through the cost of living, and I want to talk about that, because this is something that I think hurts businesses and families. We run through some of the things: CPI has increased at 40 per cent over the duration of this government, housing rental prices have gone up 54 per cent, property charges 87 per cent and state taxes 92 per cent. These are the ones that really hurt, though: gas bills up 136 per cent, electricity bills up 160 per cent and water bills up 227 per cent. Those numbers are absolutely phenomenal and they hurt local communities, local sporting clubs, local businesses and, more importantly, they hurt families.

I heard with interest, as a couple of members in the house were talking about the automanufacturing industry. It was pointed out by the member for Hammond, and rightly so, that

when Holden closed, which was very sad for all the workers and people involved, it was pointed out by General Motors International in Detroit that it did not matter how much money was going to get thrown at them, they had made the decision that they were going to close that down.

I revert back to my past life when I worked in the media when I heard the Minister for Tourism talk about the Clipsal 500. I was heavily involved in that event over the journey, and a few of my mates were drivers with different teams; one of them was with Holden, and had great support from Holden and that was fantastic, but what was noted in the supercar industry over the past few years—and I suggest it goes back as far as four years and I think there were even negotiations five years back, and I found this really intriguing—they could see what they called 'the writing on the wall'.

There was a move within the industry. There was always a rivalry between Ford and Holden on the track and it had great success, but when they saw the writing on the wall—and this was a few years ago now—they started to bring in Volvo, Mercedes and they chased down other marks and other names to bring in. They brought in Nissan as well. They brought in these other marks and other names. Why did they do that? I can tell you why they did that. They saw what was going to happen in the manufacturing industry with cars here in Australia, and that was five years ago. They were very clever and they got things in place.

They realised if you sit still and sit stagnant, you are not going to grow. You will not grow if you are going to sit and do what you have always done. So, they had a look at it and they thought, 'Let's bring these other marks, these other makes in. We want to stay alive.' They stayed with Ford and Holden, they knew that because of what was going on in the economy that things were going to wind down, so they brought in these extra makes and extra marks, and they maintained their vibrancy and their business.

It was fascinating to me that in this state the writing was on the wall for the car industry and people in the know, through the car industry and whatnot, were looking at what was going on there, and they could see what was taking shape. But what did we do here as a state government? How did we look to address this situation? What were the contingencies we had in place? Well, it seems to me there was nothing.

There were no contingencies, nothing in place and when the shutdown came. As the member for Hammond pointed out, General Motors Holden overseas said, 'We are sorry but no matter how much money you throw at us, there is nothing we can do,' and this government said, 'What happened? It is not our fault.' They started pointing the finger again and everyone was to blame but themselves. They took no responsibility for it and that is the sort of thing that happens.

When you have a budget you take responsibility. You set your benchmarks, you set what you are trying to achieve and it is your job and your fiscal responsibility to uphold that. That is where Liberal reformist governments around the states and in New Zealand have done a marvellous job. They set their benchmarks and their levels and they attain their levels, and they stick to a budget. They do not just say, 'Well, that is a budget.' I have heard the leader say this, and it is very apt: budgets are not a target to try to shoot past, budgets are a target to try to attain.

That is how businesses operate, that is how a business has to operate if it is going to be successful. You cannot run a business or a household by blowing your budget: earning only so much and spending X amount more. If you keep spending more than you earn, you are going to get yourself in very big trouble. Not to make mention of that, if you start paying your mortgage on your Visa card—again, people at home will work out very quickly that if you pay your mortgage on your Visa card, eventually things are going to catch up with you.

I refer back to the car park tax, which is one that this government is adamant about. They are driving a message to try to get people onto public transport, or so they tell us, yet they are building new roads. They have people coming from my electorate down south. They have the nice Southern Expressway duplication that they are starting to open—the fact that half of my electorate cannot get on it and it goes through their backyard is another story—funnelling people into the city, but they are saying not to use it, to go on public transport 'and we'll tax you for that, come in your car and we will tax you for that'. So, stay at home, but we do not want to be a stay-at-home state. We want people to get moving. We want the place to be vibrant. We want to get things going.

When people come to South Australia and they see the taxes being piled upon them and building upon them because of the 12 years of financial mismanagement by this government, they

realise that this government is just trying to claw back money. They have spent recklessly, they have kept no control over what they have been doing and they are needing to claw back money any way they can. I stress with the emergency services levy, and the Treasurer explained that so well, that the government used to fund part of the emergency services levy.

Now they realise they need to take that money back, again, to cover all of their mismanagement and all of their out-of-control spending for so long, so they need to take the money out of that. So they will just up the emergency services levy and, again, take more money from everyday South Australians, just take it out of their pocket; 'We need it, we're taking it from you.' There is no incentive for people to get ahead here and start a business or start something that would get this state moving. Where is it?

Every time people go to do something, more money gets taken out of their back pocket, and it really does deflate people. It is why so many leave this state, why so many people leave South Australia and head interstate or overseas. It has happened in my family just in recent times. My cousin has been here for a number of years—he came back from Queensland to be close to his family—but he could not last here because there were no jobs. Industries are closing down and there is no opportunity here in South Australia, so what do families do? They pack up and they move; they go back to Queensland, they head to Melbourne, they head to Sydney.

Just recently my neighbour sold up her house. I thought it might have been because I moved into the street, but she assured me it was not. I was actually great friends with her son when I was growing up, and I said 'You are getting to retirement age; why are you leaving South Australia and getting out of here?' She said that Johnny, her son, lived in Sydney and their daughter lived in Melbourne, so they are moving to Ballarat; there is no point being here in Adelaide because the kids can never come back. There are no opportunities for their kids to come back here to South Australia so they have had to get up and move out.

It is happening across the board; young people looking for opportunity or older people wanting to be closer to their kids and grandkids. They are just packing up and moving out of South Australia. South Australia is much better than that. I have four children and I want to see them have opportunities. By all means they can go and travel the world and do what they want, but you want them to be able to come back to South Australia, have a job and have opportunities, across all generations. Those are a couple of things we really need to take into consideration, and the way that the economy is travelling and the way the budget that has been handed down by this Labor government is shaping up, it looks to me to be of great concern. It is about tax, tax and more tax.

Equally, there is the way that all the attention is being diverted to the feds and no responsibility, none whatsoever, is being taken by this state Labor government for the situation they have put us in. I stress again that the Treasurer on radio the other day admitted that the budget for the last financial year we have just been through, a \$1.2 billion deficit, was nothing to do with the feds. So, no smoke and mirrors; do not try to do the spin any more. Take responsibility for the financial situation this state is in; 12 years of mismanagement has put us in this situation. We are coming from a long way back.

A few moments ago the leader talked about business confidence. Business confidence is higher in Tasmania than it is in South Australia, and that has to be an alarming fact, first and foremost. When we are falling down, and we are playing in that ball game and we are getting beaten by Tasmania, we really do have to take stock of what is going on. This has happened over 12 years and it has to stop, the mismanagement has to stop. We have to make sure that we stick to budget.

I welcome the government saying that they are going to be back in surplus in two years' time. I really would like to see it; I do not believe it is going to happen, but I would like to see it. So that is what I look for. I would really like to see the budget back under control and this government take some responsibility for its actions over the past 12 years.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I notice there is no mention today of my visit to Mitchell.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Since he has been elevated he is a different man.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Too late, too late.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:08): I would like to make a contribution and talk about this car park tax, this transport development levy. Call it what you like, it is another tax. It is one of many taxes that have been handed down in this recent budget.

It is a sad indictment on South Australia that we have got ourselves into such a position, such a financial dilemma that we have nowhere to go and no way out. South Australians are the lesser for it, they are the lesser for a government that is in for its fourth term. It was elected because won more seats, the government continues to tell us that; it did not win the popular vote.

South Australians will now need to make an assessment of just why this current government continues to get back in. This is another one of the reasons they should not be put back in. This development levy is going to impact every car park space in the CBD, around \$750 a space. As the leader has explained, that is just a token of where we are headed, a \$750 tax on top of an events levy. That is something that grinds my gears.

Sport is meant to be apolitical, yet we have a minister over there who laughs about introducing another tax. It is just outrageous that while the state government is introducing taxes we have ministers laughing about it. I am sure the minister responsible for the tax is a Port Power supporter, but he will have to answer to every South Australian who is going to grace events where they will have to pay another tax, a fun tax. I think it is a sad indictment. So it may be that any one of those 5,000 people attending those events needs to reassess how they will vote next time. Maybe those people who are coming into the CBD will have to reassess where their vote will go.

I have a petition here to stop the introduction of the Adelaide car park tax. It has reached 5,000 signatures. We have 5,000 signatures saying no, which coincides with 5,000 attendees going to events who are going to get a double whammy of taxes. It stands out that this government is just intent on managing their mis-spending by introducing another tax.

Some of the people who have been part of this petition have said, 'The CBD should be accessible yet also affordable. I won't be coming to the CBD. I'll shop elsewhere.' Another person said, 'Through circumstances, these significant implications to the Adelaide CBD will favour me shopping outside the CBD. I'll go elsewhere.' There are many comments. Another comment is, 'I'm already finding the car park in the city so expensive that I cannot afford to go. This then means I will do more shopping online.' So no-one is the winner.

While people are deterred from coming to the shopping precinct, they will shop online, so no-one in the CBD will win; we will not get anyone in the metropolitan areas winning, the local shops, the local businesses. They will be the losers from this car park tax because people will be deterred from coming into the city. I would like to remind you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I do not live in the city. For me, parking in the city will be a deterrent with the introduction of this car park tax, I will go elsewhere. I think that is a pretty clear message of exactly what is going on. This car park tax, car park levy—call it what you want—is a deterrent for people to come in to keep the city centre vibrant.

As the Minister for Tourism (the minister for dining) continues to say, 'Shops aren't open. Why aren't they open?' Because people are not going to go there if they have to pay extra tax in the CBD. They cannot afford the penalty rates. They deter people from coming into the city. It all just multiplies. Soon we are going to have more taxes—the fun tax, the car park tax, the levies, the wage implications for people working after hours, working weekends. It is a recipe for sending the tumbleweed down the streets.

South Australians will have to endure many extra taxes and levies thanks to this budget. Does anyone across the chamber remember pre-election that the Liberals promised no new taxes and no new levies? Labor's decision to add new taxes and levies really does fly in the face of every voter in South Australia. I call on the voters in South Australia, in voter land, to remember that. It might be a long way off—three years, two hundred and something days—but I just want voters to remember that they were given an opportunity to vote for the Liberal Party, with no new taxes and no new levies, yet they went with the same old same old party that continues to up the taxes, up the levies, hit the pocket and make the cost of living more and more expensive and unaffordable.

I have had many seniors come to my electorate office saying that they are doing everything in their power to drive the cost of living down. As I said in my contribution to the budget reply, these people are not turning their heaters on, they are not turning their lights on and, in some cases, they

are turning their TVs off and turning their radio on because it costs less to run. That is sad. That is a sad indictment of life in South Australia. To those people: I share your pain but, sadly, the current government has imposed these taxes, this cost of living, on you.

Again, I have a scenario. When volunteers come to Adelaide for their screening check, and in that screening check visit they want to go to the football at the Adelaide Oval, how much is it going to cost them? Not only are they paying extra to park in the city and extra to go to the football, they are also paying extra to have their screening check. It beggars belief; it really does beggar belief.

I want to touch on the NRM community grants funding program. It comes around—well, the NRM cuts. They have axed \$1.5 million from the program. Those volunteer groups give their time; they are the environmental warriors that go out there and are custodians for keeping our environment in a better condition, making it a better place. This is what volunteers are about. It is \$5 billion industry to South Australia and yet we see a government that puts another tax on them; increases the screening by 33 per cent. I think it is just outrageous.

I look across. We have a Premier who is touted to be from the left, the green finger. He is an environment lover and yet he does this sort of thing. He allows this sort of thing to come across the cabinet table and be passed. Again, he claims to be a champion of the environment, a champion of the river; he got more water for the river. We called for 4,000 gigalitres and a basin plan. It did not happen. He said 4,000, gigalitres and no water would come from the irrigators. Sadly, it did not happen. He promised something that he could not give.

What I would say on this side is that the South Australian Liberal Party—and I am quite proud to say that I was part of that consultation in delivering a sustainable basin plan—came up with 2,750 gigalitres. We came up with that number a long time before it was announced, and the reason that we came up with that number was we consulted. We did not go out and tell people what we thought they needed to hear. We consulted with people. We went out to communities. We went out to environmental groups. We went out to the food producers and we asked them to come up with sensible ideas, to come up with sensible outcomes for the sustainability of the river.

Over the last 40 or 50 years, those operators have gained efficiencies. They have been great managers of the river. They have been great managers of their land. They have been great managers. They do the bird counts; they do the fish counts. They undertake all the environmental management responsibilities that they have to undertake so that they have a pristine environment, they have a sustainable river, they have a sustainable piece of land that they manage, and yet we have a Premier who has broken a promise over and over.

As I said, he said 4,000 gigalitres; the basin plan was 2,750. No water from the irrigators; well, the water has come from the irrigators to date. When the cabinet was up in the Riverland Monday week ago, I asked the Premier to outline a plan of just where they were going to take some responsibility for their contribution to the basin plan. South Australia—183 gigalitres. In amongst that 183, so far to date the irrigators and their communities have given up about 100 gigalitres. There are about 83 gigalitres still to be recovered.

The federal government has put money on the table. They are looking for 40 gigalitres; that leaves 43 to go. There are some environmental works and measures that I see will contribute to that; there are still another 20 gigalitres of water unanswered for. I think that the Premier needs to stand up and make an announcement. I would applaud him if he was to put his hand in his pocket and pull out that 20-gigalitre parcel of water and make a contribution to the plan. If he is such a champion of the river, put his water where his mouth is.

What underpins the sustainable river, again, are those community groups. In particular, the Loxton Bookpurnong Local Action Group have been in the game for 18 years. They have managed about \$10 million worth of projects in planning. They have been outstanding citizens, outstanding environmental warriors for that Loxton Bookpurnong region that they look after. They have great watering programs, they have great environmental rebuilding programs. They look after the wildlife, they do the bird counts and the fish counts, they keep an eye on the pests and the weeds. They do all the responsible actions, yet accessible grant funding for many of these projects has now been cut.

Who is going to perform those duties? Let's face it, people cannot be expected to dip their hand in their pocket and pay for the car park tax levy and the fun tax, to pay for all of these other new

taxes, new levies and broken promises. All of a sudden, we have no-one out there looking after the environment. With these broken promises, it seems to be a theme that we have this continual blame game. Everyone on the government's side of the chamber has stood up and had a little blah, blah about federal government cuts to the budget and what it means to South Australia. The reason we have had to make cuts is that we had a federal Labor government that did not know when to stop spending, they did not know where to spend.

When we look at some of those programs, they were absolutely outrageous. We have seen debt and mismanaged funds. We have seen the country go from surplus into deficit, we have seen money put into areas that should never have been there, and we say that it was to stimulate the GFC. Well, please! Every other state had it, every other country had it, yet here we are in South Australia paying the price. It is beyond belief. With the \$1.2 billion deficit, the Treasurer did say on radio that it was not the fault of the federal government, so I think that really does highlight that the truth is slowly going to eke out. We cannot have ministers and Labor backbenchers standing up and playing the blame game.

I want to touch on vehicle manufacturing. I know that the previous speaker, the member for Mitchell, talked about the Clipsal and friends within the car racing fraternity. I watched the Premier yesterday politicising and having a political stage play, as I call it, standing up and pretending to get angry. Please! That was the lamest pretend I have ever seen.

Yes, it is sad that the vehicle manufacturing industry in this state is destined for the heap. But I can tell you that, five or six years ago, the industry and the unions knew what was going on. It was not just the race car fraternity. The industry and the unions knew about the decline of the vehicle manufacturing sector, and they predicted back then that for both Ford and Holden their days were numbered and, funnily enough, they also predicted that Toyota's days were numbered.

We get this blame game again that it was all about the South Australian Liberal Party not sticking up for the vehicle manufacturing sector. It was inevitable that it was going to happen. The federal Coalition had done the negotiations, they had been to the manufacturing sector internationally and sought advice about what their plan was going to be, and it was plain. The vehicle manufacturing sector came out and said, 'No matter how much money the government tips in, the industry is doomed.' So, it is a sad day for South Australia.

As I said, I did an apprenticeship at GMH at Woodville, and I was proud to be a GMH apprentice because they offered some of the best facilities in the state and in the country. I went on to do post-trades in toolmaking and other areas. They offered me an opportunity, they offered me something to go on with in life. When I was made redundant—out of a workforce of 20,000 people, I was part of the 3,600 redundancy packages—I got on with life. They had given me the opportunity to gain skills, and I went out and used those skills in another sector. I went out there, and I was part of a workforce in another area. Life went on.

For those who are potentially going to lose their job, I say that there is hope, there is light at the end of the tunnel. For those who are potentially reaching an age where they do not think they can go on, I say to them: look outside the square, there are other opportunities. They do not have to go into the manufacturing sector; they can go into something that is different. They can go out there and—

Ms Sanderson: Be a member of parliament.

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes, they can. They can do some volunteering, they can be good, and they can make a difference. So, again, to those people: there is life after the manufacturing sector.

One thing I would like to reiterate is that the food sector, agriculture, again seems to be underpinning our state's economy. One thing I want everyone in this chamber to remember is that the food sector is the largest employer in manufacturing. So, take heart, because the agricultural sector will pick up this state's economy once again, as it has done for 120 years, and we will move on and this state will become great again. With a change of government, and more reliance on agriculture, this state will be a great state.

Just on the back of that, the trade opportunities, I will quickly touch on opportunities for South Australia. We continue to look at export opportunities. We continue to say that the shining light is in China or that the light that is about to start shining is in India. We have many shining lights. We have export opportunities all over the globe, in particular in South-East Asia. They are creating

opportunities every day, and when we have a presence in those markets that is when we have the opportunity to grasp those negotiations with exporters, marketers and producers, but they need to be looking at one another face to face.

My recommendation to the new ideas minister—oh, that is right, the trade minister, the minister with all the ideas that no-one else has—is that he needs to have the face to face. We cannot just have politicians and bureaucrats going over there negotiating trade deals—that does not work. The Asians, the Chinese, the Japanese, all sectors, want to look a producer in the eye. They want to meet the person—the man or woman—who is growing the product, who is manufacturing a product, who is an innovator. They want to look at and engage them so they can form a relationship and can say, 'I've met this person, I have a relationship with them, I'm going to do business with them,' because they do not do business with a politician, they do not do business with a bureaucrat and they do not do business with dignitaries. So, that is some advice I have for our minister for ideas.

Export opportunities: it does not just have to be international export opportunities for South Australia. We need to cast ourselves to our brothers and cousins across the borders, we need to put products into other states. Mark my words, every other state in this nation is coming to South Australia to sell their wares. We need to get out there and sell our wares. It is about opportunities in another country, in a faraway place. We need to look close to home as well as at bringing in new money. It is not about South Australia making the same money go round and round. It is about bringing international money, about bringing interstate money to South Australia, and making South Australia a greater place. That is why I entered politics: to make South Australia a better place.

Time expired.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:28): I rise to also make a contribution regarding the Budget Measures Bill and to indicate my strong opposition to the car park tax, which I think will have a devastating effect on the City of Adelaide. For some background, the transport development levy was issued in a RevenueSA circular on 18 December 2012, so it is 18 months since that was first indicated by the Labor Party, yet this is the first time they have decided to put it with the budget rather than testing out this policy with the public, presenting it before the election, bringing it to parliament and letting us have a proper debate. They have waited and put it in with the budget bill, which brings us to an extraordinary situation where, for the good of our state, the Liberal Party will be voting against this and trying to amend the budget bill.

The car park tax will apply to all public car park spaces, long or short-term leased car parks, privately owned car parks that are subject to the fringe benefit tax, and on-street ticketed car park spaces. It will not apply to residential car parking spaces or privately owned car parks that are not subject to fringe benefit tax, disabled car parks, parks for emergency vehicles, the short-term visitor car parks at the Royal Adelaide Hospital or special event car park spaces. However, they have brought in a fun tax for that, and that is unusual.

From 2014-15, owners of car parking spaces will be subject to the transport development levy which, announced at \$750, if you include the GST is actually \$825. The state government estimates that revenue generated in the first two years following this car parking tax will be \$25.7 million in 2014-15 and \$26.4 million in 2015-16. The state government has already announced that the levy will be used to fund new park-and-ride facilities that are quite far out of the Adelaide City Council area and will not actually improve any of the public transport in the city area.

The car parking tax is actually a solution to a problem that the government created. The problem, the government states, is its own poor record in providing efficient public transport, and it has meant that there are 5.5 million fewer boardings on public transport. Part of that is caused by the botched bus contract that was based on price and, as we know, it cost several million dollars to reprint all the bus timetables to allow more time.

Many users of buses lost faith in the bus system. There was news article after news article and news reports of people complaining that their bosses were upset and going to fire them if they were late to work again, and students were getting into trouble at school for being late to school. It was the highest number of complaints ever recorded to the complaints line. It was just chaotic, and many people lost their faith in the public transport system, particularly buses, at that time.

The government spent millions to reprint the bus timetables allowing more time, so a trip that normally should take 15 minutes now takes 20 minutes—so it is not more efficient, it is less efficient.

Then the government spent more money putting bus lanes throughout the city which, if there is congestion, would be one of the main factors why we have congestion in the city. The government wants more people to catch public transport and fewer people to drive into the city.

However, I do not think that this car parking tax will achieve that goal at all. In fact, I think that a lot of the measures the government itself has instigated have caused the problem. If we start on a time line, the tram was extended through King William Street and onto North Terrace. Everyone loves trams and everyone loves Melbourne. It is a great city, and I think we are trying to copy their vibrancy.

However, the tram the government put in is a tram that took away every right-hand turn through the city. It has a raised platform so you cannot cross over the tramline. You cannot drive on the tramline through King William Street or North Terrace. On North Terrace, it has a raised median strip so, as a business owner on North Terrace, when the tram came in, it meant that there was absolutely no way of accessing my office in the city due to the tram. Not only has the tram made accessing the city very difficult but also it has contributed to congestion by the removal of all the extra lanes. In Melbourne, and also in the southern part of King William Street, cars can use the lane that the tram has. That is one reason we have more congestion.

Then, of course, we have the bus lanes (which were also to try to cover a mistake the Labor government had made with their cheaper bus contracts), and now we have the bike lane that has just gone into Frome Street. There are many reasons why there are problems with congestion throughout the city, and I really do not believe that the car parking tax will help alleviate that at all.

I have some examples of businesses that have contacted me. One business in the city has several car parks they lease out for their customers to park for free, so now an extra \$825 a year will be added to the cost of already leasing those car parks for them to provide parking for people to go to their store and buy food, drinks and whatever they buy there. Another example is the Target car park, which has 980 bays. If you multiply that by \$750, that is \$735,000 a year extra that business owner will have to pay.

As you know when you value an asset, it is usually valued on the income that it makes, so now the income-producing ability of that asset has been reduced by \$735,000 which will then potentially devalue the property. If that property is mortgaged against other properties, it has a knock-on effect and it will have a devastating effect on many businesses far beyond what the government is perhaps considering.

Several accounting firms have contacted me that provide parking for both their staff and customers, who are also very annoyed. We have St Luke's Church on Whitmore Square which leases out its parks on its premises in order to help with the running costs of the church. They do some wonderful work with people throughout the city and that is the way in which they fund it. There are many other charity organisations. The National Council of Women also leases out parks and the Salvation Army leases out parks.

Many not-for-profit organisations and non-government organisations actually make money by leasing out parks on their land in the city, and so they will all be hit and they are people that we really need to be supporting rather than penalising. This does not only have an impact on businesses but it also has an impact on residences, which is even worse from my point of view. They are the people that I represent in the city area, although I am very aware of all the businesses and the concerns that they have raised.

After the introduction of the Capital City DPA, minimum car parking requirements have been removed from the Capital City Zone and catalyst sites. This has led to numerous housing developments that have been built throughout the city without adequate and sometimes without any car parking and, at the same time, the government has introduced stamp duty concessions and first homebuyer concessions for young people and low-income earners. So, on the one hand, we are trying to get people to move into the city, yet we have taken away the compulsion to provide adequate car parking.

Resident one, we will call them, who contacted my office, lives in the Uno Apartments and does not have a car park. Uno was built with only 36 car parks for 146 apartments. As this person does not have street frontage she is not entitled to a parking permit from the council. This person 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 for her to have a car and thus will make her feel even more isolated.

Another resident who contacted me purchased an apartment in the city where there was no car park provided. She understands that private residents could be exempt; however, the permanent car park that she leases at a cost of \$270 per month is a public car park adjacent to her building and will be subject to the car parking tax. So, this levy will be passed on to city residents and others who have bought new apartments in the city where car parking is not provided, which is a lot of new city developments.

As we know, the cost and convenience of car parking is the number one deterrent for people shopping, dining and visiting the city. The car park tax will provide further disincentive when travelling to the city for shopping and leisure as the \$825 with GST per annum per space will inevitably be passed on to the consumer. Retail and hospitality as well as the vibrancy in the city will unavoidably suffer as an unintended consequence of this levy.

The Property Council has condemned the car parking tax, claiming the tax will make the CBD less attractive for businesses and only exacerbate the CBD office vacancy situation which is already at the worst it has been in over a decade. From memory, I was checking office vacancies just in the 5000 postcode and I am pretty sure it was up over 600,000 square metres of vacant office space in the city already.

The last thing we need to do is to make it even more expensive for people to run a business in this city. The Adelaide City Council has raised concerns several times in their meetings and it believes that the direct cost of the levy in its current form to council will be \$6.4 million per annum, which would involve a 20 per cent increase on their current rates and which we know will also then be passed on to business owners and residents of the city who already pay high rates for the privilege of being in the city. The car park tax is merely an add-on land tax. We already have the highest land tax in the country and now we are adding another tax on the owners of any land in our city.

Let's look at some of the results in other cities. Melbourne has a congestion levy. That was introduced in 2006 at \$400 per space and has increased several times since then. It applies to approximately 50,000 places in the city and some surrounding districts. It produced a marginal reduction in car park trips of 8 per cent. The corresponding increase in public transport use was only 2 per cent, so this means that 6 per cent fewer people are choosing to go into the city of Melbourne, which is devastating for the city of Melbourne as well. It is not a good thing and they are clearly not the workers whom this is aimed at. These are the people who have a choice to shop at Westfield or shop somewhere else or go to a local dentist.

We can see from experience interstate that this will mean fewer people going into the city and it will not be the workers: it will be the people who have a choice, the people who create the vibrancy that we all so dearly seek. Most business owners in Melbourne absorb the cost of the car parking rather than charging that on to their staff or customers which added yet another cost to running their business and, as we know, we have the highest cost of business in Australia, so the last thing we need is another cost added to our business owners.

In terms of commercial car park owners in Melbourne, the experience was that they transferred the burden of the levy from their long-term contract parking spaces—people who lease their car parks on a monthly basis. They did not put the price up for them. What they did was pass that levy on to the people with the short-term parking, so the cost of going shopping for an hour or two or three had a double levy, rather than affecting the long-term parkers which was what the government was trying to do. What we are trying to do here is get the long-term parkers to catch public transport into the city and, as we can see from what happened in Victoria, that was not what happened. It was passed on to the short-term users of the city and again, they are the people we need in the city shopping, visiting dentists, visiting lawyers, using services in the city.

In Sydney they have two different categories: \$2,160 in the city and business areas and \$770 in Bondi Junction, Chatswood, Parramatta and St Leonards, with extensive exemptions being given. This was brought in in 2009. When they surveyed respondents who drove to an exchange where you can drop off your car and jump onto public transport, 38 per cent of them stated that they were catching public transport because of the cost of parking, but 36 per cent—almost the same amount—drove to the bus stop because public transport was faster. We certainly do not have that in

South Australia. That is what we need to get to. If we want to really encourage people into public transport, we should actually be looking for affordable, reliable and safe public transport, not the system that we have.

I have endless complaints to my office about the G10 in particular. They have slowed down slightly with the changeover of bus contractors, but certainly there are still lots of issues with the buses being full by the time they get to my electorate, not picking up and with many out of service. There are endless issues with safety as well. If you are not travelling in peak hour many people feel unsafe on the buses. It would not even cost money to make our public transport more efficient. We just should be working on getting the buses on time, making sure they are safe and clean and having inspectors visible like we used to have when I used to catch the bus regularly and making it affordable, so you encourage people.

In Perth, they also have a parking tax. However, theirs states that any levy taken from an area must be used for infrastructure and public transport in the same area. The levy that we have takes from the city and moves the money into completely another area, which is another reason why I think it will have devastating effects on the city. From what I hear, I believe the pickup points are going to be near Westfield—as if you would then go into the city and shop! So, the car parking tax is an unfair levy and it is counterproductive to creating city vibrancy.

I think it will damage business and it is simply an example of this government engaging in class warfare against those living and working in the city in an attempt to fix a problem that they created and is an opportunity to take money out of the city area. It will put up the rates for people who work or live in the city council area because they will also be forced to pay the levy as one of the major car park owners in the city area.

I think this is a very detrimental tax. It has not been well thought out. The unintended, perhaps, consequences are varied and broad and I really think the government should remove the car parking tax from its budget measures.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:45): This is an appalling bill and I will certainly be opposing the Budget Measures Bill 2014. I implore the government to retract it and to stop this atrocious levy on parking spaces within the central business district of the city of Adelaide.

This bill and its quite intelligent and enlightened writers have made this bill with several flawed assumptions. One is that people who drive cars are rich and, of course, the government hates rich people; it hates people who drive cars. The second one is that it is a crazy left-wing suggestion to think that you can tax your way to prosperity. We have seen time and time again that that does not work and it is certainly not going to work in South Australia.

Thirdly, there is also an assumption that transport in South Australia works, that it is on time and that it is clean. It does not work, it is not on time and it is not clean, and you can blame the member for Lee for that. The member for Lee, instead of taking these issues seriously wants to endorse bad comments about personal members. He wants to do everything else except address the issues at hand. It is a toxic tax and it is—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: I only have 14 minutes left.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I need to protect the member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: Thank you for your protection, Deputy Speaker. It would not be the first time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And he is just lucky I'm sitting here!

Mr TARZIA: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. This tax will hurt businesses, it will hurt jobs and it will damage city vibrancy without a doubt. The government does not have a mandate to pass this bill. I know they only had 47 per cent of the two-party preferred vote and many of those voters were in the city. The government does not have a mandate to take this levy to South Australia; it did not have a majority in its own right. I will reiterate that point here.

The Hon. P. Caica: Oh, Vincent, you know you have to win marginal seats.

Mr TARZIA: I know, and if only more people won marginal seats, the member for Colton.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I need to remind members that it is out of order to interject and it is also out of order to respond to interjections.

Mr TARZIA: My apologies, Deputy Speaker. I would like to take the parliament to the bill itself. First, I would like to address what a levy or parking space is under the bill, particularly paragraph (d) which states:

- (d) a parking space that is set aside or used for the parking of a car used by a Minister or other member of Parliament on a regular basis—

here it comes—

(other than any such space within an area that constitutes part of the South Australian Parliament),

What we trying to do here? Are we trying to say that this tax is good but it is not good for the writers of the bill? That is absolute hypocrisy.

I would also like to take the attention of members to Schedule 1—Exempt parking spaces, Residential parking. The first part addresses exempt parking spaces for residences, the second relates to tenants but the third one states that a parking space is an exempt parking space if:

- (c) no separate cost for the parking space is charged above payments of rent or other consideration under the lease, licence or other agreement or arrangement to occupy the residential premises.

This in itself is a farce because tell me who does not charge in the CBD, who does not get charged for a residential parking space? Therefore, based on that assumption, this is going to hit commercial landlords, and not only commercial landlords but residential landlords. Why is it going to hit residential landlords? Because the Labor Party and the South Australian government think that someone who owns a property in the city who leases it out is a rich person and, therefore, they are going to punish them. So, we see the real agenda here coming out.

This is a tax on middle class South Australia. It is not just going to affect people who work in the city every day. It is going to affect people who do their shopping on the weekend, it is going to hit the aspirational class, it is going to hit the middle class, and it is going to hit university students who cannot rely on the transport system that the member for Lee has oversight of at the moment. These people would use public transport. I get so many complaints in my EO about public transport day in and day out. I understand what the government might be trying to achieve, but if it was working, people might have some more faith in the system, and it is fair to say at the moment they do not.

I also want to talk to the house about the reality of this issue. I have in my hand an invoice from a parking firm, and it is dated 6 June 2014. They have already passed on the expected cost of this levy which is only in bill form; it has not been passed. This is the reality and it is because this government has not installed confidence in the business community. It has not installed confidence in consumers, so businesses feel that they need to prepare for four more years.

What is coming? I hope it is not economic Armageddon on behalf of the South Australian government, because if they are charging people already, if they are that worried that they are passing on their costs before the act is actually passed, then we are in trouble. We are in a lot of trouble with what will happen in reality.

The reality is that they are passing the cost on already, and I am covering the logo. What happens when you pass the cost on? The Minister for Health was a very good treasurer at one stage, a much better treasurer than the current one. He would know this.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: I am an even better Minister for Health.

Mr TARZIA: He understands. He is here for the long game. He understands that this is a poisoned chalice at the moment. He is a smart guy and he understands, as I am sure some other members do, that you cannot tax your way to prosperity. Because it is a flawed system—

Mr Gardner: You are South Australia's only hope for the next three years.

Mr TARZIA: He is the white knight. There are going to be fewer people in the city; fewer people in the CBD. What is going to happen when there are less people in the CBD? It is an economic

argument: supply and demand. When you stop the supply of people in the city, when you cut demand, who is going to hurt? I will tell you who is going to hurt—all those employers, those good people who hire people in South Australia, including employers who have SDA members on their database, I might add. It is going to hit retailers. It is bad for business. Retailers are going to cop this; unquestionably they are going to cop this.

What is going to happen when retailers underperform? When retailers underperform they will have no other choice but to pass on drastic measures, like a fee which they have not even been charged yet, and indirectly down the track there will be more job losses, unfortunately. We have heard our leaders speak of this today. We have seen how many jobs have been lost in South Australia in the past 12 months and the past 12 years. Former premier Mike Rann went to the South Australian electorate many years ago with a mandate that he promised to create 100,000 new jobs by 2016, and we know that that is just a lie. It is an absolute lie. It will take a miracle for that to happen.

In relation to the cost of living, I would have to say that this is the number one issue for real people in middle class South Australia. I doorknocked the entire area of Hartley during the campaign and I can tell the house this is what is hurting people, and I will tell you why.

The increase in costs in Adelaide from 2001-02 to 2013-14 are as follows: while CPI has been a 40 per cent increase, housing rents have gone up 54 per cent, property charges have gone up 87 per cent, state tax is up 92 per cent, gas bills 136 per cent, electricity bills 160 per cent, and, finally, water bills 227 per cent. That is before we consider the punitive measure that is the new emergency services levy and the associated changes with that. That is before the state credit rating deteriorates even further.

What happens when the state credit rating deteriorates even further? Again, it is an economic argument. Obviously, it becomes much more expensive for the state to borrow money. We are already seeing what happens when they cannot borrow money based on their own debt. What do they do? They start these creative mechanisms called public-private partnerships.

When debt becomes too hard, and when one credit card becomes maxed out, what do you do? You get another credit card. It is called public-private partnerships, and that is what this government is doing. That is why they are building this new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Have you seen that contract, Deputy Speaker? I tell you what, I would love to have some shares in that proposal; let me tell you, it would pay very high dividends. Unfortunately, though, it is at the detriment to the South Australian people.

Finally, I would like to talk about what industry is saying about this proposal. The member for Adelaide gave us a couple of case studies whereby, wholeheartedly, this type of bill has been rejected interstate. It has been rejected in Sydney, and it has been rejected in Melbourne. Why? Because they understand. These are states where economic reformist Liberal governments are building those states back up. They understand you cannot tax your way to prosperity; they understand that you need to increase the number of people going into the city for retailers to do better. They understand that small business is the engine room of this economy.

I draw on the comments of the Property Council of Australia (SA) executive director Nathan Paine in May 2013, when the government was looking to introduce this bill, where he said that the tax is designed to reduce the number of people driving into the city and instead boost public transport patronage. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MARINE PARKS (SANCTUARY ZONES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2014

Estimates Committees

The Legislative Council gave leave to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. G.E. Gago) and the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation

(Hon. I.K. Hunter) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Thursday 24 July 2014 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***FORESTRYSA INDIGENOUS PROGRAMS**

5 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (22 May 2014). What Indigenous programs, grants and funding were provided by each department or agency under the minister's portfolio for 2011, and in each case were these funds recurrent, current, operational or capital expenditure?

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): The Minister for Forests has received this advice: ForestrySA does not have any Indigenous programs, grants or funding.

DEPARTMENTAL CONTRACTS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (20 May 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

Mr Rod Hook concluded his employment as Chief Executive, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure at close of business 9 May 2014. In accordance with the terms of his employment contract, Mr Hook is entitled to:

- four (4) months written notice or payment in lieu (equating to \$118,966);
- a termination payment of \$242,170 based on four (4) months adjusted remuneration for each uncompleted year of the term of appointment (subject to a maximum of 16 months adjusted remuneration).

In total the termination payment equates to \$361,136.

In addition, payment of leave entitlements of approximately \$147,959 (\$31,653 in annual leave and \$116,306 in long service leave) brought the total gross payment received by Mr Hook to \$509,095.

CORCORAN, MS MARY-LOU

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (18 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

Ms Mary-Lou Corcoran is no longer in the employment of the government of South Australia. She resigned her employment prior to the swearing in of the new government.

She received all of her entitlements up until her resignation.