

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 June 2013

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

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2013-14

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

That the 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, 82nd, 83rd and 84th reports of the committee, concerning various Natural Resources Management Board levy proposals for 2013-14, be noted collectively.

One of the Natural Resources Committee's statutory obligations is to consider and make recommendations on any annual levy proposed by a natural resource management board where the levy increase exceeds the annual CPI rise. Of the seven proposed increases in the division 1 land-based levies for 2013-14, only two were higher than the 1.7 per cent CPI rate. All of the division 2 water levy proposals were equal to or lower than the CPI. This is an improvement on previous years when, in some cases, all seven boards together had sought to increase their levies by more than CPI.

Whilst members are sympathetic to the desire for the NRM boards to increase their funding bases, members believe that above CPI increases should be the exception rather than the norm. The Adelaide & Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board has sought a 5.1 per cent division 1 increase, while the Kangaroo Island board has sought a 3.8 per cent division 1 increase. In both cases, members were told that, due to an increased number of properties, the increase per rateable property was not expected to increase above CPI.

This year, the committee is determined not to object to all of the proposed NRM levy increases. The increase in funding that the Adelaide & Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board will receive will enable it to increase staff numbers at a time when most other state government agencies will be forced to reduce their staffing due to budget constraints. While the increase in levy property is only \$1.00, this represents an overall increase in funding for the board of approximately \$1 million. The AMLRNRM Board is lucky to have such a large and constantly growing rate base. The ability of the AMLRNRM Board to raise funds in its region contrasts starkly with the rest of the state's NRM boards. Now that that board has finished its process of levy equalisation, the committee looks forward to a levy increase next year that is much closer to CPI.

In the case of the Kangaroo Island NRM Board, committee members were impressed at the depth of knowledge shown by presiding member Richard Trethewey and the regional manager, Bill Hadrill, with regard to Kangaroo Island and its natural resources. In particular, members were impressed to hear that the feral goat numbers had been reduced to a same-sex population. This means that effectively, unless someone brings a goat of the opposite sex to the island and releases it, feral goats should be excluded from the island.

The committee was pleased that the Eyre Peninsula NRM Board proposed to keep its levy increases equal to 1.7 per cent CPI rate. When giving evidence to the committee in April, we heard from the NRM board's presiding member, Heather Baldock, that several board members will not seek re-election to the board when their terms expire later this year.

Committee members were made to understand that one of the reasons for this is that some board members felt that they had become 'punching bags' for disaffected community members. While we understand there is a lot of emotion around the issue of water supply, which is the subject of our inquiry, this does not excuse bad behaviour from community members. Board members who have volunteered their time trying to find positive solutions to environmental problems should be applauded for their efforts, not abused.

The committee was pleased to note that the Northern and Yorke NRM Board proposed to freeze its levies for 2013-14. Two years ago, we received feedback from the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, the board's presiding member, with regard to the complexity of updating business plans annually. As a former member of the Natural Resources Committee and current presiding member of the Northern and Yorke NRM Board, Caroline Schaefer is in a unique position to comment on the process of amending board business plans.

It was Caroline Schaefer's plain speaking in April 2011 in evidence to the committee that convinced members of the need to prepare a special report to parliament on NRM levy

arrangements. This report was tabled in September 2012. Similarly, the Natural Resources Committee was pleased to hear that for the 2013-14 period, the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin NRM Board is proposing to increase both its division 1 and division 2 levies by CPI. The committee was unhappy with the above-CPI increases in previous years, and warned last year that it would not entertain such increases in the future.

Despite that fact, the board included a proposed water levy for the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges Prescribed Water Resources Area in its business plan last year. The Water Allocation Plan was not adopted during 2012-13. The board has once again included the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges in its business plan for 2013-14. The committee hopes that in the next 12 months, the Minister for Environment and Conservation will be in a position to adopt this plan.

Members were impressed by the enormous contribution volunteers made to the NRM projects in the SA Murray-Darling Basin NRM region during 2012-13. Committee members heard that almost 3,000 volunteers are involved annually in the board-managed NRM projects. I might say that I think we have been overwhelmed by the work that volunteers generally do with NRM and associated projects, and this is a real highlight of the scheme. We thank them most strongly for that input.

The Arid Lands NRM Board is, for the first time ever, proposing to keep both its levies within the CPI. After visiting the region in late 2010, members gained a new appreciation for the unique logistical demands facing this remote area board, including difficulty sourcing and securing long-term funding and employment for staff. The committee was impressed with the work the Arid Lands NRM Board has done over the past year in continuing its work in eradicating athel pine and date palms and monitoring cane toads' progress towards South Australia. The South-East NRM Board restricted its levy increases to CPI. The committee was pleased to hear of the good work that the board has done in eradicating pest plants and animals.

We heard that nearly 1,400 properties covering more than 160,000 hectares and 15,000 kilometres of roadsides had been inspected over the last year: 657 feral deer and 57 feral goats were removed; 3,000 hectares of rabbit control was carried out on six priority areas; 125 hectares of priority blackberry sites were controlled; and over 45,000 fox baits and 7,500 kilograms of rabbit baits were sold to land managers and property owners. Members look forward to hearing more good news from the board next year.

The South-East NRM Board has constantly worked hard in achieving its aims and objectives in its regional plan, and its board and regional NRM group members have put enormous effort into guiding the efforts of volunteer organisations and staff. The South-East NRM Board is renowned for its high achievements in the area of water resource management and pest control. It has faced some enormous challenges in finding the right balance between improving land productivity and preserving wetlands from increased salinity and reduced rainfall. These challenges will continue as climate continues to change and local drainage schemes are put to the test.

I would like to commend the members of the committee: the member for Frome, the member for Torrens, the member for Little Para, the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Stuart, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire, the Hon. John Dawkins and the Hon. Russell Wortley. I would also like to make special mention of the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars who is still associated with our committee, thank goodness. Finally, I would like to thank the committee staff for their excellent work, and I commend these reports to the house.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Stuart replies, I would like to welcome to Parliament House people from the University of the Third Age, Victor Harbor, who are guests of the member for Finnis.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2013-14

Debate resumed.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:12): I rise today to comment on this report, which relates to levies for seven different boards. I am a member of this committee, and four of these seven NRM regions actually share an overlap with the electorate of Stuart, which I represent, so I have a very keen interest in this issue.

Let me start by saying that I support the comments made a moment ago by the chair of the committee, the member for Ashford. I would also like to thank all of the NRM staff and board

members who came and presented to our committee and put their views and thoughts forward and explained the work that they are doing and the levy increases that they have sought. I would also like to put on record my thanks to the NRM staff and the volunteers who contribute to their work throughout our state and particularly in the electorate of Stuart that I represent.

With regard to the levies, my view is that the work that the NRM boards do essentially is endless. There is a community expectation that all weeds everywhere, all feral animals everywhere, all water courses that are not in pristine condition, etc., should be fixed up by NRM boards and the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. The reality is, of course, that it would take an infinite budget to achieve this infinite amount of work.

I understand very well that the people who do this work—and in this instance we are talking about the NRM boards, their staff and their volunteers—want to do as much as they possibly can, so it is quite natural to seek as much of a levy increase as they think they might be able to get. But the reality is that if the NRM boards—any NRM board—had twice as much levy funding, or three times as much levy funding, or four or five or 10 times as much levy funding, there would still be very good projects they would like to do that would be beneficial to our state that they would still not be able to fund because the work is potentially endless. So I do have the strong view that you have to stop somewhere.

As the member for Stuart, working on this committee—with one vote out of nine—I have taken a personal decision to not support levy increase requests which are in excess of CPI. That is because I think that you do need to stop somewhere and I think CPI is the fair place to stop.

I respect the fact that the work that could be done with levy increases in excess of CPI would be very good and very valuable work, but it would never stop, regardless of the levy increase that was granted. There would still be work that could not be funded. So that is my position on these levies, but I do take very seriously the work that the boards do and I thank their staff and volunteers again for what they have done.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the staff of the committee, Mr Patrick Dupont, our executive officer, and Mr David Trebilcock, our research officer, who both do very good work for our committee. I would also like to thank my parliamentary colleagues on the committee whose contribution I also value and enjoy working with.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:16): I would like to make some general points about NRM boards. Sometimes we hear, I think, ill-informed criticism of these boards. On the whole, I think they do an excellent job. Some of the matters that they focus on include soil conservation, pest plant eradication, pest animal eradication, general conservation, and an educative role amongst young people, in particular. I have not had one person in my electorate complain about paying the levy—whether that be people in the rural part or the urban part. The community is very supportive, I believe, of what the NRM boards do.

We have heard, in recent times, some criticism about the Mount Lofty board trying to control the use of water in the Mount Lofty Ranges, and the significance of that issue was highlighted only this week when one of the officers from the City of Onkaparinga pointed out that one of the creeks (sometimes we call them rivers) by the time the water that was meant to flow down the creek got towards the latter part of the river (or creek) there was no water at all because people upstream had taken it all.

So some of the issues that need to be managed are very important, and if you do not have some management arrangement and it is overseen by the NRM board, then the landholders further down the stream will get nothing. If anyone can argue to me or show me that that is fair and reasonable, I would welcome their input.

A couple of people, I think in another place in particular, and a few people who get on radio, are continually bashing the NRM boards, I think quite unfairly—inappropriately. They do a great job; they will never be perfect in what they do, but I commend all the people associated with them. I read the material they produce, the various publications, and I am often heartened by what I see, the constructive work being done by farmers, in association with farmers, as well as water conservation projects in the urban environment.

There is still a lot of work to be done, in particular the restoration of some of our creeks, particularly in the Mount Lofty Ranges which have become degraded, and need significant restoration. That is one of the challenges, I think, for the NRM boards to adopt.

In essence, I think it is an excellent initiative; it came out of the original water boards and I think I am correct in saying it was a Liberal government initiative some years ago, so it has now evolved into the NRM boards. I think having those boards and a natural resources management committee in the parliament itself is another very good initiative, and I commend all of those people for the good work they do.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:20): I rise to speak to this motion in regard to the levy proposals for the natural resources management boards for this state, but I would just like to concentrate my remarks around the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal. I commend the thoughts and the commitment of the member for Stuart on this committee in making sure that levy proposals do not exceed CPI (consumer price index). We have seen here, as recently as 12 months ago, that the Natural Resources Committee rejected some of the proposals for the rate rises, and they succeeded, so I commend the whole committee for that.

I would just like to say that I think there is some good work done through natural resources management, although it has bothered me over time that it does seem to have developed a huge bureaucracy. My wife, Sally, was part of the integrated natural resources management setting this up in the early 2000s. It has grown to a bit of a bureaucratic beast since then, and that is what concerns a lot of people, a lot of farmers on the ground.

Rightly or wrongly, a lot of people do not seem to have any feeling as to what is going on. They see these offices spring up around the state and they are concerned that there is not more of an interaction with farmers and land managers so that they know exactly what is going on on the ground in regard to pest plant management, feral animals, soil management, and the like. I think the one thing that does concern me is that now that all natural resources management boards have come under the control of the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources it seems that it has become just part of another government department. I think quite a few community members feel that they are more distanced by what has happened with that governance arrangement.

However, I do think that there are some positives. Some of the senior people in natural resources management are suddenly realising that they do need to better connect with landholders. It is going to take time. It is going to take time because they have been distanced for various reasons. There is a right to know where the many millions of dollars go in these arrangements so that people can see real outcomes, and real outcomes on the ground instead of plans which are endlessly being reviewed. I know there are discussions about sorting that out, with better time frames so that people do not complete one annual review and their whole role in life at the NRM board is to start on the next one. So, a whole lot of bureaucracy, at the end of the day, is starving some of the funding that could be hitting the ground.

I know that in the Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board funding proposals the division 1 levy proposal will go from \$2,073,240 to \$2,108,485, and that is the link to a consumer price index increase of 1.7 per cent. The division 2 proposal rises from \$6,775,999 to \$6,891,190, and that is a 1.7 per cent consumer price index increase as well. I note that overall, through the federal funding, the division 1 levy and the division 2 levy and approximately \$2 million of other funds, the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board will have just over \$15 million to complete their programs.

I think it is absolutely appropriate that the levy not be increased by more than 1.7 per cent. What I wish for in the future is that we have better collaboration between the bureaucracy of natural resources management and the farmers so that we do not get this antagonism, as the member for Fisher indicated, on the airwaves and people can see real outcomes. We do need to manage our natural resources; we need to get it right. As we have seen with the recent drought and the River Murray, we do need to manage our waterways, but we need to take everyone with us on the ride, otherwise it becomes a very antagonistic situation.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:25): This subject cannot go through the house without me having something to say about it. If you read through my 23 years here, I would like \$1 for each time I have mentioned this subject, and I have not always been a positive critic in relation to the activities of the NRM boards.

The SPEAKER: No, that's true.

Mr VENNING: But one does mellow with age, I think. I appreciate very much those boards that have used restraint in lifting their levies. I noted the words used by the member for Ashford and

I am quite encouraged by them. I pay tribute also to the Hon. Caroline Schaefer and that her board is freezing their levy for two years. I think that is a very commendable thing to do and certainly will silence a lot of the critics. I do live in her board area, so I suppose you could say I have a conflict of interest, but I do not believe that is so. I do put on the record my appreciation of her.

No board should ever raise its levy above CPI, I believe, and I commend the committee's support of that, yet some of these boards tend to become empire builders. I have witnessed it myself. Even though the member for Ashford did comment that there be some areas where their rate revenues increase, they think it is their due then to be able to increase the employment level within the board.

The Hon. R.B. Such: Your local council is putting up the CEO's pay by 4.5 per cent.

Mr VENNING: I did not know that. I better check that one out. That is on the record and I will get that off the record. Thank you, member for Fisher. Just because the rate base has increased, it should not be an automatic panacea for them to increase employment on the board. I support the committee and the Chair when they note the wonderful efforts of the volunteer members, and they should never be subject to abuse from irate ratepayers, landowners, etc. I have certainly been a witness of that sort of activity and people have to understand that a volunteer is not there to be abused.

NRM boards have many roles, which include the control of weeds, feral animals, soils and land care in general. I had experience in this area before I came here, which was funded by direct state and federal funding, and the landowners, as ratepayers through their local councils, contributed as well. So, it was a rather complicated area. The local board, with the member councils, watched carefully the costs and expenditures, and levy increases were very rare indeed. When you did increase levies, the council certainly copped it through the ratepayers in general, so it has totally changed.

The difference today is that there is a flat levy, which is easy, but of course it is also easy just to keep hiking it up. I am very pleased that this committee is sitting there as a watchdog and reining it in, because otherwise the NRM boards would keep hiking up the levies. The big criticism of the NRM boards that we have been discussing this morning is the amount of bureaucracy that is now in there. As a previous chairman of an animal and plant control board, I did combine the weed board with the feral animals, and we were the first board in South Australia to do so, which we called the Animal and Plant Control Board.

Again, I was involved in bringing in soils into the same area. Funding was complicated, because soils was funded by the federal government and animals and plants were funded by the state government. We were going through this process when it became an issue in this parliament about combining them. Rather than just bringing the soils in, they brought the whole lot in, and this was when we saw the huge build-up of bureaucracy, and this was when I think we lost control of it. We had bureaucrats running everywhere and the cost went through the roof, and that was the saddest part, and many said at the time that service diminished.

I have come through that and the NRM today is very important. It is also important that we always work with and encourage our landowners. Most landowners—not all, but a huge majority of them—know the responsibility for the land that they have, particularly the younger generation, my son included. They are very conscious of the soil and the land because it is a resource that, once destroyed, is almost impossible to regain, and much more so now than when I was a lad.

We just got out there—in hindsight, we could have been called miners—and poured fertiliser on it and took the crop off and, if there was a tree in the road, it just did not thrive. We now have rules on our property: every tree we remove, we replace 10 back, and when you drive around you can see that. It is marvellous to see the difference that the continual work of these people has made over the years.

I also note that the current chairman of the NRM Council, Mr Andrew Inglis, is a personal friend of mine; in fact, he is a lifelong friend. He would agree with much of what the chair has said this morning, and I am sure he is pleased that the committee is there as well. I have been an outspoken critic of the new bureaucratic beast, as the member for Hammond just called it, but I have moved on, and people like Andrew Inglis and Caroline Schaefer give me much confidence.

I believe that landowners really want to see more activity and more contact with them so that they get back to being part of the process. I think we are going that way, and I think we have made progress in the last 18 months to two years. I was involved in these matters before and,

when I retire in nine months, if given the chance, I would probably like to serve again. I commend the committee on the seven reports tabled here this morning and congratulate them on their work.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:31): I would like to thank members for their contribution. I know that there are a number of people who watch very closely what happens with their local NRM board and, as members of parliament, a number of us are very keen to make sure that we watch those committees, but also do that in a positive way. I commend the report to parliament.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: WORKFORCE AND EDUCATION PARTICIPATION

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (11:32): I move:

That the 80th report of the committee, entitled Workforce and Education Participation, be noted.

On 15 November 2011, the Economic and Finance Committee resolved to inquire into matters relating to barriers to employment, training and education. The inquiry arose from a motion put forward by a former member of the committee, the member for Reynell.

The terms of reference for this inquiry for the committee to investigate and report on were: barriers to full participation and education training and employment; ways to enhance access to and participation in education, training and employment, including through improved collaboration between government, health, community, education, training, employment and other services; and strategies to improve the capacity of individuals, families, community members, co-workers and employers to respond to the needs of people with limited experience of participation in education and/or the workforce.

Underpinning the inquiry terms of reference was the importance of South Australia striving to grow its workforce participation rate. South Australia has a wealth of resources, vibrant communities, quality training systems and a healthy business community. To achieve continued growth, the committee noted throughout this inquiry that more South Australians need to participate in education, training and, ultimately, the workforce. A key theme that emerged throughout the evidence received by the committee during this inquiry was that, by increasing people's participation, multiple benefits for individuals, families, business and society as a whole ensue.

Before proceeding any further, I would like to acknowledge and thank the other members of the committee, including former members, for their contribution to the inquiry. I would like to note that I was elected and appointed to the presiding member role in February 2013, in the latter stages of the inquiry. Therefore, in particular, I would like to acknowledge the former members of the Economic and Finance Committee who contributed to this inquiry, including the former presiding member, the now Deputy Speaker. I also thank all current members—the members for Colton, Davenport, Torrens, Ramsay, Goyder and Flinders.

On behalf of the committee I also acknowledge and thank the many organisations and individuals who presented evidence to the inquiry, both in writing and by attending hearings. I also thank the committee staff for their ongoing support; they do a wonderful job. I pass on our best wishes to the executive officer of our committee for her forthcoming baby due very shortly.

The inquiry received 24 written submissions from a variety of interested stakeholders, including individuals, a range of community based organisations, peak interest and industry bodies, business groups, education and training providers, the South Australian Training and Skills Commission, and the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (DFEEST).

Throughout the inquiry the committee invited 17 witnesses to attend hearings and present evidence. We heard from a range of groups, directly representing people in the South Australian community, who are experiencing challenges to participating in education, training or the workforce, and that included carers, youth, mature age workers, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, and people experiencing unstable living conditions. A number of industry and business groups also presented oral evidence to the committee. In addition, the committee heard directly from a range of service deliverers and administrators of relevant government programs. The committee noted throughout the inquiry that the current Skills for All program, administered by DFEEST, is responding to many of the issues raised in the inquiry. However, there is room to undertake further activity to support more people into education, training and work.

As to the inquiry evidence, while evidence was received from a broad range of stakeholders, a range of consistent themes and messages emerged throughout the committee inquiry. In summary, based on the evidence received, the most common barriers identified to participating in education, training or the workforce related particularly to low literacy/numeracy skills and low educational attainment; training costs; lack of suitable work experience; caring responsibilities; disability, poor health and mental illness; generational unemployment; poor English as a second language; employer perceptions or discrimination regarding age, race, work history, carer status; geographic barriers, including a lack of access to nearby employment and training activities; homelessness or unstable living arrangements; and gender issues.

I will endeavour to highlight some of the main themes raised throughout the inquiry. The committee consistently heard from a broad cross-section of the community that poorly developed literacy and numeracy skills were the most common and fundamental barriers to employment and education participation. It was also noted by the committee that people who did not complete secondary school and who lacked general employability, including digital literacy, were at a further disadvantage. The committee heard that people who face multiple challenges, such as having English as a second language or caring responsibilities, find it even harder to address the barriers to participation.

Another theme heard throughout the inquiry was that of isolation and marginalisation as a result of not being engaged in education, training or employment. It was evident to the committee that the adult and community education (ACE) sector, and particularly the community and neighbourhood centres, have a pivotal role to play in engaging and connecting with people who are marginalised and disconnected from the community at large. Such centres offer foundation skills and vocational courses that assist in building people's confidence and in finding their way back to or into employment and training. The way in which these centres are resourced and administered was of particular interest to the committee.

Another theme raised throughout the inquiry was that of the need for workplace flexibility. The committee heard throughout the inquiry that for many reasons a range of people in the community, including carers, older workers, youth and people experiencing homelessness, all needed access to more flexible workplaces.

With an ageing population and a need for people to find work later in life, it was evident from a number of witnesses that workplace flexibility would become increasingly important in maintaining participation. It was evident to the committee that if workplaces were to offer more flexible working arrangements, more workers, and particularly carers, would be able to maintain a career, income and superannuation and be less reliant upon pensions and welfare systems.

Towards the end of the inquiry the committee became aware of, and were supportive of, changes being made to the federal Fair Work Act, enabling more people to request flexible working arrangements. The committee received evidence during the inquiry of the often complex and long-term challenges faced by carers. However, the committee was particularly concerned by the set of unique challenges faced by young carers when they try to enter or remain in education or the workforce. The committee heard how important it was for young carers to have access to understanding, flexible and supportive educators and employers to ensure their continued participation.

The committee also acknowledges the important role older workers have to play in the workforce. In particular, the committee heard that many older workers want to continue working because they enjoy their role, while others may need to continue working for financial reasons. A need to raise awareness amongst some employers about options for older staff to transition to part-time employment was also recommended to the committee.

The committee received evidence in relation to a number of concerns from the Aboriginal community about barriers to participation in education, training and employment. It is evident that more funding and resources are being directed towards Aboriginal education and labour market programs than ever before. However, the evidence presented to the committee also suggests that there is still much to be done to reach parity between Aboriginal and other South Australians with regard to education, training and workforce participation. These areas include literacy and numeracy skills again, school completion rates, and entry into further education.

The committee received evidence from the Aboriginal community that suggested greater scrutiny and tracking of funding is necessary to help highlight where outcomes are being achieved and where systems can be improved to ensure funding further elicits the outcomes intended. The

committee also heard a variety of evidence regarding the impact of providing intensive case management approaches to people who are experiencing multiple barriers to participation.

The committee consistently heard references to the success of investing in intensive 'wraparound' services, which in particular were achieving good results for service providers working with homeless clientele or people experiencing generational unemployment and other long-term challenging situations.

Another important theme throughout the inquiry related to the importance of having access to relevant, timely and accurate career information and, where necessary, career guidance in an individual's pathway planning. Evidence was received on a number of occasions about the importance of access to such information, not only in schools but for people at all ages who are seeking a career change or wishing to re-enter the workforce.

Related to this was the important role played by community centres in connecting people back into training and employment. It was also recommended to the committee to resource community centres with suitably qualified community education officers to help guide people's choices towards sustainable career pathways.

The committee has made 14 recommendations as a result of the inquiry. The recommendations seek to aid in increasing South Australia's participation rate on a number of platforms, by promoting better engagement with particular segments of the community. This includes: assisting more long-term unemployed into employment; assisting carers to remain in work and balance caring responsibilities; enabling older workers to continue working, but with more flexible pathways to retirement; and enabling underemployed workers to increase their hours via more flexible working arrangements.

The committee has recommended that a range of measures be introduced or expanded upon to increase participation amongst different cohorts within the community. The committee also recommends that some of these measures need to be tailored and intensive for the most disadvantaged in the community.

In conclusion, the committee recognises the importance of increasing participation in South Australia's workforce and in education. The committee has identified a range of opportunities to support the participation of more people into work and training, while also recognising the current work of DFEEST in the Skills for All initiative. The committee is optimistic that if the recommendations are accepted there will be an improvement in participation and a reduction in the number of barriers experienced by members of the South Australian community to accessing education, training and entering the workforce.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:45): I congratulate the member for Giles on her presentation of the report from the committee. I think it was about 15 minutes, but it was very detailed about all the work done by not just the current membership but, indeed, by those who have served since 2011, when the committee first heard evidence. I was on the committee at the start, off it for a lengthy period of time and then and back on, and I know the fact that changes have occurred on both sides of the membership group has allowed a greater number of members to understand the importance of the issues that were raised in the committee's investigation and the key that it is going to be for the state's future.

I think I should recognise also the member for Reynell. In every meeting I have attended with the member for Reynell she pushes workforce participation issues, and I acknowledge her long-term interest in this as a previous committee member. I congratulate her.

It is a 117-page report and there is some level of repetition in it. However, the recommendations, while we would all like them to be a bit stronger, I suppose, are quite sound about opportunities to improve the workforce and education participation opportunity for South Australia. It was interesting, Mr Speaker, that you recognised the attendance of the University of the Third Age from Victor Harbor before because that group in my own area has told me that, indeed, for them, learning is a lifelong experience; and I think for all of us learning has to be a lifelong experience. Particularly to ensure that the future economy of the state is good, we need to be continually upskilling ourselves, and that requires a level of education and a level of workforce opportunity and participation.

The report is a very good one. I also commend the staff who have been involved in this. Susie Barber, the research officer, has done some excellent work. Lisa Baxter, the young lady who is about to leave soon to have a baby, is our secretary and also did some good work. I am sad that

I was not there for the full time to hear a lot of the submissions and have an opportunity to ask questions on them but, in reviewing all the information presented, I think the report is a very sound one that provides some good recommendations for both side of politics to consider in future years because, as much as the parliament can put the policies in place to ensure this happens, it still is the responsibility of society to challenge itself, accept those responsibilities and ensure it does all it can to be part of what we need to do to increase our workforce and participation rate because it will be an absolute driver of our state. I commend the report.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:47): I commend the Economic and Finance Committee for the report and also the member for Reynell for initiating the inquiry. I am very passionate about education and opportunity for people because I think one of our goals and objectives here should be to maximise opportunity for people to realise their potential and ability to contribute. I say that as someone who left school at age 14. I did not even have one year 10 subject to my name. Anyway, over time, I have addressed that a little bit. You need to give people opportunity. I do not think we do maximise that opportunity for everyone or allow people to use their abilities to the fullest possible extent.

We hear the cliché of lifelong learning. You learn one way or another throughout life, but I think we could do more to assist people to participate in the workforce. One category I think that really needs attention is people who may have reached a midpoint in their work experience but cannot easily upskill because of commitments to family, mortgage and so on. There are a lot of people who have ability and would like to do something different from what they are currently doing in the workforce but cannot get away from the requirements to sustain their family, and that needs to be addressed. That would have to be a commonwealth initiative.

I believe there are thousands of people in South Australia alone who, at a midpoint in their working life, could be upskilled to do activities other than their current employment. That is not to be critical of what they are currently doing, but I think they need the opportunity. With a mortgage around your neck and a family to support, it is pretty hard to do that. I know how hard it is to study part-time when you have young children literally at your feet.

We do not make full use of the potential of the elderly in our community, either. If you think about it, it is not logical that a person retires at, say, age 55, 60 or 65 and the next day they are unproductive. That is just nonsense. In fact, in some societies, like Japan, they have people working right through to their 80s. I do not issue that as a threat on my own behalf, but that is what happens in Japan and places like that.

We have—and I have in my electorate—a lot of people who have been in charge of government agencies or running major companies, and suddenly on retirement they are often considered to be unable to contribute further to the community in any workforce type situation. That is silly and ridiculous. In fact, there are some disincentives in relation to WorkCover and other arrangements that operate to deter people in that age group from continuing in the workforce.

In terms of young people, particularly but not exclusively, for those who have come here for example on humanitarian visas, or for some of the people in the Aboriginal community and some people who have grown up in a disadvantaged background of whatever nature, there need to be special traineeships or cadetships, because I have found in my own office that the traineeship is a wonderful stepping stone for young people.

I have had a lass from Iran who has gone into the Attorney-General's Department. All they need is a step up the ladder and to be given an opportunity. One of the ways of doing that is in a supervised workplace—it does not matter whether it is private sector or public sector—where they are paid something, they learn the skills, improve their language and become more readily employable. We need to pursue that vigorously.

There needs to be flexibility in the workforce and I do not think it is fair to expect business always to pick up the cost of that. I think the wider community should support those arrangements because the community benefits ultimately, as it does through having a more highly educated and more highly skilled workforce.

One of the things that has concerned me for a long time—and I know it is a federal issue—is the current HECS scheme. I had never been a fan of that. I was one of those who benefited from tertiary study when we did not have to pay back anything towards the cost of that education. People will—and they should—pay back through the taxation system, and the more you earn through your income as a result of your higher education, the more you should be paying back. I think that is the way to do it.

If you look at stats, there are billions owing on unpaid HECS debt which shows that the scheme is not working all that well anyhow, but I believe in making education and training accessible to everyone, irrespective of their financial status. I am a great believer in giving people a go; let them have an opportunity, let them have a chance. I think our society would be better off with a better system rather than the current commonwealth HECS scheme.

I notice that in the report there is a focus on farm training. As any member who takes an interest in agriculture would know, the agricultural workforce, including the farmers themselves, is ageing and we need to get young people involved in agriculture. Historically, we have had many schemes. My father was actually in one. He came out as a Barwell boy in 1922 as a 16 year old, and he worked at Huddleston and Harrogate and other places.

Many of those Barwell boys obviously stayed here and married local girls. Some of them continued in agriculture, but I think we need some system, whether you call it 'farm apprenticeships' or some other name. We need to get more young people into agriculture because the current average age indicates that some change is essential.

I conclude by commending the committee on this report and also the member for Reynell, who I know is passionate about educational opportunity. Once again, this demonstrates the value of the committee system in parliament that can look at issues in depth and come up with some sensible recommendations which, hopefully, will be implemented to make our state a better place.

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:55): I rise to support the report of the Economic and Finance Committee, entitled Workforce and Education Participation. Being a new member of parliament, this is the first inquiry that I have seen through to the final report stage. The terms of reference were broad and enabled the committee to seek a wide range of submissions from peak bodies in the private sector, such as the AHA, the MTA, the SA Farmers Federation, Business SA, the SA Wine Industry Association and the Australian Industry Group, and peak bodies representing the not-for-profit sector, such as Carers SA, the WEA, Community Centres SA, the Council on the Ageing and the Youth Affairs Council. Also represented were the SA Training and Skills Commission, DFEEST, the skills councils for primary industries and food, tourism and hospitality, the Hutt St Centre and Catherine House.

I have a personal interest in this inquiry and in particular I have an interest in the barriers to full participation in education, training and employment. This was one of my passions and a reason for putting myself forward to become involved in politics. My own family upskilled themselves: my mother, who had a diploma in teaching, went on to get a Bachelor of Teaching when I was about four or five years old, and my father (a fitter and turner by trade) furthered his technical abilities at technical college when I was about four years old. I remember my mother saying that she would not feed my father his dinner until he had done his homework—and that was the only way she was able to make him finish it.

One of the key aspects in regard to this topic is that South Australia does have a lower participation rate (62.9 per cent) than the national average of 65.5 per cent, so this is a key challenge for our state. Although our demographic profile is older and we have a lower proportion of the population with post-school qualifications, it is really important that we acknowledge this and look to address it.

Throughout the committee's time with witnesses we learnt that the key factors of disadvantage—and a central theme that we heard time and time again—were things like early school leaving, low literacy and numeracy skills and poor work history, and these barriers were compounded by language issues and homelessness. I am very pleased to say that this government's Skills for All program, enabling fee-free access to certificates I and II and FEE-HELP for certificates III and IV, goes to the heart of this challenge—and this was acknowledged by the chair.

I want to touch briefly on some of the successes of the Skills for All program. We have seen, as the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills released this month, that South Australia has recorded a 15.5 per cent increase, compared with the national average of 3.3 per cent, for students in vocational education and training in 2012. We now have the highest growth rate in the nation. We feel very strongly that Skills for All is helping more people to access training and boost their skills in areas where there is a high demand for more workers both now and into the future.

I have a particular interest in the northern suburbs of the state, including the seat of Ramsay. There has been an increase in the northern Adelaide region—including Enfield, Salisbury,

Modbury, Tea Tree Gully, Playford, Elizabeth, Munno Para and Paralowie—of 53 per cent; that is, people enrolled in Skills for All's training certificates in the second half of last year.

Some examples of increased enrolments include 722 enrolments in Certificate III in Children's Services, a rise of 400 compared with the previous year; and 314 enrolments in Certificate III in Aged Care, a rise of 149 enrolments compared with the previous year. These are things to be celebrated. This is a serious challenge for us in South Australia and this goes to the heart of the challenge but, of course, there is always more to be done. One of the key parts about our Skills For All is the support for foundation skills, focusing on literacy, numeracy and digital literacy courses.

As we have heard from other members of the committee, there are several recommendations in the report, but what I would really like to concentrate on today is the role of the community development sector or community centres. I have to say that during the course of this inquiry I changed my opinion about the role of community centres. I really did not know what they did. I thought they were nice touchy-feely things, but what we really see is the adult community education, and this community development sector is a first doorway for people. It is an incredibly important way to engage people. We have more than 100 community centres or Neighbourhood Houses in South Australia. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WATER EFFICIENCY LABELLING AND STANDARDS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This bill applies the *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2005* (Cwlth) (as amended) as a law of the State and repeals the existing *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2006* (SA).

As required by the *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2005* (Cwlth), an independent review of the Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards scheme, or WELS scheme, was conducted in 2010. The Standing Council on Environment and Water, comprising environment ministers from the Commonwealth, State and Territory governments subsequently agreed to most of the recommendations relating to improvements to the scheme and the Commonwealth Act.

The WELS scheme was established by the *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2005* (Cwlth) as part of the Council of Australian Governments' National Water Initiative.

The WELS scheme is supported by complementary State and Territory legislation to ensure comprehensive national coverage.

Products currently in the scheme include clothes washing machines, dishwashers, showers, toilets and tap equipment. All of these products must be registered and labelled with a water efficiency rating. The scheme currently also sets minimum water efficiency standards for toilets and clothes washing machines.

WELS labelling plays an important role in consumer purchasing decisions and has received widespread support from the industries affected by it. Furthermore, the WELS scheme has improved information for consumers about the performance of water-using products and the link between water saving and cost saving, increased registration and sales of products with an efficiency star rating of 4 or above, introduced minimum water efficiency standards for washing machines and reduced urban water consumption across Australia. Information from the WELS scheme is also used in State and Territory building and planning arrangements and to support product rebate schemes.

Changes to registration and fee arrangements will deliver improvements not only for the scheme's administration, but also for industry. The improvements include simplifying and streamlining product registration processes so that these are easier for registrants, and providing a common expiry date for all registrations so that retailers will know when the registrations of products they supply are due to expire.

By repealing the *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2006* (SA) and applying the *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2005* (Cwlth) (as amended) as a law of the State, this Bill will reduce the need to amend the State legislation should further amendments occur in future.

New South Wales and Tasmania have taken this approach with their corresponding Bills and Victoria and Western Australia are considering this approach as well.

The Bill will also enable the Commonwealth Minister, through a disallowable ministerial determination, to determine more of the detailed arrangements for the scheme than previously. This will make it easier for the scheme to be modified from time to time to improve its efficiency and effectiveness, particularly in relation to the registration

of products without the need to amend supporting State and Territory legislation. Previously, any minor change to legislation (even a typographical error) required agreement from all jurisdictions. This reduced the effectiveness of the Act and created a significant amount of unnecessary work. All States and Territories will still need to agree to the terms of the scheme, or to any variation of the scheme (other than a variation to remove an ambiguity or uncertainty, or to correct an error) before the legislative instrument is made.

This Bill will ensure that the State legislation consistently applies the Commonwealth's definition of supply to include the wider range of ways in which WELS products are supplied, such as the supply of WELS products in or as part of new dwellings such as display homes, renovated kitchens, laundries or bathrooms, or through service provision such as plumbing service contracts. This is intended to provide a regulatory environment which has more equal application to the various suppliers of WELS products (as previously only those in the retail supply chain were explicitly covered by the Act). It is also intended to ensure that consumers who are buying WELS products as part of another item are made aware of the water efficiency of those products at the time of purchase. This change is intended to make the WELS scheme more efficient, effective, fair to all registrants and informative to consumers.

By aligning this Bill with the Commonwealth Act, the roles and function of the Regulator are made nationally consistent. Furthermore, civil penalties and corresponding criminal offences provide alternative enforcement options to criminal offences, ensuring that responses can more closely reflect the nature and circumstances of the breaches.

This Bill will ensure that the evidential burden of proof for civil contraventions aligns with the Commonwealth Act and improve the regulation of the Act. Without this, it could be a long and difficult process for the Regulator to prove that the product is or is not registered, impacting the ability for the Regulator to efficiently implement the Act. This is considered reasonable as registrants and suppliers are required to keep records under the WELS standard.

This Bill addresses industry's concerns about compliance and enforcement activities, cost effectiveness and people 'free riding' off of the WELS scheme as well as contributing to the efficient and effective operation of the WELS scheme.

Furthermore, the Bill will create a consistent national approach and achieve positive environmental impacts such as:

- conservation of water supplies by reducing water consumption;
- provision of information for purchasers of water-use and water-saving products; and
- promotion of the adoption of efficient and effective water-use and water-saving technologies.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the measure. In particular, the *applied provisions* are defined as being the Commonwealth water efficiency laws that apply as a law of the State because of the measure.

4—Object of Act

This clause sets out the object of the measure which is to adopt in this State a uniform Australian approach to the regulation of water efficiency labelling and standards.

Part 2—The applied provisions

5—Application of Commonwealth water efficiency laws to this State

This clause provides for the application of the Commonwealth water efficiency laws as a law of the State.

6—Modification of Commonwealth water efficiency laws

This clause allows the regulations to make modifications.

7—Interpretation of Commonwealth water efficiency laws

The *Acts Interpretation Act 1901* of the Commonwealth is to be the applicable interpretation law.

Part 3—Functions and powers under applied provisions

8—Functions and powers of Commonwealth Regulator and other authorities and officers

The Commonwealth Regulator and other authorities and officers referred to in the applied provisions have the same functions and powers under the applied provisions as they have under the Commonwealth laws.

9—Delegations by the Commonwealth Regulator

This clause gives effect to delegations by the Commonwealth Regulator for the purposes of the applied provisions.

Part 4—Offences

10—Object of this Part

The object of the proposed Part is to treat offences against the applied provisions as if they were offences against the Commonwealth laws. The clause also outlines examples of the purposes for which an offence can be treated as a Commonwealth offence.

11—Application of Commonwealth criminal laws to offences against applied provisions

This clause provides that the relevant Commonwealth laws apply as a law of this State in relation to the applied provisions. The clause also provides that an offence against the applied provisions is not to be taken to be an offence against the laws of this State.

12—Functions and powers conferred on Commonwealth officers and authorities relating to offences

Commonwealth officers and authorities have the same functions and powers in relation to offences under the applied provisions as they have under the relevant Commonwealth law.

13—No double jeopardy for offences against applied provisions

This clause ensures that if a person is punished for an offence against the Commonwealth laws, they are not punished for the same act or omission under the applied provisions.

Part 5—Administrative laws

14—Application of Commonwealth administrative laws to applied provisions

Commonwealth administrative laws apply to any matter arising out of the applied provisions, except where the administrative law purports to confer jurisdiction on a federal court, or as stipulated by the regulations.

15—Functions and powers conferred on Commonwealth officers and authorities

Commonwealth officers and authorities have the same functions and powers under the applied provisions as they have under the Commonwealth administrative laws.

Part 6—Miscellaneous

16—Act to bind Crown

The measure binds the Crown.

17—Things done for multiple purposes

This clause provides that the validity of an act, licence, certificate or other thing issued, given or done is not affected only because it was issued, given or done also for the purpose of the Commonwealth laws.

18—Reference in Commonwealth law to a provision of another law

This clause deals with references in a Commonwealth applied law to other Commonwealth laws.

19—Fees and other money

This clause provides that all fees, penalties, fines or other monetary sums imposed on a person in connection with the applied provisions are payable to the Commonwealth.

20—Regulations

This clause provides the regulation making power.

Schedule 1—Repeal

1—Repeal of *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2006*

The Schedule repeals the current *Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Act 2006*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2013

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2013.)

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:02): I rise to speak on the 2013-14 budget that has just been handed down. The leader of the Liberal Party spoke about studying economics at university—

Mr Venning: Very well too.

Ms SANDERSON: I also studied economics at university and have an accounting degree, and certainly I find it very alarming when I look through the budget figures. In fact, one of the

reasons I decided to stand for a seat in parliament was my total desperation and hopelessness that I saw under a Labor government running our state and what I saw was financially very bad decisions and their priorities being wrong. I am very thankful to be a member of parliament and hopefully will one day be a member of government where we actually have some control over the budget and bring our budget finances back into a surplus position, and somewhere where people can be proud of being a South Australian and actually create jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms SANDERSON: From accounting practices, when you minus your expenses from your revenues you come up with either a surplus or a deficit. On seven occasions so far this government has predicted seven surpluses, yet six of these surpluses have become deficits, so I certainly have no faith in this Labor government's ability to actually predict their own figures, and we are heading towards a \$1,314 million deficit prediction—the highest in South Australia's history.

South Australia's total deficit over the next three years is bigger than the budget deficits of New South Wales, Western Australia, Tasmania and Victoria combined. In context, those four states have 16 million people to serve their deficits—almost 10 times more people than in South Australia. This year's deficit alone will add \$65 million in interest every year from this year forward, and that is considering that we are at the lowest interest rates experienced in many years. If this interest rate headed back up to what it was when I bought my first car in the early 1990s—around 15 or 17 per cent—that would be absolutely devastating to South Australia.

Whilst one may think it is just a deficit, it is a one-off, we have actually had six out of seven deficits, and they are adding and adding, adding to what will become a \$14 billion debt. So, it is not only the highest deficit but now also higher debt than when the State Bank collapse happened. The member for Morphett yesterday in his speech mentioned that there was good debt and bad debt, and I happen to agree.

Good debt certainly would be debt that was building an asset or infrastructure, something that would recoup money either financially or be of benefit to the state. Certainly for you to consider debt to be good, you would have to have the ability to repay it. You cannot just take on more and more debt with no ability even to service the interest, which means it will spiral out of control.

It is certainly bad debt when a state government is borrowing money to pay operating costs, such as wages. That is absolutely irresponsible and, if it were a company, it would be in liquidation. Good debt is when you are building up your assets and building your state. However, this government sells all of our income-producing assets. It recently sold the forests and recently sold SA Lotteries, yet how will we service our debt when we have predicted deficits for the near future?

In fact, the government actually predicts our highest surplus ever coming up in the 2015-16 year. The only possible way that I can imagine our revenues increasing by the percentage the Labor government is anticipating is if there is a Liberal government. There is absolutely no way that I would expect a Labor government to be able to bring in a surplus, a record surplus, by the year 2015-16, because people have no confidence in this government.

Business owners are in tears in my office out of frustration and desperation under this Labor government, under which we have the highest taxes for business. Payroll taxes, since Labor has been in government, have increased by 93 per cent; conveyance duties are up 89 per cent; land taxes are up 311 per cent; and taxes on insurances are up 101 per cent. The total taxation increase since Labor has been in government is 92 per cent, or 41 per cent above CPI.

When I was doorknocking prior to the last election in 2010, people were saying to me, 'We're moving our head offices out of South Australia; we cannot continue to do business in South Australia. The payroll taxes are too high, the land taxes are too high, the red tape makes things difficult, there are so many restrictions.' These are the people we need in our state because employing public servants does not actually bring in money to the state because it is paid from taxes.

We need businesses that employ new people who pay taxes that run the state, and this government has done nothing to help those people. In fact, it reversed a decision which would have saved \$120 million in payroll tax for employing trainees and apprentices; instead, it returned with an \$11 million a year saving over two years, which looks a lot like an election sweetener, given that it lasts only two years—so, just after the election, very suspicious.

Businesses are really struggling in South Australia. We have had 264 insolvency appointments in the March quarter—the highest number of insolvencies since records were kept. I think we all realise that businesses are doing it tough. We know that retail businesses in particular are doing it tough: not only are they competing now with online shopping, where there is no GST on purchases under \$1,000, but also we have Rundle Mall being redeveloped and all ripped up. We have low confidence. People are not spending their money. So, what does the government do to help all of these businesses in the city? It brings in a car parking tax that will make it even more expensive to go into the city.

The experience from interstate is that the car parking tax was not put on the long-term users, so there is some validity in saying, 'Well, you know, the people that work in the city 9 to 5 that take up all the early bird spots, perhaps they could catch public transport.' However, the experience interstate is that the long-term parkers' prices were not increased and it was the short-term parking that was because who would want to upset their good, long-term clients who lease on a monthly basis, or are regulars and are there early? It is a lot less work, it is less maintenance and it is less people in and out of your car park.

My concern is that the increases will hit the very people who we want in the city: the short-term shoppers, the people visiting the lawyers, the dentists, the doctors. As the member for Hammond said, people in the regions do all of their shopping and all of their lawyers, dentists and accountants are usually in the city, so they make a trip of it. They cannot just catch public transport, they have to bring their cars in and it is these people who this car park tax is hitting.

If you look at the other side of this, the bringing in of a car parking tax, I believe the government is hoping that people might catch public transport, yet we have consistently had a reduction in users of public transport. In fact, I was calculating earlier the reduction in users: there has been a decrease of 600,000 trips in the last year and there has been 5.5 million less trips since the year 2009-10. If you times 5.5 million trips by an average of, say, \$3 (if they are all on multitrips), that would be \$16.5 million. So, you would not need a car park tax if you sorted out your public transport. Why don't we make it reliable, on time, clean, that you do get a seat and that you do get to work on time and then perhaps you would not need a car parking tax, and you would not have the congestion in the city because people would have faith in the public transport system.

It is not just businesses that are suffering under the Labor government, it is householders. Every day my office receives calls from people who are beside themselves when they receive their bills. They are unable to live in their homes anymore. Property charges have increased at twice the rate of CPI. State taxes have increased at three times the rate of CPI. Electricity bills have increased greater than five times the rate of CPI and are up 150 per cent. Gas bills have increased at seven times CPI, which is a 108 per cent increase. Water bills have increased a staggering 11 times the rate of CPI.

Households are paying an extra \$536 more per year for water than they were in 2002. A lot of this increase in cost comes as a direct result of the government's economic mismanagement and because of the decision to double the proposed size of the desalination plant at a cost of \$2.2 billion. This went against independent advice. There was no economic modelling. There was no reason to do this, and now that plant is being mothballed.

These are not the only things that are affecting householders. Multitrip tickets are up, increased at above CPI. Vehicle registrations have increased greater than CPI. Speeding fines have increased greater than CPI. Fines for driving unregistered cars will treble from \$300 to \$1,000. This is, of course, after removing the stickers from everyone's cars, which helped them to actually remember when to register their car. That was another cost saving of this government. If they could manage their own budget they would not have to remove the stickers because they could actually afford them.

I think that nearly every resident or driver in South Australia would prefer to have a sticker on their car, as would I, because it was a permanent reminder of what month you needed to look out for registering your car. So, now not only have we removed the sticker, the government is going to increase that to a \$1,000 fine. Fines for driving uninsured are about to double from \$750 to \$1,500 and the liquid waste levy is up from \$11.60 a kilolitre to \$35 a kilolitre. So householders are suffering under this government.

There are also other projects going on in my electorate that show the economic mismanagement of this Labor government, and the Royal Adelaide Hospital is one of them. I believe it is one of the main reasons I was elected, because people in the Adelaide electorate could

see that the Royal Adelaide Hospital was a bad economic decision. This government originally said that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, or the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson as it was to be called at the time, would cost \$1.7 billion. We see that that has already increased to \$2.8 billion, and that does not even include the remediation of the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital site.

Anyone who has had a business where they have a lease knows that, when you move to another office, it is always in the terms of the lease that you must make good where you are leaving. Any business person would always include the cost of remediating where they had left and leaving it ready for another use in the cost of the move or the cost of the rebuild. The costs of this hospital are increasing exponentially.

The Liberals argued that building on the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital site had the benefits of collocation. The medical school was there, the Hanson research centre was there, the IMVS was there, the university was there; everything that supported that teaching hospital was there. Now we find that bit by bit every one of these services wants to move down to the west end of North Terrace. We have Adelaide University and Uni SA having another building. Members might say 'Well, it's not state money,' but it is certainly state land, and it is Parklands. It is federal money, but they are still the same residents, the same taxpayers, so it is still their money.

It was very misleading to say 'We'll just build this hospital and nothing else will have to move.' This move of the hospital will end up costing us billions and billions of dollars. The IMVS will want to move next, and what about the Hanson research centre? Of course it will want to be at SAHMRI or in the vicinity; why would it want to be left at the eastern end of North Terrace when every other medical service has been moved to the other end?

So this so-called \$1.7 billion new Royal Adelaide Hospital is getting out of control. We even have the Women's and Children's Hospital saying that it would also like to be collocated with the new hospital. When will this cost end, and how will we pay for it? Generations of South Australians will still be paying off decisions which sound as if they were made on the back of an envelope and which will have implications for many decades to come.

There is also the question of Adelaide High School. The election promise was that Adelaide High School, along with three others, would be expanded by 250 places, that it would be ready by the school year of 2013 (which has come and gone), that it would expand the zone to include students in Prospect and Walkerville (the zone has still not been released), and that it would not encroach on Parklands (which it almost entirely does). None of the promises are coming to fruition.

Building has finally started, but it probably will not be ready until at least 2015 if not 2016. The zones have not been released, so people in Prospect and Walkerville are really worried about where their children will go to school. People will want to move just to get into the right school zone. It is ridiculous that people in my electorate do not have access to Adelaide High School, which is the closest high school to my electorate. Other than Adelaide High School there is not a single high school within the boundaries of the state seat of Adelaide.

It is absolutely ridiculous that we have been waiting now for over three years for these zones to be released. Even worse, with five years in a high school 250 places is the equivalent of only 50 new places. So in 2015 or 2016—whenever it is finished being built—only 50 new year eight students will enter that school. This does not solve the problem of students in Prospect and Walkerville who do not have access to a school. It will not help when you are expecting 30,000 people to be living in the city in the future, it does not help if you say that you want all these people working in the city to create a vibrant city, because they will want their children to go to school in the city.

This is another example of a bandaid fix that was not well thought out. In fact, I believe that it was released less than a week before the last election, after about eight years of all of the primary schools in my electorate petitioning the then minister for education and nothing being done. So, a week before the election, finally something was done. Again, it looks very suspiciously like an election bid to win a few votes. What we need to do is to return our budget to surplus, we need to grow our economy through supporting small business, and we need to make South Australia a great place to live.

In conclusion, what Labor has given us is the biggest deficit (\$1,314 million) in South Australia's history; it has given us the highest debt (\$14 billion) ever seen in South Australia, even higher than the State Bank debt of \$11.6 billion; it has given South Australia, with its AA credit rating, its worst credit rating, the worst in Australia; and it has given us the worst consumer

confidence in 16 years. Our economy is going backwards; businesses are going badly; jobs are being lost; the cost of living is going up; fees, taxes and charges are going up; and projects are blowing out and being delayed.

South Australia cannot afford this Labor government. This budget is bad for families, it is bad for business, and it is bad for South Australia. This Premier cannot be trusted to manage the state's economy, he cannot be trusted to deliver what he promises, and he cannot be trusted to manage our state's future.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:21): Once again, I find myself in this place condemning the state budget for what seems a number of years in a row. I thought about getting out previous budgets—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Don't worry, it seems even longer to us.

Mr PENGILLY: Well, sunshine, if you want to have a say, you can get up in a minute. I could read out the same speech, but there would not be much point in it. I really do not want to go over all of the numbers that have been put about this place in the last day or so. I do not see much point in repeating those, but I will make a few general comments in relation to the budget.

I regard it as a creepy-crawly Labor budget, slimy around the edges with not much in the middle for anybody apart from Labor-held seats. I hope the Liberal Party is successful in getting elected next March and sitting on the other side of the chamber in government and listening to howls of derision coming from Labor Party members as they come to grips with being in opposition and whingeing and whining about the first Liberal budget.

I feel particularly hard done by on behalf of rural and regional people. There is little or nothing in this budget for anyone outside of the metropolitan area, quite frankly. I do support the announcement of \$8 million in the next financial year for a primary healthcare centre at South Coast District Hospital. That is a good initiative, and I am supportive of that; that will be most beneficial to the rapidly increasing population down there.

That is one thing but, in the same breath, I draw attention to the government's failure to come to grips with the doctors' issues, both at Victor Harbor and on the south coast more generally and also on Kangaroo Island. This is a festering sore that has been going on and on and not being resolved. The health minister seems unable to deal with it. I find interesting that the health minister was given the health portfolio to sort it out and things seem to be going backwards at an even greater rate of knots at the moment.

This creepy-crawly budget really does nothing for my electorate. There are no major projects, apart from that primary healthcare project. There may be money ferreted away in government department budgets, which will no doubt come out over the time of the estimates committees, and we will look forward to that.

I am concerned about policing, as indeed are, I am sure, metropolitan and country members. We seem to have increasing numbers of police; however, what they are doing is simply filling out more and more paperwork. They complain to me regularly about the amount of bureaucracy that is thrust upon them and the amount of paperwork they have to do and, if they arrest someone, the amount of time they are there dealing with that paperwork just to take someone into custody.

Overwhelmingly, the biggest concern for most members of my electorate is the cost of living; it is just killing them financially—it is absolutely killing them. The cost of water, the cost of electricity, the cost of fuel—it goes on and on and on, ad infinitum. I do not blame the government for everything, but there are a few things there that I do blame the government for, particularly water. It is outrageous what has happened with water, and it is only getting worse.

The government seems unable to bring SA Water to heel, and they seem dependent on the drip-feed of dividend from SA Water which helps them over the line. There has been a litany of disasters, in my view, that has been inflicted on the poor old taxpaying sector in South Australia, and on families who are just trying to survive.

I have increasing numbers of people coming into my office and complaining about the cost of living: people who have finished their working lives and are trying to survive on the age pension but cannot survive, despite limited concessions; young families with kids at school who want to go and do all those things that we did with our kids but are having trouble; the list goes on and on and on.

While I am talking about this, I think I also need to say in this place that I am also critical of what local governments are doing with rates. I will probably get some applause from both sides of the house on that. I think it is outrageous that local governments are putting up rates, in many cases by 5, 6 or 7 per cent, well above the CPI, saying that they are factoring in growth factors, and that they doing this and that.

I have no doubt that they have cost pressures on them like everybody else does, whether it be state government, federal government, families, businesses, whatever; but, I do not think that local governments have woken up to the fact that they need to cut their cloth to fit their suit. I believe that the government has a succession of ministers at the local government level who have failed to come to grips and do anything about it.

I think it is about time that something was done about it, and that they were ripped into gear. I wanted to make my thoughts known. I am sure that other members in this place also have ratepayers come in grumbling about their respective councils—

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Can I have a bit of quiet?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: Sir, I am sure that other members in this place have ratepayers grumbling about activities within their respective councils. I am even further annoyed by the fact that local government in South Australia is spending a million dollars supporting the 'Yes' case at the referendum. I think it is obscene, quite frankly. They are my personal views; I do not think it is right, and I think it is totally out of order. At the end of the day, the thing will get done over anyway, so I think there is some room to move on that.

The education sector seems to be going through yet another transition under another minister. The former minister has disappeared off into the sunset, and the current minister is trying to grapple with a department that is controlled from Flinders Street. I know that the government are not game to take them on, but they ought to try to sort them out a bit.

Flinders Street is a dictatorship which preaches and tells schools what they should be doing. The regional control seems to have gone, not only in education, but also in health and other areas. You take all the direction and control out of regional areas and stick it back into an office in the city and you lose the impetus and the ability to make local decisions, which should be done. I just do not like it at all.

I know the leader referred to that sort of thing in his speech yesterday. We have seen it with hospitals, where the boards are disappearing. There are well-meaning people in HACs, but the HACs have no control over anything, and are expressing frustration. I also see it in education. Our children are critically important to us and they deserve the very best, and I do not think they are getting the very best currently in some areas. I am close to the vast majority of schools in my electorate and speak to them regularly, so I get good feedback both from staff and from parents involved in those schools. It is my job to listen, not to preach to them, and I do listen and raise their concerns in this place.

This creepy-crawly budget does not do a lot for me at all. I will be very interested to see what happens, as we have a rapidly decaying federal government, and Blind Freddy can see what is going to happen there, despite whatever happens in the next week, if anything. We have a government in South Australia trying to attach itself to the shirt tails of the federal Gillard government. They want to be very careful about divorcing themselves from that, as well, I think, as they ought to make their own way in the world.

I just want to relate a couple of necessities in my electorate which I view seriously and which must have attention. Whether it be by this current government or by us if we are fortunate enough to be elected in the future, there have to be some major decisions made on the Adelaide to Victor Harbor road, particularly the Cut Hill section. A lot of the road is okay, let me say that, and I pay tribute to what has gone on there. The former minister, the member for Elder, had quite a bit of work done down there and I am very grateful for that.

The Cut Hill section is a disaster, in my view, and it will only be the scene of more and more accidents and more and more frustration as the numbers grow on the south coast, and that worries me. The Myponga to Yankalilla road is also a nightmare and, with increasing numbers of people living in the Yankalilla and Normanville area, that road also needs serious attention. There

has to be some long-term planning for both these roads—and it needs to happen pretty quickly, let me tell you.

I turn my attention now to the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority, which is a creature of the Deputy Premier. A couple of years ago, we had a lot of puff and blow from former premier Rann, of blessed memory, when he announced that \$24 million was going to be invested on Kangaroo Island. Well, I am still waiting. It seems a classic case of a grandiose announcement and not much guts to follow, quite frankly. I know that a couple of million dollars of funding is being put into roads on the island—dirt roads. I might say, the road that was—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Recurrent, Michael.

Mr PENGILLY: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: A couple of million recurrent. You've never had it before.

Mr PENGILLY: Well, if you let me finish, you might hear that. The \$2 million that was spent last year is breaking up. My view is that it should be project managed by the Department of Transport, but that is another story. I am grateful for the money, do not get me wrong, and I understand that it is recurrent funding, and I appreciate that as well.

However, KIFA itself has swallowed up \$3 million in the last two financial years. It has another \$1.5 million put on the budget for the next year, and it has achieved what Paddy shot at, quite frankly. It is a complete waste of time, it is another bureaucracy, and it is achieving little if anything. I am highly critical of it. All it has done is produce a glossy brochure called *Paradise Girt by Sea*, and not much else.

They have successfully alienated many of the government agencies on the island, severely upset the Department for Education people, the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources people, and they have met their match in a number of those areas. They do not listen, they do not want to listen, and they will not listen. They think they know everything. They have been trying to insert themselves over and above the local authority, in my view, and they are an abject failure. I would much rather that \$1.5 million actually went into something of substance, such as the roads, and achieved better outcomes.

They have all these projects running at the moment. I get the newsletter from Eco-Action, which is the environmental lobby on the island. I am not particularly close to them, I might add; however, I get their brochure when it comes out. They send it to me, which is good. I see in there that they are very grateful for the KI Futures Authority and that the general manager of KIFA is assisting them in their protest against oil and gas search off the west end of the island. I thought, 'Well, what's all this about?'

The next day I picked up *The Advertiser* and there was a three quarter-page spread from minister Koutsantonis, applauding oil and gas search in South Australia of which we are fully supportive on this side of the house—we are at one on all of that, there is no question about that. When I raised the subject with the Deputy Premier, he nearly blew a fuse. So I seriously question why on earth we are using taxpayers' money doing that sort of thing.

The issue that KIFA should be dealing with is the cost of getting across the water between the mainland and Kangaroo Island. Now they are not dealing with it—whether they have been warned off it or will not go near it or what, I do not know. They are doing some work on the power issue. The former minister the member for Elder and I had some discussions about the cable a couple of years ago and I am at one with him on that, and we were at the time—quite rightly so—but they are fluffing around the edges on that.

I hear more complaints about the issue of getting across that water and the cost of getting back and forth to the island than anything else, quite frankly. I am inundated with complaints from locals, and that includes locals on the Fleurieu. I am inundated with complaints from the tourism industry; and the list goes on. Freight operators do not walk away from this; it is the number one issue. Yet KIFA will not deal with it and it is ridiculous. That is probably enough said on KIFA, but I am not satisfied that they are justifying their existence and I just think at the moment that it leaves a big gaping hole, which is probably only exacerbated by the loss of the Kangaroo Island development board a few years ago when they went to the RDAs.

Now the RDAs are in a fair degree of trouble and not guaranteed of funding in many areas. I understand that the RDA in the Riverland is working quite well according to the member for

Chaffey and I applaud that. However, there are many others that just do not know where their funding is coming from and they are in a bit of a mismatch about it at the moment.

Let me turn to small business in my concluding remarks. Small business is the engine room of the economy of South Australia, along with primary industry, of course. It is the employer and it is not getting any support whatsoever. I was bemused to hear the Premier say he used to own a small business—or he used to run a small business. The only comparison I can give is that, when he finished, it was probably even smaller than when he started. However, the costs on small business are a killer; the payroll tax issue is a killer and it goes on and on.

Small business needs a break. I listened to the radio with interest this morning when big business in General Motors was talking about wanting to make cuts in payroll across the board just to keep going. Mr Camillo from the union was on there, loudly objecting to any drop in wages—which is his job, I might add—but if we want to keep these industries here, we have to accommodate how they can proceed in South Australia.

Finally, the primary industry sector needs some time spent on it in this place. The primary industry sector, including farming and fishing, complement the tourism sector in my electorate. I have 2.9 million people, on the last count, go to the Fleurieu Peninsula each year—and that is not all my electorate—with over one million visitors alone going down to Victor Harbor.

Tourism is an industry where the employers need good people. Farming and fishing complement one another; they sit alongside one another and they are great industries together. People come to see the scenery; they like to drive along the roads and look at sheep and cows and crops and feel as though they are still part of the country, even though they may live in a metropolitan area somewhere. The farming sector is doing it tough. The dairy industry is doing it extremely tough, although there is a bit of light at the end of tunnel with milk prices in the near future—but they have been doing it very tough.

Apart from the high dollar, what really impacts on the farming sector's ability to go about their business and make a good profit at the end of the day is overbearing government red tape and bureaucracy. They are fed up with filling in forms, they are fed up with being told what they should be doing, they are fed up with not getting support and they are fed up with having PIRSA's budget cut year after year, as is tourism. Be in no doubt that tourism is fed up with having its budget cut. They are convenient whipping boys. Tourism is a big employer and, more conveniently, the government seeks to make it a minor industry and a minor player, despite the protestations.

The government likes to go out and applaud everything that happens in Adelaide in March or in the wider regions, but you cannot go on cutting the guts out of PIRSA and the tourism budget. It is cutting off your nose to spite your face. I am not impressed with the budget at all. As I said, it is a creepy-crawly Labor budget. I will have to support it for obvious reasons, but I do not have to like it.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:40): I will take the opportunity to speak about the 2013 budget and, more particularly, on the Appropriation Bill. Today we are debating the appropriation of \$12,245,316,000 to run the budget from October through to June next year. This is in addition, of course, to the supply of several other billion dollars that we have already appropriated. I will touch base first on the headline figures. For the current financial year we are looking at a \$1.314 billion deficit. That is the largest deficit in South Australia's history. This, of course, was supposed to be a \$304 million surplus. When Labor first put this year in the forward estimates, we were looking at a \$300 million surplus and they have managed to turn that into a \$1.3 billion deficit—it is extraordinary.

This deficit, and those that have come and those that will follow, will lead us to a debt for South Australia in the 2015-16 year of \$13.7 billion—the largest debt in South Australia's history. It is a debt that dwarfs the debt of the State Bank fiasco. It is a debt that dwarfs all those that have come before. There will be \$13.7 billion of debt, plus the unfunded superannuation, the WorkCover and all of the other liabilities that the state government has responsibility for, which takes our total liabilities to over \$30 billion—it is extraordinary.

This debt has a very clear and present danger not just for our next generation, as the Leader of the Opposition said, but indeed for next year. Next year's budget is going to be constrained by the choices that cannot be made any more because of the increased interest that the deficit and the debt has put on the people of South Australia. Indeed, at that peak debt in the 2015-16 year our interest payments will reach \$952 million per year. That is \$952 million that

cannot be spent on schools, hospitals, police, tax cuts or debt reduction. That is \$952 million just to tread water, before we have paid for a single nurse, teacher or doctor in South Australia. We will spend more on interest payments to meet our obligations for our debt, which this government has created, than we spend on the entire police budget.

We all know that Labor's election promise was to create 100,000 new jobs by the 2016 year. We were told 100,000 new jobs and yet, since the current Premier came to power, there are 14 per cent more unemployed South Australians, and there is more jobs pain to come, with job ads having fallen for 25 consecutive months. In our northern suburbs we face a 41 per cent youth unemployment rate. To meet that 100,000 jobs target, which we ask the Premier about on a pretty regular basis and which he consistently confirms is still Labor's promise, they need to create 2,400 jobs each month. That is such an increase on the trend over the last three years that it defies credibility, and it goes directly to the credibility of the government.

Why do we have such a problem? The government argues consistently that it is because of a drop in our revenues, that it is all out of their hands and that it is not their fault. It is because the global financial crisis has been terrible and very difficult, and our revenues have dropped. If only that was the full story. There are some facts that need to be introduced to this debate. The fact is that revenue has actually grown by 3 per cent per year for the last four years. The fact is that there has been \$3.8 billion of unbudgeted spending under state Labor. The fact is that South Australia's GST revenue will still grow by 3.1 per cent a year over the forward estimates, and that is above inflation. The fact is that the federal budget says that federal specific purpose payments to South Australia have increased by \$285 million since the federal Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook. That is an extra nearly \$300 million coming from the federal government that was not in the budget at the Mid-Year Budget Review.

The facts of the matter are that the government has a spending problem not a revenue problem. The Premier, in question time yesterday, defended the position of the budget. He said that it meets the targets that they have set. He said that the assumptions on which the budget is predicated are conservative assumptions, they are credible assumptions and they are believable assumptions. He talked about independent commentators from all sides and all newspapers agreeing with him, and this interested me because I had a look at the newspapers on budget day and the days shortly thereafter. In *The Advertiser* I noticed the lead from Jessica Irving, National Economics Editor, who started out by saying:

This budget is banking on the hope of an economic recovery that has so far failed to materialise.

In *The Financial Review*, Matthew Dunckley said:

...he [in referring to the Premier] will, like his counterparts in other states, chase rainbows into the forward estimates courtesy of optimistic rebounds and revenue and promises of cost cutting. He may be right but, as Standard & Poor's noted quickly, he may be wrong.

'Chasing rainbows into the forward estimates' is what the economic commentators think of this budget's assumptions. In *The Australian*, to complete the triad, Judith Sloan asked the question:

Can Australia afford two Tasmanias?

And she was not saying it in a good way, talking about the beauty of their mountains or the passion of their people, she was talking about the economy. In particular, Judith Sloan went on to write:

And be particularly suspicious of the prediction that the budget will return to surplus in 2015-16—pigs might be flying over the redeveloped Adelaide Oval and the new Royal Adelaide Hospital by then!

It is not a bad question to ask because this budget is not based on conservative assumptions as the Premier would have us believe, this budget is based on particularly heroic assumptions. It is heroic to assume that this deteriorating budget will turn around. It is heroic to assume that because over the last four years we can see that the very opposite has occurred. In fact, when all of the last four years' budgets have put surpluses and deficits into the forward estimates, nothing like what has been predicted has come to pass.

When the 2010-11 year was put into the forward estimates, it was supposed to achieve a \$278 million surplus. The fact of the matter is, when it came to pass, we ended up with a \$53 million deficit, a \$330 million turnaround. In the 2011-12 year, when it was put into the forward estimates, we were supposed to achieve a surplus of \$424 million, and what came to pass was a deficit of \$258 million—more than \$600 million—nearly a \$700 million turnaround in the budget position.

In the 2012-13 year, the current year for which we have a predicted figure based on most of the year, it was supposed to be a \$304 million surplus. The truth of the matter is that we are seeing a \$1.3 billion deficit, a \$1.6 billion turnaround in the fortunes of this state's budget.

The next couple of years are faring no better. Next year the 2013-14 year was supposed to be a \$480 million surplus when it was introduced into the budget paper forward estimates, and now we are looking at a \$911 million deficit, again a \$1.3 billion turnaround—nearly \$1.4 billion.

The 2014-15 year was supposed to be a \$840 million surplus and is now headed towards a \$431 million deficit. Why on earth would we believe this government when they predict a surplus for the following year when six out of the last seven years they have predicted surpluses and delivered deficits? It is not credible. It is heroic to assume that Labor will turn the budget around. The assumptions they have made are really the problem we are facing.

It is heroic to assume that Labor will deliver their promised savings with no blowouts given their record in this area. They promised a Royal Adelaide Hospital would cost \$1.7 billion and it has blown out to \$2.8 billion. They promised Adelaide Oval would be not a penny over \$450 million and it is already skyrocketing northward of \$600 million. They promised the Southern Expressway duplication would cost \$370 million and we are at over \$400 million. The water interconnector was to be \$300 million, and it is over \$400 million already.

They promised no increases in taxes and charges, and no new taxes, yet that promise has been scrapped too, with the new car park tax, and the River Murray levy that they introduced. The gambling tax is up, the mining royalty is up, and there is a raft of other increases to taxes and charges.

It is an heroic assumption to believe that Labor will come anywhere near meeting the savings that they have promised. It is an heroic assumption to believe that stamp duty revenue will grow at an average of 12 per cent per year over the forward estimates—that is double the stamp duty growth over the last 10 years. It is heroic to assume, as this budget does, that GST revenue forecasts in the budget are accurate, given that they are \$1.5 billion higher than the forecasts in the federal budget for how much the federal government expects they will be giving us in GST. The state government expects to get \$1.5 billion more than that.

It is heroic to assume that even this year state final demand will grow by 1.25 per cent as the government presumes in the budget, given that in the first three quarters of this year the decline in state final demand has been over 3 per cent. It would take a record turnaround that has been unprecedented in South Australia's history for us to go from the position of decline over the first three quarters to a growth of 1.25 per cent in the final quarter and for us to meet that target.

It is heroic to assume that Labor's spending will not balloon from here as well, given that over the last seven years there has been a turnaround in their budget fortunes of \$5.6 billion—\$2.6 billion of promised surpluses, \$3 billion of delivered deficits. It is absolutely heroic to assume that any of these things will come to pass and, even if they do, we will still be in the absolutely dreadful position that the Labor Party predicts we will be in. It is heroic to presume that we will be in a dreadful position. God knows what they are actually going to deliver if they get the opportunity to stay in power.

What are we doing with the \$12 billion? Of course, it pays for all of the public services that we support and it pays for a number of new investments. There is \$100 million in this budget that has come from the Motor Accident Commission to pay for some transport projects. A number of the transport projects are good projects, which we support, but the way that the money has been delivered for this rather than general revenue and rather than out of the transport capital budget is through taking \$100 million from the state's motor insurance reserves. The way that this has been done is quite curious because it was only 12 months ago when then treasurer (the current minister for health, the member for Playford) described such an action as being 'the equivalent of me going to the Motor Accident Commission and raiding its reserves in order to prop up the budget.' About 12 months later we have a new Treasurer and a new approach to what is an appropriate way to deal with government.

The car park tax forms a central part of the government's budget despite the fact that it goes very much against their stated claim of pursuing a vibrant city agenda. They have the electrification of the Gawler line in this budget, but not to Gawler, only to Dry Creek, and it is not going to carry a passenger. The rail yard hospital is in here for \$2.8 billion. One thing I noticed was \$295 million of what is described as contingencies for which we only assume that is the bank that will be raided to pay for Labor's election promises, whatever they may be.

For the constituents of Morialta, I am happy to report that there are one or two things that will be positive. Magill and Glynburn Roads get a \$4 million upgrade, and I congratulate particularly councillor Vincent Tarzia, the Liberal candidate for Hartley, who has worked very hard on this, and he has been out collecting signatures on petition for months on this.

The Hon. C.C. Fox: As has the member for Hartley.

Mr GARDNER: For months Vincent Tarzia has been working his jacksy off to get this project up—

The Hon. C.C. Fox: His what?

Mr GARDNER: —to draw to the attention of the government the sincere need for improvement at the corner of Magill and Glynburn Roads.

The Hon. C.C. Fox: Sorry, member for Morialta, what did you say he worked off?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GARDNER: I think he needs to be congratulated for that and I certainly do so in this place and commend him for achieving a result. Before he has even had the opportunity to go to a state election, he has achieved results for the constituents of Hartley. The Britannia roundabout has been something that members on this side have been fighting for for many years. After initially in 2004 announcing an \$8 million project to fix that roundabout, then going back on it, the government then came out later and said that we could never fix that roundabout because it would cost \$100 million.

They have now come forward with a \$3.2 million proposition to fix that roundabout which will be of benefit to some constituents in Morialta and those who travel around it. I hope that the solution works. I am not a traffic engineer and I do not pretend to be. At \$3.2 million it is cheaper than those promises offered before. I just say that I hope it works but we are pleased that some attention is being paid to this significant black spot.

There is not much else for people in Morialta. There are 10 fixed location speed cameras—actually the government calls them road safety cameras now. It is one of those Orwellian doublespeak things. They are speed cameras and they are going to be around the place, so people can look out for those. I look forward to finding out where they are going to be. There is some payroll tax relief, totalling \$21 million over the next two years.

Unfortunately that does come after payroll tax relief of \$100 million was ripped away from small businesses to be put back into government coffers last year. But that is a small snap of several thousands of dollars that will help those small businesses. We just think that it should be much more. Budget Paper 6 does identify one other item that will be relevant to people in Morialta: \$3 million for the Magill Training Centre, to pay for what is described as:

...demolition of the existing buildings, completion of a site contamination audit, all associated environmental works for the area that the buildings occupy, and security and maintenance of the site during the sale process.

The Magill Training Centre sale has been on the cards for four years. It would have been nice if the government had noticed that those things would have to be progressed before this year. They have known about it for four years. I think we knew that the site was going to have to be cleaned up and the buildings knocked down; nevertheless, that is relevant to people in Morialta.

What is particularly important for people in Morialta, though, is that the cost of living is going to rise as a result of this government, as a result of its decisions, as a result of the decisions in this budget. Since Labor came to power, we know that payroll tax has gone up 42 per cent. This is after CPI; this is in real terms. Conveyance duty is up 39 per cent, land tax is up 203 per cent, other property taxes are up 17 per cent, taxes on insurance are up 48 per cent, and motor vehicle taxes are up 26 per cent. The cost of living is skyrocketing and it is the government's fault.

Just this year alone the impact on the cost of living of Labor's decisions is that property charges have increased at twice the rate of CPI, state taxes have increased at three times the rate of CPI, electricity bills have increased at greater than five times the rate of CPI, gas bills are up seven times the rate of CPI, and water bills a staggering 11 times the rate of CPI, as a result of the bad decisions of this government.

In addition to the cost of living, the cost of doing business is very high in South Australia. Sometimes we hear from the government that South Australia is a low taxed state. It is not

believable; it is not credible. I am pleased to say that the Commonwealth Grants Commission is saying what the government refuses to, although the government has included in Budget Paper 3 on page 54 its table that identifies tax effort ratios by jurisdiction. South Australia has the highest tax effort of all states and territories. We come eighth out of eight, including the two territories. South Australia—108.3 per cent on the index, which compares extremely unfavourably with states like Victoria, which is just above the national average, at 101.5.

Queensland is something to aspire to, at 92.2 per cent. That is what businesses are dealing with in Queensland, as opposed South Australia. Of course, when it comes to government procurement, when they put out these big contracts and everyone in Australia can bid for them, those businesses in South Australia are competing against businesses in Queensland, New South Wales, Tasmania and every other state and territory in Australia which has a lower tax base on which to base their business costs. It is harder for South Australian businesses to get these government contracts because they have a higher cost base.

The Liberal approach is quite different. We want to get the budget into surplus as soon as is plausible. We have announced policies that will help this. We have announced a productivity commission that will help get maximum efficiency, maximum bang for our buck, out of the Public Service. We do not want to have cuts, but we do need reform. By taking advantage of the great wealth of skills in our Public Service, we think we can get a better bang for our buck. We need to grow the economy, which we will do through bodies like Infrastructure SA and by abolishing the car park tax and focusing on small business so that we can improve the procurement processes, improve the grants and pay our bills on time.

We need to have an attractive state for young people to build their future here in South Australia, through creating more jobs, more prosperity and more confidence in our economy. As the member for Bragg said yesterday, this government spends, borrows and wastes too much. We need a government that is going to instil confidence in our business community. We need a government that is going to have an efficient Public Service and we need a government that is going to make sure that those 32,000 people who have left South Australia for other states over the last 10 years on a net basis have a future in South Australia that they may be interested in coming back to.

Most of them are young people; most of them are school and university graduates who do not see a future in South Australia. We need a government that is going to create a future for them, their families and their careers, and one in which they can have confidence. We support the bill, but I hope that next year we will be able to do a lot better from the other side of the aisle.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. C.C. Fox.

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

BUS ROUTES

Mr PISONI (Unley): Presented a petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take action to provide an extended service on Metro Bus Route No. 300 on Sundays and public holidays.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

BUS CONTRACTS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (14 November 2012).

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bragg—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts): I have been advised of the following:

The individual payments made to each bus contractor for 2011-12 are commercial in confidence and cannot be disclosed.

BUS CONTRACTS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (14 November 2012).

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts): I have been advised of the following:

All contractors were aware that the benchmarks set were based on the average performance of the preceding three years by contract area. Allowance was made to those benchmarks to reflect the shift to late running status of a trip from 5:59 minutes to 4:59 minutes. This allowance was in the order of 3 per cent to 5 per cent reduction in the on-time running benchmark dependent upon the size of the new contract areas and actual number of trips performed. Discussion regarding the actual applicable benchmark occurred in the first quarter of operation by that respective contractor.

I am further advised that on-time running benchmarks make allowance for the unavoidable incidents that occur on the roads and across the public transport system each day, such as road works and special events, including the Adelaide Fringe, the Clipsal 500 and the Royal Adelaide Show.

In terms of prolonged and substantial works, such as the Harris Scarfe redevelopment, the Southern Expressway duplication and the North-South pipeline works, the impact of these works on on-time running is also taken into account when assessing operator performance and their ability to meet the benchmarks.

GAWLER AND DISTRICT COLLEGE

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (7 February 2013).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs): I have been advised:

The following are the 27 children's centres that are currently operational:

1.	Blair Athol North School B-7	15.	O'Sullivan Beach
2.	C.a.F.E Enfield	16.	Parafield Gardens
3.	Cowandilla	17.	Port Augusta
4.	Elizabeth Grove Community Campus	18.	Renmark
5.	Forbes (at South Plympton)	19.	Sturt Street
6.	Hackham West	20.	Tinyeri (at Murray Bridge)
7.	il nido (at Paradise)	21.	Trinity Gardens
8.	John Hartley School B-7 (at Smithfield Plains)	22.	Woodcroft Heights
9.	Kaurna Plains (at Elizabeth)	23.	Parks
10.	Keithcot Farm (at Wynn Vale)	24.	Woodville Gardens School B-7
11.	Kirton Point (at Port Lincoln)	25.	Elsie Ey (at Hewett)
12.	Mark Oliphant College B-12 (at Munno Para West)	26.	Gawler
13.	Mount Gambier	27.	Ernabella Children and Family Centre
14.	Ocean View College (at Taperoo)		

Dame Roma Mitchell College is not included in this list as it is not a children's centre and does not provide child care. The construction of this school included capacity for a crèche for use by students with children, however no students currently require this service.

Mark Oliphant B-12 College Children's Centre offers preschool, occasional care and community development programs. The Munno Para Stepping Stones Childcare and Early Development Centre is located in very close proximity to the Children's Centre and there is a strong relationship between the Children's Centre and the Childcare Centre. Currently the Childcare Centre brings children over to Mark Oliphant to access preschool and use the library facilities. The Mark Oliphant community identified the need for occasional care and an increase in preschool places. In Term 4 2012, 83 children were enrolled in the occasional care program with over 85 per cent of families being concession card holders.

The government expects to open additional children's centres and dedicated Aboriginal children and family centres in coming months.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

SACE Board of SA—Annual Report 2012

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:02): I bring up the 28th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament students from the Burnside Primary School, who are guests of the member for Bragg; also students from Navigator College, who are guests of the member for Flinders; and students from Nazareth Catholic College, who are guests of the member for West Torrens and me. I also welcome shop stewards from the warehouses for the Shop, Distributive & Allied Employees' Association, who are guests of me.

QUESTION TIME

GM HOLDEN

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his previous assertions that no serious person thinks the carbon tax affects car manufacturing jobs, given Mike Devereux's comments this morning that the carbon tax affects car manufacturing jobs here in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:04): I thank the honourable member for his question. As usual, he misrepresents the words that Mr Devereux in fact used.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He in fact does. Let's just remember, while we are in the present debate about Holden's, that we have at the moment Holden's executives telling the South Australian government and the commonwealth government that they cannot make a decision to recommit to South Australia until they know what the policies of both major parties are, going into the federal election. They know that the Coalition is choosing to take \$500 million out of the Automotive Transition Scheme for investment in the automotive sector in this country. They also know that \$1.5—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker, on the relevance of the Premier's answer.

The SPEAKER: The question was: 'Does the Premier stand by'—

Mrs REDMOND: —his statement about the carbon tax—nothing to do with the federal Coalition's policy on car manufacturing or anything else.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the Premier has to say.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Apart from the question containing a premise which is false, it also needs to be understood in the context of the assistance that is going to the car manufacturing industry, or not going to the car manufacturing industry, and the decisions that are in front of Holden's as they make their investment—about \$1 billion worth of new investment—in Adelaide, as they seek to build two new models between 2016 and 2022.

What we know is that the federal Coalition is removing \$500 million. We also know that \$1.5 billion, which is the balance of the funds that are available for automotive assistance, will be sent to the Productivity Commission by an incoming federal Coalition government. So, here we have it: \$2 billion in total commonwealth assistance which is in jeopardy. Let's just take the figures the opposition used yesterday of \$40 million, the \$40 million they say the carbon tax is costing Holden's—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No; I'm using your material—the \$40 million that you said yesterday as being—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for MacKillop?

Mr WILLIAMS: I am still struggling with the relevance, sir, of the answer to the question. I have noted that you have been listening—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I'm having difficulty hearing your point of order because of the interjections of the Leader of the Opposition. Can you make the point of order again? It is one of relevance, is it?

Mr WILLIAMS: The point of order, sir, is one of relevance. The question was clearly about the carbon tax and the Premier's statement that it had no material impact on car manufacturing in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: And your point is that the federal Coalition's policy on that matter is of no relevance to that question?

Mr WILLIAMS: My point is that the Premier is not addressing his answer to the question; that's my point. I am wondering, sir, what the point of our coming to question time is if the government doesn't address the—

The SPEAKER: Yes, thank you for that impromptu speech.

Members interjecting:

Mr Marshall: We're waiting for a ruling. You've already told him what to say.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will apologise and withdraw that remark.

Mr Marshall: Yes, I will withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: I would prefer you to stand to do that.

Mr MARSHALL: I am happy to withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: I haven't even seen the Premier today, let alone been in touch with him. Clearly, the federal Coalition's policy on the carbon tax is not something for which the Premier is responsible to the house.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, sir. My remarks were actually directed at the carbon tax that the opposition said is worth \$40 million; that was the point of order that was taken. And about that matter, the \$40 million that they say Holden's has to pay as a result of the carbon tax—

Mr Marshall: The industry.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Oh, the industry. So, Holden's is paying less than \$40 million. Have it your way: the impost on Holden's is less than the \$40 million you say is an impost on the industry as a consequence of the carbon tax. So, let's use your figures, whatever ones you choose to have—\$40 million or some lower number.

What Mr Devereux in fact said was, in comparison with the \$2 billion which is at risk, 'I don't think that the quantum of money that we're talking about, they're very different quantum of money.' What Mr Devereux is saying is that the carbon tax is a minor consideration in this whole equation. The more significant consideration in this whole equation is the level of commonwealth assistance. If you want the true test of that: if you abolish the carbon tax and you did not fix up the subsidy, Holden's would still close.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on the size of the public sector and what the government is doing to reform it?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:09): I thank the honourable member for her question and I thank her for her role in assisting me in her function as parliamentary secretary to the Premier with reference to the public sector. Since 2002, the state government has significantly increased the number of employees working in roles providing direct services to the public.

We have hired more than 1,300 more doctors, 4,300 more nurses, 460 more emergency services employees, 800 more police officers, and 1,600 more teachers and school services officers. While delivering these extra services to South Australians, we have also sought to drive efficiencies. In the past three years, whilst we have seen a 3 per cent increase in the number of front-line workers as a percentage of the total workforce, we have also seen a corresponding 2 per cent decrease in our back office staff.

Since the start of the global financial crisis, we have implemented \$5.5 billion worth of measures to reduce debt and we are committed to delivering more with the reduction of 5,000 full-time equivalents by 2016. On this side of the house, we have been clear about our policy on the state public sector. We have made it clear what efficiencies we are seeking to deliver and that we will not be hacking into the groups of workers we know the public relies on in times of need. While we continue to wait for those opposite to reveal their policies on these matters, the government is getting on with the business of—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order. While we continually wait to hear from those in the opposition, it is clearly debate.

The SPEAKER: The Premier should be offering the house information that updates the house on the size of the public sector and reforming it, so I will listen carefully to the Premier's reply.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am sorry if a subordinate clause in one of my answers offends those opposite, but I will return to the substance which is that the government is getting on with the business of improving the quality and effectiveness of our Public Service. Through Change@SA, our public sector renewal program, we have accelerated the delivery of more efficient, innovative and effective services and the public sector is responding to the changes that we are making.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, what they are telling us is that they are frightened of you lot; they are frightened of you ever occupying the Treasury benches and slashing into the services that people rely upon in times of need. They are excited about the changes that we are making which are meaning that people on the front line are being empowered to make the sort of changes that make a difference in our community.

One of the first projects we saw was the SAPOL fast-tracking court processes for relatively minor, victimless offences. So instead of having the lengthy exercise of a police officer going to a home, serving a summons and the first court date—all of the paraphernalia around that—this is an invitation to come into court; a quick guilty plea speeds up the matter; it saves a whole lot of heartache for people who are worrying about a court date and an enormous amount of administrative expense.

We have also seen a fantastic initiative around the criteria-led discharge in the Flinders Medical Centre which we are expanding to the rest of the system—something that we had trouble with cracking for a very long period of time—the notion of nurses discharging patients who are well. This had been the province of doctors in the past, but with criteria-led discharge, we have enabled nurses, under very careful criteria, to ensure that patients who are well can go home early, and it means that doctors are not taken out of the important work that they need to do to ensure that they are treating patients who are unwell. It is freeing up enormous resources, another example of public sector efficiency, and we continue with a series of these further 90-day projects which are spreading culture change around the public sector.

Ms Chapman: As important as this subject is, the time has expired.

The SPEAKER: No, the time has not expired and accordingly, I call the member of Bragg to order. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you. A second round of these 90-day projects has begun with a focus on red-tape reductions and online services, providing passengers with real-time information through smartphone apps about where buses are and when they will arrive; enabling parents to register their child's birth online; making the process of getting a driver's licence simpler in the remote APY lands; and also reducing red tape by streamlining immigration procedures.

Time expired.

GM HOLDEN

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. As the Premier does not support abolishing the carbon tax and he does not support wage cuts at Holden and he does not support an automotive industry task force, does he support a federal Productivity Commission review of the car industry to ensure assistance to the sector is targeted and effective?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:15): I thank the honourable member for his question. One of the reasons we are actually debating the future of Holden's at the moment is because of the uncertainty created by the federal Coalition's commitment to cancel \$500 million of public investment and put at jeopardy a further \$1.5 billion of investment. Let's be absolutely clear about that. The order of magnitude of what those opposite are talking about is small in comparison with those matters.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, sir.

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

Ms CHAPMAN: Quite clearly this is debate. The question was very simple: does he support a Productivity Commission inquiry?

The SPEAKER: Yes; the Premier is not responsible to the house for the Liberal Party's policies. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the uncertainty that has been created by a federal Coalition government, which most pundits predict—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier is repeating exactly the same material that was presented and, furthermore, is now defying your order. He started again on the Coalition.

The SPEAKER: The federal Coalition's policy on this matter is a matter of record, and the Premier need not share it with the house.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What we are being asked to do is comment on the federal Coalition's policy, so I find it difficult to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have been asked whether I support the reference to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, they are asking whether you support a particular element of the federal Coalition's policy, and it has been framed as: do you support the aspect about a Productivity Commission review?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I don't, because it is creating the uncertainty, which is leading to the debate we have now. The reason we have committed—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Of course I don't support it. The federal government has committed to \$2 billion worth of support for the automotive sector. Now, \$500 million of it we know has now been cancelled, courtesy of the Coalition if they were to form a government, and a further \$1.5 billion has been placed into limbo as a review is undertaken. I support the federal government's proposition about sending this \$2 billion to this most important supply chain within Australian manufacturing.

There is only one fully complete supply chain of this sort in the nation: it is the car industry. It happens to have its home—or a very substantial part of its home—here in South Australia. If you

do not understand how central car manufacturing is to the future of manufacturing in this state and you do not have a settled policy concerning it, you are not entitled to call yourself a political party with the respect of that name.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: now the Premier is insulting you.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't feel insulted. Does the Premier have more to offer us?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, I certainly do, sir. The car manufacturing industry sits at the heart of a number of important supply chains that fan out across the South Australian manufacturing sector. The idea that you would jeopardise it by supporting a federal Coalition policy to pull \$2 billion out of the support of that sector and still say that you are standing up for South Australia beggars belief.

This far into the life of this government—11 years into the life of this government, and a period for those opposite to have presumably come up with some policy to offer the people of South Australia nine short months from now at the election—for them not to have a policy on car manufacturing—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart. I presume the point of order will be debate, because the Premier is not confining himself to the question of Liberal Party policy he was asked about and is extending to another aspect of Liberal Party policy that you would prefer he did not discuss. Thank you. That will be enough, Premier. The member for Waite.

GM HOLDEN

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. As he indicated yesterday that he won't lobby the Prime Minister to abolish the carbon tax because Holden has not 'raised the carbon tax as an issue of concern', will the Premier now lobby the Prime Minister to abolish that carbon tax, given that Holden has today raised the carbon tax as an issue of concern, not only for their own business directly but for their suppliers in the SME sector?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:20): I don't accept the proposition that you advance. We have been in regular conversations with Holden. They have never asked me to advance a proposition with the commonwealth about the carbon tax. It was no part of our discussions which led to the agreement that we reached and it has been no part of the renegotiation since. Properly understood, Mr Devereaux's remarks are that the carbon tax, while making a contribution to their input costs is, in the scheme of things, a small proposition compared with the overall support that they are requiring from the commonwealth government in relation to the future of their operations here in this country. We need to put this in some sort of context.

Mrs Redmond: Yes, we've got the context.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Exactly. There is not one country in the world that manufactures cars that does not support its car manufacturing industry. They either support it directly through subsidies in the way in which the Australian government has chosen, they support it indirectly through tariffs, or they use other indirect measures through currency revaluation. All of those are particular mechanisms, and the Australian government has chosen the most transparent method, and that is subsidies, so you can see exactly what you get. An effective tariff which would be across all cars would provide a more blunt instrument for protecting industry.

Subsidies allow one to achieve commitments in return for the direct subsidies that are given. That is the mechanism that the South Australian government used when it sat down with Detroit and negotiated the package of measures for the reinvestment in Holden's in South Australia. The reason that this has all been thrown in the air is that the underpinnings of our arrangement have been pulled out by the federal Coalition. Our negotiations were negotiated against a backdrop of \$2 billion of commonwealth assistance—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that you are putting in jeopardy.

GM HOLDEN

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:22): A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Given the Premier's reply to my question, which referred to coinvestment and subsidies, did he support the Gillard Labor government's decision to scrap the \$1.3 billion car innovation fund, heralded by his predecessor, the member for Ramsay, in a media release in November 2008, and is that, as industry observers have observed, a cause for Holden's problems today—the axing of that funding by Labor?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for his question. I don't know whether he understands that question. I certainly don't understand it. Can I say this: there has never been on one occasion raised with me by Holden that the fate of that particular fund has been material to any of their decisions. What they have raised with me is that they cannot conclude arrangements with us until they know the fate of \$2 billion worth of commonwealth assistance, which is hanging in the balance by virtue of Liberal Party policy. The equation is very simple: vote Liberal, close Holden's.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is warned for the first time. The member for Mitchell.

CLIPSAL 500

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:24): My question is to the Minister of Tourism. Can the minister inform the house about the economic benefit of the 2013 Clipsal 500?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:24): I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. Great news today for the South Australian economy with the figures released for this year's Clipsal—the best ever in terms of economic benefit to the state, a \$36.6 million return to the South Australian economy. I will mention some of those figures. There was \$54.8 million, in total, in event-associated expenditure; \$36.63 million in economic benefit to the economy, as I have said; and 286,500 attendances, the second best of all time.

Of course, on the Sunday, we had to put up the 'house full' signs. There were 15,053 interstate visitors, which is an increase of 3,000 in the number of people coming from interstate. The hotel bed occupancy was almost 80,000 and anyone trying to get a bed in Adelaide over that Clipsal weekend would have struggled because it is such a popular event. Ninety per cent of the people who were surveyed who had come from interstate said they would come back to the event again and would certainly recommend it to others to enjoy the weekend that Adelaide puts on.

Adelaide, of course, is a fantastic place, whether it is for festivals, bike races or the Clipsal. When we have an event of this magnitude, the whole state gets behind it and really comes alive. I was pleased to see the record figures from the Fringe that were announced last week by the Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts. Fringe, WOMAD and the Tour Down Under are all great economic drivers for South Australia.

I think one of the reasons we had such great attendances at the Clipsal 500 this year was that, for the first time, Holden and Ford, that traditional rivalry, had the addition of Mercedes and Nissan; and next year there will be another player, which will make it interesting. The Volvos are joining the race; we will have the Volvo drivers out there. That will make it pretty spectacular. I am not sure whether or not they will have hats at the back but the Volvo drivers will be out there mixing it with Holden, Ford, Nissan and Mercedes next year.

Of course, as the member for Hammond knows, Kiss played on the Sunday night, along with Mötley Crüe and hometown heroes the Hilltop Hoods. There was something for everyone (particularly if you are into bands like Kiss) on the track and off the track. I congratulate the Clipsal 500 board and everyone involved, including all those great volunteers who put in so many hours over the Clipsal weekend for a very successful event this year.

GM HOLDEN

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:27): My question is again to the Premier. What payroll tax and land tax charges did the state government require of Holden in the last financial year, and were those charges greater than would have been charged in any other state for a business of that size?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:27): I will take that on notice and bring back an answer but, once again, Holden have not advanced to us, in any negotiations, that they sought relief from payroll tax or land tax. Indeed, the most recent study that we did in relation to land tax demonstrated that in South Australia, for industrial lands of the type that are occupied by Holden, the land tax burden for properties of similar amenity located similar distances from the metropolitan area would actually attract a lower level of land tax than in most other jurisdictions. We are either at the middle of the range or at the lowest of the range for land tax.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is because, Mr Speaker, those opposite, when they actually bandy around their land tax figures, compare properties of the same value in different states and seek to compare land tax on that basis when, of course, a property of the same value in a different place buys you a very different property.

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

Mr PENGILLY: The Premier has sat down, but he was actually debating the issue and talking about what we do.

The SPEAKER: We can't have that. Supplementary, member for Waite.

GM HOLDEN

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:28): Given the Premier's answer, can he tell the house whether Holden received any tax concessions or exemptions from the state government in the last year?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:29): The first concession that they receive is the very substantial reduction in payroll tax that has occurred during the life of this government. We have reduced the rate from 5.67 to 4.95 per cent and increased the tax-free threshold from \$504,000 to \$600,000. That is a very substantial benefit that has been enjoyed by Holden during the life of this government, a measure that was introduced some years ago by this state Labor government.

So they have enjoyed the benefit of a substantial reduction in their payroll tax arrangements. In relation to their land tax arrangements, they would also be the beneficiaries of the indexation of the taxation scales which have also led to substantial benefits for businesses in South Australia. I will bring the precise advantages that Holden has received by virtue of that tax relief back to the house and if there—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They don't seem to like the fact that we have provided tax relief to businesses in South Australia more generally. They seem to also be implying that they want me to inquire as to whether there has been some further relief, and I will inquire as to those matters and bring back an answer to the house.

GM HOLDEN

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:30): My question is again to the Premier: of the \$3,750 added to the cost of producing a motor car at Holden's Adelaide plant compared to overseas operations, what proportion of that cost is due to federal Labor's carbon tax, increases in power bills and declining productivity under his government?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his question. I noticed there were some pretty wild assertions of additional costs associated with the carbon tax on the price of a vehicle in Australia made by Mr Abbott. I won't be relying upon those estimates.

I understand that there was some evidence given to a federal estimates committee by a federal official about making some estimate about those matters. I will seek to track down that information. It's a relatively modest amount and does not compare to the very substantial issues associated with the subsidies that would be necessary to allow the South Australian and, indeed,

the Australian car industry to compete on a national scale through the support of its national government. I will bring back an answer to the house.

PARAMEDICS

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister please update the house on the government's investment in more front-line paramedics?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:32): I thank the member for Ramsay for her question. The government is investing an extra \$4 million a year to boost front-line ambulance services in South Australia. This important investment in emergency care will see an extra 34 paramedics on the job. South Australia's demand for ambulance services has increased by an average of 8 per cent over each of the past five years.

The ambulance service has already taken important steps to meet this demand, including the introduction of bicycle and motorbike response crews, extended care paramedics and a new computer-aided dispatch system; innovative steps that have made sure that our ambulance service remains one of the best in the nation. The government's decision to boost frontline staff means that the SA Ambulance Service will have the staff and resources it needs to meet demand in the future and continue to provide world-class emergency care for South Australians in need.

The extra money will provide for a combination of Single Paramedic Response and Intervention (SPRINT) and traditional two-person emergency ambulance crews. In addition to these extra frontline paramedics, the government also plans to increase staffing levels in the emergency operations centre, making sure that the wellbeing of patients and staff remains the top priority.

Our paramedics and ambulance officers are incredibly committed professionals who provide life-saving medical care to South Australians. Can I thank them for their hard work and congratulate them for the high quality service they provide. The government's new investment will mean that their service continues to improve and that the SA Ambulance Service remains one of the best ambulance services in the country.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister accept that his press release of 22 February 2013 specifically refers to a 'secure paediatric ward' as part of the Modbury Hospital redevelopment?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:33): That press release is referring to the redevelopment of the emergency department at Modbury Hospital—and that is continuing. What is in that press release continues to be the case and remains completely true.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:34): Again my question is to the Minister for Health. Has the minister been advised what annual cost savings will be achieved by the proposed closure of the paediatric ward at Modbury Hospital and, if so, what are the annual cost savings?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:34): I haven't been advised about that, and I am not sure there will necessarily be any savings. It's about better utilisation of the beds that we have in our system. The first thing to say is that we are going through a consultation period. A decision has not been made about relocating the paediatric ward. I can just emphasise for the house's benefit that no decision has been made about the paediatric ward at the Modbury Hospital.

However, it is quite clear that the paediatric ward at the Modbury Hospital is underutilised. Generally, it is only about half full, and those beds in that ward cannot, obviously, be used for adults. You cannot mix adults and children together, so generally half of that ward remains empty. I cannot just stand by and allow four beds in the paediatric ward at a hospital, in a system for which there is huge demand, and growing demand for hospital beds, to continue to remain unused or underused.

This is a proposal that has been put to me by the department. They are in a process of engagement, obviously, with the community who live around the Modbury Hospital. I am one of those people. I am a frequent user of the Modbury Hospital emergency department. With six children you do tend to spend a fair bit of time taking them to hospital.

Can I reassure families like mine, who live within the catchment area of Modbury Hospital—and I know the member for Ramsay was there the other day—that, regardless of what happens with the paediatric ward, they will be able to continue to take their children into the emergency department when they need emergency care. There will be absolutely no change whatsoever to the availability for families in the north-eastern suburbs to access emergency care for their children.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There will also be dedicated beds there, short-term beds there, for children who need to stay overnight. If the change is made, it will affect people with children who are in need of longer term stays in hospital. If the change does happen, they will either have to be transferred to the Lyell McEwin or the Children's Hospital, but this is about proper and good utilisation of the beds we have in our hospital system.

The SPEAKER: I call the members for Heysen and Florey to order. The member for Morphett.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:37): Again, my question is to the Minister for Health. Is it correct that children who are assessed at the Modbury Hospital as requiring transfer to the Lyell McEwin Hospital will have to wait an average of at least three hours for an ambulance?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:37): It will depend on how serious their condition is. Obviously a child who presents at the Modbury Hospital with a serious condition, in need of urgent medical treatment, will firstly receive that treatment in the emergency department. They will be triaged, the same as any other patient is, and if their condition requires immediate attention, then they will receive that.

If their condition requires further treatment at one of our tertiary hospitals, whether that be the children's or the Lyell McEwin, they will be prioritised and transferred to the hospital. For some, that may mean a longer wait. For others, if their condition is serious and they need immediate transfer, they will be immediately transferred. It will depend on the seriousness of their condition, and that is exactly what happens at the moment, as the member for Florey points out.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:38): Again, to the Minister for Health: is it correct that the cost of providing ambulance transfer of children from Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital will be about \$900 per trip, and is the estimated total cost of ambulance transfers about \$1 million per year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:38): I do not know what the cost of an individual trip is, what the cost is to the department; I can find that out. But, can I say a couple of things about the way our hospital system works. For one thing, it is important that, when you have particular specialised services, where those specialised services are provided, the clinicians who are providing those services are doing so on a regular basis.

Firstly, it is not efficient, but secondly and more importantly, it is not clinically safe to provide a full range of services at every possible site, because the doctors who are providing those services are not doing enough of a particular procedure to become proficient at it. I was in a meeting last night with the president of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, who was telling me that—I think he was talking about vascular surgery—if they were doing 30 procedures a year, then that was a much safer number with far fewer complications than if they were doing only 10.

So, it makes good clinical sense for us to concentrate particular highly specialised services at a few locations. Occasionally, what that means is that patients are going to have to be transferred. They are transferred for their own safety and for best clinical outcomes. Obviously,

they are also transferred because that provides us with a more effective and efficient health system which is able to deliver more services to South Australians.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned for the first time. The member for Morphett.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:40): Again, to the Minister for Health: when will the promised new rehabilitation centre at the Modbury Hospital be completed?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:40): That was, I think, deferred. It might have been deferred in last year's budget. I haven't got to hand exactly when it has been reprofiled to. If my memory serves me correctly, it had been pushed back to outside the forward estimates, but I am happy to come back. Obviously, the government is looking, in a broad way, at the provision of rehabilitation services, including the continuation of the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre as well.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (14:41): Supplementary. Could I ask the minister: when he says 'deferred outside the estimates', that means indefinitely postponed with no finishing date?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:41): No, it doesn't. I am surprised a former leader of the opposition wouldn't understand how a budget works.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:41): Again, to the Minister for Health: is it correct that specialist paediatric services, such as ENT and dental surgery, will no longer be provided at the Modbury Hospital if the paediatric ward closes?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:41): Not necessarily, in that it will be part of the consultation.

CULTURAL VALUE RESEARCH PROJECT

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:41): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts. What does the Flinders University Cultural Value Research Project say about the real worth of arts in Adelaide?

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (14:42): I thank the member for Colton. I am well aware of his rampaging interest in the arts. Yesterday, I had the privilege of attending Flinders University's Cultural Value Symposium, entitled 'The real worth of the arts in Adelaide'. Recently, there has been much discussion about the economic impact of the arts in South Australia. Just last week, the government announced that the Fringe had delivered a massive economic expenditure benefit to South Australia of \$64.6 million. That is a 34 per cent increase on last year's Fringe. It is a staggering difference.

Mrs Redmond: That's more than the Clipsal.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I hear the member for Heysen; she supports the Fringe and the Clipsal. It is true that tourism arts work well in this state. It is a good thing. It is a staggering difference, the 34.4 per cent, which has been achieved in just 12 months. However, dollar figures are only one measure of assessment. Figures such as these lead many to ask the question: what is the real worth of the arts? There is some scepticism about equating culture solely with its economic impact.

When looking at a government's investment into the arts, the economic result is an important part of the outcome. We can look at the actual dollars earned by cultural activities, the jobs created and the effects on businesses, but this is a narrow measure. We also need to have an understanding and appreciation of the enhancement that arts and culture bring to our general quality of life.

Adelaide, as the festival state, recognises the role that arts and culture plays in our everyday lives and this is why the government is a very strong supporter of the arts in South Australia. Research by an international team based at Flinders University looked at the cultural value of the 2013 Adelaide Festival. It discovered that the cultural value of this festival was worth almost \$85 million. This is much higher than the sole economic impact.

These results were determined through a trial of contingency valuation methods carried out at the Festival this year. The approach was developed through Flinders University's relationship with the Swedish University of Gothenburg and was analysed by Dr Steve Brown, principal investigator for the cultural value research project, from Flinders University and his dedicated research team.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not interact with the gallery, especially while she is answering a question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.C. FOX: You are a hard, stony-hearted man, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: And I call the minister to order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I'm here; I'm here for you. Professor Julian Meyrick, Strategic Professor of Creative Arts at Flinders, looked at qualitative methods that ran in tandem with Dr Brown's quantitative approach. This is why the cultural value project is unique. It has a double-research focus on numerical and text-based analyses which, I know, Mr Speaker, makes you very, very happy.

I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate both Dr Brown and Professor Meyrick and their research team at Flinders, along with their international peers, for their work on this important topic. This cultural value project highlights the benefits of investing in the arts. This government, unlike some, has always been highly supportive of the arts, and this research vindicates our decision to do so. Thank you for your indulgence, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes, that is the second question time in a row when the Minister for Transport Services has been disorderly. The member for Frome.

FLINDERS RANGES TOURISM

Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the Minister for Tourism please give us an update on the activities of tourism in the southern Flinders Ranges and the outback?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:46): I thank the member for Frome for his interest in a very important part of the economy in his patch. I was glad to be in Port Pirie last Saturday night to MC the Flinders Ranges and Outback Tourism Awards. The member for Stuart was also there, as was the federal member for Grey. It was a fantastic night where the whole tourism industry of that region came together to salute those who have excelled during the past 12 months.

I would just like to mention the winners on the night: the Arid Festival, Port Pirie Visitor Information Centre and Maggie's Rendezvous Cafe, which is in Orroroo; anyone going through Orroroo, make sure you call in. Jane and Warren Luckraft won two awards for their fantastic Bendleby Ranges at Orroroo, and it was fantastic to spend time with them. Another winner from Orroroo was Black Jack Get-A-Way. That award was sponsored by the member for Stuart. The member for Frome was also a sponsor on the night.

Excellence in Food and Beverage Tourism went to the Wirrabara Producers Market. The Sunday was going to be their 100th market at Wirrabara, so it was fantastic to meet the people involved in there. Port Pirie Regional Council was also another winner, and the winner of the Outstanding Contribution by an Individual was Chris Bretag. So, congratulations to all those winners—very well deserved winners they were, too.

Last week, on a separate trip, I was in the Flinders Ranges and Peterborough and, again, the member for Stuart was there when we had about 30 tourism operators from around the Flinders Ranges at a function at Rawnsley Park in their Woolshed Restaurant. It was tremendous to go out and explain to the tourism operators what we are doing as a government in their sector and also to hear what they would like done.

We all need to work together. There are 3,500 tourism operators throughout the state and we are there to help them in marketing and providing data. So, it was a terrific night. It was really good to catch up with them. Rawnsley Park, for anyone who hasn't been up there, is a sensational part of the world. I'd really like to thank Julie and Tony Smith at Rawnsley Park and, in particular, Tony, who took me for a walk up Rawnsley Bluff the next day. It was a 12-kilometre trip up and back, and it is truly a spectacular part of the world.

We had a night in Peterborough. Peterborough is a rural community that was once at the crossroads of the railway systems in South Australia. It's a community filled with great volunteers and people who are really doing well to put Peterborough back on the map. I want to congratulate everyone there, including Horst with his sound and light show at Steamtown, where you can go in and watch a film that goes through the history of how Peterborough was a cross on the map, because that's where the railways would meet up, to the demise of the rail system in Peterborough in the early 1970s. For anyone who is heading out into country South Australia, Peterborough is a fantastic place to go.

I also want to thank the member for Frome for teeing up a meeting with Neville Thomson from the Port Pirie Harness Club while I was in Pirie; it was a very fruitful meeting. It was opportune to be there because Port had a big win that day, and I know that the member for Frome is the No. 1 ticketholder at Port. So, well done, and thank you for teeing up that meeting.

REGIONAL JUDICIAL SERVICES

Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:50): I will correct the minister: the Port Pirie Regional Council won two awards. My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that the frequency of the District Court circuit courts in regional locations in South Australia is to be reduced? At the same time, can the Attorney-General advise whether the frequency of sittings in the Supreme Court in country regions will be reduced after 1 July?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question; I know that he is very much interested in what goes on in that part of regional South Australia and, indeed, all of regional South Australia.

The situation, as far as I understand it, is that today there was a report appearing somewhere in the media to the effect that one District Court judge had made some remarks about the availability of judicial officers to participate in circuit work around South Australia. I have not been able to ascertain as yet the exact detail lying behind that particular set of remarks by His Honour. I can, however, advise the parliament of a couple of matters.

First of all, as members would be aware, the Courts Administration Authority is an independent authority, independent from direction from me as Attorney-General or, indeed, anybody other than the Courts Administration Authority itself, the chief executive of which, in effect, is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. So, the matter of how its funds are allocated is entirely a matter for the disposition of the court within its own budget.

The second thing I would say is that, as honourable members may or may not be aware, over the last couple of years, there has been quite an effort made to introduce a greater amount of videoconferencing between remote locations and the courts. This has meant that there has been a diminishing requirement for the physical presence of judicial officers in remote parts of the state, although, in saying that, I do not wish to suggest that all need for people in distant parts of the state has been accommodated entirely by video. But I am making the point that the change in technology is delivering an opportunity for remote matters to be dealt with in a more opportune and less expensive fashion.

The third point I would make to members is that, in recent discussions I have had with the Chief Justice, he has intimated to me that he has some particular plans in respect of delivering improved justice services to regional South Australia, and those plans are things he is working his way through presently. It would be inappropriate for me, in the absence of his having completed those conversations with the other judges, and in the absence of his officially advising me of the outcome, to say anything further. But I can tell the honourable member that the Chief Justice is aware of issues relating to regional South Australia—as, indeed, I am—and both of us are keen to make sure that it is well serviced.

REGIONAL JUDICIAL SERVICES

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (14:54): I have a supplementary question to the Attorney, on a related issue. People from the country—and it can work both ways of course—who commit or who are alleged to have committed an offence in the city have to attend the court in the city, and this argument extends in the various locations around the state. With modern technology, why can't those matters be heard, for example, in the city where the person lives?

I will give an example: someone who is in the electorate of Frome. That person has had to travel to Adelaide I think four times on a traffic matter which is alleged to have occurred in Adelaide, when there is a court in Pirie. This is a gross burden, particularly on country people, but it can work the other way with city people who have allegedly committed an offence in the country.

The SPEAKER: The member didn't seek leave to explain the question. The Attorney-General.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:54): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for Fisher for that question. The honourable member makes a very important point and that is that increasingly, for us to be able to deliver justice to the people of South Australia in an efficient and timely fashion, we are going to need to embrace new technology, in particular, video technology. That is something which is occurring as we speak. However, in order to deliver that, I think there are a couple of things members need to bear in mind.

The first thing is that there is a qualitative and quantitative difference between the delivery of a service through video linkage if it is an interlocutory matter, in other words, something like an adjournment or a directions hearing or something of that nature, when compared with an actual trial. Even at trial, a plea of guilty is clearly a different proposition to a trial in which there are contested facts and witnesses need to be cross-examined and suchlike.

I think the day when we are able to deal with a contested matter routinely in court by video link is yet to arrive. It is an exceptional thing that does happen from time to time when we have interstate or overseas witnesses in some of the higher courts, but it does involve quite a lot of activity and staffing at both ends, which is something that is important.

That said, the Courts Administration Authority has been looking at questions about providing more of these remote opportunities for people in the country, for example, to have their matters dealt with by attending at the courthouse in a country town. Likewise, if the situation were reversed, it would be possible for a person in the city, maybe, to be able to take advantage of those links.

This is an evolving thing and it is something that I am very keen to discuss with any of the non-metropolitan members here who might have those issues, because it is something that we do need to develop in the justice system. It is something we are working on, but presently there are practical and technological limits to how much can easily be done using that remote technology.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How much more will non-government schools receive in 2014 over and above the existing indexation model under the new education funding agreement signed with the Gillard government on Friday?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:57): The agreement that has been signed with the federal government to deliver a new funding model for schools here in South Australia will not be delivered under the existing indexation model. Under the existing indexation model, we would see schools in South Australia effectively going backwards and I am happy to explain why that would be. It is the Australian government school recurrent costs index and that is based, and struck, according to the investment that states around Australia put into public education. What we have seen is—

Mr PISONI: Point of order: my question referred specifically to non-government schools. The minister is talking about public education.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, I am not. I am talking about—

The SPEAKER: I will adjudicate the member for Unley's point of order. I will listen carefully to what the minister has to say. Minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Under the old model, the indexation rate that is used for non-government schools is determined through the amount of funding that states put into their education systems. Under the old model, my understanding is that schools would be going backwards as far as their indexation is concerned simply because other states around Australia have reduced their contribution to education. So in fact our non-government and Catholic schools would have been going backwards.

Instead of that, they will next year be getting something like an additional \$18 million for Catholic schools and \$17 million for independent schools all up. There will be something like \$197 million extra funding going into our Catholic schooling sector over six years and \$186 million dollars going into the independent schooling sector. I guess the overarching question that remains is: does the member for Unley support these schools getting that extra funding?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, what the member for Unley supports or does not support is of no relevance.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:59): I do have a supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Excellent, a supplementary.

Mr PISONI: Will the minister guarantee that not a single South Australian school, government or non-government, will be worse off in 2014 with the new funding model compared to the funding model it is replacing?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:00): Over a six-year period there is going to be something like \$1.1 billion of extra funding—

Mr PISONI: Point of order: my question was specific to 2014 and the minister is talking about a six-year period. My supplementary was specific to the year 2014, not a six-year period.

The SPEAKER: To next year.

Mr PISONI: That is correct, sir.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I gave the answer in response to the last question. Catholic schools will get an additional \$18 million next year and independent schools an additional \$17 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: The question was: can she guarantee whether there will be a single school in South Australia—government or non-government school—that will be worse off in 2014? That was the question that she chose not to answer.

Mr PISONI: The member for Unley is warned. Minister, do you have anything to add?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I answered the questions.

Mr Pisoni: No, you did not.

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

PORTABLE FINGERPRINT SCANNERS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): My question is for the Minister for Police. Can the minister advise if the 150 portable fingerprint scanners promised by the government at the last election are currently operational?

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

(15:01): The last briefing that I received, which I think was about three or four weeks ago, was that they were to commence a trial.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, well, apparently there were legislative difficulties in commencing the trial.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: That is the advice that I received from the police commissioner: that the trial was to commence. The number that were being trialled, I am not sure. The delay, the police commissioner informed me, was due to a legislative difficulty. I will return to the house with the specific number being trialled, but the trial is underway.

The SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: No.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Kaurna.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Why has there been an increase in the number of international students choosing to study in our state and how does this relate to the quality of education offered at our public universities?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:03): I am very pleased to respond to the member for Kaurna's question. There are many factors that contribute to the number of overseas students choosing to make Adelaide their destination, but clearly the quality, standing and choice offered by our education sector plays a very significant role. I am pleased to report that there has been an increase in the number of international students choosing to study in South Australia.

If we look at our standing from an international perspective, the 2012 Academic Ranking of World Universities puts Australia as the fourth most successful higher education system globally. In fact, I was very pleased to note that the importance of a quality education was acknowledged by international students who were surveyed by *The Advertiser*. I think it was a couple of weekends ago or last weekend. We add value to that, because Adelaide is recognised as a safe city and Australia's most liveable city.

The latest figures confirm that more international students are choosing to study and live in Adelaide. The number of students who commenced study in South Australia increased by 3.9 per cent in March and 2.3 per cent in April. Student numbers in March also increased at a faster rate than the national growth for the first time in three years. More broadly, the number of prospective students applying for visas to study in Australia is also on the rise, and that is a very important sign.

More than 7,100 new international students have started their studies in South Australia this year, taking our total enrolments so far to nearly 21,000. If we look at this growth right up to 2011, South Australia has outperformed the national growth rate for international students for seven out of the past nine years. Compared to 2002, there are 2½ times more international students living and studying in South Australia today. This means an extra 17,000 international students have chosen to make South Australia home and there are, of course, significant economic benefits because we know that international education contributed \$863 million approximately in export earnings to the state in 2011-12.

I take this opportunity to wish all of our international students and their families the best. I thank our education sectors for the work they do in educating our international students, and going that extra step to ensure that they have not only a very productive time but also a safe stay here in South Australia.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

GM HOLDEN

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:06): I rise to speak on behalf of General Motors Holden, on behalf of the workforce and on behalf of the union movement. I rise also to clarify the misinformation, and, can I say, quite untruthful misinformation, being put about by the government in respect of the Liberal's position both state and federal.

I start by reminding the house that the motor cars produced by Holden are first-class motor cars. They are top-10 cars. Both the Cruze and the Commodore are award-winning cars, and they are fantastic products. It was an absolute disgrace that a former deputy premier and treasurer would go on morning radio and decry the products as being below-par and being rubbish products. If that is a signal of what the Labor Party feels about Holden's products, they should be standing in shame. They are excellent motor cars and they are a credit to the company and the workforce.

The second thing I want to point out is that the state Liberals are very firm in their resolve to stand side-by-side with this company, the workforce, and the unions to see a vibrant future for this company. We not only support the company and their products—unlike certain prominent Labor people—but we also support the coinvestment package and we decry the government for not having already signed up to it given that they were approached by the company over a year ago. If they had moved more swiftly, we might not be here today. We will certainly be supporting the coinvestment package and we want Holden to have a vibrant long-term future.

Can I also clarify the utter rubbish put into the house today by the Premier in regard to the federal Coalition's position. I draw the house's attention to a media release from the minister for this area, Sophie Mirabella MP, of 13 June. The Coalition stands strongly in support of Holden. They have provisioned \$1 billion into this scheme from 2015 and a further \$1 billion from the start of 2016.

The number of car manufacturers has decreased from three to two with the departure of Ford. There is more than enough money there for the coinvestment package with Holden and it is available to be deployed. They make the point that the carbon tax has cost \$640 million to the industry, in their view, and they make the point that the Coalition will be working to sort out the mess Labor has created with car industry funding through a Productivity Commission report and review, to make sure that the money that the Coalition does deploy to support the industry, works, because on Labor's watch we have lost Mitsubishi and Ford, and we risk losing Holden. Thank you, Labor, federal and state.

I also remind the house that the Rudd Labor government promised a \$1.3 billion green car innovation fund. When Julia Gillard became the Prime Minister she canned and axed the entire program. Only a couple of hundred million had been deployed. Holden decried that decision. The Labor Party was condemned universally for having made it. That cut to funding of \$1.2 billion is largely why Holden are in the position they are today—because Labor cut funding.

What did the current Premier have to say about it at the time? Absolutely nothing! It is Labor who have cut funding to the car industry and to Holden. It is simply a lie to say that the Coalition does not support Holden. It is simply a lie, and anyone who says it, whether it is the Premier or a minister, is not telling the truth. The Coalition supports the car industry, and the billion dollars on the table, and the further billion after 2016, are proof of the point.

Can I also reassert to the house the absolute resolve in the state Liberal Party to stand by Holden, its workforce and the unions, and we commend all three. If it was not for the prevarication and delay of Labor, both state and federal, this coinvestment package would have been signed up a year ago. We now have to await the outcome of a federal election. Why? Because Labor, both federal and state, delayed making a decision and put it off. I do not blame Holden now, on the eve of a federal election, to want certainty as to who they will be talking to. Hopefully it will not be Labor, because they have delivered ruin to the automotive industry. On their watch, this state has lost Mitsubishi. On their watch, we have lost Ford. On their watch, we risk losing Holden. They have delivered a wreckage.

Time expired.

NOTABLE AUSTRALIANS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:11): Today, I would like to remember some special people and their service to Australia, in two cases, and, in the other two cases, to the State of South

Australia. Hazel Hawke died on 23 May and will be honoured in Sydney on Tuesday 25 June and, I am sorry to say, I cannot be there to attend and pay my respects. Hazel's love of music was well known and will play a key role in the ceremony, and her work as a tireless campaigner for social justice issues will be celebrated along with her patronage of the arts and bravery as a dementia advocate in her later life.

Hazel opened the Lurra childcare centre in Florey many years ago, and it is perhaps for her role as Australia's first lady that she will be most remembered, in which she pioneered many roles. Susan Ryan, her friend, said, 'Hazel chose to remain her approachable, easygoing self and support causes that reflected her deeply held values.' Another dear friend, Wendy McCarthy, was close to Hazel and, along with Susan Ryan, has been a role model and mentor to many of the women in parliament today. Condolences go to Hazel's family and, of course, her many friends throughout the Australian community.

Another lover of music was Graeme Bell, Australia's great in New Orleans and trad jazz. He died last year in June and his legacy lives on in Australia through the musicians with whom he came into contact. It is because of my association with Generations in Jazz, the annual competition here in South Australia, that I have become a jazz lover, and Graeme Bell is a household name here and beyond. Born in Victoria, Graeme recorded some compositions of our Adelaide jazz great, Dave Dallwitz. Graeme entertained troops in World War II, toured Europe with the Australian Jazz Band and, soon after taking a distinctly Australian voice there, he convinced people in London that jazz was for dancing as well as listening. He then toured China in 1990, along with Little Pattie—goodness only knows what China thought of all of that—and received many awards. The Australian Jazz Awards, The Bells, are named after him.

A great South Australian whom I knew who died in September of 2012, Doug Claessen, was a Public Service secretary to Don Dunstan and is thought to be the first Sri Lankan-born magistrate in Australia. Doug studied law and held many positions, advocating for people before meeting the then attorney-general Dunstan, becoming his trusted confidante. Doug worked with Dame Roma Mitchell and went on to hold many senior roles, retiring as a magistrate of the Licensing Court in 1984. He went on to work part-time with a legal firm here in Adelaide and, even after retiring from that role, still went on to win cases for people until just before he passed away. He was a true friend of the Florey subbranch and is survived by his wife Verna, his children Rohan, Yolande and Jerome and their families, and our condolences go out to all of them.

Yesterday, we learned of the very sad passing of Bronwyn Halliday. A young vibrant woman, she made a great contribution and is remembered for her board work throughout South Australia for Minda, National Pharmacies, the State Theatre Company, the Australian Institute of Company Directors and also Planning SA. She was a Flinders University counsellor and a chair of KESAB and the History Trust, among many other roles.

It is her work for the State Library that will be her greatest legacy, I feel. That is how I first met her. I well remember the day she showed me around the State Library just before it was completed. It was a project that she fully embraced. We had great fun talking about all the new innovations that she was putting in place there. As with me, she also shared a love of Mintaro in the Clare Valley. Although I only saw her infrequently after she left the State Library, it was always good to catch up with her and say hello. My sincere condolences go to her husband Simon and to her family, friends and many colleagues.

These examples of service to others and being mentors for us all are something we need to take on board. Community service and public life can be very demanding but without people putting themselves forward in these capacities we would all be the poorer. I know these four will be very sadly missed.

PS MARION

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:15): On Saturday 15 June I was proud to attend at Mannum to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the PS *Marion's* time in Mannum. I was joined by my colleagues the Hon. David Ridgway MLC and the member for Schubert, Ivan Venning MP, in what was a terrific celebration of this historic paddle steamer.

The PS *Marion*, built in 1897, is one of the last original operational paddle steamers in the world. She was used as a trade and passenger steamer and is still powered by the original engine imported from Gainsborough, England in 1900 by William Bowring. Designed and built in the Murray-Darling river system, she has spent all her life on the river and has become recognised as a part of it. Her continuing and intimate link with the Murray River is of great significance.

The PS *Marion* is one of the flagships of river transport and is the third-oldest Australian vessel on Lloyd's Register. The vessel reflects the evolution of the economic, trade, transportation and social development of the Murray-Darling system and its regions during the 20th century. In her time the PS *Marion* has hosted a range of notable Australian political figures and dignitaries, including prime ministers, premiers and attorneys-general.

The vessel was used as the setting for the ceremonies which marked the initiation of the locking on the river and marking one of the first unified acts of the states under the commonwealth. The PS *Marion* was best known during her days as one of the passenger steamers of Murray Shipping Ltd, and in December 1934 she left Morgan for the first of what became regular summer cruises. She went upstream as far as Renmark, then down to Goolwa and back to Morgan.

In 1963, after being sold to the National Trust, the PS *Marion* made the trip from Berri to her new home in Mannum, where she would sit in the Randall Dry Dock at Mannum for over 30 years, serving as a memorial and museum. This was going to be her last ever trip. The five-day trip 50 years ago captained by Captain Bill Drage created much public interest with many dignitaries, including the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford (premier of South Australia), the Hon. Sir Edward Morgan and the Hon. G.A. Bywaters MP on board from Bow Hill for the last leg of the historic voyage.

The PS *Marion* sat in dry dock from 1963 until 1994 when, thanks to over 100 dedicated volunteers and thousands of hours of labour, the PS *Marion* was fully restored and recommissioned. To celebrate the 50th anniversary of the PS *Marion's* trip down the Murray River to Mannum, the Mannum Dock Museum organised a re-enactment cruise of that historic journey.

The PS *Marion* left Berri on 6 June with the trip expected to take a little over a week, ending with a grand celebration on Saturday 15 June on the banks of the Mary Ann Reserve in Mannum. Along with my wife Sally I joined a small number of the original crew and families of those who have since passed on. We were on the trip from Bow Hill to Mannum. Thankfully, it was a lovely sunny winter's day and it was terrific to spend the day taking in the majestic surroundings of the mighty Murray River.

The PS *Marion* was followed by a large flotilla throughout the day, and those on board were met by thousands welcoming the PS *Marion* at Mary Ann Reserve. A family fun day had been organised, with the local community out in large numbers enjoying the river festivities and live entertainment. To keep with the entire theme of the 50-year anniversary celebrations, the arrival of the PS *Marion* included a re-enactment of the unloading of the original cargo, and original crew members had arranged for a shipment of brandy to again be sent to the Queen. A similar gift had been forwarded back in 1963 to commemorate this milestone in river history. I note that Buckingham Palace is going to accept the half dozen bottles of brandy, once again, for the 50 years since the last lot.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely. For the surviving members of the original crew of the journey 50 years ago, the families of those who are no longer with us, and the many volunteers that continue to maintain this historic paddle steamer, it was an historic day which brought about a great deal of emotion and celebration. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Mannum Dock Museum and the 50th anniversary committee for a terrific day. It was a great showcase of the river, its history and the times of yesteryear.

GONSKI EDUCATION REVIEW

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:20): Last week, we noted that the Premier and the Prime Minister had signed an agreement to implement the Gonski reforms in South Australia. One of the key features of the Gonski reforms is to enable an increase in professional development of our teachers. It is not that our teachers are not working hard and working well now. The issue is that our modern world requires different skills and different abilities in our students and, therefore, in our teachers; and these things do not just come because you are a clever and well-meaning person. They come through observation, discussion with your peers, research, reflective practice, and general development of every teacher, every year.

I have been fortunate that my final parliamentary study tour has been to Canada, where I met many teachers and people involved in education administration, and learnt that each teacher has a growth plan every year. The growth plan can be on something as apparently minute as

improving their questioning techniques. After 20 years in the profession they still want to learn how they can stimulate children's learning better by improved questioning techniques.

The schools in Reynell are demonstrating how schools can improve. While great achievements have been made, these schools constantly ask me: when are we signing Gonski? I know each one of them will be very pleased that we have, because they see how they can develop the students in their care and the teachers undertaking the important work in these skills in a greater way. There is a bit of a myth that not all parents care about their kids' education, but what I observe is that, in my area, when a school develops real excellence in an area, parents vote with their feet.

One example of this is Pimpala Primary School, which under the leadership of Linda Olifent has produced extraordinary results. In 2007 the school had only 122 children. Pimpala is in Morphett Vale. This is not an area of high growth of young children; Seaford and areas to the south are where the young families are more concentrated. From 122 enrolments in 2007 Pimpala in 2013 has 370 students; 85 per cent of the reception families are first-time school families. There is significant parent and caregiver involvement.

There are now 130 regular registered volunteers who participate in programs like the Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden program; government council, which has about 16 to 20 members, it seems to me, every time I am there; and in all sorts of classroom support programs. It is an inclusive school. It has at times up to 15 per cent of students with a disability, and currently it has 21 Aboriginal students, one of whom has been accepted into the Ignite program.

The attendance rate surpasses benchmarks (approximately 93 to 95 per cent), and the achievement data is significant for category of disadvantage level 3. Junior primary reading levels are above state average. NAPLAN data, and particularly progress rates of students, is exceptional. For example, year 7 writing was 78 per cent above the national average, with 27 per cent in the top two skill bands. The school is excited about the fact that the preschool will be moving onto the site as a result of a budget decision.

I have already spoken to the house about the considerable progress at Wirreanda High School with the rapid increase in its ATAR results. I now want to congratulate the principal, Tony Lunniss, who, with four other principals from the southern region, will be presenting at the International Confederation of Principals conference about creating professional learning communities, which will be in Cairns in July of this year.

COUNTRY HEALTH SA

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:25): Today, I rise to speak about an issue in the electorate of Chaffey concerning Country Health SA. At the moment, they are looking at secretive job cuts. After being informed by the community that Country Health SA was offering targeted voluntary separation packages to local health staff, I became extremely concerned in a region that has been an ideal place for the aged and retiring. It is critical that the large elderly population has good health services.

Given the difficulty in recruiting and retaining doctors in the region, any suggestion that jobs were being cut from our local health services, to me, seemed absurd. Both Country Health SA and the health minister denied that any such packages were being offered. I have asked the minister about these voluntary separation packages and he said that he will come back to me. As yet, I have heard nothing.

Recently, in a local newspaper article, a Country Health SA spokesman said that the most recent round of targeted voluntary separation packages was finalised last year, and yet just eight days after those comments were made Country Health SA has now admitted that these packages were offered to all Country Health SA local network staff. Country Health SA tried to soften the blow by stating that staff involved in direct patient care were not included in the offer and the redundancy offer was supposed to, according to the state government, improve the way we do business and effectively manage resources to ensure that the services we provide are sustainable for the future.

Far too often we have seen this government reduce services, and it is left up to others to pick up the role that is left behind. In this case, doctors and nurses may find themselves forced to do more administrative work to the detriment of patient health. At this stage, I am not aware of how many of these redundancy packages are being offered to health staff in Chaffey, but I do know that one is too many.

The Waikerie and Districts Health Advisory Council presiding member has come out in the media sharing his alarm at this revelation by the government. He believes that the Waikerie Hospital & Health Services is already operating at minimal staffing level and does not know where they could trim anyone from the existing workforce. I agree, our small hospitals in Loxton, Waikerie, Renmark and Barmera are all running as efficiently as possible when it comes to staffing numbers.

We have read in the Labor government's budget that there will be further cuts to health jobs. The Rural Doctors Association has come out and said that it believes that 200 of those jobs will be in rural and regional South Australia. That is the concern I have. It beggars belief that the government continues to neglect rural and regional South Australia. Instead of being offered support in extremely tough economic times, we are being cut to the bone.

We have already heard revelations last year over nursing staff numbers at the Riverland Regional Hospital. We were told that the positions of nursing staff who had resigned remain unfilled. Nursing staff were being asked to work extra shifts and overtime and administrative support was being reduced. At a union meeting in Berri last year, nurses said that they were being put in charge of up to 15 patients rather than the maximum eight in equivalent circumstances. We heard that midwives have been exposed to impossible expectations, by being in charge of a ward while at the same time caring for a woman in active labour and, in some instances, working 18 hours straight and being called in after just hours of sleep.

How does the health sector get to that point? It is the continual sneaky tactics of a government to trim back health numbers that puts patients' care at risk. My concern is that, when the \$36 million Riverland Regional Hospital at Berri is complete, this government will reduce services to the surrounding hospitals, despite the passionate calls from community members that these critical elements of life in the Riverland need to be supported.

Another issue is that the hospital boards are being denied access to the auxiliary funds they used to have which are now under the control of the health system, so the money is unable to be spent on providing services and providing upgrades to the hospital. Why is that so? Why are we being denied the opportunity for the hospital to spend their money, supplied by their community with fundraising, on their hospital? It is just not good enough.

VIETNAM VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:30): I would like to speak today about an event that I attended on Sunday afternoon at the Golden Grove Arts Centre to support the northern Vietnam Veterans Association, which is situated near the Edinburgh base within my electorate. It is certainly a wonderful group of men and women who support them in raising funds for northern veterans and for the general veterans community, both from the Vietnam era but also for contemporary veterans who are certainly a rich vein of people in our community in the north.

This particular day was a really special afternoon. It was particularly well attended because it was actually a musical afternoon where we had the opportunity of hearing the band of the 10th/27th Battalion of the Royal South Australian Regiment, and what a fantastic band it was. In the afternoon, we had an introduction from our MC, but we also had some fundraising events with Pedro Dawson and Ian Le'Raye, from the Vietnam Veterans of the north, talking to the crowd and giving them some feedback about wonderful projects that they have spent their fundraising money on.

In the first half, we heard the 20th Century Fox Fanfare, music from *The Dambusters* and a fantastic solo by a musician, Josh Koop, called *My Funny Valentine*. We had vocals by Corporal Portakiewicz, his brother Anthony Portakiewicz and musicians Koop and Tucker as well in *GI Blues*. We also heard music from the *Bridge on the River Kwai*. We had *Mack the Knife*, with a vocal accompaniment by the MC Mr Williams, then we had *007*. It was just a wonderful selection of music and it went on for several hours.

The thing I really want to talk to you about today is how this band supported the northern Vietnam vets and what a proud history the 10th/27th Battalion Fighting Band has in our state. This particular Royal South Australian Regiment is the only infantry battalion band in the Australian Army, and is the oldest serving band in Australia. Its heritage begins with the formation of The Adelaide Rifles, circa 1860, and it draws its lineage from the bands that have served in all South Australian infantry battalions which have served in both world wars.

These battalions were among the first ashore at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915, and they earned the respect of the German Afrika Korps in 1941 as The Rats of Tobruk. They were also among the

first to defeat the Japanese in the jungles of New Guinea and played a crucial role in turning the tide of the Japanese advance on Australia during the Second World War.

Throughout these campaigns, an integral part of the battalion was its bandsmen. These men featured prominently in the bitter fighting that occurred and all too often were amongst the casualty lists. As stretcher bearers, they had the responsibility of recovering the wounded and were required to expose themselves to deadly enemy fire. It was here that they earned the reputation of The Fighting Band.

In 1936, the regiment was presented with brass drums by the citizens of Adelaide and they still proudly carry those today on ceremonial parades, emblazoned with the battalion's battle honours. An ornately decorated drum major's staff was presented in 1938 by the Manchester Regiment (a sister regiment) and is paraded on important occasions. Today, the band performs at regal, vice-regal, ceremonial and civic functions, such as the one we saw the other day, and provides support for the South Australian-based units in the ADF.

All of the members of the band are Army Reservists, combining the obligations of civilian employment with the considerable commitment necessary to be in the band. They are required to maintain a high level of competency in their musical, military and weapon-handling skills and to be medically and physically fit. Members of the band are cross-trained as Reserve Response Force, infantry soldiers, combat signallers and drivers.

The band's repertoire encompasses many musical styles, including military music, classical, modern popular, jazz and vocal arrangements. Its versatility was on display on Sunday with the magnificent breadth of music we heard.

In 1985, this talented and dedicated group of musicians was given unprecedented recognition by being presented with the Advance Australia Award for Outstanding Contribution to Music. It was the first time that this honour had been bestowed upon an ADF unit. In 2002, the band was invited to perform at the prestigious Edinburgh Military Tattoo as part of the Queen's Golden Jubilee. The band has also performed in Glasgow and at the International Highland Games in Perth, Scotland.

The band of the 10/27 RSAR and the members of the battalion are committed to perpetuating this proud history and tradition, and we are very fortunate to have in our state a military band of such a high calibre. So, bravo to the Northern Vietnam Vets raising funds for the veterans in the north, particularly the people of the battalion, who contributed so admirably on Sunday.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (SAMFS FIREFIGHTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:36): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SAMFS Firefighters) Amendment Bill 2013 gives additional protection to firefighters exposed to higher cancer risk as a result of their work. Career firefighters are at a greater risk of developing certain types of cancer due to their direct exposure to carcinogens released by combusting materials.

This measure will ensure that, as from 1 July 2013, South Australian MFS firefighters, including retained firefighters, who contract any of the 12 specified cancers will, subject to qualifying periods and in the absence of proof to the contrary (but subject to other provisions of the act), be entitled to workers compensation without having to prove that the cancer arose specifically from their employment with SAMFS. The extended entitlements will significantly reduce the emotional and financial burden that would otherwise fall on career firefighters and their families. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Commonwealth has accepted that employed firefighters are at greater risk of developing certain types of cancer, and enacted the *Commonwealth Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Amendment (Fair Protection for Firefighters) Act 2011*, on 6 December 2011. The establishment of this legislation was underpinned by the work undertaken by the Australian Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Legislation Committee (the Senate Committee).

The task of the Senate Committee was to consider the work relatedness of cancer in firefighters. It received 27 submissions from individuals and organisations, conducted public hearings, and listened to personal accounts from firefighters and their families. A finding of the Senate Committee was that the type of exposures identified in the research was more often experienced by firefighters working in urban areas, and that most operational activities undertaken in these areas related to structural and non-structural fire incidents.

As reported by the Senate Committee in the Report on the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Amendment (Fair Protection for Firefighters) Bill 2011 (the Senate Committee's Report), '...studies and meta-studies conducted around the world, including in Australia in the 1980s, demonstrate that certain types of cancer are caused by the release of carcinogens from combusting materials in structure fires. These known carcinogens can include benzene, styrene, chloroform and formaldehyde, and are absorbed by firefighters through the skin or by way of inhalation.' (Senate Committee's report at paragraph 2.27) 'Most operational activities undertaken by urban firefighters are structural and non-structural fire incidents. Car fires, although technically considered non-structural, produce toxic chemicals rivalling those found in structure fires...due to the prevalence of plastic components found in cars. Unsurprisingly, even ordinary houses and household products release toxic chemicals when they burn.' (Senate Committee's report at paragraph 2.30-31).

The hazards of a fire may migrate away from the scene of the fire. Evidence provided to the Senate Committee indicated that the hazards of a fire are pervasive and 'the hazards of a fire scene may be transported away from the fire scene by firefighters and the equipment they carry...' (Senate Committee's report at paragraph 1.39). The migration of the hazards of the fire may result in further hazard exposures when, for example, cleaning fire equipment or the truck back at the station.

In the South Australian public sector, SAMFS firefighters and retained firefighters (retained firefighters are employed by the SAMFS on a part-time basis, generally in regional centres) are employed largely in urban contexts where they are exposed to structure fires.

The Senate Committee concluded that when a firefighter, with a certain number of years of service, develops cancer, that cancer is most likely to be caused by occupational exposure to carcinogens.

The 12 compensable primary site cancers and the applicable specified periods of employment in the *Commonwealth Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Amendment (Fair Protection for Firefighters) Act 2011* are:

- Primary site brain cancer—5 years
- Primary site bladder cancer—15 years
- Primary site kidney cancer—15 years
- Primary non-Hodgkins lymphoma—15 years
- Primary leukaemia—5 years
- Primary site breast cancer—10 years
- Primary site testicular cancer—10 years
- Multiple myeloma—15 years
- Primary site prostate cancer—15 years
- Primary site ureter cancer—15 years
- Primary site colorectal cancer—15 years
- Primary site oesophageal cancer—25 years

The scope of the research evidence considered by the Senate Committee about the work relatedness of cancer in firefighters, incorporated all firefighters, including volunteers. The Committee was satisfied with the scientific evidence demonstrating a link between firefighting as an occupation and the greater numbers of cancers (Senate Committee's report at paragraph 2.18). Whilst it was noted that the Commonwealth legislation does not expressly differentiate between volunteer and professional firefighters, the effect of the applicable definition means that volunteer firefighters would not be covered by the legislation because firefighting does not comprise a substantial portion of their duties, nor would they be able to satisfy the requirements of the qualifying periods (Senate Committee's report at paragraph 3.49-50).

The Commonwealth legislation sponsored by the Hon. Adam Bandt (Australian Greens, member for Melbourne), and co-sponsored by the Hon. Maria Vamvakinou, (Australian Labour Party, member for Calwell), and the Hon. Russell Broadbent, (Liberal Party, member for McMillan), was given broad support on the strength of the currently available evidence considered by the Senate Committee, evidence that is primarily limited to career firefighters. When speaking about the proposed legislative amendments, the Hon. Adam Bandt stated that the legislation could be expanded to volunteer firefighters and to other groups that could demonstrate a science based case (House of Representatives, Consideration in Detail Debate at 31 October 2013, page 12190).

The introduction of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Protection for Firefighters) Amendment Bill 2012, by the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC, on 14 November 2012, proposes to provide the South Australian Country Fire Service volunteer firefighters with the same deeming provisions as proposed by this Government for the SAMFS career firefighters.

The proposed amendments to the *Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986* are consistent with those introduced by the Commonwealth and recognise the considerable effort by the Senate Committee to establish legislation based on the best currently available evidence.

The gap in the research relevant to carcinogen exposure during firefighting activities undertaken by volunteers, and the more general limited research applicable to the Australian context, will be addressed through the Australian Firefighters' Health Study conducted by the Monash University Centre for Occupational and Environmental Health. This study is expected to be completed by September 2014.

The Government recognises the importance of this work. Consideration will be given to the outcomes of the Australian Firefighters Health Study and any new evidence as it becomes available, including in relation to volunteers.

This Government is satisfied with the Senate Committee conclusions regarding the scientific evidence about the work relatedness of cancer in career firefighters. The Senate Committee concluded, in accordance with a number of studies which focused largely on urban based firefighters, that when a career firefighter, with a certain number of years of service, develops cancer, that cancer is most likely to be caused by occupational exposure to carcinogens.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

Operation of the measure will commence on 1 July 2013. If the Act is not assented to until after 1 July, it will nevertheless be taken to have come into operation on that date.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986*

4—Amendment of section 31—Evidentiary provision

Section 31 as amended by this clause will provide an evidentiary presumption applicable to a worker who was employed by the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service ('SAMFS') as a firefighter. If the worker suffers an injury of a kind referred to in the first column of Schedule 2A (inserted by clause 5) and the injury occurred on or after 1 July 2013, the injury will be presumed (in the absence of proof to the contrary) to have arisen from employment by SAMFS. The presumption will apply if the worker was employed as a firefighter for the qualifying period referred to in the second column of Schedule 2A opposite the injury and, during that period, the worker was exposed to the hazards of a fire scene (including exposure to a hazard of the fire that occurred away from the scene).

5—Insertion of Schedule 2A

This clause inserts a new Schedule. The Schedule lists the injuries that will be presumed under section 31 to arise from the worker's employment as a firefighter and specifies the relevant qualifying period in relation to each injury.

Schedule 1—Review of amendments

The Schedule requires the Minister to appoint an independent person to carry out a review concerning the operation and impact of the amendments made by the Act. The appointment is to be made as soon as possible after the fifth anniversary of the commencement of the measure and a report of the review is to be provided to the Minister within four months of the appointment. The Minister must then have copies of the report tabled before both Houses of Parliament.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (POLICE) BILL

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Police Act 1998* and its Regulations provide the legislative infrastructure for the management and control of South Australia Police (SAPOL). This Bill now seeks to amend the Act by addressing a number of issues that were identified during an internal review by SAPOL, but which were unable to be rectified administratively. Also included in the Bill is an amendment to the *Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act 1985* regarding appeals, and minor complementary amendments to the *Public Intoxication Act 1984*.

Drug and Alcohol Testing of Police

A major emphasis in the Bill concerns the introduction of on-duty drug and alcohol testing of police officers, community constables and police cadets. Because such testing procedures cannot be effectively introduced by administrative means alone, significant additions to the Police Act and Regulations will be required.

As in any industry, SAPOL has the potential for alcohol and drug related problems to occur within its workplace. While the use of alcohol (as a legal substance) can form part of a community culture, extent of the use of illicit drugs or abuse of prescription drugs by police in South Australia is not known. No in-depth or ongoing research has been conducted in this regard, and it is stressed that there is no evidence to suggest that such a problem actually exists within SAPOL. Even so, it still behoves SAPOL as a statutory policing authority and responsible employer to ensure all possible endeavours are taken to prevent and deter its occurrence. SAPOL currently has in operation a comprehensive policy concerning alcohol and drugs in the workplace, but this is principally directed towards the health and welfare of its members and the standards expected of them. It does not provide an enforcement process and, until appropriate legislative authority is put in place, the effective ability to detect any actual substance abuse will be limited.

Alcohol and drug testing of police was one of the issues in the South Australia Police Enterprise Agreement 2007, between the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, SAPOL and the Police Association of South Australia. It was ratified on 17 January 2008 by the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia. The wording of the agreement states that parties 'agree to support the introduction of legislation that enables targeted and mandatory alcohol and drug testing of police officers in certain circumstances in support of the provisions of the Act.' The agreement binds 'the Chief Executive Officer, Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the police officers, commissioned officers/officers of police, community constables and cadets' of SAPOL. Finalisation of the agreement now requires appropriate amendments to the Police Act and Regulations.

The use of alcohol or drugs by police officers can give rise to 3 main aspects of concern. Firstly, there is the matter of operational safety. Officers on duty under the influence of alcohol or drugs threaten to jeopardise the safety of themselves, their colleagues and the public. SAPOL is bound by occupational health and safety legislation to provide a safe working environment, and the use of these substances can severely compromise the operation of established safety standards. Secondly, the issue of integrity comes into question if alcohol or drugs are abused. In particular, the use of banned substances first requires their acquisition and, by so doing, the inherent contravention of the criminal law. This severely compromises an officer's position by making the officer vulnerable to further criminal influence and corruption. Personal use of drugs and involvement in the drug culture may also dissuade police from carrying out their expected drug enforcement responsibilities. Finally, the abuse of alcohol or some prescription drugs, or the use of illicit drugs, would be likely to damage the reputation of SAPOL and undermine public confidence. This Government is of the view that the ability to ascertain whether or not police officers are under the influence of alcohol or drugs is paramount to the proper management, control and operation of its police force.

It is noted that most other Australian jurisdictions have legislated to permit the drug and alcohol testing of police. While some have extended this to include random testing at any time or place, South Australia is not adopting such a position. Instead, it prefers the model of specifying the actual circumstances when testing can occur. Circumstances for such testing will include:

- where there is a reasonable suspicion that a drug has been used or alcohol consumed;
- where a defined critical incident has occurred involving death or serious injury (such incidents including the discharge of a firearm or while detained by a member of SAPOL);
- following 'high risk' driving;
- a police officer applying for a designated classified position;
- a person applying to join SAPOL.

The types of drugs to which these proposals are to apply will be defined and refer to any substance that is a controlled drug under the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*.

Testing for a drug will involve a sample being taken of blood, urine or oral fluid. Testing for alcohol will be by breath analysis, using apparatus of a kind approved under the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

The majority of actual testing processes, policies and other related aspects are to be contained either in the Police Regulations or addressed by internal directions from the Commissioner of Police. These will include:

- prescribing procedures for drug and alcohol testing;
- the authorisation of persons to conduct tests and operate necessary equipment;
- collection, analysis and use of test samples and results;
- evidentiary provisions to facilitate proof;

- confidentiality of test results;
- destruction of samples collected.

Other Amendments to the Police Act

A number of other miscellaneous amendments are included in the Bill to address difficulties and shortcomings that have been identified in the administration of the Police Act. These include, removing a legislative impediment in determining the length of probationary periods; addressing aspects involving punishment and appeal options; providing a right of review to an applicant for a prescribed promotional position when no selection has been made; and allowing the Commissioner of Police to suspend the powers of police officers who are absent from duty for extended periods by reason of, either physical or mental disability or illness, or approved leave.

The laws regarding the appointment of special constables will be extended to give the Commissioner of Police authority to make oral appointments during times of declared emergency. In such instances, confirmation of the appointment in writing must follow as soon as possible.

Three amendments are proposed to provisions relating to the Police Review Tribunal. These deal with the appointments of its presiding officers and the secretary to the Tribunal.

Amendment to the Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act

The Commissioner has current authority to impose punishment on a member of the police force who has been found guilty of a breach of the police Code of Conduct. Similar authority also exists for the Commissioner to impose punishment on a police officer who has been found guilty of a law of any State, Territory or the Commonwealth. Pursuant to section 46 of the Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act, a right of appeal exists for the former situation but not the latter. This amendment seeks to correct the apparent oversight.

Amendments to the Public Intoxication Act

A new police position of responsible officer under the Police Regulations is to be created with responsibility for managing persons in custody in police cells. The position will support, but remain distinct from, the current obligations of an officer in charge of a police station. Because the Public Intoxication Act contains a number of references to officer in charge of a police station in relation to the detention and handling of lawfully apprehended persons, the new position of responsible officer will also need to be recognised in that Act. Duties of the new position will relate to the admission and discharge of the detained person, and the giving of directions that are reasonably necessary for the purpose of detention.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

- 1—Short title
- 2—Commencement
- 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Police Act 1998*

4—Amendment of section 27—Probationary appointment

It is proposed to repeal current subsection (2) and substitute a new subsection that will provide the Commissioner of Police with the flexibility to be able to determine that the period of probationary service of a member of SA Police will not include the whole or part of any period during which the member (while on full or reduced pay) is absent from duty (other than on recreation leave) or performs limited duties. A probationary period will also not include (unless the Commissioner determines to the contrary) any period during which—

- the member is absent from duty without pay; or
- the member's appointment is suspended.

New subsection (7) substantially re-enacts the previous subsection (2) to provide that section 27 does not apply to the following appointments:

- appointment as the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner or an Assistant Commissioner;
- appointment for a term under Part 4 Division 1;
- appointment of a member of SA Police to another position of the same rank as that held by the member immediately before the appointment to the other position;
- appointment as a community constable.

However, there is a proviso that if the appointment of a member of SA Police to a position is on probation and the member is, during the probationary period, appointed to another position of the same rank, the period of probation carries over to that other appointment (and the provisions of this section (other than subsection (7)(c)) apply accordingly).

Other proposed amendments to this section are consequential.

5—Amendment of heading to Part 6

It is proposed to amend the heading to Part 6 to 'Conduct and discipline of police and police cadets' to better reflect its contents.

6—Insertion of heading to Part 6 Division 1

It is proposed to divide Part 6 into Divisions to accommodate proposed changes to the Part. Division 1 (comprising sections 37 to 41) is to be headed 'Code of Conduct'.

7—Amendment of section 37—Code of conduct

The proposed changes to section 37 will make it clear that the Code of Conduct established under the regulations may include provisions relating to drug and alcohol testing of members of SA Police and police cadets. Other amendments are consequential.

8—Amendment of section 40—Orders for punishment following offence or charge of breach of Code

It is proposed to amend section 40(1)(g) to enable the Commissioner to transfer a member of SA Police, as a disciplinary measure, to another position. Such a transfer may be for an indefinite period or specified term, and with or without a reduction in rank, seniority or remuneration. The current paragraph does not make provision for the period of time for which such transfer may occur.

9—Insertion of Part 6 Division 2

It is proposed to insert this new Division after current section 41. This Division will make provision for drug and alcohol testing of police and police cadets.

Division 2—Drug and alcohol testing of police, police cadets, etc

41A—Interpretation

This section contains definitions of words and phrases for the purposes of interpreting this Division. For example, a *critical incident* is defined as an incident where a person is killed or suffers serious bodily injury—

- while detained by a member of SA Police, or while in police custody; or
- as a result of the discharge of a firearm or an electronic control device; or
- in circumstances involving a police aircraft, motor vehicle, vessel or other mode of transport; or
- as a result of alleged police action.

41B—Drug and alcohol testing of members and cadets

Subsection (1) of this section provides that a member of SA Police or a police cadet may, in accordance with this section, be required to do undergo *drug and alcohol testing*; that is, either or both of the following:

- to submit to an alcotest or breath analysis, or both, for the purpose of testing for the presence of alcohol;
- to provide a biological sample (that is, a sample of blood, urine or oral fluid) for the purpose of testing for the presence of alcohol or drugs.

Drug and alcohol testing, in accordance with orders or directions of the Commissioner, of a member of SA Police or a police cadet may occur in any of the following circumstances:

- if the member or police cadet has, while on duty, been involved in a critical incident;
- if the member or police cadet has, while on duty, engaged in driving that is classified by the Commissioner in orders as high risk;
- if there is a reasonable cause to believe that the member or police cadet has recently consumed alcohol or used a drug;
- if the member or police cadet is applying for a classified appointment or position.

41C—Drug and alcohol testing of applicants to SA Police

If a person who is not a member of SA Police or a police cadet is applying for appointment to SA Police or to become a police cadet, the person will, in accordance with orders or directions of the Commissioner, be required to do either or both of the following:

- to submit to an alcotest or breath analysis, or both, for the purpose of testing for the presence of alcohol;
- to provide a biological sample for the purpose of testing for the presence of alcohol or drugs.

41D—Procedures for drug and alcohol testing

This section makes provision for the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of this Division dealing with drug and alcohol testing and lists examples of what such regulations may deal with.

41E—Biological samples, test results, etc not to be used for other purposes

This section regulates the use of any biological sample or other forensic material taken, or the results of any drug and alcohol testing or analysis conducted, under this Division.

10—Insertion of heading to Part 6 Division 3

Division 3 (comprising sections 42 to 44) is to be headed 'Minor misconduct'.

11—Amendment of section 42—Minor misconduct

The proposed amendment to section 42(1) will give a member of SA Police or a police cadet suspected of a breach of the Code involving minor misconduct the option to have the matter dealt with by a hearing before the Police Disciplinary Tribunal, rather than through an informal inquiry under this section. Other amendments are consequential.

12—Amendment of section 55—Right of review

This amendment will require the Commissioner to publish in the Police Gazette notice of the selection decision (including notice that no selection has been made) following the conduct of a selection process in relation to a prescribed promotional position.

13—Substitution of section 59

59—Appointment of special constables

New section 59 makes provision for the Commissioner to appoint a special constable by instrument in writing or, if a declaration has been made under Part 4 Division 3 of the *Emergency Management Act 2004*, orally. If an appointment is made orally, it must be confirmed by the Commissioner by instrument in writing.

14—Amendment of section 61—Duties and powers of special constables

The amendments proposed to this section are related to the substitution of section 59.

15—Amendment of section 67—Divestment or suspension of powers

It is proposed to insert additional subsections that will allow the Commissioner to suspend all powers and authorities vested in a member of SA Police by or under this or any other Act or law during any extended period of leave or, if the member is on leave by reason only of physical or mental disability or illness of the member, until the suspension of the powers and authorities is revoked by the Commissioner.

16—Amendment of section 70—Suspension or revocation of suspension under Act or regulations

It is proposed to repeal current subsection (2) and substitute a new subsection that provides that, despite (current) subsection (1), remuneration may only be withheld under that subsection for more than 3 months if—

- the person has been committed for trial for a serious offence; or
- the person has been found guilty of a serious offence; or
- the person has admitted or been found guilty of a breach of the Code in respect of which the most probable outcome is termination of the person's appointment.

Other amendments are consequential.

17—Amendment of Schedule 1—Police Review Tribunal

These proposed amendments update the provisions relating to the constitution of the Tribunal and the office of Secretary to the Tribunal.

Part 3—Amendment of *Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act 1985*

18—Amendment of section 46—Appeals in respect of discipline

The proposed amendment to section 46 will insert a new subsection to provide a process for designated officers (as defined in section 3(1) of the Act) to appeal to the Court against an order of the Commissioner made after the commencement of this subsection imposing punishment on the designated officer for having been found guilty of an offence against a law of this jurisdiction or another jurisdiction.

Part 4—Amendment of *Public Intoxication Act 1984*

19—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

The proposed amendments to section 4 will insert a definition of *responsible officer*, in relation to a police station in the following terms:

- (a) the police officer in charge of the police station; or

- (b) if a police officer has, for the time being, been designated by the officer in charge of the police station as the officer with responsibility for persons accepted into custody at the police station—that officer.

20—Amendment of section 7—Apprehension of persons under the influence

21—Amendment of section 10—Custody of persons detained

The amendments proposed to sections 7 and 10 are consequential on the insertion of the definition of *responsible officer*.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

The Schedule contains provisions of a transitional nature.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

LATE PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT DEBTS (INTEREST) BILL

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:39): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for interest to be paid on the late payment of debts due to small businesses in connection with contracts for the supply of goods or services to state government; to make a related amendment to the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The public sector has recently been criticised for not paying invoices in a timely manner. While overall payment performance, outside of SA Health, is in an acceptable range and showing progressive improvement, there is still an ongoing opportunity to do even better. Particularly for small business, late payment can cause cash flow problems and negatively impact on the capacity of these businesses to meet their financial commitments.

In June 2013, a report was delivered to the Government by Mr Warren McCann, Independent Consultant making a range of recommendations to improve invoice payment performance across government. Development of late payment legislation was one of the key recommendations.

The purpose of introducing this Bill is to demonstrate the Government's commitment to ensure that small business suppliers are paid within the Government's standard 30 day payment terms. Where this does not occur, the Bill provides suppliers with the opportunity to be paid penalty interest to help offset any costs associated with not being paid on time.

Legislative schemes regarding the payment of interest on overdue invoices are commonplace in many parts of the world, including other Australian Government jurisdictions. Adoption of this legislation will send a clear message to the small business sector that the Government takes its invoice payment obligations seriously.

The untimely payment of invoices, where it occurs, is as much a cultural issue as it is a systems issue. Therefore, enacting late payment legislation will also send a strong message to agencies throughout the public sector that the prompt payment of accounts is an important objective of the Government. Establishing a financial penalty will clearly reinforce this message and act to change behaviours over time.

The key elements of the proposed legislation are as follows:

- The scheme will apply in relation to public authorities designated by the Treasurer.
- Only small business suppliers (defined as non-government Australian vendors with revenue of less than \$5 million per annum) will be able to claim late payment interest.
- Interest will start to accrue from the 31st day after the date an invoice was received by a public authority.
- Until a date to be fixed by the Treasurer, small business vendors will need to invoice the applicable public authority of any late payment interest entitlement. After that date, public authorities will be expected to pay any interest at the time that payment is made for the provision of the relevant goods or services. It is the Government's intention to move to the 'automatic' payment of interest under the Act within the next 2 years. In order to ensure that there is a smooth transition to the 'automatic' payment of interest, a review is to be undertaken within 18 months after the commencement of the legislation.
- To avoid excessive administrative costs, interest will only be payable to small business vendors when the total amount of interest owed is greater than \$20.
- The Small Business Commissioner will have a dispute resolution function under the Bill.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause is formal.

3—Preliminary

Subclause (1) defines terms used in the measure. Subclause (2) provides that the Treasurer may publish principles for determining the annual turnover of a business for the purpose of the Act by Treasurer's instruction. Subclause (3) details the invoices or claims to which the Act applies.

4—Change in identity of parties

The clause provides that the operation of the Act is not affected by a change in the identity of a party to the contract creating the debt, or the passing of the right to be paid the debt, or the duty to pay it (in whole or in part) to a person other than a party to the contract creating the debt.

5—Occurrence of default event

The clause sets out that for the purposes of the Act, a default event occurs if—

- goods or services are provided to a public authority under a qualifying contract, being a contract where the purchaser is a public authority and the supplier is a qualifying person or body (being a person whose principal place of residence is Australia, or a corporation incorporated under Commonwealth law); and
- an invoice is sent or a claim is made by the supplier under the qualifying contract for the payment of a qualifying debt (being a debt created by the qualifying contract); and
- the invoice or claim is rendered in accordance with any relevant Treasurer's instruction; and
- the invoice or claim complies with GST requirements; and
- payment by or on behalf of the public authority is made to the supplier more than 30 days after the relevant day, being the day on which the invoice or claim is received by the public authority; and
- the public authority did not dispute a relevant matter within the designated payment period (being the period of 30 days that applies under clause 5(1)(e)).

Relevant matter is defined in subclause (3) as:

- whether goods or services have been provided in accordance with the qualifying contract; or
- some other matter relating to the terms of the qualifying contract; or
- whether the invoice has been properly rendered; or
- any other prescribed matter.

6—Interest payable if default event occurs

This clause outlines the amount and circumstances in which a supplier is entitled to interest (subject to the outcome of any dispute under clause 7) as follows:

- subclause (1) provides that if a default event occurs (as prescribed in clause 5) and the qualifying contract in relation to which the default event occurs relates to the supply of goods or services as part of a small business carried on by a supplier on the qualifying day (being the day following the end of the 30 day designated payment period), the supplier is entitled to interest calculated in accordance with the formula outlined in the subclause. Small business is defined in the measure as a business carried on by a qualifying person or body whose principal place of residence is situated in Australia, where the annual turnover of the business does not exceed \$5 million (or a greater sum prescribed by the regulations) in the financial year immediately preceding the financial year in which the relevant qualifying day occurs;
- subclause (2) defines the default period for the purposes of the formula, being the period beginning on the day immediately following the end of the designated payment period and ending on the day immediately preceding the day on which payment is made by the public authority;
- subclause (3) defines the day on which payment is made by the public authority as the day on which payment is made either by electronic funds transfer, payment or credit card, or the day on which a cheque is posted to the relevant supplier;
- subclause (4) provides that a supplier is not entitled to interest if the interest calculated is less than \$20;
- subclause (5) provides that the interest payable will be a liability to be satisfied by the public authority that is in default, payable out of money held or made available for the purposes of the public authority;
- subclause (6) sets out the scheme for the payment of interest;

- subclause (7) makes it clear that interest is not payable on interest;
- subclause (8) makes it clear that the clause is subject to the outcome of any dispute under the Act;
- subclause (9) is a relevant definition.

7—Disputes

The clause provides for disputes on matters outlined in the clause to be referred to the Small Business Commissioner. The clause further provides for the manner in which the Commissioner may resolve a dispute, including exercising any of the powers of the Commissioner under the *Small Business Commissioner Act 2011*.

8—Reporting

This clause outlines the reporting requirements for an interest payment made under the Act in any month. In the case of a government department, the Chief Executive must furnish the Minister responsible with a report within 21 days after the end of the month in which the interest payment is made. In the case of a statutory authority that has a governing body, the report is to be made to the governing body of the authority at the next regular meeting occurring after the end of the month in which the interest payment is made. The report must contain any information required under a Treasurer's instruction.

9—Regulations

This clause allows the Governor to make regulations in respect of the measure.

10—Review

The Treasurer is to prepare a report on the arrangements that are to be put in place to ensure that the scheme envisaged by clause 6(6)(b) of the Act will operate in an appropriate and effective manner. The report must be completed within 18 months after the legislation comes into operation and be tabled before both Houses of Parliament.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987*

2—Amendment of section 41—Treasurer's instructions

The clause amends section 41(1) to allow the Treasurer to issue instructions setting out the procedures and processes for rendering invoices and claims with respect to public authorities.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.F. Evans.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2013

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:40): Illustrative of the government's incompetence that I had outlined in respect of the Appropriation Bill and, in particular, the mismanagement of the finances of this state, was the rail electrification project to Gawler. Members will recall that in 2010 the state Labor Party promised South Australians that there would be an electric train service to Gawler by 2013.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: If you were to rule, sir, that I have already spoken to the 20 minute debate and sit me down, then I think that others might want to continue the debate and I will make some comments later. I invite you to sit me down—a once-in-a-lifetime!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, if you would sit down, that would be appreciated. We will now look to the government side and we have got the member for Mitchell.

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:42): Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I am very proud to be a member of a Labor government that has again delivered a responsible and carefully considered state budget with a focus on the things that are most important to South Australians: health, education, housing, and perhaps, most importantly of all, jobs.

A secure job is a very important part of our life. It means we can earn a reliable income to pay the bills, feed the family and keep a roof over our heads. A secure job enables us to be active contributors to the world we live in and provides us with an opportunity to learn new skills. It often provides a social network on which we rely and by which we can learn safety, tolerance, cooperation and teamwork.

Given that most Australians spend more time each week with their workmates than they do with their families, a secure job is very important to our general health and wellbeing. Therefore, any mass redundancies are obviously painful whether it is public servants, finance sector workers or vehicle builders—it hurts us all. It hurts the people themselves, their families and their communities. It hits them in the hip pocket and in the heart at the same time. It is devastating and the choice for South Australians is becoming clearer and clearer every day when it comes to who is looking out for their jobs.

Our big build investment in major infrastructure projects designed to a world-class standard is done right the first time and continues to keep South Australians in jobs. The budget sees investment in roads, rail lines and other works to improve public infrastructure which will support 8,700 jobs in the next financial year alone—not like the legacy of those opposite, their idea of infrastructure investment being a half-baked, half-funded, one-way expressway.

This budget extends the \$8,500 housing construction grant and enables an affordable housing program. This not only supports jobs for local tradies and contractors but also improves the opportunity for South Australians to realise the dream of owning their own home.

There is also a package to support small businesses, including tax cuts, red tape reduction and assistance to win more government work. This pays real dividends for local businesses. I recently met with a local manufacturer whose business has grown and now employs 30 people, tendering and winning contracts for both the Adelaide Oval and the Tonsley redevelopment. This government does not take the slash and burn approach so favoured by the Liberal Party as a quick, unimaginative and cutthroat way to save a quid by forcing people out of their jobs. You only have to look at Queensland to see the massive cuts in Public Service numbers and the resulting reduction in frontline services. That is the modus operandi for Liberal state budgeting.

Then there is the contrast between Labor and Liberal on manufacturing. The state government is investing in helping the South Australian industry develop and transition their businesses to capitalise on niche markets using advanced manufacturing. Advanced manufacturing is generally thought of as highly skilled, highly valued, most certainly involving technology, and the creation of value-added processing to provide a competitive edge. The state government's advanced manufacturing priority has been supported in this budget with a package of measures to assist with the transition to an advanced manufacturing future.

Then there is the future of our automotive manufacturing sector here in South Australia. Nearly all of my working life has been spent working in the car industry. I have experienced firsthand the shattering effects of a vehicle manufacturer exiting the country and the economic and social price that is paid. Without government support, the Australian vehicle industry is destined for a slow and inevitable decline, and thousands of vehicle workers and their families will continue to live and work under a cloud of employment insecurity.

We need to be honest about whether we actually want to sustain automotive manufacturing in this country. There is one simple truth about this sector: without industry support from government and without the appropriate policy setting in place you will not have a vehicle manufacturing sector. This is a global certainty and an economic reality.

Every single country in the world that builds cars provides government assistance to its automotive industry. Of the 13 nations that have the capacity to design and build automobiles, each and every one of their governments provides industry support through tariffs, direct support, coinvestment and non-tariff trade barriers. Without similar government support to our Australian vehicle industry the sector will continue to decline.

The federal Liberal Party recently announced that it will take an axe to the current industry support coinvestment platform to support Holden until 2022. Their spokesman, Ms Mirabella, has said that we must end all subsidies to prop up the car industry. Funnily enough, this echoes former Liberal leader John Hewson's statement to the auto sector back in the early 1990s that, 'If you need tariffs and subsidies to survive then I don't want an automotive industry.'

The state Liberals have defended their federal counterparts and have offered no commitment to Holden, other than the establishment of an automotive task force. The federal Liberals will set up another review of the sector within the Productivity Commission. However, this is time for action rather than words, and the Liberal's position is as plain as the nose on your face. They are content to sit back and let the automotive manufacturing sector wither and die. They will not provide government support, and there is not a country in the world making a car that does not have government support.

An estimated 16,000 South Australians will lose their livelihoods if Holden's shut down. That is what reducing industry support will do. That is what the Liberals are offering the South Australian people. Adelaide's manufacturing suburbs are also home to nearly half of the people who are unemployed or on disability pensions. So, the closure of Holden's would also economically devastate some of our most vulnerable communities.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBBONS: If the choice is industry support or bust, the Liberals say 'bust'. Given this is the same party which wanted to sit back, do nothing, and wait and see what happened, when the global financial crisis hit, rather than move to protect jobs and our economy, it is hardly a surprising attitude. But what is the alternative? The answer is industry support, something that the state and federal Labor governments are offering. Dr Remy Davison, the Jean Monnet Chair in Politics and Economics at Monash University, notes—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBBONS: He notes this:

No country has ever become a developed industrial economy without an auto industry. Not even Switzerland. From Belgium, to the Netherlands, to China, the employment, skills and export potentialities associated with car production are enormous. That's why South Korea under Park Chung-hee in the 1970s invested heavily in auto production. South Korean car imports surpassed Japanese imports in Australia in the 2000s. That's also why Indonesia and Malaysia in the 1990s sought to build and develop their own car industries. It's also why China places so much emphasis upon its own auto industry as an avenue for employment growth, foreign joint ventures, direct investment and technology transfer.

Dr Remy suggests that we remove or cut GST on locally made vehicles; reduce registration costs for locally made vehicles exclusively; increase R&D tax credits for local car manufacturers and automotive components firms; and introduce significant tax credits for exports and technology licensing.

I also believe that there is merit in looking at significantly increasing the tariff on all imported vehicles. As an incentive for Australian vehicle manufacturers, the tariff should be reduced significantly or even removed for companies that manufacture a minimum of 50,000 vehicles per year on Australian soil. This would give the remaining manufacturers at least a sporting chance. It might even lead to Ford reconsidering its decision to shut down Geelong, although I feel it is too late.

A research paper from the University of Melbourne, entitled *100 Years of Tariff Protection in Australia*, says that tariffs have occupied as much time in parliamentary debate as almost any other topic. As an economic tool, I acknowledge they are a blunt instrument. However, they do make a difference, and economic modelling by Latera Economics in 2008 showed that reducing tariffs below 10 per cent would do more harm to Australia's economy than good. I acknowledge that tariffs alone will not have the necessary impacts unless they are just one aspect of a broader industry support package.

But we must completely understand the underlying value that an auto sector really contributes to our economy. ABS Labor force figures from March this year show that vehicle manufacturing accounts for more than 50,000 jobs across Australia, with another 260,000-plus people employed in associated industries such as automotive parts retail and wholesaling. Indirectly, the job head count this industry supports is even higher.

The multiplier effects of this sector's investment and turnover upon Australia's economy is significant. There are more than 110,000 businesses in the Australian automotive sector. The annual turnover in the Australian automotive industry exceeds \$160 billion. The industry pays more than \$10 billion in tax to Australian governments each year and is the largest contributor to manufacturing, research and development within Australia, investing around \$668 million in 2009-10.

There is also a training and skills factor that has a spillover benefit for other major industries, including the defence, mining and aerospace sector. Dr Remy notes that auto manufacturing generates a skills base comprising mechanical, process and materials engineering, fluid mechanics, CAD/CAM designers, welders, and fitters and turners, alongside specialisations in chassis systems and lubrication products. So, if we lose automotive manufacturing, we inevitably

also lose skills that are transferable to other key industries in South Australia such as mining and defence.

When we lose the capacity to make cars, what other manufacturing might we be losing into the bargain? Will defence manufacturing and mining suffer as a result of the lack of training and skills? How will manufacturing research and development fare with the loss of its most significant investor? The automotive sector drives demand, sustains capabilities and stimulates innovation across the manufacturing sector. Once these manufacturing capabilities are lost, they are lost for good.

Our competitors in the automotive sector are actively protecting their car industries as much as they possibly can. Australian government support is minimal compared to that of our competitors. In the US, both the Bush and Obama administrations have thrown billions into the auto industry, effectively saving both GM and Chrysler from bankruptcy. Billions more in subsidies have been given in the form of sales tax relief and partial tax deductibility for locally produced vehicles.

Japan subsidises green auto technologies and has employed many non-tariff barriers to make foreign market entry into Japan's auto sector difficult. China only does joint ventures, and the EU uses a state aid system to subsidise its auto sector across 27 countries. Thailand, also known as the Detroit of Asia, has taken a deliberate policy to support and attract automotive manufacturing to Thailand. An example is offering a new manufacturer generous tax and import concessions in return for agreed minimum quotas of locally manufactured vehicles.

So our competitors are not arguing about industry and government support. On the contrary, they are doing everything within their power to ensure they hold onto their auto sector. Yet, here in Australia, we continue to debate the benefits of industry support by government, while the Liberal Party advocates abandoning it entirely.

Another recent red herring once again being tossed into this debate is that the cost of labour within Australia makes it unpalatable for the automotive sector to manufacture here. That's just rubbish, and we need to get some facts on the table. Wages contribute approximately 15 per cent to the total cost of vehicle manufacturing in this country. This is not a significant percentage in terms of overall cost.

Holden workers are currently on a wage agreement that provides a 3 per cent wage increase per year for three years. This is on the back of incredible labour adjustment due to the GFC that hit them a few years back. ABS statistics from November 2012 tell us the average full-time adult annual earnings were \$72,436 per year. The majority of Holden workers are at or below the average weekly wage.

Car manufacturers do not set up shop—or, indeed, go offshore—because of labour costs. They set up shop because of domestic market share, export potential and government support. The facts before us right now are very, very simple. A Liberal government will dump \$500 million worth of targeted industry support that has been negotiated with our car industry, including a coinvestment by GM Holden of more than \$1 billion into its Australian operations.

Under a Liberal government GM will close its doors and 16,000 South Australians will lose their jobs. It will be a final death blow to a sector already challenged by the global economic climate and with increasing protectionism from our competitors our car industry will be lost once and for all. Under a Liberal government future generations will never have the opportunity to purchase a car that was proudly built on Australian soil by Australian workers. That is the simple and plain truth. This budget, like this Labor government, invests in jobs, opportunities, skills, and a manufacturing future—the opposite do not.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (16:00): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (16:00): By leave, I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. G.E. Gago) and the minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I note the suggestions from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't let them interrupt you!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (16:01): I won't move them but they should be worthy of consideration by the house at a later point. I move:

That the house note grievances.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:01): I will continue some comments in relation to the Appropriation Bill 2013. Illustrative of the government's financial incompetence was my reference to the rail electrification to Gawler project. Members will recall that in 2010 the Labor Party promised that there would be electrified trains to Gawler by 2013. Well, here we are and, of course, we haven't got them—what went wrong?

Last year, in 2012, after some \$400 million had been spent on train upgrades to the north, including resleepering and the like, the government announced in its budget that it had run out of money—I paraphrase that by saying that they would need to defer the rail electrification to Gawler and that they would have savings of some \$315 million by delaying it. It was not an abandonment, it was a delay.

The government then went through about an eight-month process of having to try to negotiate with minister Albanese to keep its money. It was required to be sent back, and I think over \$40 million was ordered to be returned. This year they have announced that they are going to not restore the project. Having put up poles without their wires out north and abandoned the project last year, this year they announce that \$152 million in the budget is to electrify the railway to Dry Creek.

You would have thought there might have been some enthusiasm from people in the north in thinking perhaps it was on its way. Well, here's the reality: the reality is that depot that the government had redeveloped at Dry Creek was necessary in order to be able to service the electric trains running on the Noarlunga line and, of course, they have to get to Dry Creek.

Some absolute genius in the department has presumably gone to the minister and said, 'Well, actually, minister, we are going to have to electrify the line from Adelaide to Dry Creek otherwise we have to tow the trains by diesel train up to Dry Creek to be maintained and serviced or, alternatively, build another (at enormous cost) in the south to do that.'

So we have this rather humiliating situation where the government, having built half the project, abandoned it and then said it would do a bit more—having left poles in the air—we now have the people in the north not getting their electrified rail service to Gawler any sooner but, in fact, will have the hideous situation of having to watch trains go back and forth across to Dry Creek from Adelaide—from a spot at Mawson Lakes or somewhere there in the north—and see trains go back and forth but, of course, not being available for passenger delivery. The other concerning aspect of this project is that yesterday, when I asked about the total cost of electrifying the Gawler rail line, the Minister for Transport said:

That project is not in the budget and the government has no plans to go all the way to Gawler, so I do not have up-to-date figures.

That is almost unbelievable, to think it is a multimillion dollar project and the Minister for Transport does not even know what the total cost is to do it. Why would you make a decision to even do the Adelaide to Dry Creek section, with an indication that there would be further work done at a later time, and leave that available, without having some idea of the total value? Of course, suffice to say, we are back here today—no mention of what that total price is.

It is inconsistent, I would have to say, with statements that have been made by the Premier since the budget announcements, which have confirmed repeatedly that the government does have plans to proceed with it. The people of South Australia clearly need to know what is going on.

Of course, we are no closer to being able to identify anything about this project. Members may not be surprised to hear that, yet again, under freedom of information, we have been denied any timely provision of information on this particular project.

Some months ago, I FOI'd the reports prepared in respect of reviews of the rail electrification that included reports prepared by Interfleet on that process. The response from the department was that they would need an extension of time of some months to find one particular report—one report. Further inquiry indicated that that would be needed. That was referred to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman agreed with us that it was perfectly reasonable for them to go down to wherever they store their reports—on a computer or in the basement somewhere—and deliver the report in a reasonable time. They still did not do it.

Those months now, that they said that they needed, have expired. They still have not produced the report and, of course, we will go through the usual process of lodging a review et al. Months later, on a current project that the government and, apparently, the cabinet have already signed off on to do—they actually started and cancelled it and restarted a bit of it—we are still denied access to this information.

We were not provided with information in a timely manner either by the minister in this place, either by inquiry by correspondence, either by the timely response to questions—and I notice from the Minister for Transport Services I got answers to questions that we asked in November last year that were tabled here today—nor, indeed, through the FOI process.

The denial of some reasonable access to information is very concerning, and it is heightened by the fact that just recently I had reported to me—it is interesting the information that comes to the fore to the opposition—that the new tactic of the department, allegedly under the instruction of the minister's office (you start to wonder who is running the show here), is that the way to thwart Vickie Chapman's FOI applications is to stamp them with the stamp 'draft'. That will stop her from being able to get access to that information.

I have had every trick in the book. I continue to go to the District Court. With the District Court, I am pleased to say, and the Ombudsman I think we have had many more wins than we have had losses; but I will say this: every trick in the book. I even had an application for an FOI rejected on the basis that it would compromise Aboriginal heritage, after putting in writing in the initial application that there would be no such attempt whatsoever to interfere with that.

I made a simple inquiry as to what protection that alleged information had had from other members of the department reading it. It was like the Hindmarsh Bridge all over again—the secret letters, who read it, and who did not read it, all designed to stop getting information, in that instance, about child protection on the APY lands and the alleged drug abuse in those circumstances. That data was rejected on the basis of it being in breach of Aboriginal cultural interests. I have had every trick in the book thrown at me about the information and it is not acceptable that, as a representative in the parliament, this sort of tactic is used to try to subvert any reasonable information to the public.

To give you a second illustration closer to home: for 11 years I have been in this parliament and for 11 years I have been going to the government to say, 'You need to sort out the Britannia roundabout.' It is a traffic nightmare. RAA put it at No. 1 on its recent Risky Roads survey. There is something like 59,000 cars a day that go through it and there are 60 plus accidents a year, on average. It is clearly a road safety hazard. We all know that. So, what happens? They come up with the twin circle solution this year—the cheap option. I should be grateful we got something, I suppose, because, regrettably, the former minister for transport's twin signal proposal was dumped by the minister now member for Elder.

I should be grateful that something is being done. Signage alone will surely help the safety aspects there. What is extraordinary is that, each year I write to whoever is the minister for transport and ask for regular briefings and, until a couple of years ago, I was given regular briefings. The last correspondence I received in December of last year from the then minister for transport now member for Elder, was, essentially, 'We are still working on it. We are looking at overways. We are looking at grade separation. We are looking at a whole lot of projects.' He did not mention anything about a twin circle solution.

Mr Hook has told us publicly on the radio that it just popped up as an idea from some engineer and was sort of thrown into the mix. That is totally inconsistent with information given to me by the former transport minister in correspondence in December of last year, and guess what? 'No, we are not going to be giving you a briefing in relation to what is happening in your electorate.'

We are not going to tell you what is happening, because we have not made any decision about what work we are going to do yet', and the allegation in the correspondence that that could be misused or misinterpreted.

This is the new government tactic: not to let anybody know what is going on in their own electorate. Recently, when I put questions to the Minister for Transport on upgrades in the electorate, I was given the same answer. It is not acceptable that we have that information concealed from the public.

Time expired.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (16:11): I want to make some comment in my grievance debate about the government response to the budget, in particular the contributions by the heavy hitters, the Minister for Finance and the Minister for Transport. It was sort of the Dean Martin and Jerry Lewis response to the budget, and I want to explain why I would make that reflection.

The Minister for Finance came in and essentially read, on my understanding, a summary of an article that was in the Australian *Financial Review* some time ago. I read the same article. It was about a group of economists who had a particular view about what has and has not worked in Europe. I think the government itself has said at times that, the problem with getting 10 economists in the room is you get 11 opinions. So, while I appreciate the minister coming in and putting on the table his view about why that particular economic report might be of value, I would much rather look at what the Minister for Finance is actually saying. What he is really saying is this: 'Don't worry South Australia, we can afford to do what we're doing, everything is okay'.

I just want to reflect on where we are. What this government has delivered is this: it has delivered the highest debt in the state's history. It has delivered the highest deficit in the state's history. We are the highest taxed state in Australia. The business community has the highest WorkCover levy in Australia. We have the highest electricity prices in Australia. We have the highest capital city water prices in Australia. South Australia, according to the Queensland Audit Commission, pays the highest amount on its interest in Australia.

What the Minister for Finance is saying is, 'Don't worry South Australia. Your cost of living might go through the roof. You might have the highest taxes in Australia, highest water prices, high electricity prices, highest WorkCover prices, but don't worry it's all under control.' What he cannot answer is this: if it is all under control why has the government announced a \$949 million cut to health? Why have they done that if things are under control? Why has the government announced a \$250 million cut to education, and why has the government announced a \$150 million cut to police?

The government cannot have it both ways. If everything is under control, why are they cutting \$1 billion out of health, why are they cutting \$250 million out of education and why are they cutting \$150 million out of police? The answer to that question is simply this: they have mismanaged the budget.

Only yesterday, the Treasurer came in and had to correct his own budget, this year's budget, increasing the amount the government overspent to \$637 million. It was not a revenue problem this year. This year, all the government had to do was spend what it budgeted to spend and this state would have been \$637 million better off—that is an Adelaide Oval project.

The poor old Minister for Finance comes in. It was a magnificent economic theory out of a *Financial Review*, based on an international report, but let us go back to what the Minister for Finance himself said about his own state management of the finances. What the Minister for Finance said, as told to *The Australian*, is this:

We are actually having to borrow to pay wages...that is unsustainable...We are in a position as a government if we were being financed by the banks, they would pull the overdraft on us because we are currently, year on year, operating in the red.

That was not Her Majesty's loyal opposition, that was not some economist examining the European market: that was the now Minister for Finance commenting on his own government's budget management.

My suggestion to the government is they concentrate more on budget management and less on the *Financial Review*, because they have run six deficits in seven years—a total budget deficit of \$3,000 million just on the operational side of the budget. Don't worry about the capital, don't worry about the Southern Expressway or the superhighway or the desal plant or Adelaide

Oval, that is on the other side of the budget. Just on the departmental side of the budget, the operational side of the budget, this government has overspent by \$3,000 million.

The Minister for Finance says, 'Don't worry. We have only overspent by \$3,000 million, but we've got the right model.' Well, if people out there want to know why their water price is so high, why the price of their driver's licence and why the price of their car registrations are so high—why do you think they are all too high?—it is because the government has to charge higher taxes to recoup the interest on our debt.

We have a bigger debt now than at any time in our state's history, and we are going to be paying as a state \$952 million a year in interest—that is more than we are going to pay the police. It is more than the police budget. Commissioner Burns wishes he was the bank interest line. He would have another \$60 million or \$70 million in his police budget. What the Minister for Finance wants us to believe is that they are such good managers and that it is good management to spend more on interest than on the police budget.

The other heavy hitter I want to talk about today and respond to is the infamous Minister for Transport, who is running around with a scare campaign saying, 'Will you rule this out? Will you rule that out?' All I want the Minister for Transport to do is explain why the government cannot keep a promise. Why can they not keep a promise?

They have promised a surplus in every budget, and they have delivered deficits. They have promised \$2.6 billion in surpluses; they have delivered \$2.4 billion in deficits. They promised seven budget surpluses; they have delivered six budget deficits. They promised to keep the AAA credit rating; they have deliberately lost the AAA credit rating. They promised not to run up a credit card debt; we have got the highest debt in the state's history. They promised that South Australia would be a different place when BHP expanded and, of course, they could not deliver the deal. They promised no more privatisations on that famous pledge card given to every South Australia and, guess what, they have sold the Lotteries, they have sold the forests.

They promised cheaper electricity prices, and we now have the highest electricity rates in the world. They promised no more increases in water prices, and water prices have gone up 249 per cent. They promised Adelaide Oval would cost \$450 million and not a cent more; that project is well north of \$600 million. They promised the new Royal Adelaide Hospital would be \$1.7 billion; it is adding \$2.8 billion to our debt.

They announced a prisons PPP project and, guess what, they scrapped it. Then they promised the expansion of the Mount Bold Reservoir and, guess what, they scrapped that. Then they promised the Sturt Road-South Road overpass in the 2006 election and, just in case we missed it, they promised it again in the 2010 election and, guess what, they have not scrapped that once, they have scrapped it twice.

Then they announced the Grange Road-Port Road-South Road upgrade, a \$122 million tunnel; they scrapped that because they were going to do the Darlington end of South Road. Then when Tony Abbott announced the Darlington end of South Road, guess what, they scrapped that and ran back to the other end of South Road and said, 'Now we've cancelled that. We were going to do this, we'll cancel that, and now we're going to do this at that end.'

Honestly, can this government keep a promise? They announced the Darlington interchange, and they cancelled it. They said that there is no way that South Australia needed an ICAC and, guess what, we've got one. They said that South Australia did not need a desal plant and, guess what, we've got a really, really big one. So, the only question I want the Minister for Transport to answer, the only question the media have to ask him every time he pops his head up with a scare campaign is: why can't this government keep a promise?

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:21): Gee whiz, the shadow treasurer has just brought out a corker.

Mr Gardner: It's a warm-up.

Mr WHETSTONE: It's a warm-up! I would like to continue my remarks on the Appropriation Bill. Yesterday, I was cut short as I had just started talking about the lack of budget support for rural roads. Rural roads are almost the artery for infrastructure and commodity movement here in South Australia. Sadly, for the last 10 to 15 years, what we have seen is a centralisation of a lot of the grain terminals and wineries. We are seeing a centralisation of most commodity industries. They are starting to move to larger towns and, in some cases, they are moving interstate because of the cost of doing business here in South Australia.

What we are seeing is increased road traffic. We are seeing increased numbers of trucks and we are seeing specifically increased numbers of EB trains or B-doubles. The reason we are seeing that is economies of scale; we are seeing cost efficiencies coming into play. But what that means is that we are seeing more trucks on the road, more wear and tear on the roads, but we are seeing no more maintenance. We are seeing no more money put towards the maintenance of our country and regional roads.

I live on those roads. I live on the Sturt Highway, which is the main highway from Adelaide to Sydney, and I am seeing an increased number of trucks on almost a daily basis. Every trucking operation I visit and every transport operation I talk to, their numbers are increasing. They are putting on more trucks, more trailers and more drivers because we are using road transport more often, but we are not maintaining the roads. We are not looking after the roads that are moving our produce and freight from terminal to terminal, and it is becoming dangerous.

The Sturt Highway is a federal road; yes. It is a much more busy road than it was five years ago; yes. We have got the federal maintenance programs underway, but when we look behind the scenes at our state and council roads, they are continually being degraded. I think, as every regional member here would know, the biggest issue on our state roads are the shoulders. The deterioration of those shoulders is due to trucks passing and the roads getting narrower and narrower.

I have issues with trucks banging mirrors on corners and I have issues with trucks not having a line of sight going around a corner. We are seeing continued injuries and road accidents on our regional roads and yet we are now seeing a road maintenance backlog of well over \$200 million. We are seeing our road fatalities increase on regional roads; we are seeing our accidents increase on regional roads, and yet we are seeing no more funding, no more support being put into the maintenance of those roads.

That is something that is very, very disappointing particularly. The regional bent on this budget is almost a highlight that it does not matter: it is out of sight and it is out of mind. Again, I call on the state government to put some priority into maintenance and upkeep to keep our roads driveable but, more importantly, to keep our regional roads safe.

The government has taken \$100 million from the Motor Accident Commission to prop up its road safety, yet MAC is supposed to be a dedicated fund to look after people injured in road accidents. So the government has actually gone to MAC and agreed to take the \$100 million and I will say that MAC has given it willingly so that money can actually be put towards dedicated funds, but it is not what that organisation is there to do. It is about the government taking responsibility; it is about the government being smart with getting commonwealth funding to upgrade our roads.

I notice that the Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure were at an opening of a mine recently down at Mindarie and people came up and said, 'Oh, it's great to see that the state government has upgraded the shoulders on the roads away from the mine.' It was a federal government project, the Black Spot Campaign, that upgraded the shoulder. It was not the state government.

By the way, the road does not finish at Karoonda. The ore that comes out of the Mindarie mines does not stop at Karoonda: it goes all the way to the ports; it goes all the way to the export terminals to be exported overseas. Again, that just highlights that the government is hiding behind a federal campaign saying, 'Isn't it wonderful that we've upgraded this road away from a mine?'

The Risky Roads campaign was organised by the RAA here in South Australia and seven of the 10 problem roads that are part of the Risky Roads campaign—believe it—are regional roads. Why are they regional roads? Because we have not got a budget for the regional roads maintenance program. Again, it is just another thing that really does grind my gears when I have to travel on those roads. My electorate is ever-increasing in size; the roads are ever-decreasing in quality; they are ever-decreasing in safety, and it is something that really does need to be put on the agenda.

The government cannot continue to ignore the condition of our roads. Yes, it is fine to do the upgrade of superways and duplication of southern expressways, but they also need to have that balance. They need to make a priority of looking after our regional roads. It is becoming dangerous; it is becoming ever-increasingly busy, but we are not looking at making those roads safer, particularly for the cars, particularly for our youth.

We have L-platers in the regions on a federal highway because that is how they get from one town to the next; they have to drive on a federal highway. They are dealing with B-doubles; they are dealing with oncoming traffic; and they are dealing with traffic that is doing 110 km/h. Recently I had some young friends of my children up to visit and they could not believe the number of trucks on the road and the danger they faced just leaving my driveway onto the Sturt Highway. They came back almost in a sweat, not realising just exactly what they were up against on those roads.

We deal with the lack of width of lanes and we deal with the challenging conditions of road surfaces. We are dealing with the poor condition of many road markers. It is not about dealing with them, it is about dealing with them not being there. We deal with the need for road upgrades and the continual repainting of white lines, and the markers are missing, the reflectors are missing and the white posts are knocked over.

We have agricultural machinery and wide loads coming down the highways knocking over kilometres of white posts. Six months later those white posts are still lying in the bushes because they have not been fixed, so there is an issue with priorities on our roads. It is about dealing with the hazards and the danger that people are continually being faced with—whether they are truck operators, constituents driving from town to town, or young L-platers or P-platers having to deal with a very dangerous situation.

As I have already said, there are an increasing number of trucks on our regional roads. As the member for Hammond would know, one thing that was highlighted when we were on the grains committee was the danger of carting grain on our roads. There was the danger of trucks passing on the bends, knocking one another's mirrors off and not being able to see sight of vision around the corner because of overhanging vegetation. Keeping our roads safe is about putting a budget towards that overhanging vegetation.

There are issues with country health. Again, we see numbers being reduced in our country hospitals. If we look at education, obviously there are going to be hundreds of full-time jobs lost with these budget measures. If we look at grassroots sport in our regions—something dear to your heart, Mr Deputy Speaker—we see a \$3.6 million reduction in funding for recreation, sport and racing. Yet, these are the priorities: a \$3 million lift at Adelaide Oval. Where are the priorities? Grassroots sport is what this state was built on. If we look at some of our premier sportspeople, where do they come from? They come out of the regions. I will have to finish my remarks another time.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:32): I rise to make another contribution in regard to the recently-delivered budget. The seat of Hammond is very much linked to agriculture and other industries, so I will reiterate my concern about the primary industries' budget being cut by another \$11.5 million and 120 employees going from primary industries. This means that many hundreds of employees have been cut from primary industries over the last four years, as well as \$80 million from the budget. In the budget, we see that rural services, SARDI and Biosecurity South Australia are some of the hardest hit areas.

We have seen regional development cut by \$4 million. We have seen no new road spend in the regions, other than some money spent on some upgrades to a road to the APY lands, and that is great, but what about the rest of regional South Australia? There is a minimal amount of money being spent on rural South Australian roads in comparison to what is being spent in the city.

In regard to the subprograms in agriculture, food and wine, we have seen a decrease in the budget by nearly \$2.5 million. Just in that subprogram there has been a decrease in funding since 2010-11 of \$8.5 million, a decrease in full-time equivalents by 10 people, another hit on industry of \$2.5 million and another \$1.5 million cut to meet budget savings targets.

If we look at Fisheries, we have seen full-time equivalents decrease by four. We have had some of the best-managed fisheries in the world, yet the government is going to implement its marine parks program and use the environment department instead of the primary industries and the fisheries departments to manage fisheries. Our fisheries have been managed sustainably all the time and it is just a matter of shifting the deck chairs in this case.

Let us look at the decrease in the full-time equivalent numbers at the South Australian Research and Development Institute. Full-time equivalents have decreased by 57. This year alone there is a \$2.1 million decrease in the budget to meet savings targets. Just while I am talking about SARDI and budget cuts, I was pleased to attend a meeting in Victor Harbor last Friday night with the member for Finnis and others.

Mr Pengilly: Don't you pinch my speech.

Mr PEDERICK: It's alright, I will just give a little bit. There was Professor Sonia Kleindorfer, who has been doing great work at Flinders University, and has researched for over two decades, especially in light of impacts on Little Penguins, and it was great to hear her story, but I question, why hasn't SARDI been doing this work with government funding? Here we have a government cutting funding all the time, so we see universities having to step up and do the research to see what is the impact on the Little Penguins, especially in regard to New Zealand fur seals.

We look at rural services and the decrease in full-time equivalents by 52, and we look at their budget being cut by \$2.6 million in a rationalisation of services. We get a lot of people talking about biosecurity. Everyone seems to have a bent on biosecurity these days but we see here that there has been a \$5.8 million decrease for it in this budget, and there has been a \$1 million decrease in the budget to meet savings targets.

We have also seen in this budget the forestry sale in the South-East, affecting the seats of Mount Gambier and MacKillop, where the government realised \$670 million, and it has just gone into the black hole. It is only about two-thirds of one year's interest on the debt. So for all the pain the South-East has been through over this issue it is such a waste that these forests were sold for only around half of their value. It is just ridiculous. I have already talked about the impact of money being sucked out of regional development, with \$4 million being taken out of regional development in this budget.

An issue that needs to be looked at more closely by this government, because they do not have enough appreciation of regional areas, is health spending, as I said, especially in the regions. We see plenty of money spent, we see billions being spent in the city for the new Adelaide hospital, and other items, but in the country things are sneakily getting wound back a bit. I see services for mental health getting funding cuts just quietly in areas like the wellness centre in Murray Bridge, which has lost funding for a staffer to keep those doors open to service the many hundreds of visitors who come through there each year for different programs.

I have also just learned that they are shutting down another bed at the Murray Bridge hospital. Why would you do that when more health services should be available in rural South Australia? Is this what is happening because of the thousands of jobs we are hearing are going out of health, and does this mean that 200 of those jobs are going in regional South Australia and will impact on all of us in our regional electorates?

We look at another issue in my electorate that I share with the member for Finnis about the after hours emergency work done by the Goolwa doctors, after they have worked their normal shifts with appointment and other work, whether it is surgical or otherwise during the day. They are then expected to do all the emergency work, and are then expected to turn up the next day. The government does not want to fund that appropriately and now the doctors have threatened to pull the pin, essentially, and to quit. This affects emergency referrals through to the South Coast District Hospital in Victor Harbor.

Mr Pengilly: Shame.

Mr PEDERICK: It is a shame; it is a great shame. It is a growing area and a lot of people retire in Victor Harbor and Goolwa and surrounding areas, and they need decent health services. Here we have a government, just because of budget reasons, I believe, which does not want to pay for the appropriate locum services in the area.

I want to look at some of the issues around education, and I spoke about them in my previous speech. I think education management needs a full revamp. I warmly welcome the autonomy policy of the Liberal Party, because then we might see some real outcomes for public education in this state. I look at things like the rainwater policy imposed by the government. Anyone would think rainwater was poisonous. I have looked at the DECS policy—or DECD, whatever acronym it is this week—and it is atrocious. I have been drinking rainwater all my life and it hasn't shrunk me at all.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Exactly. It doesn't hurt you, I tell you. The biggest problem is that we have people who are risk averse, even though the testing is done by the appropriate plumbers, and now money is going to be wasted at schools like where my children go at Coomandook. Thousands—

probably tens of thousands of dollars—will be spent to plumb in new pipes because they have to put on mains water.

I talk about issues like our road infrastructure, and I commend the member for Chaffey for his comments. There are far too many roads in our electorates where the shoulders are not wide enough, and he was right in mentioning the truckloads of mineral sands going to Adelaide from the Mindarie mine. The road does not stop at Karoonda and they have to keep going, and it is atrocious as you go through Karoonda and head to Murray Bridge or Tailm Bend and you hit the patch at Wynarka.

It would shake the hell out of a truck, I can assure you, because it shakes the hell out of cars going along some of that road and around some of those corners there. Instead, what we have as far as a road maintenance program in South Australia is the government just turns back the speed limit 10 km/h so that you have to drive more slowly. I will also look at what else is happening with the budget, just quickly, in closing my remarks.

It is an absolute disgrace that this government, even though they say they are contributing to Murray River reform and the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, are bleeding \$14 million out of that plan and not supporting it appropriately as well. You cannot say one thing and do another. It just does not work. The Murray River was in grief for many years. I was right at the forefront of that battle and, if you say you are going to support something, you just cannot bleed funding out like this as the state Labor government has.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:42): This morning, I made some fairly broad remarks about the budget. I would like to narrow that down this afternoon to, particularly, the tourism industry in my electorate, both on the Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island. I am desperately concerned about the reduction of money put into tourism by the state government. I think it is a bad move. Tourism is a great industry. It is a word-of-mouth-industry. It is a fun industry, but it is a lot of hard work. The people out there involved in the tourism industry, in particular in my electorate but more widely across the state and the nation, know just how much work it is.

On any given weekend, whether it be summer, winter, or whatever, there are thousands of people who go over the hill at Willunga or over from Mount Barker down onto the Fleurieu into the member for Hammond's area at Goolwa or across to Middleton, Port Elliott and Victor Harbor and across to Yankalilla and Normanville and all points in between. It is the big employer down there, along with the aged care sector, and many jobs rely on tourism.

In saying that, they also rely heavily on marketing. Miranda Lang, from Fleurieu Peninsula Tourism, works very hard, as do the tourism people on Kangaroo Island. I think Whaletime Playtime is a classic example. A couple of weeks ago, you could not move in Victor Harbor for families and kids. The steam trains were on the go and, right on schedule, there were whales. It was a terrific opportunity and it brought a bit of vibrancy to that town, and across to Port Elliot and Middleton as well. It is just such a vital industry, and needs encouraging.

Not only do people go to look at that but also they go to Alexandrina Cheese Company or down into the Hindmarsh Valley cheese places and enjoy the fine products from there or drink the wine. They might come through to my electorate from McLaren Vale. It is an industry that I believe does not get enough support from this government by a long shot.

I noticed that the tourism minister was talking in this place today about regional tourism. The Fleurieu tourism industry is looking to capture more of the international market that goes through there and I think that is very worthwhile. I know that tourism in South Australia is looking at bringing airlines from China straight into Adelaide, to introduce the Chinese market to South Australia. While I applaud that, I will make a few other comments shortly about that aspect.

On weekends, visitors can visit the Fleurieu. Indeed, there are members in this place who regularly visit the Fleurieu and have a great time. However, that does not happen over on the island simply because of the cost of getting there and the fact that you have to take a ferry ride, etc. While the Fleurieu continues to bubble along over winter, on weekends particularly, it really comes to a halt on Kangaroo Island. As I mentioned this morning, the cost of travel plays a big part in that. Also the availability of ferries reduces in winter, as do flights.

I now turn to the island's tourism and I would like to comment on the international side of it. Having had some involvement in tourism before I came to this place, I had a lot to do with international visitors, particularly Europeans—French, Italian, Swiss, German, Italian honeymooners—and the list goes on. There were also considerable numbers of Americans and

increasing numbers of Canadians. What we have seen in the last few years is a large increase in Indian tourism—a number of resident Indians in Australia, I might add—and now there is a push for the Chinese sector to come in.

I will pose a word of warning. I am a little bit concerned that the big push for Chinese tourism by some may well be at the expense of our traditional markets such as Europe, the United States and North America. I do not think that we should ignore them too much. Indeed, the United States' economy is starting to turn around and pick up and, from what I glean from some of the operators, some of the European market numbers are slowly increasing, which is good.

However, the Chinese market in particular is very price sensitive. They screw down operators to the last cent in order to get better deals. They screw them down on accommodation costs and tour costs. That is fine; that is the way they operate and I can understand that. I am just suggesting that we need to make sure that we put plenty into our traditional markets. By all means we should support and accommodate Chinese tourists who are coming into Australia, and if we can get an airline from China flying into Adelaide that is all for the better.

I know that the council on the island is trying to achieve a \$17 million grant to do something with the airport. I have raised concerns about that. I think that needs a lot more thought. I am not privy to the business case and I am not sure about pursuing the federal government for that sort of funding, to bring aircraft from interstate to land at Kingscote. My view is that the airline industry is based on spokes and hubs: the hubs being the main centres like Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney and the spokes being regional centres like Port Lincoln, Kangaroo Island, etc.

Spending millions of dollars on the airport over there needs to be very carefully thought out. That could well be at the expense of the only airline that operates there, Rex, which local people need to use as well. I urge caution on that and think that it should be thought through.

The notice in the *Gazette*—that government charges are out—I am going through and scrutinising that, particularly on park entry fees. The parks on the Fleurieu Peninsula are, to all intents and purposes, free of charge to enter. That is not the case on the island. Places like Seal Bay, Kelly Hill Caves, Flinders Chase, Cape Borda and Cape Willoughby are all at a cost. Seal Bay, for example, is a gold mine for the Department of Environment, etc.—an absolute goldmine. They have nearly thrown the baby out with the bathwater financially, because the numbers have reduced substantially in Seal Bay and Flinders Chase. They have just made it too expensive. They are trying to cream off the money; they are actually making it difficult for families.

I believe that tourism into all areas of my electorate is for families as well as others, but I think they need to be very careful, this department. They are making it an elitist destination, and families simply cannot afford \$70-odd to go to Seal Bay. They cannot do it; it is just beyond them. I think it is greed and mismanagement by the Department of Environment. I would say that places like Seal Bay have been taken out of local management. They are managed from ground management, but the business side of it is now stuck here in Adelaide—surprise, surprise! I think it is spoiling what could be a good experience for many more families. Yes, the numbers are monitored on the beach, but they are making it an elitist destination.

There is another thing that the government have failed on in this marketing program. Yes, they did a large marketing program over there last year, and they are doing one in the Barossa now; that's good. However, what pops up pretty regularly for the island is Southern Ocean Lodge. That costs \$1,800 per night per couple. That is well beyond the workers who work around Adelaide in manufacturing, and any other place. It is beyond them; they cannot do it. It is beyond me and probably beyond most people in this place, with the exception of a couple. It is fantastic—

Mr Pegler: Name them.

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Mount Gambier said he's going to stay there, I think. It is beyond most people. You need to be very careful about what you are doing in the tourism industry and not break its back. By all means, the government needs to put more money into it, but in the case of the island do not make it an elitist destination. Someone in the current government needs to talk to these fools in the Department for Environment and tell them to get their heads back out of the clouds and encourage your average visitor to go back to Seal Bay or Flinders Chase. It is just too expensive, it is a foolish move. I am very supportive of tourism, always have been, always will be, and I will continue to be, but in the meantime this government needs to take a long hard look at where they are going with it all.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (16:52): I might say that I have heard quite a few say in this house that they have degrees in economics. Well, I can certainly assure you that I do not; I went through the school of hard knocks instead. I do have grave concerns with this budget. The net operating deficit for 2010-11 was \$427 million, and then the next year it was \$284 million.

Of course, this year we have spent \$1,314 million more than what we have earned. It was predicted to be a deficit of \$867 million; so there is certainly some major concerns there on where we are going financially. Of course, on top of that, you have the sale of the pines in the South-East, and the lotteries. With those pines, it took our forebears 100 years to build that estate up, and we have blown that money in six months, which is quite incredible and an indictment on us, and future generations will wonder what the hell we were doing.

The net debt of this state over the last six years has gone from \$82 million to \$659 million, to \$1,587 million to \$3,217 million, to \$4,282 million, and now, \$5,611 million. It keeps going up and up, and we have to arrest that at some stage. What really worries me is the projections into the future of the budget forecast, with a forecast next year of a net operating deficit of \$911 million and a debt of \$6,951 million.

This could really blow out, given that the state final demand is predicted to rise by 1.25 per cent, when it has actually fallen by 2.6 per cent in the last year. On top of this, total revenue is predicted to rise by 5 per cent in 2014-15, by 9 per cent in 2015-16 and by 6 per cent in 2016-17. I feel that those figures are quite optimistic and if those growths in revenue do not happen the impact on the end result will be quite dire.

I believe that many of our financial woes go back to pre the global financial crisis. Our government at that time overspent and overcommitted future governments. There was a time when they should have been putting a lot of money away. I know they did reduce debt, but they should have been putting money away then for when times were tougher, and, of course, they allowed the public sector to grow by 21 per cent in 10 years, which is way above what our population growth was in that time. So, that is where most of the mistakes were made.

Governments themselves and the management of the finances of governments are different to private enterprise in the fact that during good times in private enterprise there is a lot of money to be spent on infrastructure and on getting your house in order so that when things are tough you can go through and, of course, you get the tax breaks while you are doing it. Whereas with governments, I do believe that when the times are good they should be salting that money away for when times are tough so that they can then spend money on infrastructure, which keeps the whole economy of that state going. So, governments certainly have a responsibility to be flush when things are tough so that private enterprise can be the beneficiary of those government bills.

I believe that in this state we have major problems with compliance and regulations costs for both government and all businesses. The more we bring in rules on how we go about business, both in government and private enterprise, the greater the costs and the greater the reduction in productivity. I feel that we are over-governed and we should be looking at that properly.

I also believe, and I have said this in every budget, that we need a complete review of how we go about doing our business so that we can gain productivity improvements. At present, we have a dictate, basically, that every department has to have an improvement of 1 per cent on productivity. I do not think this is the way to go about it because I believe that there would be some departments that are extremely productive and the 1 per cent is an imposition on them, and then there are probably other departments where much greater improvements could be made.

There is no point in having a set rule. What should be happening is there should be somebody from outside of government looking into every department to see where those productivity gains can be made, and that is not necessarily about getting rid of people or anything like that, it is about making sure that we do business in the best way possible. I hear quite a few people talk about reductions in Public Service numbers. We have to have teachers. We have to have nurses and doctors. We have to have policemen. We just have to make sure that in the administration of those organisations we are doing it in the best way possible.

I congratulate the government on the reduction in payroll tax. I know it is only in for two years but the future government can make that permanent. That reduction in payroll tax is certainly going to make us very competitive with other states, in particular New South Wales and Victoria. I think in New South Wales the payroll tax cuts in at \$689,000 and it is at 5.45 per cent and in Victoria it kicks in at \$550,000 and is at 4.9 per cent. So, we are certainly going to be very competitive with other states into the future as far as payroll tax goes.

I hear a lot about there being nothing for the regions. I have heard this all my life, when we were being governed by both Liberal and Labor governments. People out in the regions have always said that there is nothing for the regions, but, when you have a look at the budget, it is a \$16.18 billion budget, and 31 per cent of that goes into health, another 26 per cent goes into education, 8 per cent into social security and 10 per cent into law and order. So, three-quarters of the budget goes into all those things that happen out in the regions and within Adelaide. The last 25 per cent is spent on roads and all those things, so there is not a lot of money left.

Anybody who criticises how the money is spent, I think, has to come up with alternatives rather than just being critical. As far as Mount Gambier goes, the government made \$1.85 million available for marine facilities at Port MacDonnell. I see the federal government just announced yesterday or the day before a further \$750 million for that, so there will be a \$2.5 million build there. Of course, the ambulance station is going ahead and we have heard about the gaol and the hospital build.

Whilst we all complain about our roads, one of the great advantages I probably have is in living so close to Victoria. If you go across the border and you see the roads there compared to what we have in South Australia, we should feel quite proud. I know there are a lot of roads that need doing, but they are in nowhere near the shape that they are in Victoria.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: It's the opposite when you drive to Queensland.

Mr PEGLER: Yes, it might be the opposite when you drive to Queensland, but I don't drive to Queensland from home too often. I also congratulate the government on setting up the food and wine clusters in both the South-East and the Riverland. I think it shows a little bit of faith in an industry that is so important to this state. Too often, I think that agriculture in this state is forgotten. We continue to see cutbacks in research and development and biosecurity, etc., to an industry that is really the backbone of this state. Of course, the government has been very good with grants for various sporting clubs, but I am quite upset that the regional sports grants may finish.

Time expired.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (17:02): One of the first points I would like to address is that, when the current major projects come to an end—the upgrade of the railway lines, the Adelaide Oval, the new hospital and the Southern Expressway—we will face a major issue in terms of ensuring that the construction industry is kept going in this state. It is going to be a challenge because the state budget, from now on, is going to be very tight and, if there is a change of government federally, then I think money to the states is going to be somewhat curtailed.

The point I was making yesterday in this place links in with that. I think we have to be careful in terms of net debt and deficits—I know that—but we cannot allow, and the government should not allow, the economy to grind to a halt, particularly with construction projects. Spending has to be prudent, but I think there are some projects that need to be considered. One would be the duplication of the Dukes Highway, which should have happened years ago.

I do not have a problem with spending money on projects and on activities that are productive and create wealth, but the construction industry will shortly be facing a major challenge. We currently have a lot of Victorian companies coming over here to try to get work, but our own construction people are going to be under a challenge in the very near future.

Some of the other infrastructure that could be engaged in includes roads that need upgrading. The member for Hammond mentioned the section of road between Murray Bridge and Loxton. That road needs a major upgrade. It is a very busy, major arterial road now and it is still lacking, particularly when you look at the use to which that road is put. There are other roads that certainly need attention, but the Dukes Highway duplication is one that should be considered in the very near future.

In terms of other infrastructure, I agree 100 per cent with the member for Finniss that we need, and the government needs, to focus more on supporting local tourism. I know we all enjoy going overseas, but we have here in South Australia some fantastic areas, not just the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Fleurieu Peninsula. As I have mentioned recently, just going up to a place such as Mannum for a few hours is fantastic. Even if you are there for only a few hours, you are spending money and helping the local country town survive.

Down in the Fleurieu, we have wonderful towns and wonderful produce, and we need to be promoting them more. I see in the Melbourne newspapers that the SA government is promoting the Barossa; I saw an ad the other day. We need, and the government needs, to do a lot more of that

to encourage not only South Australians but people interstate to come here to have a look at what we have and to see the produce we have available. We have fancy shops in the city selling imported jams and products from overseas; we have better quality locally-made products than what is brought in from overseas.

We need to get our own people to visit and stay in some of these regional areas, and that would be helped, too, if the airports in the key tourist areas were upgraded significantly so that they can take the largest jets or close to the largest jets. A lot of people in other parts of the world do not have the same length of holiday as Australians enjoy, and they do not have a lot of time to spend, so you would need to be able to fly them close to those tourist areas so that they can enjoy what is offered and they can have easy access by way of aircraft to those areas.

In regard to other matters that are linked to tourism—and I stand to be corrected—I do not believe that the government supports SteamRanger to any significant degree. That is the sort of tourist activity that should be supported and encouraged. The government has withdrawn funding for the National Trust, yet the National Trust looks after a lot of properties which are owned by the state. Much of what the National Trust owns is not ever put on display because it does not have the resources to display all of those heritage items. The government should be supporting the National Trust rather than withdrawing funding.

Linked in with this, of course—one of my hobbyhorses—is that we still do not have in South Australia a comprehensive social history museum to showcase what this state has achieved and will continue to achieve. I think that it should be integrated with traditional Aboriginal culture—we have fantastic Aboriginal artefacts—and we could have living displays as well. We have, I understand, the biggest collection of Aboriginal artefacts anywhere, yet they are not shown to the public. The government, along with the Adelaide City Council, needs to get serious in having a place where we can showcase what has been invented and developed here. I do not have an objection if they can get Rupert Murdoch to come on board because News Limited started here.

We as a state have pioneered a whole lot of things that have contributed and added to the welfare of people not only in South Australia but throughout the world, yet nowhere is it showcased the fact that we invented a whole lot of things here, such as the stump-jump plough and the photocopier, and developed political processes, including the secret ballot and the Torrens title, all of those sorts of things, yet people coming to the state know nothing about it, and tourists, as well as locals, want to see those things. If I visit a country, I want to have a look at what that culture has generated, yet we do not highlight those particular achievements.

But it goes beyond tourism, and one of my concerns is the decline in a lot of our country towns. They are fantastic places, but sadly a lot of them are losing population and services, and we should be encouraging (and the government should be encouraging) people to live in those country towns—whether they are retired, or otherwise. The infrastructure is already there, the housing is often there and with modern technology it should be possible to create employment opportunities in some of those country towns. It saddens me to go to country areas and see towns which are literally dying before one's eyes.

In relation to traffic issues, as I said yesterday, I think the Minister for Road Safety is coming onboard in terms of improving signage, but we need to go beyond that in terms of catering for cyclists and motorists alike who, particularly during the warmer months, are out in their hundreds on the Hills roads enjoying a bike ride, yet some of the roads are not suited to having cars and cyclists on them at the same time.

You cannot pass a lot of the cyclists. Legally, they can ride two abreast, but in fairness they often go in single file. I fear that there are going to be tragedies on some of these country roads, through the Hills in particular, because motorists cannot get past, there is no provision for them to get past, and you have cyclists who are legitimately out enjoying themselves and doing the right thing. People are going to take risks and we are going to see some tragedies.

So on the popular cycling routes through the Hills there needs to be some attention given to catering for the cyclists so they can enjoy their bike ride and, likewise, motorists can get on with what they want to do without being jeopardised, either, with people trying to overtake on double lines and that sort of thing.

We need improved signage. I have been trying to get improved signage on the freeway. Between Hahndorf and Callington there is no reminder of the speed limit. That is where the police like to catch people. For some reason that is beyond me, the department does not want to spend \$80 on a sign to remind people what the speed limit it is. I think it is important to remind people of

the speed limit; we need better signage in many places, and should follow the example of New South Wales where they do it really well.

In terms of some local road improvements in my area, the junction of Chandlers Hill Road and Bishops Hill Road needs attention, and we need an extra lane on Flagstaff Hill Road. I know money is tight, but they should be in the planning phase at least with improvements to those particular roads. So there is a range of issues that a future budget would address.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:12): I would like to use this budget reply speech grievance opportunity to focus on issues in corrections. As I mentioned yesterday in my main budget reply speech, this budget does include money going towards Correctional Services which is a very positive thing. It includes \$2.9 million over four years for bail housing, 30 beds, \$66 per bailee per day (which I think is an exceptionally low budget) and \$6.3 million over four years for the operational costs of the 20 beds that are nearly completed at the Adelaide Women's Prison.

Of course, it is fair to ask, 'Well, that prison has been planned to be built for a very long time, so why wasn't that operational money put earlier into the budget?' There is \$6.1 million per year for the operational costs of 108 new beds at Mount Gambier, which are also nearly complete. So one can ask the same question: why wasn't that money put into previous budgets? I suspect the answer is, so it would look like they might end up in surplus, which, of course, they haven't.

There is \$25.4 million over four years to build 60 more beds at Mount Gambier, in addition to the 108, but no additional operating funding for those beds. So if they are actually to be built within the next four years, why isn't there some money in the budget explaining exactly how they are going to be funded and run? It also includes \$6.2 million for operational costs of the 20 new beds at Port Lincoln prison, which are already operational. They are already up and running, but now we are just getting money into the budget for their operation and their running. Clearly, that is very poor financial management but, unfortunately, that is not the end of it. Probably even more important is the fact that, unfortunately, these beds will not be enough, based on current prisoner growth numbers.

According to FOIs that I have put in and received the information back, our prison system reached full capacity on 9 April this year when there were 2,267 prisoners in custody, and our prison system has the official capacity for 2,266 prisoners. The system is clearly under enormous stress and, of course, what has had to happen is that the hardworking people from the Department for Correctional Services have had to put in temporary beds at Mount Gambier and the City Watch House, and perhaps even other places that I am not aware of, so that they can manage this demand in excess of supply.

ABS figures tell us that this growth in prisoner numbers is all in secure prisoners, at the top end. These are the people who require being put into prisons and it would not be acceptable to put these people into bail housing situations, as has been proposed. I certainly hope that this oversupply—if that is the right word—of prisoners is not going to mean that some people who require secure incarceration are pushed down into low security or no-security facilities.

Growth in prisoner numbers over the last 10 years has been 3.9 per cent per annum, and in the last two years it has been 4.1 per cent per annum. Let's say that a very good indicative number is 4 per cent per annum which, based on current prisoner numbers, is 90 prisoners per year. The extra beds that I have just mentioned, which the government has announced the building of, are not going to keep up with that growth. The extra beds that are in the budget are made up of 60 additional beds at Mount Gambier, 108 additional beds at Mount Gambier, 30 bail beds—so even including those very low-security beds—and 20 at the Adelaide Women's Prison. That adds up to 218 beds.

At current growth rates of 90 prisoners per year we will reach that capacity, if all of those beds were built immediately, in two years and five months and all those beds would be full. The budget says that these extra beds will be built over four years, not two years and five months. However, even if they were all done straightaway, in two years and five months—which is a little bit over halfway through the budget forward estimates period—all the beds that are planned to be built, plus the existing ones, will all be full.

Our capacity will get to 2,484 beds, but that capacity will all be needed in two years and five months, which puts extraordinary pressure on the prison system and on the police. As I mentioned before, not only are many of these beds funded to be built but not funded to be run, they

will not actually meet the demand that is necessary. They will not be sufficient to cater for the number of prisoners that are required.

What is the government going to do? Perhaps next year it could announce some more funding. If we are in government, perhaps we could announce some more funding, but the budget is going to be under extraordinary pressure. I challenge the government and the minister to come out and say how he thinks that what he has in this budget is going to be sufficient to meet the demand, because clearly it is not. The other thing the government could do, of course, is say, 'Well, we are actually just not going to grow our prisoner population by 90 per year.'

That 4 per cent seems to have been pretty steady for a decade or so, so let's assume that crime continues as it does and let's assume that police do what they have been doing for the last 10 years. How on earth is that going to be done? You obviously cannot tell the police, 'Look, don't go and catch as many crooks.' You obviously cannot have a system where the people who require medium to high-security imprisonment do not get that and go into low-security imprisonment. This is a problem that is very serious and very genuine, and I challenge the government to come out and explain exactly how it is going to deal with this issue.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (17:19): I also would like to speak on the Appropriation Bill. Whilst I understand that everyone, including this state government, is facing very trying times with finances, but we need to keep a good control on our expenditure. I, along with the member for Mount Gambier, am concerned about the ever-growing deficit; however, I feel that if there is to be a deficit, it needs to be in infrastructure, not in social justice and things like that. However, the people of regional South Australia and, in particular, the electors of Frome are very appreciative of these challenges and understand them very clearly, but it is very disappointing to read that regional South Australia again has not received any large amounts of funding that will directly assist the people in the regions who are facing very hard times, with the ever-increasing cost of utilities and associated activities.

It is pleasing to see that extra work has been carried out on the Whyalla hospital with regard to new and enhanced cancer facilities and equipment but, as stated in the budget, this is very generously assisted with commonwealth funds. This assistance is needed in the country. Cancer is a very personal and invasive issue and we need to get as much help as we can out into the regions to allow people to get treatment closer to their homes. I encourage the government to not only look at Whyalla but look at putting more of those facilities in other hospitals.

The electorate of Frome is pleased to see funds continue towards the establishment of the Port Pirie GP Plus centre, a project that has been on the agenda for many years, and this goes back to before I joined this house, in my time as the mayor of the Port Pirie Regional Council. Again, this is a project that has been going on for many years. I am also very appreciative of the previous funds allocated under the Black Spot Program for some road junctions across the electorate of Frome and look forward to other funding from the Black Spot Program, which is a partnership of both the state and commonwealth governments.

There are several issues that have been previously applied and relocated to Adelaide from the regions, and one of these is Shared Services, which was to achieve vast amounts of savings, but in actual fact has achieved the opposite. It is now costing more to operate than previously and has been very detrimental to the regional areas. I ask that the government reconsider the operation of Shared Services and look at bringing it back to where it was before. There is no shame in saying 'We got it wrong. We made a mistake; let's go back to the best opportunity. We can handle these issues in regional South Australia.'

Small business operators are doing it tough and, even though there has been some relief in payroll taxes, it may be too late in some cases to allow some of these small business operators to survive. To be able to feel secure in your employment in the regions, you need to have a successful employer and, unfortunately, there are many business operators in the regions that are not growing but are just hanging on.

I will mention again that I am disappointed there has been no nominated road funding for Frome. In actual fact I see very little for regional South Australia. Our resources for the state are produced in the main from regional locations and it is getting harder to be able to transport these products to an export location due to the deteriorating road infrastructure and declining rail standards. This, coupled with the lack of another nearer port, is making it very hard for the emerging mining companies to get their products efficiently to the markets. The road system in regional South Australia—and I will mention roads in my electorate—is getting to the degree that in

many areas there have been more opportunities for fatal or long-term injuries to occur. There are many roads in my electorate which have been neglected over many years: Yacka to Clare, Port Broughton to Bute, and also Bute to Kulpara.

I took the member for Goyder to the previous minister for transport—two country members united—to lobby for some work to be done on the Bute to Kulpara Road. Unfortunately that did not occur in this budget. These roads have not deteriorated overnight. They have been deteriorating for many years due to a lack of maintenance by both major parties. These roads have to be utilised by our transporters to be able to transport goods from their home locations to the market areas. If this infrastructure is not maintained to the highest level, then we will be facing major challenges in getting our export commodities to the relevant port or location for shipping.

I have several regional roads that are utilised largely by the grain industry and also regional bus services getting people from the regions to Adelaide, whether it is for recreation or health. Some of these roads are nominated in the top 10 worst roads in South Australia, and the member for Goyder is very aware of two of those roads, because one of them was the Bute to Kulpara road. Even if these roads were nominated to have some work commenced, which would allow for the regional communities to understand that they are being considered, people do not expect the roads to be reconstructed immediately. They understand it will be time before they are completely reconstructed, but a time frame giving these people in the regional areas some hope would be beneficial to their concerns.

We only have to look at road infrastructure being implemented at South Road and also the southern metropolitan regions. This is a tremendous activity for those living in these areas. However, I would hope that these road infrastructure improvements continue to move north of Gepps Cross to accommodate the ever-increasing demands from those residing in the northern areas.

We need to place more moneys in regional South Australia and, whilst I agree we need to provide the required recreational facilities within the Greater Adelaide area, we should not forget parts of regional South Australia. Again, I reinforce that regional South Australia appears to have been neglected for many, many years—and not only by this government but, also, previous governments. I think both major parties need to really look seriously at where we allocate our funds.

Another area that is of concern to me is the current land tax imposition and, whilst I understand there needs to be revenue collected by the government of the day, I question how this system actually works. The tax is calculated on the capital value of the land in question—

Mr Griffiths: Site value.

Mr BROCK: Sorry, the site value of the land in question, thank you member for Goyder. Whilst this is great, there are numerous instances in the residential development of regional areas where developers have established estates and, due to the economic situation, there are many blocks that have been serviced ready for sale that cannot be sold but they are still paying not only council rates but also the land tax. These developers are not only paying council rates but, as I said earlier, they are levied land tax each and, in some cases, in excess of \$2,500 to \$3,000 a block. After a couple of years, that makes a project unviable and, in actual fact, I question why people would want to go into land divisions in the regional areas.

In many cases, the values of non-earning properties continue to escalate and in many of these cases the increase does not equate to any extra revenue coming in to be able to pay the increased taxation that has been imposed. Whilst I agree that we need to be very aware of our expenditure, we must also remember that to be able to create more employment opportunities, provide resource capabilities and also allow for production of not only our food produce but also our export opportunities, we need to spend more money in the correct areas to allow for growth in these areas.

I am very fortunate in my electorate that we have many opportunities for growth in the resource sector, and I would look at getting more infrastructure to accommodate this growth or we will lose all the opportunities. The more assistance that we give to areas where people can choose a 'lifestyle' and live will only assist the issues that the Greater Adelaide area will encounter in the next few years.

I request that regional South Australia not have any further cutbacks and that the government looks at our growth in revenue (export earnings and royalties) and where it is going to

come from. It will come from regional South Australia. We as a state do not appear to have a concrete vision or a plan for regional South Australia with regard to infrastructure growth.

There is one area that I have been very persistent about since coming into this place, and that is for a review of the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS), and I am very pleased that the Minister for Health is undertaking a review of this to ensure that it relates more to those who require assistance in getting to specialist services outside their locations. Well done to the minister, and I am looking forward to a very good outcome from this review.

The global situation has been under great uncertainty across the whole of the globe. However, this state has very large amounts of wealth in resources that the world is looking for, and we as a nation should be looking forward to value adding our products, not digging them up and shipping them to other countries and then importing the final products at a very inflated price to what we have exported in the first place.

In closing, I understand that we are facing very trying times but expenditure should be allocated to areas more so that provide the resources. We need to be very strategic in allocating moneys where we can assist the state in growth and employment opportunities.

In closing, I thank the Premier and minister Koutsantonis, plus the commonwealth government, for allowing me to continue to lobby and continually pester them for the result that has been achieved to provide an in-principle support for an opportunity to allow for a new technology plant at Port Pirie. For this, I am grateful, as are the people of Port Pirie.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:29): Each year appropriation speeches provide an opportunity to comment on the budget and the budget process. While others are half-empty people, I am afraid this year I am trying to look on it as being half full. That is because I do not think any budget is as bad as the opposition is saying and carrying on about. Appropriation has allowed the opposition the opportunity to attack, and that is all they seem to be able to do. Nothing in the budget appears to have provided them with any joy.

The government's priorities are to do the best it possibly can for the people of this state. That is what happens with a budget. Projects and initiatives are prioritised and rated and, after rigorous scrutiny and evaluation, they are adopted, delayed or discarded. This happens for two interrelated reasons: priorities change, as do circumstances. There is no doubt that circumstances have changed globally, as the member for Frome just said, and they also change nationally.

If—and it is a big if—we had the gift of accurate prediction of the future or hindsight, no-one would ever be wrong. The budget is prepared on the advice of departments that are run by our state's Public Service. I am able to say that I have great faith in that Public Service. This government values the Public Service and has always valued its work and knows how important its contribution is. This side of the house has always recognised the Public Service and will not stand by as its role and service are denigrated by the opposition.

No-one (and I mean no-one) puts together a budget that is as incompetent as the opposition would have you believe this budget is. Confidence in South Australia and its capacity is vital. We know we live in one of the world's most liveable cities—not our rating but a rating by a recognised external body with a reputable reputation.

We know and value the role of small business and have always recognised the important part it plays in employing South Australians and keeping SA great. No government goes out of its way to aggravate small business operators when we know they are the backbone of our economy and, in a seat like Florey, even more so.

The leader claimed that South Australia is at the bottom of the pack. I believe South Australia has always punched above its weight and when evaluating statistics there are many ways to express what is happening. Opportunity is an important factor in planning for the future, and recognising and taking opportunities, as well as creating them, is something that this government is committed to do.

At the same time, it is important to recognise that 'community counts'. My original campaign slogan, which remains my mantra to this day, is that 'We live in a community not just an economy.' While keeping an eye on the future we must make sure we all get there and bring those less well placed or unable to progress, along with us.

This government is committed to education and health, jobs and shelter. Education reforms have been part of our agenda forever. Our Premier's recent commitment to the Gonski reforms

underlines this, giving every child the best possible opportunity to succeed and excel. We have in this budget preschool upgrades, support for child care and work to support and keep families at risk together, particularly with work on the APY lands and the challenges that remote delivery of services presents and continues to present.

In health, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and the developments on North Terrace provide exciting opportunities, and the relocation of the University of Adelaide's Medical School and the University of South Australia's research precinct is something that will provide unlimited opportunities and present the right settings for discoveries of the ilk of penicillin and produce the Floreys of the future.

The South Australian health plan provides a framework to deliver efficient, functioning and sustainable health services into the future. When people say we have a Third World health service in South Australia I am astonished. Third World means that there is often no-one there when you get to a hospital. I am also very disappointed when people have adverse medical experiences. I am very sorry whenever it happens and I want to work with them to make sure we have the best possible outcomes for everyone. This can only be done by evaluating the problems as they present themselves.

I also want people to recognise that they can do things to help their own health and I ask them to make sure that they look after their own health as much as they can, because prevention is far better than cure. It is only when you lose your health that you realise how fragile life is. That is why our cancer and heart research will be such a valuable resource and industry—as they have said this week—an employer of people well into the 21st century.

This government is committed to jobs. Every government knows the importance of jobs and employment and does its utmost to maintain every job in this state. Every job is important to the community, and I want to put on record the value of every person's contribution to making this state great. Mining is and will be an important contributor into the future, and manufacturing too. Places like Holden's is working hard to keep their place at the moment in a world environment that is continually changing, to continue to provide stimulating employment in this sector into the future.

Infrastructure is one area about which this government can hold its head high. No-one can accuse us of not placing an emphasis on infrastructure. It is the very nature of progress that booms often happen, and we are certainly experiencing a boom here in Adelaide at the moment. There are great roadworks, especially the South Road upgrade, and there is the Torrens to Torrens, the Tonsley Park public transport hub, and work on the APY lands. In my own electorate of Florey there is the O-Bahn car park, which has been long awaited, and we have upgrades to the Modbury Hospital accident and emergency section. Work at the Lyell McEwin will also be vital for the people in our area. We have the Adelaide Oval and the Riverbank upgrades. We know what that is going to do for us here; it is going to completely revitalise the city.

We also have upgrades in the cultural precinct of North Terrace. I still hope to see the Constitutional Museum come to life again in another venue, providing learning opportunities and tourism potential for people in South Australia, highlighting, as the member for Fisher says, the number of firsts that South Australia has created. In particular, I would like to make sure that South Australia is recognised for its world first, when our women won the right to what we call the dual franchise—the right to both vote and stand for election.

In the arts, this budget commits \$6.1 million over three years to upgrade the Festival Centre, and this underpins our emphasis on the importance of the arts. Our calendar of events in South Australia extends well beyond 'mad March' now, and places us as a city that really recognises the importance of art in a vibrant city. Our focus is also on tertiary education and being a university city, engaging students and creating links with students from all over the world. Our tourism and clean, green food industries are another important part of this drive and is another way that South Australia excels.

The Leader of the Opposition, in relation to this budget, accuses South Australia of taxing and spending into recovery while not seeming to appreciate the impact of stamp duty and payroll tax changes we have made. We must also as a government pay our bills on time; this is a very important aspect. As well as connecting government to business, this budget puts an emphasis on cutting red tape, and undertakes to do just that.

I want to talk a bit more about jobs as well and the importance of making sure that we keep the focus on creating employment wherever we can. We also need to commit to doing more to keep our young people here. They want to travel and gain experiences all over the world. I do not

think we can stop them or prevent them, or want to prevent them from doing that, but we also want them to come home, and many do come home. To ensure this keeps happening into the future, this budget is creating Hub Adelaide, which has been established to promote and provide a network and to create opportunities and experiences for this very purpose. The North Terrace developments will be a big part of this new initiative.

Good government works hard to provide good outcomes and to provide opportunities. I believe this government has done its best to do both, and it continues to do so with this budget. We care about the environment and we care about the River Murray and sustainability, and this government has a proud record in those areas; they remain some of our major concerns. Safer communities are another one of our priorities. A new court building provides better opportunity for justice, and we continue our commitment to policing into the future.

We must always do our best to strive harder to do more as we encourage better productivity throughout the state as part of our 'growing the pie'. We in this government will always do our best to underpin those processes and to work hard on behalf of all South Australians.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (17:39): My recollection is that the member for Florey, when she first spoke, said that she was a glass full person, I believe, or glass half full?

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No; you were trying to define yourself. This is not a criticism of you, I am just trying to define what you said.

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Glass half full. I try to be an optimist also, so I am a glass half full person.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order. All remarks should be addressed through the chair, not to members directly opposite.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure the member would concur with that.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am wondering who I should apologise to. I just wanted to be sure that I quoted the member for Florey correctly. I am also a glass half full person and I am going to start off by saying that there are two things that I am pleased are in the budget. One is the announcement of \$15.9 million to assist six sites for preschoolers that are being moved in the state. I am lucky enough that one of those is in my electorate; it is, indeed, in the town in which I live. So, I do put my thanks on the record, minister, for that investment having been made.

My kids were beyond kindy when I moved to Maitland, so I have not had the physical involvement there, but I have spoken to the parents group that is associated with that and it was a front page headline in the school newsletter last week when the budget came out. So, I offer my thanks for that commitment to the area.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: The budget delivers.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am not sure if I will say that much. I also thank the member for Kaurna, as the previous minister for health, for the commitment made to a chemotherapy unit at the Wallaroo Hospital, which is about to open, I believe. That is also a very good investment in the area. As a regional person who wants to see as many services as possible based in the community, I am grateful for that because those who are suffering terribly will be assisted enormously.

The member for Schubert has asked me to acknowledge that it is wonderful to see some young people in the chamber from Faith Lutheran College in the Barossa. So, well done. Having a Lutheran school at Maitland and seeing the outstanding young people who come from that school, I have no doubt that you are wonderful future leaders of the state. Thank you for coming into parliament this evening. There are some criticisms, of course, or some concerns from me about budget figures.

Ms Bedford: What about suggestions? Call them suggestions.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well, if I can, a suggestion. It is a frustration also, member for Florey, from a decision made a bit over two years ago about Regional Development Australia. I am very much pro that group. I recognise, having been involved previously on several of the boards that currently exist and with the Business Enterprise Centre for the short time that I lived and worked in

New South Wales, that economic development authorities around the state have actually done great work in the past.

The Business Enterprise Centres that operated in metropolitan areas have suffered their funding cuts already, and that came in 12 months ago, but for the RDA groups 30 June is the D-day date where they lose \$4.1 million and are suddenly left to fend for themselves based on the funding support they receive from the federal government and from their local government partners. The position on the funding for that will be a key issue for me when it comes to policy for regional development.

I am a believer in what they do. I have seen so many great examples where the network of people they know and the hard work, initiative and skills shown by their staff have made an enormous difference to a business not only being able to stabilise itself in challenging times but a chance to grow and a chance for new business to establish. As somebody who stands in here continuously thinking about regional communities, I am concerned about the impact of the decision from 1 July when they lose that level of funding. It averages out to about \$585,000. The funding varies between the seven of them, but it will make an enormous difference.

I also want to talk about the RAA roads report that came out a few weeks ago. There have been many people in this chamber who have expressed concerns and raised issues about the quality of our road network. As a previous shadow in this area, I know that the challenge for the minister is enormous in trying to determine where the funding goes across the whole network to provide not just the safety required but the expectation from communities and business opportunities about an improved road vision.

The RAA public consultation had, I think, about 2700 people. Two of those roads are in areas that I am very familiar with in my electorate and are of concern to me. There are a lot of people out there, and not just the ones who contact me or the ones who might choose to contact the minister and his predecessor, who have taken that chance to express their frustrations and their desires. No matter who is in office from March of next year there is a very strong expectation of delivery. Regional people want some return for the tax money that they have paid over a lot of years. Yes, there are the intangible things tax dollars go into that they cannot see that we all know occur behind the scenes, but it is some of those key infrastructure areas that they want to see happen.

Can I say that I am also pleased about the extension of the \$8,500 housing grant. As a parent of two young people who had already bought their homes before this grant was available—they were 20 and 21 when they did that—I am so pleased that there has been this level of support shown for the construction industry and for the civil contracting industry, by association with this. So, that is a good move, finishing at the end of December. I hope that it brings with it more confidence to the sector, and those looking for an opportunity to buy and build a home, and that it helps drive our state forward.

I was lucky enough, with a few other members of parliament, to have visited the Holden's site at Elizabeth, probably about two months ago. We met with Mr Devereux and some of his senior staff, we walked across the workshop and we looked at the production lines and saw the commitment from the staff there. It is of great concern, no matter where you are based, to understand the implications of what is occurring at the moment.

I have listened to the contribution from the member for Mitchell and other people who have spoken about this and to the members of the opposition. There needs to be an approach taken where state and federal governments work cohesively to make sure that motor vehicle manufacturing in Australia actually has a future.

The Ford decision and the impact that will have in Victoria in particular is significant. For South Australia's future to be as bright as I believe it actually will be, it is important that we get it right, not just for those 2,000 workers who are at Holden's but for all those other people who are associated with the components industry. I know the Premier has talked about 16,000 people being impacted by this. It is of such critical importance to our state that we actually get it right that it has to transcend bipartisan issues and we have got to work together.

Can I also talk about marine parks. It has been talked about for a long time, but it is still a key issue in communities. There has been some adjustment made, there has been some delay in the implementation of the sanctuary zones until October of next year, but there are still some communities that feel gutted by it.

In my own electorate, Port Wakefield is one of those. They have put their case quite well, I think. They have talked about the impact on the future for them as a community that has been driven, in many ways, not just by the travelling public that go through there and the roadhouses that exist but by a long-term history of professional fishermen and recreational fishing opportunities.

When you look at the spatial closures for snapper and the issue about blue swimmer crabs that is occurring within the gulf and predominantly on the other side of the peninsula, it is a really important issue and these people are going to keep fighting for it. They are going to ensure that, no matter where you come from, as a representative of the people, you understand their issue and it becomes a key election issue as we approach March.

Can I also just note the member for Frome, who talked about PATS—that is, the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme—and the review that has been announced by the Minister for Health. As a person who has contacted the government about this many times in the past and had one particular lady from my electorate who has been very strong on the need for this to be a more appropriate system that works better and provides a greater level of support, I am fully supportive of the review that is being undertaken.

My great frustration is with the financial situation. I think, in 2010, we took as an election policy an additional \$1 million per year to go into supporting PATS. My fight within what I talk about with people is to try to ensure that that additional money is available because it is an absolute key.

I am lucky enough to have a health bus that operates in my area. It leaves from Yorketown, collects people who need expert medical treatment, takes them to Adelaide, leaves very early in the morning and gets back late at night, but, for a lot of people, the health bus is not the option because of their particular illness and sickness and the level of support that they need. So, PATS has to be a system that actually provides the level of financial need to recompense these people, even though it is only fractionally, for the travel component and often the accommodation component of what they are required to do overnight.

I look forward to the passage of the budget. I am hopeful that there is a chance for another party to put forward a different budget next year, which is also going to face enormous challenges but will be one that I know is going to be driven by the need of the people of South Australia to make us a great state.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (17:49): I would like to speak today on the Appropriation Bill for 2013-14. This is a budget that, despite tough economic times, stays true to core Labor values and is a reflection of my own personal values. It is an example of this government's commitment to provide South Australians with the best support and the best services. It is a commitment to giving our children the best education and a commitment to maintaining high-quality health services in our community. It is a commitment to training that will expand job opportunities for many and a commitment to keep our communities safe. Treasurer Jay Weatherill has taken on challenging financial circumstances and delivered a budget that makes sound, reasonable financial decisions, while protecting jobs, industry and development, to ensure a better quality of life for all South Australians.

We understand that many families struggle with cost-of-living pressures, and we are working hard to provide the support we can. This year's budget has delivered several initiatives to help ease the financial pressures on the families in my electorate, including \$21.1 million over four years for increasing water concessions to pensioners and low income earners from 25 per cent to 30 per cent for those eligible, starting from 1 July this year. Compulsory third party reforms will reduce the cost of registering a typical family car by \$148 over two years from 1 July this year. Further to this, a new monthly direct debt payment system for car registration will help spread the cost over the year.

These initiatives demonstrate the choice we have made to listen to our constituents. We have and always will put their needs first, and we will continue to work with them to build a strong future for our state. This choice will steadily return the budget to surplus in 2015-16 without jeopardising our local jobs, our state development, the construction sector, the health and safety of our local communities or the education of our children.

Education is a key for a brighter future, and it is something I truly believe in. I benefited from a good education, and I want to make sure the children in Taylor have this as a key priority in their life as well. It is certainly the case for our government by its having 'Every chance for every child' as one of its seven strategic priorities. That is why I am so very pleased about the commitment to rebuild the Sir Thomas Playford Kindergarten at Elizabeth South Primary School.

The \$2.6 million relocation of the kindergarten will directly benefit so many families in my electorate.

When I was first elected to parliament in 2010, I visited Sir Thomas Playford Kindergarten, and I immediately knew that the building needed to be improved in order to provide a high-quality learning environment. Since then, I have been working hard, alongside the kindergarten's director, Kate Walker, to ensure that this could be made possible so that the families in my electorate would be provided with the services they need and deserve.

I am so proud that now the kindergarten will be able to accommodate 20 more children after the relocation, which is due to be completed in April 2015. This will provide space for 66 children, and it is invaluable to our growing local community. This investment will not only provide a new building; the relocation to Elizabeth South Primary School will help parents with more than one child to make one-stop drop-off and pick-up easier for working families. It will also ease the transition from kindergarten to primary school by allowing children to stay in the same location from preschool all the way through to year 7.

I am thrilled that this government has chosen to invest in our children and to support families in my area. This kindergarten is just one part of the \$32.7 million investment to upgrade 15 preschools across the state. I am sure that no-one in this room would disagree on how important it is to invest in these young children.

For the wider north, an investment of \$46,000 at the John Hartley School will go towards the \$2.3 million construction of a new building to build a better learning environment for both teachers and students. This is great news for students of the north, and I know that it will be particularly well received by several families in my electorate who live in the Andrews Farm-Angle Vale area.

I would like to talk about Skills for All for a moment. I commend this year's budget for making a statewide \$27 million extra investment in the Skills for All program. Skills for All is an excellent program that provides courses to improve job skills to meet industry training needs. Education and training are crucial for local business and industry and, in turn, for the future of our state. We have chosen to continue our commitment to training that will help open up job opportunities for all people in South Australia.

I would also like to speak about the Lyell McEwin Hospital. It is a fantastic health provider in the north, and it is an essential part of any community, particularly in my area. The ongoing investment of \$50 million towards the \$177.7 million stage C redevelopment will provide much needed inpatient accommodation, a new multideck car park and the expansion of support facilities. Access to good health care is crucial for the wellbeing of all South Australians, and I am glad that we continue to invest in the north, in Lyell McEwin.

Community safety and public transport are things I often hear about in my electorate office. The 2013-14 budget also reaffirms a clear commitment to keeping our communities safe and increasingly connected. These are highlighted in several areas. First, for the fourth year in a row, \$1.44 million has been invested in making sure we are installing new bus shelters statewide. In fact, there is one right near my electorate office that people are using right now. This continues to be a great investment to make sure public transport is both easier and safe, regardless of the weather conditions.

Secondly, forward estimates for the 2013-14 year include 28 new buses to replace old buses and seven additional buses will begin supporting public transport services from July next year. Investment in public transport plays an important role in keeping our local communities connected, and that is a challenge in the north.

Other projects like this ensure that we are on track and that we have a bright future in relation to rolling out the bus service for 407s, last year's budget commitment. A new project to provide \$6.4 million over four years to emergency services communications will aid increased capacity to take calls and dispatch support for our 000 response system.

There is also an ongoing investment in our police force with \$3.5 million of the \$4.48 million for high-tech crime-fighting equipment. This equipment will include hand-held computers, a portable fingerprint system and an automated numberplate system for our police. I know the police in my area are looking forward to this additional technology.

This budget works to provide better services for transport, emergency and safety, but it also gives a sense of security to South Australians so they can feel safe living and travelling in our local communities, knowing that these services are ready for when they need them.

At a glance, budgets are a set of numbers on a piece of paper but these decisions are critical to the quality of life for South Australians. Irrespective of the financial challenges, the 2013-14 budget has given children in my electorate and many others the opportunity for an education in a growing, learning environment right from the start and a continuing commitment to good quality, easy access to good health care at the local hospital.

Statewide, this budget has chosen to invest in skills and training to help job opportunities for the future and actively keep transport, emergency services and police services as a priority to keeping our communities connected and safe. This budget supports every South Australian and I urge the house to support the bill.

[Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis]

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (17:57): There are some special guests in the chamber tonight: the principal of the Faith Lutheran school in the Barossa, Mr Gavan Cramer, his lovely wife Sue, and the two head prefects and the two deputies. Can I say how pleased I am to be associated with this very fine school. Gavan is only the second principal of this school in 25 years, or thereabouts. Brian Eckermann, of course, was the first inaugural principal of the school and Gavan has been there for seven years. They head-hunted this fellow. I wondered who was going to replace Mr Eckermann, but I am very pleased; they certainly came up with a cracker here.

When I became the member for Schubert to represent the Barossa Valley in 1992, this school was brand new and it was on a greenfield site. When you see it today, approximately 25 years later, wow. The proudest moment for me was the official opening of the Brenton Langbein performing arts centre at the school. The Liberals were in government and minister Ingerson, after a very effective presentation led by the school's development officer, Mr Tim Clemow, gave an amount of money over four years. It was a large amount of money, but only a fraction of the cost of that fine building. Somebody dared to dream. Can I say to the members of the house: you must see this building to believe it. People walk in there and they cannot believe that a building such as this exists in regional South Australia.

An honourable member: I've seen it.

Mr VENNING: You have; it's impressive, isn't it? The equipment in this building is equal to, and better than, the Festival Centre alongside us here in the city. So it is a fine moment and somebody has dared to dream. I now remember who the captains are: Jack Crawford and Nadia von Bertouch, Ethan Moore and Maddie Savage. Welcome to Parliament House. I look forward to an evening with these people here tonight. It is the last time I will have the honour of doing this after many years, and that is sad.

Again, I really have enjoyed my association with this very fine school. Families in the Barossa are so lucky to have the opportunity to send their children to a school like this. I congratulate all those involved with the school—principal Gavan, the staff, the head prefects, the deputy prefects, the prefects and all students, and of course the Lutheran Church and the Lutheran community—for the way they support this fine school. I will leave this job in March 2014, but I hope to have a lifelong interest in this school.

I will move now to another very positive story after a very negative week. This is another very good news story, together with the Faith one. I am pleased to bring a very positive story to the parliament. I rise today to speak about a wonderful and spectacular piece of our state's musical history that is now housed in Tanunda. It is being well cared for and restored back to its former glory. I refer to the Hill & Son grand pipe organ that was erected in the Adelaide Town Hall in 1877 and was there until 1990, when it was dismantled, stored and advertised for sale. It remained in storage in the Adelaide Hills until March 1995, when I first saw it, when it was offered to the South Australian committee of the Organ Historical Trust of Australia. If they did not take it, it was going to go to the tip—an absolute disgrace.

The organ measures approximately eight metres in width, five metres in depth and 10 metres in height. It weighs in at approximately 20 tonnes. It is truly an awesome site. As you can imagine, it is a massive instrument. William Hill & Sons were the most prominent British organ

builders of the later 19th century. This organ was commissioned in 1875—it really is a big part of our state's history—and it was designed to add prestige to the Adelaide Town Hall. At the time, it was the largest of its type in the Southern Hemisphere, and certainly the largest in Australia at the time.

The city organ was used almost daily in those early days, making the city organist the most important musical figure in the city. It was taken out of the Adelaide Town Hall in approximately 1990 after it was ruined by electrifying the action, thus destroying the organ's soul. The new organ now in its place does not have the same pedigree as the original Hill & Son. Once restored to its former glory, it will have a great appeal for all sorts of audiences. Matched with the lovely acoustics of the Soldiers' Memorial Hall in Tanunda, it should prove to be as popular in the future as it was in the past.

The organ will soon be available for many purposes, including teaching, competition use, recordings for media broadcasts, and as a tourism attraction for both historical and musical purposes, and recitals and concerts. It is the trust's intention to restore the organ fully to its 1875 condition, which has involved accurate reconstruction of its missing bellows, sound board and all the action. As I said, this was all but destroyed—at least its soul was—when the organ was so-called 'renovated' back in the 1960s, when all the mechanical action was replaced with electronic operation.

My late music master at PAC, the late Roland May, and Dr Peters were the two most famous organists in the state, and they just loved this instrument. They were the best organists we knew of and they were very disappointed with what happened when the organ was renovated. Almost all of the original pipework is present, but the case pipes will need to have the original decoration restored. The original organ had pale blue pipes with gold features and the body was made of natural wood. Most people can remember this organ in the Adelaide Town Hall when it was painted this ghastly white. I do not know what they were thinking when they did that. Three months ago it had a small number of limited playings.

When I heard the organ three or four months ago, only four stops of the 37 were working, and it sounded magnificent. I have heard the instrument played several times now and I have been very impressed. I also heard it before it was taken out of the Town Hall many years ago. I went to the very first Festival of Arts—that is how old I am—and I heard the organ played then, and it is going to be a lot better than it ever was. It makes a majestic sound; however, more funding is needed to ensure the organ will be fully operational. I have given a large donation to the restoration of the organ myself, as have many people in the Barossa, yet approximately \$50,000 is still needed to complete the job. There is still a way to go.

Two weeks ago, I had a private demonstration with Mr Stephen Kaesler when 80 per cent of the organ was operational. It gave me goose bumps; it was absolutely fabulous, and there is still 20 per cent to go. I would love to see this wonderful piece of musical history completed and totally restored to its former glory before I retire. It will be such a great achievement for so many volunteers who have given their time and made donations toward the work, to finally see the project completed.

I will again be publicly appealing for assistance with funding to complete the job once and for all. To have this spectacular piece of history restored to its original beauty and to bring it once again to full voice would be of great interest and bring renewed enthusiasm for our musical heritage. Organs of this size and grandeur are often referred to as the king of instruments. This one certainly is. It has a new soul, and all its intricate workings are visible behind a new plate glass facade down in the cellar, all built and donated by Ahrens Ltd.. What a generous donation!

One of the last things I want to achieve before I retire is to attend the grand recommissioning concert. I pay tribute to Steve Kaesler, the members of the Organ Historical Society of Australia and the many local citizens on a wonderful achievement. I hope the \$50,000 can be forthcoming so the organ can be debt-free when it becomes a vital part of the musical heritage of the Barossa Valley.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (18:06): The big announcement recently about funding for disability services across Australia is something that the Liberal Party in South Australia strongly supports. I want to put that on the record because there are some people out there who are saying there may be some issues with it. In fact, a press release was put out yesterday by the Disability Speaks Steering Committee and the Intellectual Disability Association of South Australia which says:

We believe our local Liberal Opposition Leader, Steven Marshall, is genuinely sympathetic and we expect a very positive response when we meet with him...

It goes on to say:

...despite the financial zealots in the Liberal Party who abhor community support programs like NDIS.

I put on the record in this place that everybody in the Liberal Party strongly supports the NDIS, or DisabilityCare Australia, as it is now known, and to have this in a press release is, to say the least, very disappointing. I know a lot of people in disability services, and the former shadow minister, the member for Morialta, and I have been speaking to them, and they trust the Liberal Party to do the right thing by people with disabilities in South Australia. We all support the NDIS and we will be doing everything we can to make sure it works.

I know there are some concerns about the way it is going to work. We want to make sure that the money that is available goes to people with disabilities and is not sucked up by a large bureaucracy as we often see when these schemes are set up. We have seen 300 jobs created in Geelong at the DisabilityCare Australia facility there; now let us make sure that the money that is available is not only paying wages for a bureaucracy. Let us make sure the money is going to the people who need the care, who deserve that care, and they certainly want that care.

The role of DisabilityCare Australia is going to be to make sure that that money goes to those people, and the Liberal Party will be watching to make sure that that is the case, and I know that my federal colleagues are of exactly the same mind. So, can I put to rest any concerns from people in the disability sector in South Australia about the future of the NDIS or DisabilityCare Australia. It is going to be delivered in the best, most efficient possible way as the Liberals can see it being delivered, so that the people who need it, and the people who deserve it, get that service.

There will be about another 12,000 people in South Australia who will be receiving care under DisabilityCare Australia, up from the current 20,000. We are concerned. Where are those people now? How are we going to get the staff to look after those people? How are we going to attract and keep staff? They are genuine concerns, because we want to make sure that this system works. I assure anybody who has any concerns about this after what I have said today to contact me, come and sit down with me, and talk to me about their concerns so that I can allay those concerns, because this is a great thing for all Australians and, particularly, for us here in this parliament, for South Australians with disabilities. It is long overdue and we strongly support it.

I will talk about some of the issues in the state budget that affect my electorate of Morphett, particularly the extra funding for dredging down at the Patawalonga. I was surprised to hear this in the budget because it has not been raised with me in my office as being a particular concern. Obviously, with the drainage going into the Patawalonga and the Barcoo Outlet working the way it is, the flushing of the Pat has been working well and the boating and recreation on the Pat has been getting more and more frequent. Every weekend, if you go down there you will see people with everything from their model boats to canoes and kayaks and their pets swimming in there. I went for a swim in the Pat a number of years ago with the then member for Unley when it was officially reopened after the Barcoo Outlet was in place, and the water was fine.

I remember there was an issue with a fish kill in there a number of years ago because there was a very large thunderstorm after a long dry spell and the oxygen depletion in the Pat killed the fish. The member for Colton should get his line out and be down there fishing because there were huge mulloway in there. Honestly, without any exaggeration—no fisherman's exaggeration—there were metre-long mulloway that had, unfortunately, died. The fish that were in there were absolutely incredible. To me, that emphasises the health of that river system.

The Pat was the second-most polluted waterway in Australia until the Building Better Cities program—which was a Hawke government program, I shall say. The then member for Morphett, John Oswald, was able to get funding and there were tonnes and tonnes of silt removed from the Pat and it was stored by the airport. Where it has gone now, I do not know. The Pat, after many years, was returned to pristine condition and the building of the Barcoo Outlet, which was a concern for a lot of people, improved the bypass and flushing of the Pat so that the system could work as we all wanted it to work, and that was as a pristine river system.

We did have the return of the milk carton regatta once and I would love to see that come back. I am desperately trying to get the birdman rally back down at the Bay. We have it at Moomba. You see the Red Bull Flugtag flying days around the world and insurance problems are not an issue for them, so getting the birdman rally back down at the Pat is something that I am very keen

to see. You can go onto my Facebook site and look at 'bring back birdman' if you want to look at some of the shots of the wonderful machines that they had back then.

There is other money that has been put aside in former budgets. In the 2011-12 budget, there was \$4.3 million put aside to modernise the lock gates, and those are the gates adjacent to the Holdfast Shores development. The old lifting mechanisms are in big concrete gantries. I understand that the new gates that will be put in there will be centre pivot gates similar to what is at the Barcoo. It will look a lot better than it does now and be a lot more open and, certainly, it will be a great improvement. That is something that this government has done in my electorate of Morphett that is very good.

It is one of the very few things that has been done down there, unfortunately. I remember a number years ago there was funding for local road upgrades, and I had a photograph on my website at one stage of me standing on the centre strip of Brighton Road with one foot in Bright and one foot in Morphett, and you know where the bitumen ended—it ended in Bright: it did not go on into Morphett. You can see the same sort of thing as you go from Ashford into Morphett on the north. Actually, it might be from West Torrens into Morphett on the north-eastern corner. As the new bitumen went over Morphett Road where my boundary is, it went a couple of hundred metres and stopped at the bridge there.

The roads in Morphett do require a lot of upgrade. The government has spent some money and is doing some work at the moment at High Street, and at the Augusta Street and Brighton Road intersections, but when you go down Anzac Highway, Oaklands Road and Morphett Road, they should rename some of these roads Rodeo Drive because it is like riding a bucking bronco going down there. The potholes and undulations are quite severe. I look forward to the government spending more money on not just road maintenance and patching up potholes but also re-laying the bitumen and making sure the good taxpayers, ratepayers and electors of Morphett get what they deserve down there and it is better than what they have got now.

Another hotspot that has affected the members for Bright, Mitchell and Elder, and certainly me, is the Oaklands Crossing. I remember, as a candidate, lobbying for the upgrade of Oaklands Crossing and I think the first form of upgrade that was envisaged was 27 years ago costing \$1 million. Since then, it has got more and more expensive and more and more convoluted, and what do you see the government do? In the last term of this government, they spent \$4 million on moving the railway station at Oaklands 400 metres towards the railway crossing, which compounded the problem, with a bus interchange. It all sounds good; it all looks good but when you see the traffic jams there—in fact, you can go onto my website and see the video of the traffic jams that occur at that intersection. It is an absolute disgrace.

May I congratulate the member for Mitchell for having the courage to voice his concerns about what his government was not doing down there. He got a bit of a bollocking, or so I am told, for speaking out, but good on him for doing that. It is just bad luck that this government will not do it. Perhaps with a Liberal government in March 2014 we can work towards doing that.

I certainly cannot promise it because we do not know what the books look like, but it is an infrastructure issue that should be a real priority for both the federal and state governments. We do not know when we can do that sort of thing but it is like many things to do with transport in South Australia, it is going to have to be done at some stage. As we saw 27 years ago, it was \$1 million and now it is about \$100 million; the longer we leave it the more expensive it is going to get.

I will mention another piece of infrastructure that is being put down along my electorate boundary along the beach—the sand pumping pipelines. We got half as much and it cost twice as much and now we have the pipes going alongside Glenelg jetty. A number of months ago I tweeted about the oil terminal look along the jetty and I suggested that that they extend the jetty out to the south with a walkway and move the handrails across. I am glad to see that is happening but why it was not in the original design I do not know.

It is certainly good to see that the sand is going to be pumped around the place rather than having thousands of trucks going up and down the beaches and the local roads carting that sand. There is that south-north peripheral drift that has been going on for thousands of years. It is going to continue, and sand pumping is a sensible way of at least ameliorating the problem.

I am privileged to be the member for Morphett. I look forward to representing that area for many years to come and I certainly hope to be doing that from the government benches after March next year. If that is the case then the issues that I have been talking about now will be receiving a much higher priority than has been the case with this government.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (18:17): I am pleased to continue my remarks from yesterday afternoon in relation to the budget bill. It looks like I am the lucky last speaker in the house this afternoon.

Mr Gardner: I think the member for Brighton wants to have a go, too.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: No, I'm good.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Right, okay—last but not least, as one might say. Yesterday we saw the leader announcing a new policy initiative. Not everybody but some sections of the community are continuously calling on the leader and the state Liberal Party to release policy—and that is what we have been doing; we have been doing that continuously. Yesterday's announcement again evidenced that fact: the leader announced that upon achieving government that a state productivity commission would be established.

This state trails the national labour productivity average by a staggering 14 per cent. This state is 'tail-end Charlie' on a whole range of economic indicators. It is not good enough. This government does not have the way or the willpower to pull ourselves out of the current dire situation, the mire of economic mismanagement that the state is currently in with record deficit, record debt and an interest bill of \$952 million which equates to \$2.6 million per day. They are staggeringly bad statistics.

As the leader highlighted yesterday, the commission will conduct reviews of public finance, produce reports on government services as requested, advise on red tape and regulation—that is going to be specifically, I think, a significant focus of a future Liberal government—devise business regulation and impact statements, and undertake cost-benefit analyses. That is all very important and crucial work that any government should be undertaking. But, alas, what have we seen from this government? They are stuck in the economic models of the 1950s and 1960s, where they think the way forward and the way to pull themselves out of economic difficulty is to tax, borrow and spend. As I said yesterday, that just does not work in the current economic climate that we find ourselves in. It has not worked federally. The previous prime minister, Kevin Rudd, with this stimulus package, and so on, said it would shield us from the GFC.

Mr Gardner: The once and future prime minister?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, perhaps. Then prime minister Rudd said the stimulus and the BER, the pink batts schemes—and you name it, he had it—were going to shield us from the GFC. Now we've got—

Mr Gardner: \$900 cheques.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes; \$900 cheques which, arguably, went to pay off Visa card bills, buy plasma TVs, LED TVs, and so on. Now we have the current federal Treasurer saying that all our economic woes are because of the GFC. Well, you cannot walk both sides of the street. You cannot say that the stimulus shielded us from the GFC, but you have got the current Treasurer saying all our economic woes are a consequence of the GFC. You cannot have it both ways.

We understand and, certainly, the leader coming from a business background understands, that the productive sectors of the economy need to be cranking along, as I said, instead of the tired old way the Labor government operates. One of the ways to stimulate the economy for the 140,000-plus businesses in South Australia is to assist them and stimulate their activity. We know the engine room of the South Australian economy is small business, just like the engine room of the parliament is the House of Assembly. That is perhaps a comment for another day.

I want to further my comments in relation to some of the issues that my colleagues on this side of the house raised in their contributions about funding for the regions and for primary industries. We see very little funding, if any, in the regions, apart from specific schemes in the Riverland, the South-East, and perhaps Upper Spencer Gulf.

Members on this side of the house are passionate advocates for primary industries. We know on this side of the house the significant contribution that primary industry makes to the state's economy. It is something like \$4 billion a year on average, and that is just in net production, not value adding through vertical integration. There is the multiplier effect on that of some significant factors. My understanding is that it is about \$4 billion that primary industries and agriculture inject into the state's economy. That is a significant amount of money, and that sector is certainly worth supporting.

But what do we see from this government? They have pulled back funding and they have sold off research centres. The Lenswood Research Centre, in my electorate, always has a question mark over its future and the services it provides and whether it is going to be retained or sold. There is a significant concern in the Adelaide Hills region, I know, from local farming communities about the future of that facility. That will be a real loss to the horticultural sector and other associated industries if it does fall away.

I also wanted to speak about funding for road infrastructure. I refer to Budget Paper 1, Budget Overview, page 7: Infrastructure investments in partnership with the Commonwealth Government. It states:

The budget commits significant funding over the forward estimates to road and rail projects under the Nation Building 2 program.

It talks about the South-Eastern Freeway and '\$24.9 million over three years from 2014-15 to improve the safety and efficiency of the freeway'. That is obviously necessary funding. The Mount Barker council and the Adelaide Hills Council have been calling on this government for a long time to see further improvements carried out on the freeway corridor.

That does not get away from the fact that we still have at least a \$200 million, if not more, backlog in road maintenance in South Australia—it is probably in excess of \$200 million now. You only have to look at the headline on the front page of the *Stock Journal* of last week. There was a headline emblazoned across the front page of the *Stock Journal* about how the roads in rural areas of South Australia are literally crumbling away.

We have had this debate previously in the house, and previous ministers for road safety have discounted the importance of the conditions of roads, saying that they do not contribute to crashes and so on. I think it was the member for Newland, the road safety minister at that stage, who was severely embarrassed in the media as a consequence of his comments along the lines that the specific road conditions do not contribute to road crashes. One of the best ways to improve road safety is to improve the conditions of your roads. If you talk to anybody in the road safety sector, that is a common message.

As I said, in the forward years we are talking about almost \$25 million, and part of that is commonwealth funding, to upgrade and improve the freeway corridor. I want more details about the proposal to upgrade the existing entry/exit ramps at the Mount Barker freeway interchange and more details about a proposed second interchange at Mount Barker. My office has contacted the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure's office several times seeking a briefing on those specific issues and we are yet to get a response.

Time expired.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (18:27): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Wednesday 3 July 2013, in accordance with the following timetables:

APPROPRIATION BILL
TIMETABLE FOR ESTIMATES COMMITTEES
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A
26 June-2 July 2013
WEDNESDAY 26 JUNE 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Premier

Minister for State Development

Minister for Public Sector

Minister for the Arts

Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts

Treasurer

Legislative Council

Joint Parliamentary Services
House of Assembly
State Governor's Establishment
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Auditor-General's Department
Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (part)
Arts SA
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

THURSDAY 27 JUNE 2013 AT 9.30 AM

Attorney-General
Minister for Business Services and Consumers
Minister for Industrial Relations
Minister for Planning
Courts Administration Authority
Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Electoral Commission SA
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Independent Gambling Authority
Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

FRIDAY 28 JUNE 2013 AT 9.30 AM

Minister for Finance
Minister for Emergency Services
Minister for Correctional Services
Minister for Road Safety
Minister for Police
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department for Correctional Services
Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
South Australia Police (part)
Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)

MONDAY 1 JULY 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills
Minister for Science and Information Economy
Minister for Recreation and Sport
Minister for Tourism
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
South Australian Tourism Commission
Minister for Tourism

TUESDAY 2 JULY 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade
Minister for Small Business
Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion
Minister for Volunteers
Minister for Disabilities
Minister for Youth
Minister for Social Housing
Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (part)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

26 June-2 July 2013

WEDNESDAY 26 JUNE 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Health and Ageing
Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse
Minister for Defence Industries
Minister for Veterans' Affairs
Department for Health and Ageing
Defence SA
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

THURSDAY 27 JUNE 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy
Minister for Housing and Urban Development
Minister for Transport and Infrastructure
Minister for Transport Services
Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (part)
Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

FRIDAY 28 JUNE 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Education and Child Development
Minister for Multicultural Affairs
Department of Education and Child Development
Administered Items for the Department of Education and Child Development
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

MONDAY 1 JULY 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Regional Development

Minister for Forests
Minister for State/Local Government Relations
Minister for the Status of Women
Department of Primary Industries and Regions
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

TUESDAY 2 JULY 2013 AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation
Minister for Water and the River Murray
Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation
Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources
Administered Items for the Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

Motion carried.

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (18:27): I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of the Hon. M.J. Wright, Ms Bettison, the Hon. J.D. Hill, Mr Marshall, Mr Odenwalder, Mr Treloar and Mrs Redmond.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (18:28): I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of the Hon. L.R. Breuer, Ms Bedford, the Hon. P. Caica, the Hon. P.F. Conlon, Mr Goldsworthy, Dr McFetridge and Ms Sanderson.

Motion carried.

ROAD TRAFFIC (EMERGENCY VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:28 the house adjourned until Thursday 19 June 2013 at 10:30.