

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3 June 2014

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

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

Parliamentary Procedure

CLERK, RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER: I advise the house that on the retirement of the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk will perform the duties of the Clerk pursuant to standing order 24, and the Clerk Assistant Serjeant-at-Arms will perform the duties of the Deputy Clerk pursuant to standing order 25.

Matter of Privilege

MEMBER FOR HEYSEN

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (11:02): Sir, I rise on a matter of privilege. I believe that a member of this chamber has knowingly and deliberately misled this house and abused the privileges of this house. On 20 May the member for Heysen in her address in reply stated that she considered the Electoral Commissioner to be 'utterly corrupt'.

The member did not substantiate this allegation with any facts. I was concerned that such a grave allegation against a statutory officer should be investigated. On the following day I wrote to the member for Heysen and invited her to provide me with further information in support of her allegation. On 26 May, I received a response from the member for Heysen. This did not contain any further information.

This allegation is of a serious nature and was expressed as a considered opinion during an address to this house; however, no information has been provided to substantiate it and I ask you to rule on a prima facie case of breach of privilege regarding misleading the house. I table a copy of the two letters to which I have referred in my remarks, together with a letter I sent to you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I will take the matter on notice, research the point and take advice on it and get back to the house.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2014

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 May 2014.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (11:04): It is fantastic to continue my remarks, made on the last sitting day, in regard to this important bill. In those remarks, I was focusing on the important role that public hospitals in South Australia that are funded by this bill play and, in particular, how they are under threat now from the Abbott Liberal government in Canberra and its \$50 billion of cuts—part of its \$80 billion of cuts to health and education.

Here in South Australia, we have the only state Liberal Party in the country that is not prepared to stand up to Canberra and fight for our public hospitals. Not only that, they are trying to defend the federal Liberal cuts to our state. How can they possibly be doing that?

They are saying that we should not be critical, on this side, of these huge cuts because the government has a responsible program of cutting bureaucracy and putting funding back into more

health services. So, unbelievably, we have the Liberal Party in this state criticising this government for being financially responsible and working to cut bureaucracy to deliver more health services.

They are even criticising something that they themselves support, because we know that the SA Liberal Party supported our programs of efficiencies in their own budget costings in the last election. In fact, they would not rule out going further than us in terms of efficiencies, and they would not commit to investing all the savings back into the health system. The patients of South Australia want the Liberal Party to finally give up its petty pointscoring and join with the government in fighting for South Australia.

I draw to the attention of the house the health sector group Keep SA Healthy that has started up in South Australia to combat these cruel cuts to our public hospitals. Doctor, nurse and patient groups have joined forces to take up the fight on behalf of the sickest in our community.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr PICTON: These groups are organising a rally here at Parliament House tomorrow, and I know many members from this government will be there supporting that. I hope the member for Hammond, who is interjecting, will actually be there as well, supporting doctors and nurses in this state.

Lastly, I would like to quote from some very perceptive arguments about commonwealth health spending. These comments come from none other than the Prime Minister himself in his autobiography, *Battlelines*:

Commonwealth spending on health and education now approaches \$90 billion a year, or about a quarter of its total spending. It's all in areas that were once wholly the preserve of the states. Most of it is not directly authorised by the constitution other than via specific-purpose grants under section 96. Still, any withdrawal of Commonwealth involvement or spending in these areas would rightly be seen as a cop out.

A 'cop-out' describes this situation perfectly; I could not have put it better myself. I believe, and all of us on this side believe, that we need to work together to make this Prime Minister reverse these cruel cuts to our health system.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:07): I indicate that I shall not be the lead speaker on the Supply Bill, but I will be speaking on matters related to my portfolio responsibility. Post the federal budget, and in the lead-up to the South Australian state budget, what a horror budget was due, regardless, after 12 appalling years of Labor's fiscal management.

The Premier, the education minister, the health minister and others in Labor's cabinet have been decrying apparent shortfalls in health and education funding over the next decade. This, of course, is in support of federal opposition leader, Bill Shorten, in his shrill outrage at fiscal measures being put in place to fill gaping holes left in the nation's budget by the profligate and unsustainable spending of the Gillard and Rudd Labor governments. These were governments he was, of course, part of—'Shorten Memory Bill'.

But, as we know, there is never any link between the spinning of Labor dreams and expenditure and any sort of fiscal reality. The fiscal realities of Labor debt are what the voters end up having to pay, and Liberal governments bear the responsibility of fixing them.

It is difficult to understand how the Weatherill government can complain about the so-called funding shortfall from the federal government when, according to the budget papers, funding for schools is actually set to substantially increase over the next four years. The forward estimates in the federal budget tell us that there is an extra \$570 million from the feds. Strangely, Labor is claiming funding shortfalls over 10 years, when budgets only cover four-year forward estimates.

We heard that debate in the lead-up to the election when Premier Weatherill continued to argue time and time again that forward estimates cover four years. Yet, here we have another argument that, of course, suits the Premier and his political agenda, and that is that budgets can be cut on amounts beyond the forward estimates. Talking of school funding beyond 2017-18 was always going to be speculative. After all, who could possibly know what economic circumstances will emerge five years or at least two federal elections into the future, but the Premier and education minister must have had at least a suspicion that the reality would at some stage kick in.

The question here, of course, is: when they did sign up for the so-called Gonski package in July last year under the Gillard government (before it became the Rudd government), did they ask

how it was going to be funded? The fact is that there was a six-year agreement, with only one-third of that funding over two-thirds of the period and two-thirds of that funding pushed out to the final third of that six-year period, and it was clear in the lead-up to the federal election that only that which is in the forward estimates—the four-year commitment—was going to be honoured by the federal government.

Yet, this government now says that it is a broken promise when, in actual fact, the first task that the federal education minister (Mr Pyne) had to deliver, when he examined the deal that was signed up by the Labor government with a number of states, was to find that \$1.2 billion that the federal government had taken out of its reserve for Gonski funding for the states that had not signed up—Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory—which they put into their costing papers before the election to help balance their costing books. That money had to be found so that it could truly be a national system and all states would be able to participate in the four-year funding model.

However, we learn very quickly that, in the first year, here in South Australia only \$16.6 million of additional funding was in the deal that was signed by Mr Weatherill in June of last year, whereas for Queensland there is \$131 million this year, with every single cent going to schools. Here in South Australia, of that \$16.6 million, \$2.8 million is going into the bureaucracy—the only state that is not delivering all of that money into schools.

Then we need to look at why the Weatherill government is so desperate to blame the federal government for its financial mismanagement in South Australia. After 12 years of financial mismanagement, it is extraordinary that the minister for training and skills blamed last year's record low completion and start-ups in apprenticeships on the May budget in 2014. So, last year's training results, delivered by this government, were because of the federal budget that was delivered in May of this year.

That is an extraordinary claim by Ms Gago (the minister for training and skills) in the other place, but this is the pattern of this government and this is how they will continue to try to blame a six-month-old government in Canberra for their 12 years of financial mismanagement in South Australia. The writing was on the wall. Back in 2010, when the current Premier was the then education minister, in his education budget he delivered budget cuts directly affecting schools of at least \$60 million, which will occur in 2013-14. That is on top of the tens of millions of dollars in cuts every year since then.

We see in the Budget Measures Statement for the Department of Education and Children's Services (as it was known back then) for the 2011-12 budget, \$8.2 million was cut from the adult re-entry programs. Three-quarters of a million dollars were cut from the audit of school financial statements. Over \$2 million were cut from basic skills testing grants. Over half a million dollars were cut from bus services to regional areas. A saving of \$5.4 million was made in the co-location of schools. There is a \$1 million cut to Family Day Care centres, and \$1 million has been cut from the green school grants.

Remember the green school grants? They were the justification in 2008 for cutting the electricity allocation for schools back to 80 per cent of 2003 levels. 'Don't worry about the extra cost of electricity; you will be able to put solar panels and wind turbines on your school grounds to make up for those cuts. We will introduce green grants to do that.' Now we see that not only have those green projects failed to assist schools in managing their energy costs but now this government has also cut the funding that it allocated in 2008. That started in 2009, the very first year after the program started.

We saw savings of \$1.7 million in efficiencies in multi and dual campus structures, and we know that when this government talks about efficiencies it is actually talking about cuts. Nearly \$800,000 has been cut this year from new arrivals support in schools—this is support for those who have arrived here as refugees in particular—after a cut of \$379,000 in 2011-12 and \$772,000 last year. Even the transport services for new arrivals have been cut—\$2.2 million has been cut this year from that program for those who need transport to get to specific schools that are offering services for new arrivals, after more than \$3 million had been cut from the previous two years.

In addition, \$162,000 has been cut from the out of school hours care program. This adds up to \$60 million—\$60 million in cuts that were announced for this year back in 2010-11. They have nothing to do with the federal budget; nothing to do with the change of government in Canberra. This

government was well aware that it was having trouble managing its budget long before any announcements were made in the federal budget, but this government will continue to blame others for its poor mismanagement.

It is an extraordinary situation—12 years, six budget deficits out of the last seven budgets, and two budgets in a row now with deficits of around about \$1 billion. It is not the impact of Canberra that is causing the crisis in economic management in the South Australian budget; that started long before there was a change of government in Canberra, long before the federal budget was handed down in May this year.

I go back to the point that this is \$60 million for this year alone, on top of tens of millions of dollars every year. Ms Riedstra, who is responsible for financial matters in the Department of Education and Child Development (as it is now known), explained to the Budget and Finance Committee on 18 November last year that this year alone (the 2012-13 year) there are \$30 million of additional savings, of which nearly \$21.5 million are unspecified. In other words, they do not know where they are coming from.

Every year into the forward estimates those annual savings are even larger. In 2014-15 we are looking at \$50 million, of which \$39.6 million are unspecified; in other words, they do not know where they are coming from. Well, they certainly did not know where it was coming from when they announced these savings. In 2015-16, we see unspecified savings of \$53½ million and \$65 million in total. So, they really know only what they are going to be cutting in those years for a very small proportion of that funding. In the 2016-17 year—this is the big one—\$77.68 million is what the government is planning to cut from its education budget.

It is all here, it is all in *Hansard* for members to read and, of course, it was also confirmed by the chief executive of the Department for Education and Child Development when, on commercial breakfast radio in early December last year, he confirmed that nearly \$230 million of cuts had to be found in the education budget over the forward estimates. But forget about all of that because there is a convenient whipping boy for the state government, after 12 years of economic mismanagement, and that is a new government in Canberra, a government of a different colour. We did not hear anything, not a peep, from this government when the Gillard and Rudd governments cut funding to apprenticeship incentives for employers, yet we hear any excuse to blame others, rather than themselves, for the financial situation they find themselves in.

I also want to discuss a major policy of the Liberal Party in the lead-up to the last election, and that was to introduce an entrepreneurial curriculum. It was disappointing to hear the Minister for Education, in her reply to the Governor's speech, basically having a go at what the Liberal Party had put on the table at the last election and what the policy was, obviously not understanding the difference between entrepreneurial education and business studies.

Most significantly, entrepreneurial education teaches young people the skills of critical thinking, decision-making, problem solving, creativity, emotional intelligence and innovation. Entrepreneurs and learners form partnerships that will rebound to the credit of learners themselves, the state and the nation. Entrepreneurship education is different from business education. While it educates young people to understand the world of business, it teaches them far more than this. Entrepreneur education teaches an understanding of self and what is required to be an entrepreneur today in the world of the future. Most significantly, it teaches young people the skills of critical thinking, decision-making, problem solving, creativity, emotional intelligence and innovation.

The basic tenets of the argument for the development and implementation of entrepreneurship education in Australia include entrepreneurial ventures which are likely to be a major source of opportunity and new jobs in the economy. Entrepreneurship is not text-book learnt; rather, it is dynamic and inclusive of many different forms of learning, including experimental learning. Entrepreneurship education is holistic and it brings together many support skills in education. Developing good communication skills and interpersonal abilities, economic understanding, social media and digital skills, marketing skills, and management and finance skills. Young people can build confidence in their ability to become entrepreneurs in the future as a result of a variety of entrepreneurial activities provided through education.

Entrepreneurship education develops successful people. Entrepreneurship programs meet the needs of many diverse groups and help develop an entrepreneurial culture that creates jobs and wealth. Entrepreneurship programs provide individuals who lose or give up their job with a set of

skills that help them to become self-employed. Of course, it also encourages our school leavers to consider being employers themselves, not just employees. For too long, we have seen the focus in our education system on producing employees for employers; our plan for South Australia is that we would like school leavers to consider themselves to be employers as well.

Entrepreneurship programs have been proven to motivate learners from an economically disadvantaged background to accomplish their aspirations and goals through entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship programs can inspire disadvantaged and minority groups who feel disenfranchised to see that they can make their own opportunities and be successful. This is all about Liberal Party philosophy, about empowering the individual.

Entrepreneurship programs can assist rural communities to see that businesses can be created at home using the advantages of modern communications and transportation. Global business opportunities engaged by local entrepreneurial businesses may be the answer to losing local jobs or creating newer and more effective jobs rather than holding onto inefficient ones. Entrepreneurship programs have an advantage of reducing business failure because entrepreneurs will have better training, providing economic benefit to all. There are many people who are actually entrepreneurs, but having that formal training will help them be more successful in their businesses.

Entrepreneurship programs will encourage partnerships with business, industry and schools. More recently, there has been increased recognition of the importance of entrepreneurship in leading economic and social development. The growth of the Chinese economy has been linked to entrepreneurs and the emergence of small firms, and the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor concludes that there is a strong relationship between entrepreneurial activities and economic growth.

I asked the Minister for Education: if business studies are the same as entrepreneurship studies, why is it that there is a job crisis here in South Australia, and why are our young people moving out of South Australia to find jobs elsewhere? Why are businesses closing down? If we are doing all that in our schools, it is not working for you, minister.

Development of a school-based program on building entrepreneurial skills in the South Australian Certificate of Education would provide both personal and community benefits. Personal benefits would empower students to learn business and enhance social and life skills, encourage creativity and flexibility, encourage initiative and help develop problem-solving skills. Benefits for students would include the introduction of entrepreneurship as a unit of learning in the senior school, particularly at stage 1 of SACE, which can deliver significant benefits to the students themselves and, by extension, the community and the state.

The benefits would go well beyond the traditional framework of subjects currently on offer. For all those students, and in particular those who are educationally more marginalised, entrepreneurship would have significant personal and learning benefits, including the development of a mindset of achievement, innovation and success. With a potential to change personal and career attitudes, the subject would help students develop the self-worth needed for the nation's future. The benefits would include:

- the creation of entrepreneurial thinkers who have the requisite skills and tools to start their own businesses;
- the development of future entrepreneurs who have positive self-worth, accept responsibility for and take control of their own lives, are emotionally intelligent and self-aware, are continuous learners and promote this among their own staff, are motivated and inspire others, and have sound interpersonal and communication skills;
- the development of future business leaders and innovators who can demonstrate skills in business start-up, write business plans, apply business and economic principles, apply basic marketing skills, manage skills, evaluate ownership structures, identify legitimate sources of capital, apply principles of human relations and management, demonstrate sound accounting and financial practices, and manage business in an ethical way;
- the development of entrepreneurs who are able to think outside the box in terms of thinking creatively, using strategies for idea generation, assessing the feasibility of ideas, problem solving, translating problems into opportunities, and applying critical thinking skills;

- the development of people who demonstrate the right mix of business, management and operational skills.

While there are subjects that support entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship education goes further and encourages high levels of active participation and responsibility—

Time expired.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:28): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2014, and obviously I am supporting the bill. The appropriation of \$3.94 billion from the Consolidated Account is necessary to keep the basic functions of the government operating before the Treasurer hands down his budget in June this year. This is my first opportunity to speak on the supply of the government in this place, and I wish to touch on the general state of the economy and what the federal budget really means for the people of our state. I also want to raise, in the house, the projects around Hartley that are incredibly important to my constituents.

The implications of the 2014-15 state budget will be challenging for the people of South Australia, but the waste and mismanagement of the past 12 years have certainly crippled our economic prospects. It is also an opportunity for our Treasurer to showcase his actual vision about South Australia's economy over the next four years and beyond.

The government has had 12 years to fix this economy, but it has been 12 years of failure, 12 years of neglect, 12 years of spiralling public debt, 12 years of rising unemployment. It is commonly said that there is no better indicator of the health of our economy than employment. The South Australian jobless rate is currently about 6.3 per cent; 18,000 people have lost full-time jobs since 2013-14 by that budget delivered by the Premier. Our jobs growth is the worst in the nation, with an overall decline of 1.5 per cent. Youth unemployment in my electorate is one in five; one in five young people cannot find work. The only jobs that those opposite are worried about are their own, and that is the most damning statistic of them all. For 12 years this government has ducked the necessary decisions to transform this state's economy.

While the Premier and all his friends complained, in this year's budget, that South Australia's tax revenue and GST allocation was declining—and it has—what did the Premier do to redress our revenue flow problems? What did he do to try to stimulate growth in the business sector? What did he do to cut red tape for small businesses and services? The government here says that everyone else is to blame for our economic woes, after 12 years. After they have been in government for 12 years, it is everyone else's fault. The Premier blames the global financial crisis, the Premier blames the international markets, the Premier blames the federal government—everybody but himself and those opposite us.

Well, what was his vision for the state? The government has no vision, that is the answer; the government has no vision. The government has done nothing. As I spoke about and alluded to in my maiden speech, this government's overreliance on taxpayer subsidies for unprofitable industries has hindered our economic growth. Whilst I fully support our agricultural industry, which is, by the way, our single biggest export industry, its long term decline over the past 100 years slowly but surely has restricted our revenue base over time. Without a serious long-term plan from this government to create an action plan that expands neglected sectors, like our resources sector and other sectors, our future revenue base will collapse even further.

This government has buried its head in the sand if it thinks that it can keep borrowing money to pay for its unsustainable spending spree. In January, Moody's actually predicted that if this state's debt burden is not resolved the economy and our credit rating will deteriorate even further. As well as that, I refer to the Deloitte Access Economic 'Business Outlook: Eyes on China' report, where I can see there is a forecasted decline in international exports in 2014-15 by -2.5 per cent and then in 2015-16 by -2.6 per cent. We just cannot keep going on the way we are. We need to build on our strong relationship with countries, especially China. While I commend part of the South Australian government's China Engagement Strategy, it certainly does not go far enough.

This morning, I attended a business breakfast where Sean Keenihan, the president of the Australia China Business Council of South Australia branch, spoke on this exact topic: the relationship between South Australia and China. Let me say that at the moment the largest population of overseas students coming into South Australia is from China. China is South Australia's largest two-way trading partner, and the Chinese business migrant community here in this state is continually

bringing more investment and jobs. Australia will be on the doorstep of overseas' largest middle class in the next 30 years.

China's growth will be the strongest in Asia and the middle class there will be bigger than anywhere in Asia. There will be sustained growth from China with its capacity to draw down on finance and investment in infrastructure currently underway to transform their economy. They also have a lot more buying power than we will ever have. Niche opportunities will certainly present themselves for South Australia and South Australian businesses to sell to China and compete globally, and to buy from China. China is our largest foreign investor. Obviously they see Australia as being a good long-term partner with low sovereign risk—even with the events of this last week—low sovereign risk.

China is exposed to the US, to Europe, to Africa and it is also our largest tourist growth area and largest foreign student base aspect. In fact, there are more exports to China than the US, the European Union and Africa combined. South Australia, speaking frankly, has what China needs and wants, and whilst the South Australian government does have a strategy to take these things into consideration, it certainly does not go far enough. However, Australia is better placed than any other nation to take advantage of China's growth.

Speaking to the federal budget, the Premier and the Treasurer like to lecture this side of the house and the South Australian people about how terrible the Abbott government's budget has been for this state, and that there is a state budget crisis, but it is simply not true. Over the next two years, the federal government has increased spending in payments to the state. Over the years 2013-14 to 2016-17, education payments from the commonwealth are increasing by \$570 million, compared with \$230 million in Labor cuts to education over the same period.

South Australia is also to receive \$11.6 million to assist students to undertake the learning of a second language and this is particularly important to the diversity of cultures and the migrant families that I have in Hartley. Whilst it is true that \$276 million of commonwealth funding has been reduced in the period 2013-17, this government is cutting a swathe through its own health budget—over a billion dollars worth of their own cuts to health over the same period of time. I refer to the federal health minister, Mr Peter Dutton, when he recently said of the Weatherill government, and I quote:

The Weatherill Labor Government is cutting a billion dollars from health over the next four years and is now attempting to shift the blame to the Australian Government. South Australian Health Minister Jack Snelling should immediately, publicly, guarantee the people of his state that there will be no cuts to health in his government's budget next month. Mr Snelling, however, cannot do so because his government has already budgeted to slash a billion dollars from health spending after more than a decade of failure in government.

Also, the federal government's proposed medical research fund will mean tens of thousands of South Australian jobs. Let us not kid ourselves; let us not play politics with this one. This state will be a significant beneficiary of the Medical Research Future Fund for decades to come for jobs indirectly or directly.

When the Treasurer of this state met with Joe Hockey and the other state treasurers recently about infrastructure spending, what did this Treasurer bring home? No bacon, that is for sure. He brought to the people of South Australia just \$2 billion—just \$2 billion of commonwealth funds out of \$50 billion. What representation is that? Two billion out of \$50 billion—four per cent of the federal pie—that is it. That is how this government intends to keep 'building South Australia', to paraphrase Labor's election slogan.

Perhaps the Treasurer was not able to justify the infrastructure spending blowouts that occurred when he was minister for transport—\$150 million blowout for Adelaide Oval; \$37 million blowout for the Southern Expressway; \$100 million blowout in the construction of the water conductor; and I could keep going on and on. This state will be a beneficiary of the federal government's efforts to scrap the toxic mining and carbon taxes.

Now that I have done that, I will focus on some of the needs of my electorate going into the future. I would like to commend the federal, state and local governments for committing to the Campbelltown Leisure Centre. This new and exciting development, a \$22.5 million project in the heart of Campbelltown, will mean that young people have the opportunity to learn how to swim in hopefully what is an eight-lane, FINA-qualified swimming pool. It will also be able to be utilised by

many sporting clubs and community groups in the north-eastern and eastern suburbs, and we welcome the support of the governments for this project; it has been a long time coming.

I would especially like to acknowledge and commend the work of our local federal MP in the area for his support. Strong local sporting clubs are an essential pillar of any close-knit community, and so I also implore the government to support the opposition's commitment to upgrade the Hectorville Sports and Community Club, which is a great community club that provides much support for our community—and they are in their 50th year, I might add.

I also commend the federal government for increased funding for Black Spot and Roads to Recovery funding; it is particularly important to commuters in Hartley due to the road safety concerns on many roads in the electorate; for example, Barnes Road in Glynde and the intersection of Magill Road and Glynburn Road. The Glynburn Road/Magill Road intersection is an issue that I lobbied for as a candidate. We now have another minister in that area, but I look forward to discussing it with him as well.

I actually started a petition on behalf of our local residents on this exact issue, and now as a member of parliament I am delighted to have been with our deputy leader during the campaign to raise these concerns about the safety of the intersection. Work has already begun on the intersection, and it has been ongoing since late last year. I thank the government for establishing a permanent fund through the Motor Accident Commission to improve road safety at trouble spots around the state.

While on the issue of road funding: Payneham Road leading to the intersection of Lower North-East Road, Glynburn Road and Montacute Road has also been plagued with congestion problems for many years, and it was a serious issue in the recent state election. A road traffic management plan for the McNally development must also be initiated. The area will see over 200 houses being built, and to think that this government has not put in a road management plan for the area is shameful.

On behalf of the people of Magill in Hartley, I call on the government to include a road traffic management plan for this area down the track, whether in the budget or otherwise. The McNally development is the largest housing development in Hartley at the moment, and I believe it is essential that a traffic plan be implemented to preserve the harmony of the local area.

I also call on the South Australian government to honour its election commitment to the people of Glynde in my electorate to relocate the proposed electricity substation to an alternative site on crown land. This issue is very concerning to me and the local residents. It is incumbent on this government to provide funding for this, to relocate this substation to government land or otherwise, but not in a residential area.

The people of Glynde deserve more than just small talk on this issue; they have had small talk from the previous member for Hartley and they deserve more now, and that is why I raise this. The house will note that one of my first actions in the house was to raise this via a grievance debate, and I would like to reiterate that today. They have been lied to and they have been neglected on this issue.

I urge and implore the Treasurer to show some valour, because he was there in the final days of the last state election; he heard the lies that the previous member for Hartley told to those people. He now has the opportunity—he now writes the cheques. He can put some money on the table and show the people of Hartley that he is serious and move this substation out of residential Glynde. On behalf of the residents of Paradise, I also call on the government to make a commitment for a long-term parking solution to stop the flood of cars on residential streets in Paradise.

I spoke last week on the concerns of Lochiel Park and how the gross pollutant trap there has not worked. Of course, this was one of the previous premier's (Hon. Mike Rann) great testimonies and one of his great projects; however, the gross pollutant trap has not worked in this development, and it is about time that the government took some initiative and took some steps to make it work.

After 12 long years of Labor in South Australia, it is official: the government, as we heard, is parasitic. The Labor government is parasitic; it is divided, it is dysfunctional, and it is not interested in good governance. South Australia's jobless rate has jumped, and in the 12 months to March 2014, retail sales in South Australia rose only 1.9 per cent compared to national sales, which have grown 3.8 per cent. We have the worst retail sales figures in all states—shame!

A report released by the Centre for Independent Studies has also provided a damning assessment of South Australia's debt levels after 12 years of this Labor government. The report notes that '...[South Australia] has one of the highest debt ratios, recorded the largest increase in debt in the three years to 2013, and has one of the least dynamic economies', and yet what is this government doing to diversify? It is not surprising that, with those opposite, the state lost its AAA credit rating in 2012.

In closing, while I will support the Supply Bill 2014, the government must certainly do many things. First, it must detail how Labor will deliver its promise to create 100,000 new jobs by 2016, which it promised to the people of South Australia. How will it do it? How will Labor deliver its promise to return to surplus in 2015-16? I am yet to see a strategy, a solution or an answer as to how this mob are going to get our state back on track.

This government must also detail how Labor will regain the state's AAA credit rating and how it will reduce debt. Which health services will it cut? Which education services will it cut? It must also confirm that every election promise will be fully funded. Also, for the people of South Australia, it must confirm that no government assets will be sold, as it promised before the election.

Rather than blame the federal government for its ineptitude and incompetence, and rather than blame the international markets and complain about the global economic crisis, this government must now, more than ever, show some leadership and discharge the responsibility of governing with an economic plan for the long-term prosperity of this state.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:47): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. The leader is the lead speaker later in the debate. The Supply Bill really is a procedural matter where the parliament approves the government to get a supply of money to go out and perform its functions and pay the Public Service. As part of the debate, members of parliament get the opportunity to contribute on the widest range of topics possible.

I want to paint a picture about where the state finances are, following 12 years of a Labor government. We need to remember that this is not a government taking over from a government of a different party, which comes into government and says, 'Things are worse than we thought and, therefore, we need to change decisions or election policies.' This is a government that has had total control of the Treasury benches for 12 years, so in any assessment the state of the state's finances, liabilities and economy are 100 per cent the responsibility of this government.

The reality is that the government is going to run around and blame the Abbott government for every decision that is going to be made in the forthcoming state budget, to be brought down on 19 June. However, the truth is that before the election, through evidence given to the Budget and Finance Committee, it was clear that the Labor state government had budgeted for cuts to the health budget of over \$1,000 million, cuts to education of around \$220 million to \$250 million and cuts to police of between \$130 million and \$150 million. These were cuts being made to those areas of government because of this government's—the same government's—mismanagement of the state budget and the Public Service over 12 years.

When the government goes to the people with the budget and say that they are making all these savings because of that terrible federal government, the truth is that there is about \$1.5 billion worth of cuts that are required in the forward estimates that were already announced prior to the election and any decision made in the federal budget.

What is interesting is that the government is saying that over the next four years of the state's forward estimates the federal decisions in the budget will impact by about \$898 million. My understanding, if you read the press release carefully, is that it is actually partly offset because there is \$355 million worth of extra GST, so the net impact then comes down to \$543 million over four years. If you divide \$543 million by four over the four years of the forward estimates you end up with about \$135 million a year, if that is the actual amount of the federal cut. Now, \$135 million is actually less than one per cent of state budget. The state budget is between \$15 billion and \$16 billion, so \$135 million is less than one per cent of state budget.

It is interesting to note that they have said that a big impact has also occurred through the decline in the state's own-source revenue, so land tax, payroll tax and stamp duties. So there is about a \$300 million to \$350 million hit to the budget, apparently, because the state's revenues are not keeping up with what was budgeted.

That is not a surprise to this side of the house, because they overinflated their predictions of revenues on payroll tax and stamp duties. Some of them were running at somewhere between nine and 12 per cent increases in those tax measures, and that inflated the revenue source's figures in the budget which, of course, made the deficit smaller and the surpluses bigger. Now, after the election, we get a bit more of the truth, where they say, 'Well, actually, our revenues did not keep up with these bold predictions in the budget and there is another \$300 million hit to the state budget.'

The point I make about the one per cent hit through the commonwealth's decisions is simply this: this is a state government that cannot deliver a surplus. It has run six deficits in seven years; it is just over a \$1,000 million deficit, a billion-dollar deficit, that we have overspent this year. Next year the deficit is about \$500 million and then, of course, like every year for the last six or seven years, in the out years (year 3, year 4) the government has predicted surpluses. The government is always predicting surpluses, but it keeps delivering deficits.

The reality is that this year's deficit—which is an overspend of over \$1,000 million by the government—when it was first predicted, was going to be a \$480 million surplus. It is a \$1,000 million deficit. That is a 1½ billion dollar difference. If you go through all of the deficits and surpluses, in actual fact what this government has promised is \$2.6 billion worth of surpluses and they have delivered \$2.9 billion worth of deficit. There is a 5½ billion dollar (\$5,500 million) difference between what they promised in surpluses and what they have delivered in deficits.

The reason I raise the issue about the federal impact on the state budget being about one per cent of the budget is that, had this government been running the surpluses it promised, whatever the impact of the federal budget across the forward estimates could have been met within the surpluses the government had actually promised if they had simply kept to their budget.

This government is going to squeal and complain about the federal budget—and I do not deny that there will be some impacts—however, this government, through its own poor budget management, has failed to prepare for what might happen if its revenues decline.

They should have planned for a contingency—what happens if their revenues decline—because the Auditor-General has been warning them, year in and year out, that they were building into the budget a high level of expenditure on revenues that may well be unsustainable, and he did that three years out of four. The Auditor-General has alerted the government to it, and the government has simply ignored the Auditor-General's warning and continued to build in a high level of expenditure; and now, of course, Canberra has changed the revenue mix and the state government is now squealing.

I argue that the reason there is going to be a more significant impact of any federal decision than there needed to be is the poor budget management of this particular government. As I say, it has delivered six deficits in seven years. The only surplus this government has delivered was in 2010. That happened to be an election year. That was the year they got over \$1 billion extra—I think it might have been \$2 billion extra but at least \$1 billion—out of the Rudd-Gillard government for infrastructure and program spending which was brought into the budget as a revenue item in the general government sector, and when it was spent it was spent out of the capital side of the budget so it artificially inflated the surplus figure.

They got over \$1 billion extra and the surplus they delivered was only around \$187 million. Even though they got \$1 billion extra in that one year, they could still only deliver a surplus of around \$187 million. For six out of seven years, the government has been running deficits. I suspect what we will see in the budget is a deficit this year, a deficit next year and, again, a future promise of surpluses. Frankly, why would you believe it? They have been promising them for seven years. Just like the Gillard-Rudd government, they keep promising surpluses and they keep delivering deficits.

The reality is that the government's budget woes are due to their own mismanagement. It is the Labor government that is promising to reduce the Public Service by at least 3,800 over the next four-year period. It is the Labor government that is slashing the Public Service by 3,800—health spending by \$1,000 million, education by \$230 million to \$250 million, police by \$130 million to \$150 million. That is a Labor government following 12 years of Labor government. It is a pretty simple argument to understand that if you do not need 3,800 public servants in 2016-17, 2017-18 and future years, why did you need them for the last three years? Why did they employ them in the first place if we can provide the level of services the government claims?

The government says they are going to take all these public servants out of the system—they will cut \$1,000 million out of health, there will be cuts to police and education and there will be no impact on services. That will be the government's argument. That simply raises the very simple question: what was the ministry doing when they were employing these 3,800 extra public servants in the first place? There has been a huge amount of money that has washed through the system that, by the government's own admission, was spent on programs that are not a priority, because they are about to get rid of a whole range of programs and a whole range of public servants.

There is an argument to say that, had this government simply managed the Public Service and departmental expenditure better, they would not be in the position they are in today. If they were running surpluses instead of deficits, they would not be in the position of having more difficulty in managing the outcomes, whatever they might be, of the federal budget.

The reality is there is a change in the debate going on around Australia about the role of the states. The Abbott government has made it crystal clear they are going to look at passing more of the functions back to the states. There is a federation white paper coming out—I am not sure when, but I think in the next 18 months—about the role of states and the role of the commonwealth, and that will lead to a debate about, if the states are going to perform these functions, how are the states going to raise the revenue to provide those functions?

If you look at what has happened with the states over the years, they actually have their own tax revenues and, down the track, state governments are going to be forced to look at how they provide their services through the tax system they currently have or how they can change the tax system to provide better services long term. That will be a debate that I think will happen on the back of the white paper, on the back of the federal GST/taxation paper, that is going to come out at the same time.

That is the debate that is about to occur in Australia's history: what is the function of states and how will the revenue be raised? My personal view is that I want more functions performed by states. I think the closer the decision-making is done to where the service is delivered, the more likely you are to get a better outcome, so I look forward to that debate more generally over the next couple of years.

The reality is that this state government has mismanaged its budget. It went out and deliberately trashed its AAA credit rating; that impacts on the level of interest, the interest rate we pay on our debt. Our debt is budgeted to climb to around \$14 billion, the highest debt in the state's history. As a result of that debt, we are paying over \$1,000 million in interest on that debt—\$1,000 million.

To put that into some perspective, if our interest on debt payment were a government department it would be the fifth biggest government department in the state. In actual fact, we spend more on interest on debt than we do on our whole police service. This is a function of the government's own program. It went out and deliberately trashed the AAA credit rating, and this is the result.

Once you take your eye off the ball on financial management and not have getting a AAA rating as your priority, then all discipline on spending tends to unfold, and that is what we have seen with the government. The government went to the election promising a significant number of promises and we expect them, as the Treasurer told this house, to honour every single one of those commitments made to the electorate.

There is just one other comment I want to make with regard to the internal workings of the current government, and I guess I am really talking to the right-wing members of the state government. If they have not worked it out yet, they have a premier who is working for the Premier and not for the whole of the state Labor government, and you just have to look at two areas that I think are worthy of a political observation.

This is a premier who refused to have in his parliament, in his party room, Don Farrell, who has given decades of loyal service to the Labor Party, not the party I support, but I think it is broadly recognised that Mr Farrell has given years of dedicated service to the Labor right wing and, indeed, the state Labor government. This Premier was so offended by the thought that Mr Farrell might come in and join his party room that he called a press conference and said, 'I'm not having that.'

Roll forward three months, to after the election, and he is quite happy to have within his cabinet someone who has given decades of service to the Liberal Party, the direct opponent of the Labor Party. It says something about the Premier, and my message is to the right-wing members of the Labor Party who think they might have done a deal with the Premier on certain matters: it is pretty obvious to me that he is going to govern in his interest rather than the party's interests. I think what he has done is quite clever, in that he has put the up-and-comers, if you like, in the Labor Party who might want to be future leaders into difficult portfolios that are going to take all the cuts.

You have the member for West Torrens, the Treasurer, who is going to deliver what has been predicted to be a pretty savage state budget and he will be the public face of that. Of course, the other one with leader aspirations is the Minister for Health, the member for Playford, who will be the public face of all the health cuts that are about to occur, and of course Mr Mullighan has been put into the difficult transport portfolio.

What the Premier is doing is trying to give the right wing of the Labor Party the portfolios that are going to suffer all of the political damage to protect his position long term. The left wing of the Labor Party have the party portfolios—tourism, rec and sport and those sort of things—that do not have the hard economics to them.

I find it interesting that the Premier of the Labor Party could say to Mr Farrell, who has given decades of service, 'You are not wanted one bit. You are not wanted one bit but I will take on the other hand someone who has worked against us as a Liberal for 17 years.' He will take them not only into the party or into the inner circles but he is taking them right into the cabinet. Don Farrell might not have even made it to cabinet, he might have been stuck on the back bench for a long time. The reality is that they have taken someone—or in particular the Premier has.

I think it is a stark message to the right wing of the Labor Party as to what they have created when they walked into Mike Rann's office with Peter Malinauskas and the member for Playford and tapped Mike Rann on the shoulder on the basis of a deal they had done with the member for Cheltenham. Now he is there and I think it is pretty obvious it is going to be everything the Premier's way and that the right wing of the Labor Party will just have to wear it until they are ready, of course, to cut his throat.

That is my view on the Supply Bill. I look forward to the budget with some interest. I think it will have a lot of debating points in it for the state. What I am really interested in is one simple point; that is, will the state government honour every single one of its commitments made to the electorate, including the return to surpluses in the years as predicted?

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:07): I also rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2014. While the Supply Bill receives opposition support as a matter of procedure, it does provide me the opportunity to make some comments regarding the state of the budget and the state of the government's performance on economic mismanagement.

The budget update handed down by the government in January this year delivered the highest debt in the state's history and the highest budget deficits in the state's history. State debt will be \$14 billion by 2016 and will increase at \$4.1 million per day for eight years. Interest on debt will reach \$1 billion per annum in the year 2017. This is more than the police budget.

The government has an appalling record. In the last seven years it has delivered six deficits totalling \$2.9 billion while, at the same time, promising \$2.6 billion in surpluses over the same time period. State taxes are the highest in the nation. Water prices in Adelaide are the highest of all capital cities in the nation. CPI during the 12 years of Labor was 40 per cent, yet in the same time frame property charges have increased by 87 per cent, state taxes 92 per cent, gas bills 136 per cent, electricity bills 160 per cent and water bills an incredible 227 per cent.

As well, \$2.3 billion worth of government contracts are going interstate each year and the cost of doing business in South Australia is at an unprecedented level. It is no surprise that this state is in the midst of a jobs crisis. There are 18,000 fewer full-time jobs since the 2013 state budget. South Australia's jobless rate has increased to 6.3 per cent from 4.8 per cent in 2010, when Labor promised to create 100,000 new jobs. Northern Adelaide has the second-highest youth unemployment in the nation, with 45 per cent of youth unemployed. South Australia's jobs growth is the worst in the nation. Small to medium enterprises in South Australia have the worst business

confidence on the mainland. Business investment has contracted by 8.1 per cent in the December 2013 quarter—the worst performance of all the states.

South Australia's economy is going backwards under this government. Adelaide was the eighth most expensive city in the world for manufacturing out of 131 cities and ranked as the second-most expensive city in the world in its population bracket. South Australia had 4,744 (or 3.2 per cent) of all businesses closed in 2012-13. South Australia also has the lowest business start-up rate on the mainland and has done so for the last 10 consecutive years. It is no wonder our talented graduates are moving to the eastern seaboard where jobs are being created by Liberal governments in those states kickstarting their economies by backing business.

I am also affected by this in that one of my staff members is leaving to move to Sydney because his partner has been offered a full-time job in Sydney as a lawyer. Every year we apparently have as many graduating law students as we have lawyers in the whole of the state. I ask whether that is the right thing to be happening in universities, that is, graduating people for jobs they know do not exist and losing our brightest minds out of our state.

Regarding interstate migration, people aged between 20 and 34 years account for more than half of our interstate migrants, meaning that South Australia is losing valuable skilled workers and university graduates. There was a 49 per cent increase in net interstate migration out of South Australia in the last year. There have been 35,000 net interstate migrants out of South Australia under 12 years of Labor. Compare this to Queensland which has recorded an average net increase of 25,000 people annually over the past decade. The lack of jobs growth in this state has made it untenable for our own skilled workers and graduates to remain in Adelaide. This is an embarrassing state of affairs for South Australia.

As a state, we invest a considerable amount in our young through education and training. It is devastating to think that this investment is being lost to our interstate counterparts because we cannot provide opportunities here in South Australia. Speaking of our investment in education and training, let me reflect on some of the horrifying results in education under this Labor government. South Australian students are falling behind: our students are well below the national average in 19 out of 20 NAPLAN categories and no improvement in these categories has been achieved since 2008. In the results recorded in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) Australia ranked 19th out of 65 countries. However, if South Australia was a country it would have ranked 35th. Our results in maths, science and reading have all astronomically declined according to the 2014 ACER PISA report.

Over the next four years, the Weatherill government will receive \$570 million in extra funding for schools from the federal government. It is the state Labor government that is making \$230 million in cuts to education over this period while, at the same time, arguing the desperate need for commonwealth investment.

Let us look at transport and consider the government's proposed car parking tax. The money of course has been spent well and truly before it has been collected in true Labor style. In an attempt by this Labor government to save money, they swapped bus providers which has led to endless problems and thousands of recorded complaints. It has led to buses running late, buses not turning up, bus users getting into trouble with their employers or schools for being late, and a general loss of confidence in our bus system. This led to a drop off of 2.2 million users of buses. To try to bandaid fix the problem caused by the government's bad decision, new bus timetables were printed, new bus lanes were installed in the city, and more time was allowed for trips previous providers had managed to do in less time for many years. We now have 5.5 million fewer boardings on public transport from the 2009-10 year compared with the 2012-13 year.

To try to force people back onto buses and public transport, the government is seeking a \$750 city car parking tax. Studies by the Adelaide City Council of similar levies in other Australian cities show that in Melbourne there was a marginal reduction of car trips of 8 per cent. The corresponding increase in public transport use however, was only 2 per cent. From this, you could conclude that 6 per cent less people were visiting the city. This would be devastating for city businesses, particularly retailers who are already suffering due to many other factors such as internet shopping and no GST on sales under \$1,000.

In Melbourne it was found that most employers were absorbing the cost of the car parking, adding yet another cost to running a business in the city. Commercial car park owners transferred

the burden of the levy away from their long-term contracted parking spaces to the short-term users, thus making short-term parking very expensive with the effect, arguably, of discouraging shoppers and visitors from going into the city. The workers the government wanted to use public transport were not using it and the shoppers they wanted in the city were not going in due to the high cost of parking.

South Australians want a reliable, safe and affordable public transport system. Instead, the government is going ahead with its toxic car park tax. It is not just businesses, workers and shoppers who are affected by this car park tax, it is also churches and not-for-profit organisations such as the Salvation Army and the National Council of Women. Most importantly, it affects city residents who have been encouraged into this city for city vibrancy, yet the government allows buildings to be built in the city without adequate and sometimes without any car parking, thus residents have to lease commercial car parks which means they will all be hit by the \$750 car parking tax.

I have had calls from residents living in the UNO Apartments which are specifically for low income people who, due to disabilities, need a car to get to their medical appointments—there are no buses on that street—and they are very worried about how they will afford to live in the city, and they have been encouraged into the city by this government. I have also had calls from a young woman who lives on North Terrace—again, encouraged into the city for city vibrancy with low-priced housing. She has to lease a car park adjacent to her building and now she is saying, 'Why did I even move into the city? It would be far cheaper for me to live in the suburbs.' People who have been encouraged into the city are pretty angry that they are now going to be hit by this car parking tax.

The Adelaide City Council is a major owner of car parks in the city and owns the majority of the metered parks on the street. They will also have to pay this levy, equating to hundreds of thousands of dollars (if not millions) that will have to be found elsewhere. It is likely that residents and business owners will also have to foot this extra cost via their rates, their rent or their leasing costs as well, making it even more expensive for people living or working in the city. The choices for people accessing the CBD are to rely on the unreliable public transport network or to pay the soon-to-be exorbitant amount for car parking.

What problem is the government really trying to address with this car parking tax? I would say it is all about making money to compensate for this government's incompetency. They might say it is about congestion in the city. Let's look at this. Congestion: it is debatable whether Adelaide has a congestion problem in the CBD. If we assume there is some congestion—and we have lost lots of lanes across the city—then I do not believe the car park tax will actually make any difference. The congestion problems have come as a result of poor planning and the lack of cooperation between the state government and the Adelaide City Council, which is also one of the reasons why I believe that the member for Adelaide should be on the Capital City Committee.

Let's look at the city. East Terrace has had two lanes removed for buses between Grenfell Street and North Terrace (a state government initiative). Hutt Street is now a 40 km/h zone (initiated by the Adelaide City Council) which forces more cars into all the suburban side streets and residential areas. Frome Street has two lanes removed for the bike lanes (Adelaide City Council). King William Street has two lanes removed for trams and the removal of all right-hand turns between North Terrace and Victoria Square (state government).

Victoria Square, if anyone has tried to drive through it, is an absolute mess. It is totally confusing, lanes merge, you cannot work out how to turn right. I do not think you even can. I am still trying to work out how to get back from the Town Hall to Parliament House from the many meetings and functions that I have there. Morphett Street has one lane missing because of the Convention Centre expansion and I am told that that lane may never be returned, so I am very interested to hear about that.

There is also no right-hand turn onto Hindley Street, which was a council initiative, and the right-hand turn onto Currie Street, if you are coming over the Morphett Street bridge, is impossible due to the bus lanes causing banked up traffic all along Currie Street. I have been on Morphett Street and, due to the no right-hand turn at Hindley and then almost impossible right-hand turn onto Currie, you can be banked up nearly to War Memorial Drive, so it is not working in the city.

West Terrace has also had two lanes missing since at least before the confluents went up, because I know we had a lot of trouble accessing West Terrace when putting up posters. That was in February, and I believe there is still work going on for gasworks. At the same time, we have removed so many different lanes for different reasons.

If we head east-west, North Terrace on the western side lost two lanes due to the tram and there is no turning because of the raised kerbing. In Melbourne, when they put in a tram, you can actually still cross over the tramline and turn right. We have one U-turn access point.

In fact, it was the tram going onto North Terrace that seriously affected my business at the time in the Qantas building because people from the north could not turn right to access my business. People coming from Port Road or West Terrace, coming up North Terrace, could never turn right, because of the raised median strip, to get across the road. We lost all the loading zones in front of my building where people would drop off children for courses, because of the new lights that were put in for the tram.

Basically, I was in an inaccessible building, in the middle of the city, paying huge rent, so I moved my business out of the city because of the tram being put on North Terrace. If we continue with the City Council and the state government removing lane after lane, right turn after right turn and restricting access everywhere, we are eventually going to move businesses out of the city which, I believe, is the opposite of what you are trying to achieve with your city vibrancy.

Still heading east-west, there is no access to Hindley Street, as I mentioned, between Morphett Street and West Terrace. Grenfell and Currie streets have lost two lanes due to the bus lanes, which was a state government initiative.

On Pirie Street, there is a new pedestrian crossing. At times in the morning, because pedestrians keep filing through and the pedestrian crossing is so close to the intersection of King William and Pirie, I have seen that the left-hand turners coming off King William sometimes can be banked up quite far back, really holding up the traffic in that area. When it was first initiated, I was driving through Pirie Street, and the cars heading westward along Pirie Street were banked up to Pulteney. I believe people are getting the hang of that a bit more. I went past this morning and it was working a bit better, but it is very close to an intersection, and I would question whether that was the best placement. There is also difficulty accessing Wakefield because of the Victoria Square issues.

The congestion problems have come as a result, I believe, of the lack of cooperation between the state government and the Adelaide City Council. Let us look at some of the broken promises on infrastructure that we have had from this government.

We have had \$75 million for the Darlington interchange promised and scrapped, and \$140 million for the South Road/Sturt Road underpass scrapped. Promised three times was the electrification of the Gawler line, and it was scrapped twice. We had \$122 million promised for the underpass on South Road, under Port Road and Grange Road, and that was scrapped. There was \$600 million for prison facilities scrapped, \$520 million for trams to the western suburbs scrapped, and doubling of the Mount Bold Reservoir was scrapped. Maybe if it had not have been, we would not have needed the desalination plant. There was \$160 million for the Upper Spencer Gulf desal plant scrapped and \$61 million for the O-Bahn extension was also scrapped.

Can we even trust this government to deliver on what it promises? When the government does deliver on what it has promised, on many occasions it is over time and over budget. Some examples would include the \$1.7 billion for the new RAH. At this estimate, it is already up to \$2.8 billion and has not been delivered yet, so who knows what the final figure might be.

The \$450 million and 'not a penny more' for Adelaide Oval cost \$600 million to deliver. The \$370 million Southern Expressway duplication, at this estimate, is \$407 million, so already over budget. The \$304 million water interconnector was delivered at \$403 million; again over its estimate.

I certainly question the government's ability to deliver its \$36 billion infrastructure plan and transport plan and whether, for things like the tram down Prospect Road, it has had any engineering studies or costings. During the election campaign there was no ability to give us a cost for individual projects, just a random figure that covered everything. I would suspect that it is not even feasible or possible to deliver a tram down Prospect Road given that the narrowest point of Prospect Road is seven metres and a tram is 2.5 metres.

Two trams are five metres wide plus their mirrors and, if 'a metre matters' for cyclists, you do not even have enough room for that let alone cars or bikes or anything else on the street. For anyone who lived in Prospect when there was a tram, they were rapt when they got rid of it the first time, let alone initiating a huge cost that will put us into more debt under this government to bring a tram back that people were pleased to get rid of in the first instance.

It was the incompetence, the wrong priorities and the economic mismanagement of this Labor government that motivated me to run for the seat of Adelaide and whilst unfortunately I remain in opposition, I will always do my best to hold this government to account and to achieve good outcomes for the people of Adelaide whom I represent.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:26): I am pleased to have the opportunity today to talk for some short time about the Supply Bill—

An honourable member: About 20 minutes.

Mr GRIFFITHS: —about 20 minutes—and indeed the \$3.94 billion that is provided in the bill as an advancement upon future budget expenditure for the 2014-15 financial year to allow the government to continue operating.

I am intrigued by the process of it actually and about the specifics of the dollar, even though it is very broad—\$3,940 million gives you a bit of leeway, no doubt about that—but given that the budget is presented on 19 June and there is a continuing political party in place that will be in government, how are we not in a position to ensure that the implementation of that is far quicker? Why it is necessary to give forward approval to such a significant level of dollars, which is about 25 per cent of the budget, to allow the continuation of payments beyond 1 July? But that is how the system works and far be it from me to try to criticise or improve some things. Hopefully, one day we will have a chance to change to the other side and see what we can do there.

I am a fiscal conservative by nature and normally risk-averse, who certainly likes to ensure that expenditure is appropriate, prioritised and the benefit for the community is always going to be there and that is why I have enjoyed, in my eight years in parliament, that there is some scrutiny of the budget figures and the understanding of not just the challenges presented to governments and opposition when it comes to forming opinions on where priorities should be allocated, but also the process of how that is done and to try to get the positive outcomes. No matter where we come from, what we try to do with between \$15 billion or \$16 billion is to ensure that the outcomes are strong ones. They have to be, because the state government is the biggest player in the game in South Australia; there is absolutely no doubt about that.

Decisions made by political parties, particularly around election time and what that does to business confidence levels, is absolutely key. In the four years in between elections, the sole responsibility rests upon the government to get it right. There are a lot of members from this side of the chamber who will criticise where decisions are made and where priorities are reached and what the actions of those priorities are, but it has to actually ensure that the parliament has an opportunity to debate it. There is no doubt that we will be here for some period today and probably tomorrow too and people will put up positions on things and try to espouse their personal views and express frustrations or express support for it and the truth is somewhere in between, probably. That is just it: the hard part is always finding what it is.

I wish to comment a little bit about portfolio areas that I have responsibility for—local government, regional development and planning—and just how, as I understand it, dollar impacts from future budgets might either support or challenge those communities that benefit from those services. Regional development funding has been a rather interesting one, it is fair to say, since the election day. The member for Frome, by virtue of supporting the Labor Party and allowing them to form a minority government, was able to negotiate some additional funds to come through which were a significant increase from the Labor Party of particular support for regional areas, and a significant decrease, I think it is fair to say, in terms of what the Liberal Party put as part of its election platform and the dollars that it was committing to regional communities.

The member for Frome continually refers to the \$39 million that has come from that agreement. Part of that is a commitment of \$13.6 million to the Regional Development Fund, which is predominantly infrastructure based, but it will be used, from what I understand from the minister and the announcements made about that, for probably a few different areas.

It is absolutely key to get that right too. It is a significant leap forward. It matches what the Liberal Party put there in the election two months ago, and it is part of a long-term commitment that members on this side of the chamber have to regional communities. I hope the member for Frome ensures, in the important role that he holds for the people of South Australia now, that the outcomes from that are very strong. It will take strong ministerial direction.

It will take some excellent action by Regional Development Australia groups to ensure that the outcomes are there, and by local communities demanding and having very high expectations of where the dollar is to be spent. It is a significant leap forward. I want to work with the minister to ensure that the outcomes are strong. I am pleased that there is a level of personal relationship between the two of us that allows us to have rather informal chats and to talk about things, because he knows that I also come from the focus of an outcome driven person. We will see how that goes in the future.

The minister has talked about an increase in funding for the Regional Development Australia group to provide for the administrative functions that it undertakes. It is fair to say that the original fund of \$1.6 million was contestable to some degree, but the outcomes are predominantly project-based, which allows a relatively small amount of that to be used for administrative support. My understanding is that the increase is still targeted in this way.

The feedback that I have received from the Regional Development Australia groups is that that will challenge their operations. They need a level of recurrent contributions to ensure that they can meet the costs of the people and the infrastructure they need to service the communities in which they are based. The minister is talking to groups about that. I am in agreement with him on the fact that some very strong KPIs need to be in place for that to ensure the outcomes are there. I hope that in future discussions (which he has to conclude very soon, to be fair) he can ensure that some level of middle ground is found that allows him to get what he wants to see from it—that is his right as a minister—but that gives the RDAs the opportunity to move forward too.

It needs to occur very quickly, otherwise we will lose some key staff. The majority of those I have met are people who try to do great things in their community. They have the networks; they have a relationship with business opportunity, not just in mentoring and the support of current businesses, but they know who to talk to to make future business opportunities a reality. They need to be supported and it is a very delicate balancing act that needs to be concluded soon, otherwise we will get to 1 July and there will be some people who do not have continuing contracts in place and they will be lost. Then, if you have the money suddenly given to you, you have to try to recruit and then develop a whole new skill set that will allow the outcomes to be strong ones from the very start.

I am immensely disappointed when I look at the unemployment figures across so many areas of South Australia. The figures from the metropolitan north are extremely disturbing; they must be for all of us in here, I think. I know that the members of any area truly feel for the people whom they know are actively engaging in employment-seeking opportunities, the good ones who are out there developing skills, constantly applying and presenting very well to potential employers, but not getting an opportunity.

There are probably a couple of reasons for that. There are so many out there who are looking for those jobs. No matter where you are, the figures are quite high, with a state average of 6.3 per cent, but in regional communities it is up to even 9 to 9.7 per cent. In the metropolitan north it is up to 45 per cent for youth unemployed, which is just disgraceful for our future generational opportunities. That has to be a key, and to me it links back to the 2010 election commitment from the Labor Party of the 100,000 jobs to be created.

I know from figures that I looked at a couple of months ago that they require something like 4,400 new jobs to be created every month to meet that target, when in effect since the commitment was first given we have gone down in job numbers. That saddens me. It has to be the absolute focus. It is not just an opportunity for us to question the Premier as the person primarily responsible for it and to get an answer back which meets the political need of the day but does not actually meet the on-the-ground needs of the community out there. So, I urge all to ensure that commitments are met—and that word is used quite often about ensuring that you meet a commitment given or a promise made and that the outcomes are good ones; they have to be.

Another one for me as a shadow minister is planning. I am a person who does try to look at what are the forward needs of a community; therefore, planning is a good mix for me personally. Coming into this place from a local government background and being exposed from that perspective of a level of government on planning controls has allowed me to understand the acronyms of everything that is used, to understand the terminology, when I am briefed on proposals about what things are and when I have some questions about areas that require some clarification, because I

do have that background in understanding it. But that means I respect how important it is. It is key, actually.

There is a level of population growth in South Australia; it is about 0.9 of a per cent. We do have a relatively low level of occupation rate in homes; I think it is about 1.75 people per household. I want our population to increase, absolutely. With that will come the challenge of accommodating people. We are not a culture where we support necessarily population continually moving up or in large concentrations. There is a need for a level of space to exist, which will put a lot of pressure on redevelopments in brownfield sites or, indeed, greenfield sites.

If we are continually spreading out, there are some significant challenges in place. The forward visions we present to the community, following engagement with the community and making them have input into it, will be either seen as an opportunity or a significant weakness by some who might work in development areas. It will create some robust discussion, there is absolutely no doubt about that, but the discussions are the good ones to have, because it is only when the really serious debate occurs that you get the positive outcomes.

No matter where you come from, you want to see a level of growth in your community. You want existing businesses to be strong, to be vibrant, to have future job opportunities. You also want to ensure that with that growth comes a sustainable community that looks at triple bottom lines—environment, economic and social impacts—and provides services for that. It presents a lot of challenges to do so, to massage that all together and to come up with a positive outcome so that there are no negatives attached to it, but it is one that government absolutely has to be focused on looking at. It will be interesting to see what happens.

Local government is another one for me. It is fair to say that a policy that we put out at the last election which talked about rate capping was not overly well received by the 68 local governments across the state. For me, though, as a former local government person, I am focused on the efficiency and the cost of delivery of services. I think that there has to be some balance between a vision that a community, via its council, holds and wants to do and the economic reality of what it can afford to do.

Aspirational targets have to be there, absolutely; we have to ensure that we strive to achieve the absolute best for us. But if that level of local government reflects upon and it is such an important one to the community, we have to ensure that the efficiency of that service delivery is the absolute best it can be. In my mind, it is a matter of either efficiency dividends or the rate capping.

I want to see a serious review take place across all 68 councils on how they can deliver their service as best and as effectively as possible because, at the end of the day, the money that they use comes from, yes, some federal government money and, yes, some state government money, but the majority of it comes from the pockets of the people who live in that area and who own property in that area—and that is where they have to demand the absolute best.

Whereas once upon time there would have been a willingness of a community to not necessarily cause too much trouble in relation to that, now any member of parliament who has been here for even a short length of time probably has a lot of contact from people who live in their community questioning some outcomes from that, and they want to see some improvements.

On 19 June, it is going to be a really important day. From an opposition perspective, we get, I think, a copy of the version of the budget that is presented, at about 1 o'clock. We get one copy, that is all. They are furiously photocopied so that you can have about five people read it. Minister, you have a great chance to review it and have input into it beforehand; we get it in that version. Until we sit down and when the Treasurer has walked in, we then get a copy, and then they are sort of shuffled off and people review it.

There is a lot of impetus, especially in that first couple of hours after it is presented. You are trying to identify where its strengths and weaknesses are from our point of view; given that we might get about 15 seconds on television that night, it is where the weaknesses are and what you can use as a grab line. It is the absolute key document that any government presents. It sets out the forward vision in some level of detail across the full four year period but in absolute detail for the next 12 months.

I have found it interesting to review it. You try to look at where the weaknesses are against where commitments have been given, and what the outcomes actually are when it comes to dollars.

The budget format changes fractionally each year, so it is harder to do direct tracking against previous years' efforts. It is an exciting day, and I hope it remains an exciting day for Treasurer Koutsantonis.

When he walks in and stands up—the Treasurer is the third Treasurer in consecutive years to present a budget to the people of South Australia, in a climate of challenging economic times, no doubt about that—it will be very interesting to see how his 30 minutes go when he is standing up reading the speech, and, indeed, what the response is over the next few days and the next few weeks to ensure that the outcomes are what the people of South Australia demand.

As a fiscal conservative, I have to say that I look at the fact that there is a level of debt of \$14 billion that creates an interest component of \$1 billion per year. That is an absolute kick in the bum; it is enormous amount. It represents about 6 per cent of our state budget being spent as an interest cost that goes to others. It is an enormous challenge for our state budget. Am I a person who would like to get it down? Absolutely. Am I a person, though, who believes in a level of debt existing to grow the economy? Absolutely, also. It is part of that delicate balancing act that needs to exist.

There was some excellent work done by a parliamentary committee, the Economic and Finance Committee, last year, which did a quite long-term review of a taxation inquiry. A bipartisan level of support existed on that, and enormous number of witnesses came in and spoke to us. Even though I had some frustrations during that committee—everybody presents the problems but no one presents the solutions, and it is always hard to find the solution to any issue—but that was a good opportunity where the parliament met for a long time to present information to those who make the decisions, so I hope that has occurred.

The 2014-15 budget will see a lot of challenges, but in setting the outline for the next 12 months, in particular, it needs to provide a forum that gives the community the chance to be successful. I am a total believer in the fact that hard work should be rewarded. It is on those who work for businesses, those who work in the Public Service or those who run businesses that the policies the budget will set out will have an enormous impact, not just in the taxation policy but in terms of what level of commitment exists to training, because with that comes upskilling.

South Australia does face enormous challenges. There is no doubt that there will be a lot of opportunities in future years, but they require a level of the skilling of the workforce that will be a challenge for some people, who might be reluctant about that or who may think they are too old for it. Personally I do not believe you are too old; I think there is always a chance to improve what you do and develop new skills, because business will need them.

No matter what the political argy-bargy across the chamber and in the media actually is, the success of business is an absolute key to the importance of the success of our state. So the policies that come from the budget and the impact they have upon business, and the flow-through effect of that impact upon the workers, will be big ones.

There are about 840,000 people in South Australia in the workforce, and probably—in round numbers—about 100,000 of those work for the Public Service. We have to ensure, for those 740,000 people who work for private enterprise or for NGOs—those who actually build things, make things, the retail industry, those who service the community's needs—that there are outcomes from it. I hope that there are.

I am pleased that I will have the pleasure of hosting a minister in my electorate soon. The Minister for Transport is gracing the people of Goyder with a visit—although gracing is probably an unfortunate word. He is choosing to come over, and will open a boat ramp at Black Point that has been built with significant community input. What I intend to do, though, is ask the minister, through this forum and through speaking to him, to actually spend a few hours in the area and look at road infrastructure.

Those of you who have driven on Yorke Peninsula probably wonder about the condition of some of our roads; they go up and down, there are shoulder issues and cambers, overtaking lane needs, and things like that. As a local member, one thing I am spoken to about all the time is the condition about road network.

I know people harp on it all the time. The RAA put out a figure some years ago of a \$200 million backlog; no doubt it is in the \$400 million range now. For those of us who live in the regions, it is our transport routes, our linkages between different places and our linkage back to

Adelaide that are the absolute key for us, so there has to be a focus on improvement of our road infrastructure.

The Minister for Transport, as a new member of parliament but someone experienced in the operations of government, has taken on a very significant role, and one in which I have no doubt, given the quality of the person he is, he will try to make the best decisions, but the priorities are enormous. I do not even begin to try to imagine how the department has provided to him some list of how things fit into the jumble of the maze and how the money is meant to be spent. I have asked for it as a local member a number of times, 'Show me where the forward planning is and where money will be spent over even the next four months, let alone the next four years.' They give you some information, but I think it is a fraction of what it is.

I live in a community that has some level of patience, but the patience is nearly expired. People want to see the on-the-ground results, they want to see improvements, because we are in a demanding society where people say exactly what they think now, and not necessarily care who they are talking to, and they want to see outcomes. Good luck to the Minister for Transport. I would like to work with him on the needs of my community, and no doubt every member on both sides of the chamber would like to ensure that that dialogue exists.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, the member for Giles is one who was suggested to me. I am sure he has some needs also in his area, with a very vast electorate, a large area. However, it comes down to that one day, 19 June, when it is out there for review, for scrutiny and for identification of any good or bad thing that exists, and it has to be a day that the parliament uses to the best of its opportunities.

Time expired.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:46): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill, and I am looking forward to the state budget being handed down in a couple of weeks to see exactly who will and who will not be happy constituents in South Australia, authorising the appropriation of the \$3,941 million for the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the state for the financial year ending 30 June 2015. Obviously, many people, particularly on this side, have highlighted the shortcomings of the current government. The time it has been in—over 12 years—has been to the detriment of many outside the Adelaide area.

If we look at the impacts over time on small business, and at the impacts on the economy, whether they be positive or negative, we continue to look at the shortcomings of a government that has agendas that are not for all South Australia. In particular, in my electorate of Chaffey I am surrounded by about 4,000 small businesses, and those 4,000 small businesses are reliant upon not so much government handouts but on stimulus and on confidence and, more importantly, they rely on good governance that is there not only to support them and to give ease of passage to undertake business but also to keep them in the game of viability, of being competitive.

Here in South Australia we cannot do a lot about the value of the Australian dollar, but we can put our small businesses on the front foot so that they have the confidence to embark on the challenges of rediversifying their businesses for better strategies potentially to export their produce or manufacturing businesses, to export their technologies, to export the skill set we have in regional South Australia.

We have all said it—and I would say it again—that we have extremely high taxes in South Australia, the highest in the nation. We have the highest water charges in the nation and skyrocketing electricity and power prices, and I will touch on those shortly. In Chaffey, particularly, as a mostly irrigation district we are paying the price for what has been noted in this place many times, of having a high level of water efficiency and on-farm efficiencies, but that is slowly being undone with the high cost of power.

People here might know that pumping water and putting water into pipes is about pressurising water and about lifting water out of the river, out of the main channel and onto the higher country, and that is what is called 'lifting' water. It is an extremely expensive process in this current climate, with the ever-increasing price of power. Not only are my constituents, particularly the irrigators, being impacted by the uncertainty of water allocations but they are also now being impacted by the high cost of power, and it is ever-increasing.

We cannot see an end to our water bills or where our water bills are going. At the moment, they are going north, and there is nothing that the government has put as a stimulus, as a control point, to put a cap of some sort on escalating power prices. Those power prices will become more and more relevant as time goes by. I think a lot of efficiencies are being looked at at the moment in any business, whether it be in regional or city South Australia. I call on the government to look at ways that capping can be put in place to give some certainty, because at the moment no-one can budget for their input in the forthcoming year when no-one knows exactly what the price of power will mean to their bottom line.

Again, we look at WorkCover. One of the main complaints I get in my electorate office from small business is about the ever-increasing WorkCover levy. It is almost a disincentive, and in some cases it is driving a lot of employment under the table because people are forever paying increased costs to run their business. Also, this component of the WorkCover levy is a real disincentive to employing people because it is one of those necessary evils that has to be part of a wage or insurance package to look after your worker in case there is an unforeseen injury or accident on the premises. It is something else that continues to stifle any sort of confidence or opportunity.

In terms of interstate contracts, I know that I have stood in this place on a number of occasions and talked about government contracts that come up for tender. South Australian businesses are tendering, and they are given concessions for being a South Australian company. They have a certain type of workforce, the people they employ—an Indigenous component, perhaps a handicap component—for those contracts, yet we continually see interstate businesses coming in and undercutting the price tendered by a South Australian business.

Initially, it was always a conspiracy that there was another agenda, but if you delve further it is the cost of doing business in South Australia that is making us uncompetitive with all states in this nation, particularly for some of my constituents who have tendered for infrastructure projects or road contracts. When we look at water projects and big infrastructure builds, every time one of these infrastructure projects gets up we see foreign numberplates coming into the region and fresh faces with decal vehicles from another state. Why is it that we continually look at the short-sightedness of the initial bottom line? It is reducing the confidence for people to invest in South Australia, and it is reducing the confidence for business to employ people to forward think about tendering for some of these contracts.

Again, I want to see the government get rid of that short-term focus and look at the bigger picture because it is not just about the bottom line with the contract price, it is about the ongoing implications that it has with not employing South Australians. Again, we look at unemployment and there are 18,000 fewer full-time jobs since the 2013 state budget. South Australia's jobless rate has increased from 4.8 per cent to 6.3 since Labor's 2010 jobs promise. Again, this is impacting on regional South Australia, particularly in the Riverland, and I note that the Riverland's jobless rate is at a staggering 7 per cent. In my electorate in the Riverland, there are 1,562 people unemployed and that is something never before seen.

Potentially we have a skill set that is required for small businesses but we also have an unskilled labour requirement with fruit picking and processing, particularly at this time of the year, and those people are not able to find work because there is a lack of confidence. Yes, we have been through a drought, and we have been through re-structure, particularly with water allocations, but we are not seeing the confidence to expand businesses or to employ people. People are now running their businesses at less than a viable option. They are now looking at disregarding part of their businesses so that they can survive and just put food on the table for themselves.

What I am calling for is that the region needs a consistent strategy to grow population and today I tell everyone here, the electorate of Chaffey is open for business. If we are looking for decentralisation, the cost of doing business in the city or the cost of setting up a business in the city, come to Chaffey. Chaffey is open for business. It has a great lifestyle, it has great weather, it has affordable housing, it has friendly people, it has the mighty river running through it, and it is looking for people to set up business. It is looking for people to come to regional South Australia to the Riverland, to the Mallee, and set up business there.

There is a skill set just waiting for people to come up and put their proposals on the table. Again, we are looking at further incentives for apprentices and an overall Skills for All focus to target those employment fields. We seem to be focused on training our youth and training or upskilling our

workforce, yet we are not focusing on creating new employers, we are not focusing on where are those skill sets, where are they going to be employed, and where are they going to put in an application for a new job?

Again, we look at the confidence that we need and I think particularly regional South Australia has been left on the backburner over the last 10 years. We are seeing a current state government that has a focus on their people—and I say that with a few exceptions—but their people are the people for whom we build big superways and desalination plants. That was a kneejerk reaction. The current government were 'diversity of water deniers'. They looked at stormwater—and I know I have had debates in this place about diversity of water sources, and everyone on the other side of the chamber used to deny that we could recycle water. They looked at reclaimed stormwater. Guess what? All water is stormwater. All water comes from the sky at one point in time. So what we have to look at is—

Mr Gardner: And other places.

Mr WHETSTONE: And other places, as the member for Morialta points out. The lack of foresight with the diversification in water supply here in Adelaide and further afield was mind-blowingly numb. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debated adjourned.

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

Petitions

CAPE JERVIS FISHERY

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition signed by 79 residents of Cape Jervis and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to make a full assessment of the fish take in the vicinity of Cape Jervis across all fishing types, implement a closed season and measurement of recovery for all commercial fishing types, and development of fishery management with proper integration of fishing and marine park policies.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome on behalf of the house students of Blackwood High School, who are guests of the member for Davenport; students from The Hills Christian Community School, who are guests of the member for Heysen; and Women's Education TAFE SA Elizabeth, who are guests of the member for Florey.

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Report of the Ombudsman—Freedom of Information Act 1991 and Audit of State
Government Departments—Implementations of the Report—May 2014

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Agreement between the Premier and the Member for Waite—May 2014
Agreement to Support Stable and Effective Government—Between the Premier and the
Member for Waite—May 2014

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Matter of Privilege—Member for Heysen—Electoral Commissioner
Regulations made under the following Act—

Legal Practitioners—Practising Certificate Fees and Levies

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Health and Ageing, Department for—Erratum Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Country Arts SA—Annual Report 2012-13

South Australian Film Corporation—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Annual Report 2012-13

Condolence

BOLAFFI, MR ALLEN

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): Sir, on indulgence, I rise to speak on the passing of Mr Allen Bolaffi, a prominent businessman, community leader and respected South Australian. Mr Bolaffi was a proud South Australian, educated at Plympton High School and the University of South Australia. He was a leader in the South Australian multicultural community.

Mr Bolaffi served the Portuguese community of South Australia, but is best known for his dedication to the Jewish community. He was involved in a number of Jewish organisations in Adelaide, including a key role in establishing the Adelaide Jewish Museum, and founded the Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce and served as its president for the past 20 years. He was director of a number of prominent South Australian companies, and was managing partner of UHY Haines Norton Chartered Accountants.

Mr Bolaffi was renowned for his generosity and involvement in supporting a number of non-government organisations, and I can remember only recently seeing his smiling face. It is a great shock to all of us that he was taken from us so early from an unknown illness. I convey my sympathies and those of the house to Mr Bolaffi's family, including his wife Viv, son Reuben and daughters Amy and Kate.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:05): I would like to echo the words of the Premier and I thank the Leader of the Opposition for allowing me to, on indulgence, share the opposition's commiserations to the family of Allen Bolaffi on behalf of the Liberal Party. Allen Bolaffi was one of the first people who gave me encouragement and advice when I became a candidate for office and, indeed, his son Reuben was the first person who worked in my electorate office, setting up my website and getting me on the path, as it were.

Allen Bolaffi was a director of a number of companies, but he gave an enormous amount to the South Australian community across a range of fields. He was the President of the Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce in Adelaide for 20 years. He was the Chairman of the SA Innovation Investment Fund Advisory Committee. He was on the Flinders University audit committee, the Chairman of the Adelaide Jewish Museum and a director of Southern Adelaide-Fleurieu-Kangaroo Island Medicare Local Ltd.

I am going to miss his comments on Twitter, as I am sure many of us will, and many of the fourth estate to whom they were often directed. His advice and instruction to the South Australian public polity was regular, informed, thoughtful, and often from a different sort of perspective, which encouraged thoughtfulness in those to whom it was directed.

It is a reminder of our own mortality. I was with Reuben at a school in my electorate only on Friday and things were going very well, but obviously the weekend's news was terrible for the family. We pass on our condolences to Allen's mother, Yvette; his wife, Viv; his children, Reuben, Amy and Kate; and his grandson, Leon. The member for Bragg and, I believe, the Minister for Communities are currently attending the funeral, which is taking place right now. I believe the member for Bragg

will be making some more comments a bit later on today, but we certainly pass on the respects of the opposition to the family of Mr Bolaffi.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Ministerial Statement

MEMBER FOR WAITE, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Members of the house would be aware that last week on 27 May I signed an agreement with the Independent Liberal member for Waite to provide strong government that works productively for all South Australians. The outcome of the recent state election demonstrated the need for a broader approach to government to show that we do govern for all South Australians. My government's willingness to undertake such an approach was demonstrated by the agreement we reached with the member for Frome. Part of that agreement commits the government to a strong focus on the regions of South Australia.

Another important focus for our state at this time must be the business sector. Since the election, this government has shown it is willing to take steps that will assist business. We will establish the department for state development, which will drive growth in the economy and coordinate the government's approach to small and medium enterprises. However, we need to go further. Given the challenges facing our state, we must draw upon the best available talent to help deliver for South Australia.

It is time to put the people of South Australia first and politics second. When it comes to creating jobs, helping our businesses to trade overseas, attracting investment and building defence industries in South Australia, there needs to be a bipartisan approach. The member for Waite is well respected across a number of sectors that are key to South Australia. His hard work in establishing networks across these areas presents a number of opportunities for the state. By including him in our government, we benefit South Australia.

He has also, over the past year, demonstrated his capacity to work in a bipartisan manner through accompanying the Minister for Trade on a number of successful trade missions. His obvious association with the defence industry and veterans' sectors over the course of his career, both before and after becoming a member of parliament, means he is well placed to serve in these portfolios.

This agreement also fulfils the government's commitment to ensure the creation of stronger links between government and the private sector so that barriers to job creation can be identified and removed. It creates a stronger bridge between the government and the business community.

The addition of the Independent Liberal member for Waite to the cabinet continues the government's effort to make changes which reflect the results of the March election. I look forward to working with him to explore opportunities for South Australia that will improve our way of life and create jobs all across the state.

FORESTRYSA

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The forward sale of ForestrySA's plantations in the Green Triangle to OneFortyOne Plantations Pty Ltd was completed in October 2012, and the five-year plantation management agreement with the company ends in October 2017. In order to maintain the contract after 2017, ForestrySA needs to become much more competitive. As members may be aware, last week voluntary separation packages were offered to up to 60 ForestrySA employees in the South-East and Mount Lofty Ranges. No staff changes are planned for ForestrySA's Mid North operations.

The state government has kept its promise to ForestrySA workers that there would be no forced redundancies, and the workers who do wish to leave have been offered very fair redundancy conditions. To support staff, ForestrySA will work with unions and the local community to identify opportunities to retrain staff to meet shortages of forest workers, specifically, harvest operators and truck drivers. Other programs will include retirement and financial planning sessions and training in interview and job-seeking skills. This offer is aimed at reducing staff in a fair and dignified way and the terms being offered are very generous by industry standards.

It is important to note that, although ForestrySA is reducing its direct workforce, the timber industry is experiencing one of its busiest periods in years, and there are many jobs being offered in the South-East. There is now a strong base of private contractors performing these forest management functions for a range of plantation owners, including ForestrySA. I am advised that former ForestrySA workers who accept a voluntary separation package will not be barred from applying for or taking work with private providers of forestry services.

The state government is also providing up to \$27 million in assistance to the private sector for capital investment in the state's timber industry. Up to the time of the recent election, \$16.5 million had been approved under the program through grants to six applicants, leaving a balance of \$10.5 million. The South East Forestry Partnerships Program has required applicants to match the government's investment on at least a one-to-one basis, resulting in commitments to projects worth \$36 million to date. This money for innovation will help secure and create jobs in the South-East, as well as increase the opportunity for us to be able to value add here in South Australia.

ForestrySA has a very important role in fire protection across the South Australian forests and is carefully assessing the impact of its changed staffing arrangements to ensure that all aspects of fire protection are covered. By using its own and contracted resources, ForestrySA will continue to efficiently manage this important community task.

The Chief Executive of ForestrySA has met with the Country Fire Service to discuss plantation fire protection in the Green Triangle and Mount Lofty Ranges. ForestrySA will employ and contract additional firefighters and services to make sure that the plantation estate and the community continue to be protected. ForestrySA has routinely employed experienced summer crew and contractors to top up its fire crews. For example, the Green Triangle fire tower network has been staffed by contractor fire spotters for many years.

Forestry SA has also been talking with other plantation owners about their level of fire preparedness and I am advised these discussions have been very positive. I can assure members here and the people of the South-East that protecting the forests will be front and centre of whatever happens in the future. Some things will change, but firefighting capabilities will remain the same. Since becoming Minister for Forests I have spent a week in Mount Gambier and intend to return there next month for further discussions with forestry workers, their unions, and the member for Mount Gambier. I will continue to talk and work with all parties in the region to make sure that together we will achieve growth, jobs and prosperity for the local area.

OFFICE FOR THE PUBLIC SECTOR

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:15): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am pleased to inform the house that from 1 July this year a new Office for the Public Sector will be created within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. This decision delivers on the government's election promise to rationalise public sector renewal, workforce relations, and public sector review functions within the government by amalgamating the functions of the Office for Public Sector Renewal, the Office of Public Employment and Review, and the Public Sector Workforce Relations agency.

The primary goal of the new Office for the Public Sector is the creation of a fully integrated approach to a more innovative and higher performing public sector that constantly delivers excellence.

I share the Premier's passion to build a strong public sector workforce that is responsive, open, productive, innovative and collaborative. The Office for the Public Sector will have responsibility for public sector leadership development, workforce planning, cultural change, partnership building across sectors, industrial relations, workforce wellbeing, and the South Australian Executive Service.

The new office will be led by Erma Ranieri as chief executive of the Office for the Public Sector and she has already taken the leadership of the teams making up this office in order to deliver the merger and associated savings for 1 July. Ms Ranieri has demonstrated her capability for this role through her experience as chief executive of the Office for Public Sector Renewal and Change@SouthAustralia, as well as the deputy chief executive of DMITRE. As an outstanding leader of one of the merging units, Ms Ranieri was the obvious choice for the leadership of the combined office.

The establishment of the Office for the Public Sector is an important step and shows this government's commitment to improving the performance of the public sector. South Australia's dedicated public sector workers represent an asset to be realised, not a burden to be minimised.

Staff from the newly merged Office for the Public Sector will continue to support Mr Warren McCann in fulfilling the statutory responsibilities of his role as Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. Mr McCann's term runs until the end of October this year and no final decision has been made on a replacement. I can assure the house that a process of due diligence will be undertaken before a recommendation to the Governor is made.

The decision around merging the three public sector agencies reflects the work of a government that is focused on delivering on its election promises and ensuring the good governance of a modern and capable Public Service that works together with citizens, businesses, and communities to deliver for South Australia.

Question Time

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that the Hon. Russell Wortley should step aside from his position as President in the other place pending the outcome of corruption allegations against him?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:18): This is a follow-on from a conversation that we were having here a week or so ago when we were last here. Can I say this: that there has been, to the best of my knowledge, no particularisation of any allegations about the Hon. Russell Wortley in the other place or anywhere else which add anything to the ones in respect of which he successfully prosecuted a defamation action against those who chose to publish the details outside of this place, and, if there has been a complaint to the royal commission being conducted by the commonwealth, that that will be dealt with in the ordinary course and at the present time there is nothing to suggest that there is any substance whatsoever to any allegation—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed, as the Treasurer points out, as recently as a week or so ago or two weeks ago the concerns of those opposite were such that they quite happy to support him for appointment to the position of President, and that being in the light of them having regurgitated these similar allegations on at least one or two occasions in the preceding couple of years.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

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

The SPEAKER: Before that, I call the Treasurer to order.

Mr MARSHALL: Given that the President in the other place has today said, 'I welcome that it has been referred to the royal commission,' why won't the Premier ask the President in the other place to step aside?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:20): I think it depends on what interpretation one wishes to put on the remarks attributed to the honourable President. One interpretation might be that he welcomes the referral to the commission on the basis that he welcomes it because it is complete rubbish and the sooner it gets there and the sooner it can be identified formally as being complete rubbish, the sooner he can get on with things. I think it highly unlikely that his utterance that he welcomes it is based on the fact that he believes he is guilty and looks forward to being prosecuted!

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): A further supplementary to the Premier. In relation to the child pornography charges against the Hon. Bernard Finnigan MLC, the Premier said, 'The crimes of which Mr Finnigan stands accused are extremely serious and carry with them the possibility of a term of imprisonment. I call upon him to resign his public office.' Why won't the Premier now ask the President in the other place to step aside from his position pending the outcome of corruption allegations against him?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:21): I think I have adequately answered this. Just because somebody makes a frivolous or unsubstantiated assertion under privilege in this place about another person—and I won't explore that theme any further just for now—just because somebody does that does not mean there is one scintilla of evidence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order and so is the member for Unley.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The Hon. John Gazzola, if I recall correctly, referred to statements made by the Hon. Mr Ridgway, statements which the Hon. Mr Ridgway has failed to substantiate, and the Hon. Mr—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The Hon. Mr Gazzola had the good grace to go into the other place and say, 'Look, I actually have got this wrong.' Mr Speaker, that is what he said.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He did. He went in there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to order and the leader is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He went into the other place, and I know this because I have seen it in *Hansard*, and he acknowledged that he had made an error and he expressed his apologies to the Hon. Russell Wortley at having made such an error.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The assertion that he is continuing to maintain some complaint about the Hon. Russell Wortley is not correct, and I think we can all take comfort from the fact that the Hon. Russell Wortley has said publicly it would appear (I am assuming that the honourable member's quote is accurate) that he welcomes being referred to the commission because the way I read that is that, just like the other allegations which were found to be completely unsubstantiated that had been made against him some time ago and been regurgitated here and there by various people, he is confident—

An honourable member: Under privilege.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Under privilege, yes, indeed—he is confident that when the commission has a look at matters regarding him a similar outcome will apply. I think it is not an

unreasonable thing to say when the allegations are so flimsy and have remained sitting out there in nowhere land for the best part of a decade, nobody having proven any of it or substantiated any of it, the suggestion that he should be asked to step aside on the basis of that flimsy material being chucked up yet again with nothing fresh is ridiculous.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Will the minister guarantee that no decision will be made regarding the Walker Corporation proposal for the Festival Plaza area before the full board of the Riverbank Authority has been appointed and has assessed the proposal?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:21): I thank the honourable member very much for that question. The short answer to the question is no, because there is a fundamental difference between the role of the Riverbank Authority and the question as to how the development of the car park immediately behind this building is going to proceed. I would like to explain that for a moment if members are interested.

Mr Whetstone: Did you say car park tax?

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think the honourable member has impaired hearing. The situation is that the role of the authority is ostensibly to curate and manage the public spaces which interconnect all the elements of the Riverbank immediately behind us, between the bridges in particular—that is its role. Its role is certainly going to be to have views about how various constructions and so on are occurring there and to help us manage those constructions so that they minimise the inconvenience to people wishing to use the Riverbank—yes, it will be involved in all of that. However, the question in respect of the development of the car park is one which will be determined by the cabinet in due course once we have received all the information we require in order to make that decision.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I have a supplementary question. Is the minister suggesting that the Riverbank Authority will not be consulted regarding the proposals for the development of the Festival Plaza?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:26): Can I just make this clear: the situation is that the Riverbank Authority presently has Mr McEvoy as the designated chair of that authority. I have met with Mr McEvoy on several occasions and he is completely informed about what we are doing and, indeed, is somebody to whom I have spoken on several occasions about this, so he is in no way out of the loop. In fact, most recently, I spoke to him on Thursday at a meeting with him. I believe he has also met with other ministers responsible for the area. I think my colleague the Minister for Infrastructure has also met with him.

Any suggestion that there is some business about keeping Mr McEvoy removed from the thing is completely false. He is involved in what is going on and at the moment there are certain works in progress involving the finalisation of what is going on in that part of the world and Mr McEvoy is involved in those matters as well, so he is not being left out and he is not being excluded. However, it is not the case that his role is such that he is a critical precondition for us to be able to proceed. He is being involved as matter of courtesy and his involvement, I have to say, has been helpful but it is not a case that it is a fundamental prerequisite for anything to occur there that Mr McEvoy says yes or no.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): I have a further supplementary question. Why was Mr McEvoy appointed as chair of the authority in February without any other board members subsequently appointed?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:27): As members might recall, this was one of those odd periods where governments go into caretaker mode and thereafter there is an election and thereafter there is a series of events. It has taken some time, from the time of Mr McEvoy being announced as the chair of the body by the then minister, to the present time. However, I can assure honourable members that it is a priority of mine that the remaining board positions are filled as soon as possible and, indeed, I have had further discussions with Mr McEvoy about that very matter as recently as last week. My intention is to discuss with my cabinet colleagues the filling of those positions very soon.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): I have a further supplementary. Given that the functions of the authority, as laid out in the government's own regulations—in fact, the very first one—states, 'To make recommendations to government about major infrastructure proposals and funding mechanisms for the development of land within the precinct', can the minister advise why he will not be seeking a recommendation from the authority regarding the final decision regarding the Festival Plaza area?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:29): Can I just try to put this into perspective for the honourable member: the issue about the car park has been a live matter for some considerable period of time. Discussions have been going on between the government, the Adelaide Casino, Mr Walker, Festival Centre and whatever. They have been going on for some time. We are at a point in time where we want those matters finally resolved and to just get on with it.

It is not the case that we want in any way to further delay the progress of any of those matters by waiting for there to be the formal approval of these things by a body whose approval is unnecessary in any event. That said, I repeat that Mr McEvoy has been given a complete and comprehensive briefing about what's going on in that space. I have met with Mr McEvoy about this as recently as last week and Mr McEvoy is engaged in the process.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell.

MID NORTH VISIT

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:30): Thank you Mr Speaker, my question is to the Premier: can the Premier inform the house about his trip to the Mid North last week?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:30): It was very nice; a very pleasant trip on 27 May.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It was indeed a very pleasant trip. Last week I visited Burra and Peterborough to listen to the stories and concerns of the people who live in that beautiful part of our state. My visit was one of six on that day to the regions by cabinet ministers and demonstrates that we are in fact responding to the election result by seeking to reach out to people in regional South Australia.

In Burra, I met the Regional Council of Goyder Mayor, Peter Matthey, over a beer at the Commercial Hotel—a black and tan, to be completely accurate with the house. I discussed the challenges facing Burra and the local region with representatives of Regional Development Australia, the Mid North industry leaders group, the Southern Flinders industry leaders group and the local DFEEST regional manager. I also spoke with several small business owners and was again pleased to visit Paolo and Clare at The Black Sheep Italian restaurant, which I can highly recommend—one of the best pizzas—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Second-best pizza.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —second-best pizza—in the Mid North. It was also great to see the excellent progress being made on the restoration of the Burra Heritage Railway Station, where Mr Roy Taplin is doing some amazing work. He is one man with a tiny grant who has produced

millions of dollars worth of work and it really is worth a visit. Whilst Burra is obviously facing its own challenges, in relative terms, it is a relatively prosperous place.

The problems facing Peterborough and those in the surrounding areas are very significant. Indeed, it is facing levels of disadvantage which are greater than any area outside the APY lands, so it does deserve our special attention, and this goes directly to the question of governing for all South Australians. We can't have it said that there is one group of South Australians who are so far behind another group.

In Peterborough, I visited the Mayor of the District Council of Peterborough, Ruth Whittle, and her council chief executive, Mr Peter McGuinness. I also met with UnitingCare Wesley to hear how our Building Family Opportunities program is helping disadvantaged families facing intergenerational unemployment in Peterborough. I met with participants of the UnitingCare Wesley's Mothers and Babies programs to hear of the challenges facing young families, and I also visited the Peterborough High School where I discussed the education and training opportunities for young people.

School principal Ms Liz Pannell showed me Peterborough High School's impressive trade school facilities. While there are great challenges in this community, there is also an extraordinary amount of hope, and I was impressed by the resilience of the Peterborough locals. But they won't be able to do this on their own and, obviously, we'll reach out to the local member and also all government agencies will make a specific effort in this area.

I spoke to these communities about my commitment to the regions to let them know that we will bring one of many community cabinets to the Mid North in the near future. But my principal purpose of the visit was to listen, not to talk, and the consistent theme that we heard was the very great concern about the future and I think very significant concern about the effect of the current federal Liberal government's budget, in particular the \$60 million in local government financial assistance grants over the next three years.

The \$18 million in cuts to local road funding was also playing on the minds of the local regional representatives. We will work with those communities, but we will be placing a significant amount of our effort on those communities that are doing it toughest in regional South Australia.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Was any indication given to Lang Walker or representatives of Walker Corporation prior to the election that Mr Walker's proposal for the Festival Plaza area would be approved?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for the question. The situation is this. There was a process which began some considerable time ago whereby there was an attempt to find a preferred tenderer, or preferred partner. That process was managed I think a couple of years ago now. At the end of that process, Mr Walker was the successful tenderer, and since that time work has been done with Walker Corporation.

Towards the end of last year, I believe—the dates I can't summon at will—or the beginning of this year; I can't recall which one it was but, anyway, at the end of last year or the beginning of this year there was basically an agreement with Mr Walker that there would be the building of a car park, and it was announced. The fine grain of that is still a matter for conversation between the parties, and that's what we are working on and that's what I'm hoping to nail down as soon as possible.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary: aside from the car park, was there an indication prior to the election of support for any further development in that area?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:36): The situation prior to the election was that—again, going back some years—there was a master planning exercise for the Riverbank precinct. That master planning exercise resulted in, amongst other things, a rezoning of areas adjacent to this building and generally in the precinct. That is as far as the planning regime could go, and it has gone, but that occurred some time ago. In respect of Mr Walker, if that's what the honourable member is asking about, there is no agreement with Mr Walker to do anything—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I beg your pardon?

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Which one of you two is doing the questioning?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay: please, go ahead.

The SPEAKER: Further supplementary.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): Well, it's really just a clarification of the original question, but thank you for the preamble. Aside from the car park, was there any indication of support for any further development in that area provided by the government prior to the election?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:37): Not to my knowledge, Mr Speaker. In fact, my recollection of this matter, unless I am very much mistaken, was that the government has always been quite clear about this: this is about a car park, full stop.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Why was Renewal SA's responsibility for the Festival Plaza project terminated in late 2013 and Rod Hook appointed to oversee the project?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:38): Off the top of my head, I don't know whether that is indeed accurate or, if it is accurate, why that occurred. I'm happy to investigate the matter if any further particulars can be given to me about exactly what the honourable member's asking for.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You don't have to do it now; you can do it later if you wish. I'll be happy to make inquiries.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): As the CEO, was Rod Hook asked by the government to meet with Lang Walker or representatives of Walker Corporation to discuss development at Festival Plaza?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:39): I have to make it clear to the honourable member and to other members of the house that I have never been the minister for the department of infrastructure and transport and I have only recently become the minister responsible for Renewal. So, the question that is being asked of me, basically, concerns my general knowledge at a period of time predating my involvement.

My understanding is that there were necessarily a number of conversations between Mr Hook, who, after all, was the head of DPTI, and various people, and I am almost certain that, at some stage, one or more of those meetings would have included Mr Walker. You need to understand that Mr Hook, in his then role both as the head of DPTI but also as the major project manager for the government, would routinely meet with many people who were involved in development around the city. The short answer is: I am sure Mr Hook would have met, at some stage—probably on multiple occasions—with Mr Walker.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): A further supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: I thought the last one was a separate question, but not much turns on it.

Mr MARSHALL: So, what am I doing now?

The SPEAKER: You are doing a first supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: Has an independent probity adviser also been appointed to oversee the Festival Plaza development and, if so, when was this person appointed?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:40): Again, for the reason I have just explained, I am not in possession of that information. I will simply have to take that on notice and find out.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): I have a question to the Minister for Urban Development, Planning and Attorney-General. Who in your department is actually responsible for the Riverbank development?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:41): Who in my department? Well, look, there are multiple agencies which have some involvement in the Riverbank. The purpose of the ministerial changes which were made by the Premier recently was to make sure that there was ultimately a single reporting line into cabinet about those arrangements.

As Minister for Planning, I have the head of planning, which is at a second-tier level within the DPTI hierarchy presently, reporting to me. As the minister now responsible for Renewal, I have the head of Renewal reporting to me, to the extent that Renewal is involved in that matter. To the extent that the area is covered by DPTI then, inasmuch as DPTI are doing work in that area, they are now expected to communicate with me.

Ms Chapman: Finished?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, having arranged an appointment with Mr Fred Hansen to discuss the Riverbank project and, in particular, the Festival Plaza project, been advised by him that he is not responsible for it and Mr Hook is responsible for it, with Mr Hook being sacked, who am I meant to be meeting with when, eventually, your office approves my meeting with whoever is responsible?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:43): We could have saved a lot of time. If we'd had that bit of the question first, it would have been easier to get here. The situation, as the honourable member would be aware, is that, at present, there is an acting chief executive in DPTI and there is an acting chief executive in Renewal. The honourable member may or may not be aware that there is also a process underway

for the calling for expressions of interest for people around the place, around the country, who might see themselves as being appropriate replacements for those two people, and that process is underway.

Ms Chapman: So, who is responsible now?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Ultimately, I am.

Ms Chapman: So, I have a briefing with you at 4 o'clock this afternoon, do I?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Not that I know of, although I would relish the opportunity.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Did Rod Hook raise concerns with the minister regarding the integrity of South Australia's planning and development process prior to raising concerns in *The Advertiser* on Saturday?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:44): I was wondering when I was going to get that question, but I expected it to come from here. The question about the matter in the paper I found rather fascinating. The first point is that it has never been raised with me by Mr Hook, okay?

Mr Marshall: Never?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Not that I can recall. Certainly, I do not agree with the sentiments contained in the article in the paper. I don't agree with it for a number of reasons: first of all, there is still a separation between Planning and the activities of Renewal SA. They operate independently; all that is happening is they are reporting up through me.

Secondly, I make this point: if things are done properly, you do planning first, then you do development. Planning comes first, then development. It is kind of basic, but some people haven't got that in the past, and one of them occasionally has been the person on whose behalf you are asking these questions.

So, planning comes first, then development. If the planning is already done, there is absolutely no question of there being any conflict whatsoever with the same individual minister having a role in relation to the development, because the two are separated in time; they are completely separate.

In the event of them not being separated in time, which is an undesirable outcome, the Premier foresaw that possibility—he foresaw that possibility—and therefore made the honourable Minister for Infrastructure the minister assisting me in respect of these matters, so that in the event of there being such an event (which I do not think is likely—not on my watch, anyway) then there is already a separation embedded into the system of reporting.

Can I make another point as well: the article to which the honourable member has referred apparently makes the suggestion that 'Mates of the unnamed minister'—and unfortunately, you don't have to be Einstein to work out who that is: that's me—'who are developers are going to get an unfair free kick.' Well, can I say, Mr Speaker, that nobody in this parliament or anywhere else can accuse me of being Sir Lunalot, out with developers all the time; I can tell you that for starters.

The other thing I can tell you is this: as far as I know, up until the day I read that in the paper, I was left with the impression that some of them had a fatwa out for me. So, the idea that they are all my good mates is ludicrous. I honestly do think that the fact is that this government has always treated those people completely transparently on a level playing field. It may be a new experience for some, but it is a good experience, and they are going to enjoy it after a while because everyone will get a go.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My supplementary is to the Minister for Planning: what action has he taken to follow up on Mr Hook's concerns raised in *Saturday's Advertiser*?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:48): I have analysed my own thinking processes; I have asked myself, 'Have I gone around building things before I have even planned them?' and I am happy to report that no, I haven't. I have asked the question, 'Has Mr Hook ever got it back to front?' The answer may be different. I have also thought about, 'Is there a fail-safe mechanism in place?' Yes, there is: the honourable Minister for Infrastructure, there he is, the fail-safe mechanism. That's there. As I said, the suggestion that there is an unreasonable, unfair, suspicious or in any way inappropriate relationship between me and any developers is absolute nonsense.

BUCKLAND PARK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is again to the Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Minister for Urban Development: if planning does come first, minister, how was it that the Buckland Park proposal was approved before it was discovered that it was on a floodplain?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:49): I think the chapter on Buckland Park is somewhere in the book of Exodus, or is it in Genesis? I can't remember, but it's a very—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Leviticus.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Leviticus maybe, but it's a very, very long time ago. It's a long time ago and I was not in any way involved in that matter at all. In fact, I know exactly where I was when this decision was made, and it was sitting there where the member for Reynell is sitting, quietly reading a book.

WHYALLA MENTAL HEALTH UNIT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about the new mental health facilities at the Whyalla Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:50): I can indeed, and I thank the member for Giles for his question. I am pleased to inform the house that in late April the new mental health inpatient unit did open in Whyalla. It is the first of its kind in country South Australia, with similar units to open in Berri later this year, as well as Mount Gambier next year. The six-bed unit in Whyalla has marked the start of a new era in mental health care for country South Australians, as now for the first time regional patients will have access to acute inpatient mental health care close to their homes.

Patients who come to the acute inpatient mental health unit will receive care from a mental health team of psychiatrists, social workers, occupational therapists, nurses, psychologists and other support workers. When they leave the unit, they will continue to be supported by our community mental health team. Being treated close to home and to their support networks will mean that patients will be able to recover more quickly and, importantly, stay well once they leave the unit.

The new mental health inpatient unit at Whyalla has been designed with country people in mind, with large indoor and outdoor spaces, as well as a high level of privacy, with individual bedrooms and ensuites. While I am aware that some patients will still need care in a metropolitan inpatient setting due to their specific needs, this unit is a fantastic step forward for country mental health services and will complement the wide range of mental health support already available in the region.

Bringing in mental health inpatient units in country South Australia was identified as part of the Stepping Up: A Social Inclusion Action Plan for Mental Health Reform 2007-12 report. The state government has budgeted almost \$2.8 million to improve South Australia's country mental health

services and infrastructure. As well as the unit in Whyalla and the unit being built in the Riverland, the government is also providing better services in our regions, including building on the community intermediate care services in Port Lincoln and Kangaroo Island and improving clinical services from eight nurse practitioner/nurse practitioner candidates across the state. We are also improving access and timely clinical assessment of patients without the need for transfer to Adelaide through the use of the South Australian Digital Telehealth Network.

Can I conclude by extending my thanks to all those doctors, nurses and other medical staff who do some brilliant work in regional mental health. We as a government can improve the infrastructure, but it is those people on the ground who will ensure we have the best outcomes for our regional mental health patients.

CAR PARKING LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Does the minister support the government's proposed car park tax?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:53): In the state budget, the government will be announcing a range of measures, and we took the Transport Development Levy to the election. At last count, we have a majority in the House of Assembly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand today is a tense moment for members opposite, but it's not as if the member for Waite would have told everyone to vote Labor at the last election. He wasn't the one standing there on Friday saying 'vote Labor'. It's not his fault. Don't blame him. There's only one person responsible for all of you sitting over there, and that's the Leader of the Opposition. Don't be angry at us. The Transport Development Levy will be a budget measure and I expect, in the traditions of this house, that it will be a bipartisan measure.

STATE FINANCES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:54): My question is to the Treasurer. As the government has run deficits in net cash flows from operating activities last year and again this year, does the Treasurer believe the government is borrowing to pay wages?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:54): We have had the debate about deficits and we took to the election campaign a strategy. We make no apology for making borrowings. We made borrowings to build infrastructure, and that infrastructure is building capacity in our economy. We are building roads, we are building bridges and we are building hospitals. We are providing jobs for South Australians.

Indeed, we are doing what many lobby and industry groups are saying for us to do, and that is to keep on borrowing money to build productive infrastructure to get through the downturn. Unfortunately, we have a commonwealth government intent on attacking confidence, we have a commonwealth government intent on attacking families—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, sir: relevance. The question was about whether the state government is borrowing money to pay wages, not about what the commonwealth government is doing.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the Treasurer has to say but, obviously, the commonwealth budget has an impact on the state budget.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A vast majority of our debt has been spent on capital works—capital works that the member for Davenport has enjoyed and members opposite have enjoyed, and that members opposite see as they drive to Parliament House. Indeed, the largest piece of infrastructure being built in the country as we speak, in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, is building capacity for future generations. The government makes no apology for investing in infrastructure. It is who we are, it is in our DNA, and we stand by it.

STATE FINANCES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:56): Supplementary, sir. Does the Treasurer agree with the former treasurer, the member for Playford, when he indicated that when a government runs deficits in net cash flows from operating activity, it amounts to borrowing to pay wages?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:56): What the member for Davenport has attempted to do is judge us at the beginning of our term rather than the end of our term, and that is what oppositions do.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have always been told to beware an old man in a hurry. The truth is the government will be judged on its fiscal outlooks over four years, not over five minutes. The reality is the member for Davenport is attempting to make reference to the government's performance before we have even delivered our first budget of this new parliamentary term. It is unfair, and the government will be answering all these questions in the budget.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order. The member for Davenport has a supplementary.

STATE FINANCES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:57): As the government has not produced a budget in this term of parliament, which the Treasurer has just referred to, how is it unfair for the opposition to ask a question on the budgetary performance at the last two budgets and quote back to the government the former treasurer's explanation as to what is borrowing to pay wages? How is that unfair, when you haven't delivered a budget in this parliamentary session?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:58): Because that is not what you asked. What the member for Davenport is attempting to do, Mr Speaker, after a very, very bad week for the opposition, is change the subject. The subject is this: this government is confronted with a once-in-a-generation task.

We have a federal government that has declared war on health and education and has declared war on the families of South Australia. We will answer that and, when we do answer that, we will see what members opposite say about our answer, because they are the ones who support the commonwealth budget. They are the only Liberal organisation in the country to still support what Tony Abbott is doing.

The SPEAKER: Is the Treasurer finished? That will obviate the necessity to take the deputy leader's point of order. The member for Morialta is called to order. The member for Finniss.

MARINE PARKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Now that the minister has had four weeks to get some facts and figures on marine parks, can the minister now advise if he supports the government marine park sanctuary zone policy?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:59): The answer to that is that I have only got the information from one section and, at this stage, I am not making any comment about it. The other information coming from the Kangaroo Island people is there has been no justification over there but economic losses.

MARINE PARKS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:59): My supplementary is to the Minister for Regional Development. Does the minister agree with Ceduna mayor Allan Suter that the October introduction of the marine park process will 'rip the heart out of commercial fishing'?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:59): The question from both members is hypothetical at this stage. Sanctuary zones have not started at this particular point. They do not start until October; however, to the member for Flinders, I am still analysing that information, but certainly the sanctuary zones have not started at this particular point and also there is a bill coming down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is called to order. The deputy leader is called to order. I regret to say the member for Goyder is called to order.

MARINE PARKS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My supplementary is to the Minister for Regional Development. Whilst waiting for this information to come from the regions, have you sought a briefing from the Minister for the Environment regarding this matter and have you read the select committee report into marine parks in South Australia?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:00): The answer to the leader is yes, I have had a briefing from the minister's department and I have not read fully the select committee report at this stage.

SKILLS FOR JOBS IN REGIONS

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. As was stated in the minister's press release on 6 May entitled 'Government invests in jobs and skills in the Barossa', 'the government has invested more than \$415,000 in local initiatives delivered through the Skills for Jobs in Regions program'. Can the minister advise how many jobs this program has created for the Barossa?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:01): Thank you to the member for that. That is not under my portfolio, but I will take the question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I will take the question on notice and bring an answer back.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order. The member for Morialta is warned for the first time. The member for Finniss is warned for the first time and the member for Hartley is warned for the second and final time.

REGIONAL BUSINESS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Can the minister for Manufacturing and Innovation inform the house about the ways in which the government is supporting innovative manufacturing firms in regional South Australia?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the member for her question. Last week I had the pleasure of travelling to the Upper Spencer Gulf to visit some of the innovative South Australian manufacturing businesses that are doing great things in our regions.

While in Port Pirie I took the opportunity to visit some of the job creating businesses that are helping to support the local economy, including Nyrstar and the engineering firm S.J. Cheesman. The member for Frome, unfortunately, given his extraordinarily busy schedule was not available to attend with me, but was well aware that I was there.

Nyrstar only last month confirmed its plans to invest more than \$500 million to transform its 125-year old smelter and substantially improve the health and environment for local residents. Nyrstar's continued commitment to Port Pirie and South Australia provides local businesses with increased confidence to invest in their own future.

S.J. Cheesman is just such a company. This Port Pirie engineering firm is among the first successful applicants to receive support under a new state government program to support home-grown innovation. I was delighted to visit their business and see firsthand some of the cutting edge

technology that is being adapted to improve efficiency at Nyrstar. S.J. Cheesman successfully applied for funding from the first round of the state government's Photonics Catalyst Program for its proposal to adapt and engineer high temperature sensors to be used at Nyrstar's existing Port Pirie smelter. The sensors were developed by the University of Adelaide's world-renowned Institute for Photonics and Advanced Sensing.

The company's successful bid demonstrated how the Photonics Catalyst Program is helping to foster and grow South Australia's expertise and capabilities in photonics. The aim of the program, set up as part of the state government's manufacturing strategy, is to better connect South Australian firms with the sort of home-grown technologies that are capable of transforming their products and businesses. S.J. Cheesman managing director, Stephen Richter, told me that the high temperature sensors ensure a better control of the smelting process and help avoid multimillion dollar production issues and work stoppages.

I was also fortunate to visit Kelly Engineering in Booleroo Centre and Sundrop Farms just outside Port Augusta. I thank the member for Stuart for his guidance in setting up these visits. Although these businesses have vastly different backgrounds, both have embraced innovation and are striving to reach a common goal—growth through continuous change. This government has a strong commitment to regional South Australia. Although this trip encompassed the Upper Spencer Gulf, there are many other businesses in our regions that are also pursuing innovation as a growth strategy.

This government will continue to support innovative manufacturing wherever that may be, whether it is in the suburbs or in the regions. To remain a state that makes things, we need to continue to innovate and push for future technologies, and connect our local entrepreneurs with innovators and our businesses with markets. Manufacturing businesses are important drivers of regional jobs and of economic performance. Manufacturing is not confined to Adelaide and, as Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, I will ensure our regional manufacturers are not ignored.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:05): My question is again to the Minister for Regional Development. In light of the minister no longer holding the balance of power in parliament, what steps has the minister put in place to ensure that regional South Australia is not ignored?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:05): Our commitment to the regions is undiminished by the joining of our cabinet by the member for Waite. Our commitment to the regions is as a direct result of the framework that I laid out from the very first day where we were faced with the election result. From day one I said that the imperative for the government the Labor Party was seeking to form is that we had to ensure that our behaviour, our conduct, the decisions that we took were consistent with and tried to give effect to the election result.

That is why we reached out to both the member for Fisher and the member for Frome, and ultimately we were successful in reaching an arrangement with the member for Frome, but at the same time we made sure that we had addressed in our arrangement with the member for Frome some of the issues that were raised by the member for Fisher, including demands around electoral reform which have now found their expression in a bill that the Attorney will bring to the parliament and also in terms of a charter for small business.

It was consistent with that that we also reached out to the member for Waite, seeking to build the broadest possible coalition to ensure that we had an even more secure majority on the floor of the house, but, more importantly, that we built a coalition with a broader set of constituencies that were available than with the seats that we were able to represent on this side of the chamber. Can I just say that that approach of seeking to actually reflect the election result in our conduct is completely inconsistent with the approach taken by those on the other side of the chamber who are seeking to blame everybody except themselves for the election result.

We are seeking to get in sync with the election result, whereas those opposite are seeking to put their head in the sand and have everybody believe that the election did not deliver the result that it did. So we respect that result and have been striving to reflect it. Those opposite content themselves with attacks on elected officials, with the electoral system itself, with the member for Frome, the member for Waite and anybody else, except looking in the mirror and taking responsibility for the outcome.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for the first time.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, it is actually the first time. The member for Hammond, the member for MacKillop and the member for Morphett are called to order, and the member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time and I know that he keeps a meticulous tally of these things.

FORESTRYSA

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:09): My question is also to the Minister for Regional Development. Does the minister support the decision to make redundant 60 ForestrySA employees?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:09): As the minister responsible for forests I will take that question. The member for Mount Gambier knows—I was on the phone to him—he was one of the first people I rang to advise of the decision last week. He also knows that we have to make ForestrySA more commercially viable, as we have 3½ years to go until the contract with OneFortyOne is to be renewed and we need to do everything we possibly can. The good news for the South-East—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the first time.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The good news for the South-East is that the forestry industry is very strong at the moment and that is very good for the people who are likely to put up their hand if they want to continue working in the industry. When I was down there a couple of months ago talking to haulage operators and harvester operators, they were crying out for more workers. It is good that the industry is going so well there.

I am optimistic about the future of the South-East. I know the member for Mount Gambier is, and we will do everything we can to work together, along with the rest of the community down there, to build jobs. There are 60 voluntary targeted separation packages that have been offered and from what I understand there are a lot of people who are working with ForestrySA who welcome those packages with open arms.

We are going to work on the wider industry down there to make sure that the forestry industry booms. We know the forecast for the next two years at least is very positive, as well, so we think we have a bright future there. In other portfolio areas I have responsibility for—tourism, agriculture, food and fisheries—we are also very optimistic that we can keep jobs growing down there. We are committed to all the regions of South Australia.

I know there had been some talk in recent years when the contract with OneFortyOne was being negotiated of pessimism about the South-East, but having been down there recently (and promising to be down there again in about five weeks), I know there are a lot of people who are quite optimistic about what is happening in the South-East.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, you have given the minister two minutes and I believe standing order 98 requires him to address the substance of the question. The question was very simple: does the Minister for Regional Development agree with the decision? I would like him to answer that question, please.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is frivolous, because it is the customary practice that any minister can answer the question and that is just what the Minister for Agriculture has done.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, the point of order 98 is still applicable. It was clearly debate that was being called by the member for Stuart.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the point of order. Member for Mackillop.

FORESTRYSA

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:12): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier tell the house on 20 May that he stood by his previous commitment in relation to the sale of the timber harvests and said, 'There are serious conditions we are putting on the sale to make sure that there is long term certainty for the people that work directly for ForestrySA', given that it is now confirmed that 60 ForestrySA jobs will be lost?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:12): We do stand by that commitment. I notice that it was expressed in a slightly different form when it was asked of me the first time in parliament. Now the actual words are put in the public sphere of course we stand by that commitment. As the minister has just suggested, the long-term strength of this sector of ForestrySA and, indeed, the forest industry generally relies upon the sorts of decisions that have been taken.

I think what has been lost in all of this is that these are voluntary separation packages. Despite the broader commitments that have been made to the public sector, we have made it clear that these particular workers in ForestrySA will have ongoing employment. They can make their own decisions about whether they choose to remain in the public sector, and suitable redeployment arrangements will be made for them. It is a particular commitment that we have made to those particular workers given the circumstances of the sale and the expectations that were generated.

If that's the best you can do in terms of trawling up something that I said—which is materially different, I must say, from what was told to the parliament last time we met—then you are going to have to look a little bit further. I maintain my commitment that the long-term security for those workers and for the forestry industry more generally is going to be advanced by the arrangements we put in place.

FORESTRYSA

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:14): I have a supplementary question for the Minister for Forests, given the Premier's answer. Why has the minister abandoned the government's promise to ForestrySA workers, given that he said on 20 May, 'we don't run away from our promises; we will stick with them'?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:14): The member for MacKillop seems to take things out of context and come in here with quotes. The commitment was to the people of the South-East. What we have seen since those commitments were made by the government over the last four or five years is that we have a very strong forestry industry in the South-East, and what we are doing is changing ForestrySA to make it competitive so that in 3½ years' time, when that contract comes up for renewal with OneFortyOne, we are in a position to re-sign that contract and continue with the work that we are doing now.

FORESTRYSA

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:15): I have a further supplementary to the Treasurer: why has the Treasurer abandoned the government's promise to ForestrySA workers given that he said on 20 May, 'If we have made commitments to the South-East we'll honour them'.

The SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary, it is a separate question. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:15): Well, that's what you get for asking the right question at the wrong time. You should have asked that first rather than now.

Ms Chapman: How about an answer?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The reality is that if the members for MacKillop and Mount Gambier are interested in economic growth in the South-East, they will drop their proposed ban on unconventional gas in the South-East.

Ms Chapman: How about an answer?

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

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Fancy, Mr Speaker, a former shadow mining minister proposing a ban on unconventional gas.

The SPEAKER: Is the Treasurer finished?

An honourable member: Chuck him out!

The SPEAKER: Is the Treasurer finished?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Then the point of order would be redundant.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services: can the minister assure the house that the Department for Correctional Services and/or his office are not investigating or considering the privatisation of any part of the current or future operations of the Port Augusta Prison, Mobilong Prison, Adelaide Remand Centre, or any other prison in South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:16): There is only one political party that at the last election had secret plans for privatisation, and it wasn't us.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It wasn't us, Mr Speaker. We didn't meet with insurance companies; we didn't meet with a consortium to talk about the privatising of SA Water.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the Treasurer is not responsible to the house for the opposition's policy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is true sir. The government has made its views on the privatisation of public assets very clear, and we stand by those pronouncements.

SERVICE SA

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:17): My question is to the Treasurer: are there any plans to close any Service SA customer service centres?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:17): If there are, you will find out in the budget, and I'm not going to make any announcements today. I'll say this: I look forward to you tabling the letters you've written to your federal colleagues about the cuts they've made to South Australian services, calling on them to reverse their cuts before you get up in here attacking us about proposed cuts that haven't actually occurred.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

SERVICE SA

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:18): Why is Service SA offering redundancy packages to permanent staff members while continuing to employ temp agency staff?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:18): We expect all agencies to meet their efficiency dividends and, if they're offering voluntary redundancies to their staff, it's their right. People have a choice; they don't have to take them and it's up to them whether they take those redundancies. I'll say this: we're not the ones who had secret plans to sack 25,000 public servants: it was the opposition.

*Ministerial Statement***REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND**

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:18): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Today the government announced details of the much anticipated and enhanced \$15 million Regional Development Fund, which is designed to stimulate economic growth, improve infrastructure, facilitate investment and create jobs in the regions. The significant increase in the fund from \$1.6 million to \$15 million a year was part of my agreement with the Premier and includes a range of initiatives that will benefit people in our regional communities.

Establishing a new high-powered regional South Australia cabinet committee is part of my agreement, and that will ensure that there is a greater focus on regional South Australia in the making of government decisions, as well as improved coordination of government and funding arrangements for regional South Australia.

The \$39 million regional funding package I have negotiated for the year ahead includes a new one-off \$10 million Jobs Accelerator Fund specifically aimed at creating jobs in the regions which is in addition to the \$13.4 million boost in new moneys to the Regional Development Fund.

The enhanced Regional Development Fund will deliver greater support for projects to provide direct outcomes for our regions through infrastructure development, jobs and leveraged investment in regional South Australia. The \$15 million annual funding will be allocated through five new programs:

- The Major Projects Program is worth \$8.55 million per annum to support major economic projects designed to strengthen regional industries and support local economies and opportunities through investment in strategic projects.
- The Community Infrastructure Program is worth \$3 million per annum to support investment in regional communities to develop economic infrastructure and grow their capabilities as a foundation for future jobs and economic growth.
- The Small Grants Program is with \$3 million to support new regional employment and investment opportunities linked with state government's priorities.
- The Regional Food Initiatives Program is worth \$300,000 per annum to support regionally based food organisations to build a stronger regional food presence in SA.
- The Country Cabinet Program is worth \$150,000 per annum to support projects in communities that host country cabinet meetings over the next four years.

I am also pleased to announce that expressions of interest for two of the programs—that is, the Regional Food Initiatives Program and the Small Grants Program—are now invited for proposals that can demonstrate direct benefits to the regions. Expressions of interest are open from now until 5pm on Friday 27 June 2014. I will also make further announcements on the other regional development programs at a later date.

To the members here and to you, Mr Speaker, I want these funds to be used for proposals that are jobs and investment-driven. I encourage individuals and groups from across regional South Australia, including local government, Regional Development Australia bodies, private enterprise, community groups and the wider community to take advantage of the increased funding on offer. The guidelines and assessment criteria and 'how to apply' information for the enhanced Regional Development Fund are available on the PIRSA website.

*Grievance Debate***BOLAFFI, MR ALLEN**

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:22): Today, I wish to address the house on behalf of the opposition in respect of the sad passing of Mr Allen Bolaffi. Today, with minister Bettison, I attended his funeral service. As members would expect, it was a Jewish funeral, one which, I would like to express to the house, was really quite beautiful. As members may

be aware, the Jewish community have certain customs in respect of their funerals. In particular, the casket it is a plain pine box, with string handles, in which the deceased is wrapped in a shroud.

There is no display of ostentation at a Jewish funeral, as the belief is that everyone came into this world with nothing and leaves this world with nothing. In Israel there would not even be a coffin, as the body has to touch the earth. When the service is concluded at the grave site, the custom is to place a small stone on the grave using the left hand.

This shows that someone visited the grave site and it is also a way of participating in the good deed of burial. Leaving flowers is not a traditional Jewish practice. Another reason for leaving stones is to tend the grave. In biblical times, gravestones were not used. Graves were marked with mounds of stone, so by placing or replacing them, one perpetuated the existence of the site.

Today's Jewish funeral service for Mr Bolaffi was really quite a magnificent occasion. Members of the opposition have made some public comment in relation to his passing, a tragic loss of life at a young age. I wish to place on record and extend my greatest sympathies to his wife Viv, son Reuben, and daughters Amy and Kate.

Members of the family and the business community made a contribution today. As I say, it was a very noble but modest celebration of his life consistent with Jewish tradition and, accordingly, it was a relatively short and simple service.

The contribution today, and those, I would have guesstimated, nearly 1,000 people who attended this service, underscore the extraordinary love and respect that has been demonstrated by the attendances today.

Very briefly, may I confirm and commend Allen's lifetime contribution to being a founder of the Australia Israel Chamber of Commerce, which has subsequently been developed in two other states—he contributed to that for some 20 years—and his directorships on a number of eminent boards of companies in South Australia. His continued advice as an accountant to many across the South Australian and interstate communities is well known.

Less well known is the personal Allen Bolaffi. It is fair to say, having come from a profession of legal people, that lawyers and accountants have attracted their fair amount of ridicule from the general public. Most are assumed to have had some personality bypass but, if ever there was an exception to the rule for these professions, it was Allen Bolaffi. He was a jovial and very, very funny man. Some said today that some of his jokes were not terribly funny, but the reality is you could not go into a room without Allen lighting up the room with some laughter and some jolly contribution to make.

He was a hard-headed businessman, he was a tough professional, he was someone who shone in a room, but he also had another special skill, and that was to be a magnificent husband and father and mentor to many. If ever there is an enduring legacy of Mr Bolaffi, it is the fact that he has mentored and provided advice to young people across the community. We will remember him as a generous friend, a good man and a loving father who lived a most worthwhile life.

ACTIVE ELDERS ASSOCIATION

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:27): Today, I want to speak about the value of a very special association, which is in the electorate of Elder. The community club offers a weekly opportunity for those over 50 to come together to share in friendship, food and activities. It offers the prospect of companionship, which cannot be underestimated. Clubs such as these are important to so many in our society who can often find themselves alone and isolated.

This club I refer to is the Active Elders Association. It is located within my electorate and is situated at the corner of Charles and Albert streets in Ascot Park. The club has been active for over 45 years, and the premises currently caters to over 360 different individuals who participate in various activities on a weekly basis.

The club provides a valuable service to the many elderly in the local and surrounding communities and is a meeting place for members to participate in the various leisure and fun activities that the club hosts. These activities seek to improve the wellbeing and quality of life for elderly members of the community and reduce social isolation. In addition, the club facilitates provision of a meeting place for local multicultural and social welfare groups. The club is always welcoming new

members and will endeavour to do its best to provide transport for those who need to have that facilitated for them to get to and from the venue.

The energy of club members is remarkable, and this is demonstrated by the fundraising abilities and vision on projects to further enhance the hall facility. The club, through various fundraising activities, has improved their meeting hall facilities to the extent that the building is now used most days of the week.

One of the unusual and very successful fundraisers they have implemented is the collection and shredding of newspapers, which is carried out by volunteers. These volunteers are generally elderly gentlemen and they are very amicable elderly men who will go around and collect newspapers from those who do not require them anymore; they will shred them and bag them, and then sell them for a small fee to businesses to use for stuffing packages so items will not break.

They also recently demonstrated their enthusiasm as the club completed the extension and renovation of the kitchen and main hall areas to accommodate the recent increase in membership numbers. As a result of this, meals can now be prepared in the kitchen and the space is used effectively, and it is a huge improvement on the small kitchen they had previously. This one now has massive surfaces and multiple cupboards. Additionally, access to the kitchen is now available for disabled and wheelchair-bound persons, and it makes it possible for them to be involved in the preparation of food.

Most recently the group, through their fundraising activities and with the assistance of the government, decided to invest in a solar panel system for their hall. This just highlights the progressive and dynamic nature of the Active Elders Association—the club that I am really happy to support. Many events have been organised by the association over the years, and in 2009 the association invited the Chinese community to be part of their celebration of the Beijing Olympics. I am told it was a huge success, with a large number of Chinese residents attending and also providing the food for lunch.

Some of the club's other activities that they celebrate during the year—I must add here they offer an activity every week of the year except over the Christmas/New Year break, so they offer celebrations of Easter; Pancake Day; Commonwealth Games, for instance; and also a Christmas Day breakup. They also have regular bingo games, eight-ball, bus tours and entertainers, and also an annual bowls tournament where they compete against the students of the Ascot Park Primary School—an event enjoyed by young and old alike, and a great bringing together of communities.

They have also recently discovered the value of the Wii computer technologies for fun, laughter and fitness. Many of the elderly members are reporting that their fitness is now improving using these Wii machines. The club also actively invites other groups to share in their facilities, such as the University of the Third Age, the Chrysanthemum Club, the Lions Club of Edwardstown and others.

Time expired.

ITALIAN CONSULATE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:32): I rise today on behalf of those with Italian origin in Hartley. I can advise that this is around 4,000 people in total. I still remember the day, a few months ago now, when I met His Excellency Pier Francesco Zazo, the Italian Ambassador, at the Italian consulate right here in Glynde in Hartley. On that day hundreds lined Payneham Road and packed into the consulate to hear the ambassador speak of the consulate's future. It was actually there that I stood side by side with many local and community leaders, including from organisations such as Com.It.Es, Co.As.It, APAIA, the Carabinieri associations and various Italian community clubs, as well as political leaders, including the member for Unley, for example, to plead the case for the consulate to remain here in Adelaide.

At the time, the consulate was under enormous pressure from the local Italian community here, and the Italian government eventually did reverse the decision to shut its Italian consulate. We were very grateful that they decided to reverse the decision to close the consulate here.

The house will recall that one of my first acts as the member for Hartley was to continue to maintain a good relationship with the Italian Ambassador, His Excellency Pier Francesco Zazo, and to lobby the Italian government on behalf of the many thousands of South Australians of Italian

descent. I recently met His Excellency with members of the Forum of Italo-Australian Parliamentarians, including yourself, Madam Deputy Speaker, where we travelled to the ambassador's personal residence in Canberra.

Amongst other things, I personally put the case to His Excellency that the consulate must remain here in Adelaide because it is simply not feasible for people to travel interstate to access consular services, especially for the frail and the elderly, and a service must remain in Adelaide. As a third generation Italo-Australian living here in Adelaide, in Hartley, I can certainly attest to the important role that the consulate plays in assisting Italian-born Australians living in Adelaide, as well as the many thousands of South Australians of Italian descent.

For many years, our community has protested, through various channels, against the closure of this consulate. Of course, this campaign has included, amongst other things, a petition, letters from key stakeholders, speeches by members of parliament and even a protest at the actual consulate. His Excellency the ambassador assured me that the Italian consulate would remain in Adelaide for the time being and acknowledged the profound role the million or so Australians of Italian origin and their families have played in building this great state and this great nation. He also admitted, however, that the Italian government is exercising fiscal restraint in a number of areas, including its foreign affairs budget.

In speaking on this issue, I thank all the community leaders and people of Italian origin who came together to help save the consulate this year. They are a stellar example of people power. I thank them for their efforts, particularly the Italian patronati, associations like Com.It.Es, Co.As.It, APAIA, the Carabinieri associations and the various Italian community clubs. At the same time, I would like to thank the Italian government for their decision to reverse the closure. We are certainly grateful to them for their sensible decision to retain the consulate in Adelaide, with the service that it provides.

I call on the people of Italian origin in Adelaide to now utilise and support the vital service that is the consulate. If Australian and Italian citizens are entitled to obtain Italian passports, I would encourage them to pay their fee and have their passports processed, which will show the Italian government that we are serious about the service that is the consulate. I will keep fighting for those of Italian origin in my electorate who use the Italian consulate services in Adelaide and in Australia to ensure that the consulate remains in Adelaide for, hopefully, many years to come.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:37): I rise to further highlight the difficulties that we face here in South Australia given the 13 May federal Tony Abbott Liberal government budget, its billions of dollars of savage cuts to health and education, and to speak about the damaging impact those cuts will have on hardworking South Australians, their families and our communities. As always, the South Australian Labor Party is committed to standing up for people being treated with respect and dignity and ensuring no-one—not one South Australian—is left behind. In the face of the Prime Minister's cruel disregard for South Australians, other than for just a privileged few, stand up for them we must and stand up for them we will.

The federal Tony Abbott Liberal government have slashed and burned essential services in their mean budget. As I said on the Tuesday of our last sitting, they have done so with a deep commitment to cruelty and, alarmingly, with glee as they reached into the pockets of South Australians Tuesday a fortnight ago and relegated them to years of pain and hardship. Unfortunately, it is just the beginning. The stripping of \$5.5 billion from South Australian schools and hospitals over the next decade has placed quality education and health care for South Australians from cradle to career at risk. The attacks are set to diminish the wellbeing of many. These attacks, however, are set to have a particularly damaging effect on South Australian women, with many of these changes disproportionately affecting women, who make up a significant number of low-income earners, pensioners, public servants, single parents, carers and those escaping domestic violence.

The federal Liberal government intends to wind back hospital funding agreements and implement a \$7 charge for visits to a doctor, and an increase in co-payments for prescriptions, X-rays, other imaging services and pathology services will also attract the charge. Changes to the PBS will mean that prescriptions under this scheme will now cost \$5 more per prescription. Women's health, and specifically reproductive health, is affected by these changes, with 60 per cent of visits to GPs

being made by women and 64 per cent of those receiving mental health treatments in the last financial year being women.

Currently, Family Tax Benefit Part B is paid to families with children under 18. This will now be cut off when the youngest child turns six, with all family benefits due to remain on hold until 2016-17. In my electorate of Reynell, more than 50 per cent of women earn a personal income of less than \$600 per week, 3,277 women work part-time and 1,739 women are single parents, or 75 per cent of the single parents in Reynell. It is often the family tax benefit that allows these low income earning women to just—and I mean just—make ends meet. It is the difference between being able to buy new school uniforms and shoes when needed, being able to take children on a very occasional outing and sometimes even just to make rent and not being able to do any of these things.

The national Office for Women's Leadership and Development Strategy is set to be cut by \$1.6 million over the next four years. The pension age will rise to 70 and will disproportionately affect women, who are 55.7 per cent of aged pensioners and retire earlier than men with, on average, around half of their superannuation and have a longer life expectancy. The low income superannuation contribution of \$500 for workers earning less than \$37,000 per year is to be cut. This contribution benefits 3.6 million Australians, 2.1 million of whom are women. This cut will seriously and negatively impact the retirement savings of almost one in two women.

The National Affordable Housing Agreement is included in the 2014 budget—however, at a reduced rate—and it is probable that this will reduce funding to South Australia by \$1 million. The National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness is not in the forward estimates. Forty-four million dollars has been cut, with the federal government only making a commitment to funding for the 2014-15 financial year.

It is understood that it is likely that the federal government will not continue to provide funding for this after 2015-16, which will significantly reduce funding to homelessness services, including women's domestic violence services. Women comprise close to two-thirds of those seeking the support of specialist homeless services, with around 25 per cent of services provided attributable to domestic violence. These changes will affect women and their children who face homelessness through domestic violence, and also single mothers and women over 55 on pensions who have lower incomes and fewer affordable housing options.

Minimum income thresholds to begin paying back higher education fee help loans will be lowered by 10 per cent, affecting young women and those wishing to return to study, who are the majority of higher education students yet are more than twice as likely as men to earn income below the current repayment threshold. Vicious cuts to Newstart do not provide support for older women returning to work or women returning to work after having children. Sixteen thousand five hundred commonwealth Public Service jobs will be cut and 70 federal agencies will be scrapped. This also disproportionately affects women, who now make up 58 per cent of the federal Public Service.

Time expired.

LOWER LAKES AND COORONG

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:43): I rise today to speak about the Lower Lakes and Coorong and, in particular, the scoping study into the future management of Lake Albert. This is a matter I have raised a number of times in this place and it is extremely disappointing to see the state government's lack of urgency in the completion of this important study.

By way of background, the scoping study was based, in part, on an initiative of the Meningie Narrung Lakes Irrigators Association, the five-point plan for the future management of the Lower Lakes and Coorong, and this plan consisted of five main points:

1. Remove the Narrung ferry causeway.
2. Remove the Narrung bund in its entirety.
3. Dredge the whole of the Narrung Narrows.
4. Install a connector at the southern end of Lake Albert to the Coorong.
5. Return natural flows to the southern end of the Coorong.

Formed in 2002, the Meningie Narrung Lakes Irrigators Association is a small group of local farmers who once derived the majority of their income from the waters of Lake Albert and who are concerned about supply, quality of, and access to water from the Lower Lakes.

We have all witnessed the debilitating effects on the environment and our river communities of what is now acknowledged as over-allocation of the river's resources. Throughout the entire Murray-Darling Basin we have been witness to the devastation and suffering caused by a prolonged drought and then a succession of weather events. Those who derive income from the river Murray, particularly below Lock 1, are acutely aware of what happens upstream. Those below Lock 1 will be the eventual recipients of whatever occurs upstream and the effects on the environment and river communities, such as Meningie, into the future.

During the drought period when the water level in Lake Albert fell to half a metre below sea level or minus 0.5 metres AHD (Australian Height Datum), everyone was impacted, and this was at least 1.25 metres below what is set as the standard setting of plus 0.75. Just as a snapshot, the 21 dairy operations in the area got down to three at one point. There was enormous economic stress on the entire area. There are reports from community service providers that there was a significant increase in mental health problems, and numbers at the Meningie Area School dropped from 278 to 160.

The Murray-Darling Basin has essentially recovered and the river is returning to health. Below Lock 1, however, the Coorong and Lower Lakes have not. Salinity levels remain high and past failed infrastructure initiatives continue to impact. The Coorong and Lower Lakes, quite simply, require attention, and to learn that the state government's scoping study has been stalled by six months is of great concern.

The scoping study, which receives state and federal government funding support to the tune of \$740,000, was due to be handed down in December 2013. At a presentation in Meningie in December, the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources explained the completion date would be extended to March 2014. It is now June. Why has this study stalled by six months? I will tell you why.

The government does not want potential improved management actions, such as a proposed connector between Lake Albert and the Coorong, because that would impact the amount of revenue made from selling potable water for commercial use to irrigators who cannot utilise the lakes due to the high salinity levels. This government knows the ongoing return received from the use of pipelines by local primary producers for the delivery of potable and irrigation water supplies will ultimately be impacted if infrastructure designed to improve water quality is implemented.

I am aware that a number of primary producers are looking to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in the 30-kilometre irrigation pipeline from the lake, allowing them to pump water a lot cheaper out of the lake than the \$3.23 per kilolitre paid to SA Water, and some of these pipes have already been put in. This government knows this is only viable if the water quality is improved and, as the scoping study report will suggest, the only way to do that is through the installation of a connector between Lake Albert and the Coorong.

Restoring Lake Albert to health would create 273 jobs and add \$30.7 million to the regional economy, a recent Regional Development Australia (RDA) study has found. In addition to this, in a recent letter I received, the Meningie Narrung Lakes Irrigators Association is not privy to the final scoping study report. The association fears there are many aspects of detail they will not be consulted on and these people know the Lower Lakes and Coorong better than anyone. Why this government does not want to help primary producers grow jobs, increase regional economic activity and support regional South Australia has baffled me since I first entered this place and it continues to do so.

Time expired.

TAYLOR ELECTORATE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:48): I would like to speak today about a recent round of principal visits I have just completed. Normally I finish this in the first term of the year, but with the state election being in March I have not had the opportunity to do this. Since 2010 it has allowed me to visit all the schools in my electorate, and there are very many—about 95. I would like to go through and briefly give people a snapshot of where all my schools are going in the area, because I would like to pay

tribute to all the principals I have spoken to, past and present, but particularly the leadership teams; there has been quite a turnover in recent years.

The one most closely located to my office is Tanya Oshinsky and Settlers Farm Campus. When I visited there in late April I was really pleased to be able to sit down and talk with their governing council chair, Brian Thomson, and Tanya about their recent award of a \$10,000 Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden Program grant and what they are planning to do with the school. The school is a multicultural school which has a rich connection with its community. We have been talking about potentially getting a Farsi ethnic school on site and co-locating that. It has beautiful grounds and has benefited from being built up over the years.

The whole community in the north would like to have placed on record our thanks to the Jeffries family and the Jeffries compost and soils division at Buckland Park for their support of local schools with their kitchen garden grants that are blossoming in our area, particularly at Virginia Primary School, Lake Windemere B-7, Settler's Farm Campus and Burton Primary School. I will speak about their garden projects as we go along.

Virginia Primary School has been led in the last two years by Ilia Tsoutouras. Ilia is a dynamic young man who is doing fantastic things in that school. He is passionate and has great vision for renewing not just the classrooms but also educational quality. The children there are so friendly. When I walk in the gate, they always rush up and say, 'Member for Taylor, we saw you at Parliament.' They come down to visit us in Parliament House.

They are very active in the education program and debating things but also when they go out to the broader community in Virginia, they are always very friendly and welcoming children. They, too, are doing a Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden and they have plans for enlarging that, but they are also looking at different play opportunities within the school, because they have a lot of ground around that area. I am looking forward to the scoping study for the expansion of the preschool in that area as well.

Lake Windemere B-7 School last year had a fantastic opening of a \$5 million refurbishment. I think the year before that they had a hall opening as a result of the schools program with the federal government. Again, they are looking at another Stephanie Alexander kitchen grant which is another \$10,000 and, on top of that, they have also been involved with the Smith Family with the Girls on Track program and Graham Jaeschke is certainly working with that school to help the girls get back on track and blossom into the beautiful young women that we need in the north to be community leaders.

I know that the beneficiaries of this year's Parliamentary Mid-Winter Ball are the Smith Family. Also at Lake Windemere, we have had the opportunity of having a great principal, Angela Falkenberg, who was in the member for Torrens' area for a long time and came out about four years ago to Lake Windemere, and she has made a profound difference to that school. I am very grateful for her leadership. Not only are they involved in the Martin Seligman positive psychology work in the north, they are also a blooming school which has seen much change with that \$5 million refurbishment.

Burton Primary School this year has a new principal, Alison Lynch, and her deputy, Nick. It was a pleasure to meet them formally for the first time on 9 May and they, too, are involved in a community garden project. They are working with their local Bunnings, Jeffries (who I have partnered them with), and Salisbury council to work towards a bigger expanded garden. They have had a long-term commitment to gardening on that site with Yates seeds.

They have been growing their own produce for many years and creating maths and science projects and cooking classes with the students. They are going to involve a multigenerational, multicultural site as the school moves forward. It is interesting and we are really excited that we might have been able to successfully cement down the Lions Club at Paralowie of which I am a member to be involved in that community project.

St Columba College, which is a very large school now at Andrews Farm, is run under the fantastic leadership of Madeleine Brennan, who was only telling me the other day that 99 per cent of her year 12 students completed their SACE, and an increasing percentage are getting ATAR scores.

Time expired.

*Bills***SUPPLY BILL 2014***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:54): Just getting back on track, I would like to talk a little bit about health in Chaffey, and today we are hearing a lot about people in government talking about the federal government's policy and yet they are not looking in their own backyard. Let me assure you, Madam Deputy Speaker, the budgeted upgrade to the Berri regional hospital of \$41 million, yes, was wound back to \$36 million—a \$5 million saving on a hospital redevelopment.

The health minister stood here today praising the construction of both the Whyalla and the Berri hospitals, about the chemotherapy unit. What he forgot to mention was that there was not any funding there for the chemotherapy chairs. We had a unit but no chairs. Where did the money come from for those chairs? It was fundraised by the local community. We found a \$5 million budget saving in a regional hospital that was desperate for an upgrade and yet this government continues to cut the funding.

I just listened to the member for Reynell and I have listened to the member for Kurna talk about the \$7 co-payment. Let me tell you, to go and visit a doctor on the weekends at the Riverland hospital costs you \$60 co-payment—\$60 not \$7. That is what happens in the regions of South Australia and yet no-one even knows about that, do they? It is \$7 here but \$60 in the regions. You ought to check up on your facts and figures when you start to bag the federal government.

On a positive note, what that will mean now is that fewer people will have to travel to Adelaide for surgery and medical treatment. In doing that Labor must commit the full \$2.5 million annual allocation to the promised PATS. There are many inequities in the PATS. The \$2.5 million is putting some balance back into the argument that when people travel from the country to the city they take someone to help them down to their medical procedures—I would like to see that implemented.

Again, the South Australian government has cut back on tourism, particularly regional tourism where we see that local government has stepped in and picked up the slack. I would like to congratulate Destination Riverland for its tireless work in promoting the region and getting that tourism industry back on track. The tourism industry is one of the leading and growing industries in the electorate of Chaffey and the recent publicity around winter on the river has gained great support. It is great to see that the Chair of Destination Riverland, the Hon. Joan Hall, is working wonders within tourism. I would also like to acknowledge the general manager, Tony Sharley, who is leading by example with his passion and his direction in steering the tourism industry the right way.

Again, we look at roads and the condition of roads. I would be very happy to accommodate any ministers or any government people when they come up to the country cabinet, if they would like me to take them and show them the condition of some of the roads that have been neglected over the last period of time. I note that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure is here and I offer him an invitation to go out and have a look at the condition particularly of the Karoonda Highway.

It was recently revealed that the rail lines from Loxton to Tailem Bend and Pinnaroo to Tailem Bend will cease operations. My numbers tell me that that will increase truck operations on that road by around 6,250 extra truck operations after the removal of that rail service. Again, I ask the minister to give consideration to an invitation to come and have a look at the condition of that road. Also the Mallee Highway has ever-increasing traffic—particularly with heavy vehicles down there with broadacre horticulture—with the cessation of the rail line down there. Again, it is going to put more pressure on a road that is already in serious trouble. The degradation of that road due to the increased traffic has become more and more obvious—and yet we only see small patches—but the increased lack of safety on that road is of paramount importance.

As I said earlier on in this contribution, Chaffey is open for business. Yes, its roads do need maintenance, but it is a great lifestyle and the cost of housing and the services are there, albeit negated. But what we need is some confidence and we need people to come up to a region that is looking to give people an opportunity to be part of a small business world that is begging for them to come up and set up in the region.

Again, we look at the cost of power, and over time I know that all sides of the house have mentioned river reform, water reform, but it has come at a great cost to South Australian irrigators. Not only have we got little confidence in this government actually pushing through water reforms in their current form, but we are now dealing with power. As I have said, the cost of pumping that water into pressurised pipes—relifting it out of the river into the faraway fields—has come at a great cost.

While we throw stones and rocks at our eastern counterparts about being inefficient, and while we say that they need to get rid of their channels and get rid of their flood irrigation, they are now looking at us and laughing because they are using the gravity feed, they are using their open channels, and they are not paying the power bills that we are. So again, I ask the Minister for Energy to look at ways that we can govern and we can put ceilings or caps on the price of power because it is crippling an industry that is begging to be a part of the state's economy.

Again, looking at solutions: salinity targets are hindering the future viability of food production, particularly in the Riverland and the Mallee. We look at the water allocation plans that are being unfairly imposed on particularly the underground irrigators. As we have seen, when something is taken away from you by government, as a business there is normally some form of assistance or some form of transition package.

We are seeing the River Murray irrigators being compensated and given incentives to improve their efficiencies, yet in the Mallee they are having between 30 and 50 per cent of their water taken away—it is being compulsorily acquired. That water is going back to the environment, and I do not have a problem with that. But what I have a problem with is that these businesses are being set up with a working model around a water allocation that is now being taken away from them—compulsorily acquired—and I think that we need to have a good look at that.

The other salinity targets are that we have a Murray-Darling Basin Plan that is being phased in by the year 2019. We have site-use approvals that are hindering the viability of our economy and we have red tape and green tape. The basin plan, the salt interception schemes and better on-farm use are prime examples of why we need to readjust our salinity targets. To readjust our salinity targets, we are exporting 2 million tonnes of salt out of the mouth; we are exporting high-salinity water into salt evaporation basins; and we are looking at better farm efficiencies and better farm practices. I will continue my remarks at another time.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader, and I remind the house that the leader is the lead speaker.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:03): Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. It is my pleasure to speak today on the Supply Bill currently before the house and I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition and also that we will be supporting this bill. We are supporting it reluctantly, and I say that because it is an incredible situation to me, coming from the commercial sector that we should be asked to essentially—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: We have just been asked by the member opposite what company.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Please don't be distracted by interjections, which are out of order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is out of order, and I ask you to continue.

Mr MARSHALL: There are plenty of companies that I have been involved with and I have a very proud history—I see the member scuttling from the chamber because he asks a question and then he does not want to hear it. But that is just so typical of those opposite. So typical—ask a question and run off. When we ask a question from this side of the house, what happens? They also run off! I have just sat through question time. Let me tell you it was question time; it was called question time and there were plenty of questions. I tell you what it was not called—it was not called 'answer time', because there were no answers from those opposite. It was a complete and utter waste of time of this parliament—but that is what we are used to.

There were such high expectations, Deputy Speaker—and I am sure you shared those high expectations—when a member from your, let's just say, side of the spectrum, for those opposite, became the leader. He came into this house and he said we would have a new period of civility in this house. He said that reasonable questions would get answers. Well, let me tell you, we asked a series of questions today and the answers that we got were a combination of obfuscation and gross incompetence. That is what we had from those opposite, and I do not see it getting any better any time soon with recent additions. Anyway, I digress, Deputy Speaker, back to the Supply Bill.

The Supply Bill is that odd time of year when the government says to the opposition, 'We would like you to give us some money.' In fact, I will tell you, Deputy Speaker, how much money the government is currently asking for: \$3.941 billion. The government is saying that we should grant this money, this cash, to the government to spend in accordance with their wishes without providing us with a budget, without providing us with an indication of how they are going to spend that money.

Now, we have asked questions in this house, and we asked a series of questions in this house today, and we heard from the Treasurer, 'You'll just have to wait. It is unfair to ask any questions before I put out my first budget.' I do not know why he thought that. How dare the opposition ask the Treasurer a question about matters in his portfolio? Anyway, we have got to wait until the 19th, but what an odd situation. People opposite say, 'Well, this is the convention.' Well, I say I am not sure it is a good convention. I am not sure it is a convention which has served the people of South Australia well over an extended period of time.

Imagine going to a bank and saying, 'I would like \$3.941 billion.' I think the bank manager would be within his rights to say, 'Well, what would you like to spend that money on?' I think that would be a pretty reasonable question from the bank manager. Yet, when the opposition asks questions of the Treasurer, or the government, they say, 'You'll have to wait and see.' Imagine, if I sat down with the bank manager and I said, 'Can I please have'—I will put in all of the niceties—'May I please have \$3.941 billion?' There is no please in this bill, but if I went to the bank manager and I asked, 'May I please have \$3.941 billion?', I think it is reasonable to ask, 'What would you like to spend that money on?'

We have had threats from the Treasurer, via the media, in recent weeks saying that this is going to be a tough budget, that there may be additional taxes. Interestingly, the Premier has not said that, but the Treasurer has intimated towards it. It begs the question: what is going to be in this budget that we are today being asked to grant this money for, going forward? It is a convention. I am not sure it is a good convention, but I do indicate that reluctantly we will be supporting it on this side of the house.

I really do hope that we have a good budget this time, because I do not think there is any time previously in the history of this place—and by 'this place' I am referring to South Australia—in which we have needed a competent budget to be delivered, because we are in a mess. After 12 years of Labor government in South Australia, we are in a mess. The centre point of that mess is a jobs crisis which has enveloped South Australia. Do not forget—and I want to remind the house as many times as I possibly can—that when this government went to the 2010 election they made a promise to the people of South Australia. They said, 'If we are elected we will create 100,000 new jobs in the next six year period.' Well, we are over four years into that period, and let me tell you it has been an absolute disaster.

Whilst the rest of Australia has been increasing employment, South Australia has been going backwards. In fact, since the last budget was brought down 12 months ago, we have lost in this state 18,000 full-time jobs. It is a disgrace, it is a crisis, and, let me tell you, the worst thing about it is there is no plan. When we went to this election, of course we had the Premier who was out there and he had a document which he called 'Building a stronger South Australia', and it outlined his job creation plan.

The centre point of his job creation plan was \$393 million worth of expenditure over the forward estimates. The detail of that, of course, was covered off in the document and never really, I do not think, accurately spelt out for people. The crux of the issue was that \$333 million was coming from the federal government; of course, it did not come.

So, \$333 million of the \$393 million that were required to implement the jobs plan that the Labor Party took to the election to address our perilous employment situation in South Australia—we have had 18,000 full-time jobs lost in the last 12 months—was coming from the federal

government, and it did not come. In fact, only \$60 million was coming from our state coffers, and even this money has now disappeared from their jobs plan and gone to the federal government's auto transition program.

This was an announcement which was made without the normal flair of this government by press release. There was no press release put out. There was no ministerial statement made about supporting this plan. Before the election they said, 'We will not be supporting this plan.' After the election, 'Here is your \$60 million over the next four years.'

It begs the question: what has happened to the government's plan to create jobs here in South Australia? I would put it to you, Deputy Speaker, that this is a government which has no plan. They have no plan whatsoever to deal with the biggest crisis confronting the state of South Australia, which is the jobs situation. They have got no plan whatsoever. They had a plan, they took it to the election, it was unfunded in their own forward estimates, they were reliant on the federal government and the federal government did not come up with the money.

They have given \$60 million of their own money for their jobs plan to the federal government's plan, and we have got nothing. We have got no plan and we have got no money, and that is why I say this is an absolutely critical time for our state. We are really hoping that we get a decent budget coming down on 19 June.

I had the good fortune to travel to New Zealand last week. Alright, it was delayed by a day, but I travelled to New Zealand and, let me tell you, it was a very informative visit. I enjoyed going to New Zealand.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: I do not know what that member over there is shouting, probably something about rugby because he seems more obsessed with that than—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind members of standing order 142.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will be from now on, I think.

Mr MARSHALL: It was a very interesting trip. What I learned was that New Zealand had a very different approach to many of the Western countries of the world to the financial crisis which enveloped the world. They came to power in 2008, and rather than being seduced like our federal government was under Labor into a mass amount of stimulus expenditure, they were quite the opposite. What they showed was real financial constraint in terms of growth in their expenditure and a single-minded focus on growing the size of their economy.

They did not put money into a range of pink batt-type stimulus programs: they put it into reforming their taxation system, lowering taxation in that country, providing stimulus to the productive component of the economy and growing the overall size of their economy. What a spectacular success it has been. I certainly do not pretend to this house that I am an expert on everything that has occurred in New Zealand over the last six-plus years, but I will say that, when we look at their forecast growth rate of 4 per cent, it is a long way from where we are here in South Australia.

When I look at their slowing to almost a stop the migration out of that country, which was running at 3,000 persons per month when they came to power and which is now down to a trickle six years later, when I look at their audacious goal to create 40 per cent of their GDP from exports, I say well done. Well done, New Zealand. Well done, John Key, the Prime Minister. It was a great honour for me to meet with him in New Zealand last week. We have got a lot to learn from New Zealand, especially around their focus on exports. It has been an area of real weakness here in South Australia for an extended period of time. I make this point: 4 per cent growth is extraordinary.

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: The member for Ashford makes some good points regarding their social agenda, because a lot of people think maybe this centre-right party in New Zealand was only there for economic benefit, but I make the point that in their most recent budget they provided free health care for children under the age of 13; they also provided increased paid maternity leave for women—

a significant increase. I see the member for Ashford shaking her head on that one; we will seek a personal explanation a little bit later as to why she is not standing up for women on that issue, but she makes a good point with those—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: She makes a good point, and that is that the New Zealand government has been a government for all people, and they have taken a lot of people with them. But, an improvement in the economy has been a benefit to the greater New Zealand population, and we can learn a lot from that. Four per cent growth is extraordinary—it is absolutely extraordinary, especially when we compare it with our growth here in South Australia. I use the term 'growth' loosely because our domestic economy contracted last financial year.

There is no growth in a contraction. I know this is news to some opposite. There is no growth in a contraction, and the size of our state final demand last financial year contracted, as did our exports last financial year. Our exports also contracted because we just simply have not had this focus in South Australia, and we need this focus. We need, more than ever, to build our economy, and that means a constraint on our expenditure; that means that we need to have a focus on growing our economy.

When you think about how we are going to grow our economy here in South Australia, you have to say to yourself, 'Well, there are only a few ways in which we can grow the size of our economy.' The first, of course, that we spoke about in the lead-up to the election was the issue of population growth, which was rejected by those opposite. We said that we wanted to create a goal to significantly increase the number of international students studying in Adelaide. This would create economic stimulus, and that is why we talked about re-funding the university program to promote our state to regions right throughout the world.

The other issue is start-ups. We have a very low rate of start-ups in South Australia; in fact, it is the lowest on mainland Australia. Again, I had the great fortune when I was in New Zealand to visit some of their incubation spaces. What they are doing to support entrepreneurial activity is absolutely outstanding. We talked, on this side of the house, in the lead-up to the election, about the need to have entrepreneurship taught in our schools. I know that the member for Unley, who is our shadow minister and is listening intently as I speak, is a strong supporter of teaching entrepreneurship in our schools, because we have got an unemployment problem at the moment here in South Australia.

We do not have a line-up of employers waiting for our school leavers to finish, and we have got to make sure that our school leavers are not just job takers, but also job makers here in South Australia. Clearly, the most important thing we can do is to have a focus on exports out of our state, and this is an area where this government has completely and utterly failed the people of South Australia.

In 2004, the Labor Party developed our State's Strategic Plan. To be quite honest, the people in the Liberal Party made it clear that we thought it was a good idea to have a state strategic plan. We did not agree with every single one on their State's Strategic Plan, but we did think it was a good idea to have a plan. The government decided that they would set a goal to increase exports out of this state, and a good goal that one was; that was one which was wholeheartedly supported by members on this side of the house, and we decided to support it because it was good policy.

The goal was to increase exports out of this state to \$25 billion by 2013. For those of you who have not looked at your watch recently, 2013 was last year, so how did the government go against their plan to increase exports to \$25 billion? Let me tell you: not very well. They knew that they were not going to achieve it before 2013, so they adjusted the goal and they said, 'We'll achieve it by 2014.' Well, here we are in 2014. Let me tell you the sorry state of our exports: exports out of this state fell last financial year. They are in complete disarray. We have had—

The Hon. S.E. Close: Grew 14 per cent over the last 12 months.

Mr MARSHALL: What's that, sorry?

The Hon. S.E. Close: Fourteen per cent over the last 12 months.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, interjections are out of order and you should not respond to interjections.

Mr Gardner: Throw her out!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I may have to.

Mr MARSHALL: I make the point about last financial year. If members opposite would like to come and do a personal explanation—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: That was almost year ago.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind all members of standing order—

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: But we haven't finished this financial year. Give me a break! We haven't finished this financial year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet. I remind everyone in the chamber of standing order 142. Please respect the speaker on their feet: no interjections and no responding to interjections. The leader.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Those opposite are a little bit tetchy. In fact, two of the three people who have been responsible for this area in the last three months—in the last three months, this government has had three separate ministers, and two of them are sitting opposite. Let me tell you, it has been a hopeless performance. In fact, they have had four separate ministers in this area in the last 18 months and none of them have done a good job.

Now, I would say that the member for Port Adelaide had only just got into the role, so we are not going to hold her responsible. In fact, she showed all the flair and aptitude of somebody who might have been able to make a fist of it. Unfortunately, that opportunity was wrenched from her by the Premier, all designed in his desperate attempt to prop up this tired, divided, dysfunctional 12-year-old government. It is a government which has not delivered on its commitments: \$25 billion worth of exports by 2013—whoops! 2014—whoops! Guess what it is now? 2020. If you cannot achieve your goal, just push out the time frame.

I cannot wait for 19 June when the budget comes down. I have already written the speech and it is like I am going to be lip syncing with the Treasurer, because I know what he is going to say. He is going to say, 'Well, this was a particularly tough year and this is a particularly tough budget, but don't worry, in two years' time we are going to rebound back into surplus.'

I know this is going to be what he is going to say because this is what those opposite say every single year, because there is not a jot of fiscal discipline on that side of the house, and that is precisely why we lost our AAA credit rating. We lost our AAA credit rating because there was no fiscal discipline on that side of the house over an extended period of time. Of course, we need to have that focus but, anyway, I digress.

I was talking about exports. Those opposite said, 'Look, don't worry, we are going to come up with a plan and it's going to revolve around China and India.' Forgive me for being cynical about this, but those two countries have enormous growth rates, well above and beyond any impact that the South Australian government's expenditure in this area would have. I think it has been a very cynical exercise, and they have ignored some of the great opportunities that we have had right throughout the world.

That is why we took a plan to the election for seven regions to be focused on. I was very pleased when, during the live debate that we had on the ABC and the moderator said, 'Is there anything about the Liberal's policies that you like and that you will adopt?' the Premier said, 'Yes, there is. We like the policy of having a focus on South-East Asia.' Hallelujah! Fancy a government wiping out their entire approach to South-East Asia. It was shameful. It is frightening that this has been their approach. They have talked a lot about this—they have talked an enormous amount about this—but the figures always speak for themselves.

Today's debate is actually on the Supply Bill and on numbers, so let's bring it back, Deputy Speaker, and look at the numbers contained in last year's budget, because we have not had an update regarding these numbers since then. But I can tell you that, in the budget last year, they said we spent last financial year on this program (which is called program No. 4, Globally Integrating the South Australian Economy) \$18 million. You would expect, for a government that is going to focus

on exports and achieving \$25 billion worth of exports, that we would see a massive increase in the money being diverted to this program.

There is plenty of waste in government and they have been identifying a lot of it themselves, but there are plenty of good programs, and you would think, if we were going to achieve \$25 billion worth of exports, that you would do this by putting some expenditure into programs which are going to yield results for South Australia. So, \$18 million last financial year. What did it go up to this financial year? Wait a minute. I do not think I have got this right. I had better check with my glasses.

Ms Chapman: Down.

Mr MARSHALL: The deputy leader has pointed out, and she is quite right, it went down. Can you believe it? We have got a focus on creating exports and we are going to slash money going to this program. This has been the problem for this government for an extended period of time. They say they have got no money. Let me tell you the budget, in round terms, is \$16 billion a year. They have got plenty of opportunities and they set the priorities but, when it comes to growing the size of our economy, they have no interest in it whatsoever.

Deputy Speaker, I put it to you that, if we are going to grow the size of our economy, if we are going to keep our young people here in South Australia and if we are going to create jobs here in South Australia, we have to grow the size of our economy through a focus on exports. New Zealand has done it. They have got a goal. Forty per cent of their GDP comes from exports. Our situation here in South Australia is hopeless. It is absolutely hopeless.

Every time we send a product or a service out of our state across our borders—whether it be into Victoria, Queensland, South-East Asia, China or India—we bring money back in and we grow the size of our economy. Why wouldn't this be our focus here in South Australia? Why wouldn't we be trying to do everything we can to export goods and services across our borders, grow our population, invest in starting companies and grow the size of our economy? That is what we will be looking for. That is exactly and precisely what we will be looking for when the budget gets handed down on 19 June.

However, I am extremely worried. I am extremely worried about the protestations those opposite have made over the last four weeks that they are going to try to blame somebody else for their fiscal ineptitude. In the past, it has been the global financial crisis. Often, hilariously, those opposite have said the real problem with our performance has been the currency out of the country. This is what has held our exports down.

When we have said our export performance is the worst in Australia and we have gone from having 8 per cent of the nation's exports down to less than 4.5 per cent of the nation's exports, they said, 'Yes, but our currency is really tough,' and then we have to point out to those opposite that the currency is actually the same for the entire country. We don't have our own mint here: we don't have our own currency here in South Australia. It is precisely the same currency which is used in Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia. It is even the same one that is used in Tasmania. So they have used a raft of excuses.

The one, of course, that they seem absolutely focused on using at the moment is the federal government. This is a beauty, of course, because it is one that they can blame on a party that is not their own. I put it to you, Deputy Speaker, that the budgets they have delivered in previous years have had nothing to do with the budget that the federal government has put down, yet in six out of the last seven years they have presented budgets here in South Australia we have had deficits presented to this house, and they are getting larger and larger. Last year, of course, was the year that we were famously going to return to surplus. Of course, as it turned out, it was the largest deficit in the state's history. This year when it was originally forecast—

Mr Gardner: Was it that much?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, exactly. This year was another year predicted by this government that we would be returning to surplus but, again, what happened? We are now heading again towards the largest deficit in the history of this state and that has been the picture of this government over an extended period of time. Well before the Coalition grabbed power in that wonderful election win in late 2013, we had the Labor Party running the country, and increasing deficits year on year being delivered here in South Australia.

Debt, of course, is increasing at an alarming rate. In fact, if we look at the last eight years of this government, debt has increased by \$4 million per day. Now, I do not know whether that scares you, but I find it very frightening indeed, and I find it particularly frightening when I look at how it is made up. I do not think anybody on this side of the house would say, 'Well, look, we do not like having any debt whatsoever,' because there is some debt which, of course, is extraordinarily productive. It is the sort of debt that gives you an asset that will appreciate over time or a productive asset that is important for improving your productivity. We do it in business all the time.

Businesses will make a decision to go into debt to purchase a piece of, let us say, capital, a piece of plant that will be used to improve the productivity of that company, and there will be what we refer to as a return on that investment, but let us have a look how the debt has been run up here in South Australia. Has it been actually run up by investing in productive infrastructure or appreciating assets? Well, the answer is unequivocally, no.

Let me tell you what the vast majority—over 50 per cent—of the net debt of this state as of 30 June last year has been run up by, and that is unbudgeted spending by this government, starting in 2002-03. In that year there was \$184 million worth of unbudgeted expenditure in one single year. It is extraordinary, isn't it?

Mr Gardner: It couldn't get higher.

Mr MARSHALL: It could not get higher said the member for Morialta, but he would be wrong, because the very next year the unbudgeted expenditure skyrocketed, in the 2003-04 year, to \$467 million in a single year. So, each year the Treasurer comes into this house and he says, 'This is what we are going to spend.' Well, that year he blew it by \$467 million, only to be followed up in 2004-05 by \$487 million. This is half a billion dollars in a single 12-month period; I mean, this is a lot of money. I am sure that those opposite could probably do the calculation of what this is per day. Well, let me tell you, it is absolutely extraordinary—2005-06, \$370 million over budget; 2006-07, \$374 million over budget; and 2007-08, \$304 million over budget.

Now, I have got to say, if you have been waiting for what the biggest year was, that the biggest blowout occurred in the year 2008-09. In the 2008-09 financial year, unbudgeted expenditure by this government reached \$670 million in a single year. It is almost impossible to believe, but it is true, and I make this point: this is spending. This is not capital, this is just spending on the income and expenditure statement; it is departmental spending. It is not money to buy an asset. It is not money to build a bridge or fix a road. This is money which has been spent on our expenditure each year and it has been appalling.

I go on, Deputy Speaker. In the year 2009-10, \$599 million over budget; in the 2011-12 year, \$174 million over budget; and in the last financial year, 2012-13, it was \$356 million. That comes to a grand cumulative total, over the life of this government, of something in excess of \$3.5 billion worth of unbudgeted expenditure. That is the problem in South Australia. The fundamental problem that we have in South Australia is that we have got a government with no fiscal discipline whatsoever. It really does not matter what sort of budget they bring down. They have got no ability to deliver on the budget that they have provided. If you want any proof of it, I am happy to table this document and it shows the budget overspend each and every year since they came to power, totalling \$3.5 billion in that 12-year period. It is absolutely shameful. They should hang their heads in shame.

That is the reason why we have found ourselves in this situation, and that is why to my absolute despair I found out last year that not only did we lose the AAA credit rating but we are the worst rated budget in the country. I travelled to Sydney to meet with Standard & Poor's with the shadow treasurer (member for Davenport). We went up there to meet with them about our credit rating here in South Australia and we were appalled to learn that our credit rating in South Australia is now lower than Tasmania. When did this occur? It has occurred because of the ineptitude of this government over an extended period of time.

There is no plan in South Australia, there is no plan to create jobs, there is no plan to create wealth, there is no plan to improve the productive capacity of our state, there is no plan to bring our budget back to surplus. There is a fantasy plan. It is called a budget. They bring down this fantasy plan every year with these heroic assumptions of what they are going to be able to achieve, but have they got close? They have not even got close in any single year.

Let me tell you about some of these heroic assumptions they have made in the past. In this current year's budget, the one that was brought down in June last year, they said there were going to be payroll tax receipts averaging 7 per cent per annum. They said we were going to have stamp duty receipts averaging 12 per cent per annum over the forward estimates. This is what the government said.

I cannot believe that they bring down these budgets with a straight face. What was the driver? We asked these questions. We said to the government, to the Treasurer at the time who was also the Premier: what is your basis for predicting that we can increase payroll tax receipts in this state year-on-year at 7 per cent per annum over the forward estimates or stamp duty receipts averaging 12 per cent per annum over the forward estimates?

No answer from those opposite. I think they just believe in this whole seance economics where they hold hands and they think really hard, 'Come on, come on, we can do it,' then magically a surplus will appear. Guess what? It has not appeared for an extended period of time in South Australia and matters seem to be going from bad to worse. That is why those of us on this side of the house are very keen to ensure that this government is not let off the hook with this budget.

They cannot be allowed to use the federal budget situation to disguise their own chronic financial ineptitude over an extended period of time. They have been out there talking about cuts to the federal budget; in fact, one report that was in the paper recently said it was \$80 billion worth of cuts to South Australia—well, that was for the nation—then the Premier was out there talking about \$5.5 billion worth of cuts, and they were over a 10-year period. Most recently they have been out there saying that over the next four years it is going to be \$898 million worth of cuts. They are gross cuts, but what are they actually bringing back to the equation in terms of the net cost to South Australia?

We have heard nothing from the government whatsoever in answering decent, reasonable and responsible questions about what the net cost to our state is, so we are left in a situation where we have no clear indication. However, what we do know is that between the MYEFO delivered several months ago and the federal budget which was announced weeks ago, there was a \$1.4 billion uplift in GST. Well, that did not appear in the \$898 million cut number—no mention of it. In fact, the Treasurer went on the radio to argue with me that the \$1.4 billion was actually a figure for the entire country. He said on the radio, 'This was a little bit embarrassing for the Leader of the Opposition who has read out a number for the entire nation.' If it was a little bit embarrassing for me it must have been humiliating for the Treasurer, who had his entire department there to advise him.

Ms Chapman: And he got it wrong.

Mr MARSHALL: And he completely got it wrong because the \$1.4 billion difference was between the MYEFO brought down in December last year and the budget which was brought down in May. That is the simple fact of the matter: a \$1.4 billion update. Even since the February update the Treasurer has had to admit that there is a \$355 million additional GST uplift coming to South Australia—\$355 million. So there is no point in talking scare tactics with the people of South Australia about the \$898 million gross cuts. They need to be reasonable and tell the people of South Australia what the net cuts are. They are a much smaller number and, in fact, we have a very reasonable chance of that money for the Darlington project, which is \$496 million, coming in over our forward estimates.

Of course, historically in South Australia we have treated those commonwealth grants as income to our income and expenditure statement in the year in which they are received. If this is the case, it is quite possible there will be no cash cut to South Australia over the forward estimates. I think the Premier and the Treasurer really need to be quite specific with the people of South Australia. What is the true case? We do not want scare tactics about what is going to be cut in seven, eight, nine or 10 years' time. The people of Australia will get an opportunity to go to the polls and if they do not like what the Coalition is doing in Canberra they are free to vote in any way they like.

In most other jurisdictions (apart from South Australia) if the majority of people do not like the government they will get rid of the government. Here in South Australia, of course, in the last four elections, the government has only won the popular vote once but has formed government in each of those four. However, for the rest of Australia, who are focused on having a quality electoral system, this has not been a problem and they will get their opportunity as we come to the next federal election.

It is critically important that the budget coming down on 19 June is a fair budget for the people of South Australia. It has to be a budget which provides incentives for the productive component of our economy and it has to be a budget which shows constraint. We believe that this budget needs to have an element of tax reform in it. In the lead-up to the election we made it very clear that if we were elected there would be no new taxes and no new levies here in South Australia.

We do not know what those opposite are going to do. At the moment the Treasurer is circling around, giving menacing messages to the people of South Australia about what a horror budget this is and the need for potentially increased taxes. Well, that is not good enough. The people of South Australia did not vote for increased taxes. We have never had a taxation-led recovery in this country. We do not need any more taxes; we are already the highest business tax state in Australia and we have been for the last five years, and it is time we had some reform.

At the top of that agenda, of course, is payroll tax reform. We spoke about this at length in the lead-up to the election. I believed it was a critical issue for the people of South Australia to consider and I remind the house that we on this side of the house received 53 per cent of the two-party preferred vote and I think people wanted genuine tax reform here in South Australia. They voted for change, they did not get change, but it is really now over to the government to deliver some real tax reform for the people of South Australia. We suggest starting with payroll tax.

We are hoping that this is going to happen because Peter Malinauskas from the SDA strongly supports this policy of ours. In fact, he agrees that payroll tax is just a tax on jobs. We all know it is a tax on jobs. It is a hopeless tax on jobs and it is one that holds our state back. We need payroll tax reform and we call upon the Treasurer to offer that in the budget that he brings down later this month.

In relation to land tax, it goes without saying that land tax is an insidious tax. We are the highest land-taxed state in Australia and we have been for an extended period of time. I do not mean we are a little bit higher—we are order of magnitude higher than any other jurisdiction in Australia. This just results in a flood of investment capital flowing across our borders into other jurisdictions with better regimes in terms of land tax in their states. It is very important.

Regarding car park tax, it goes without saying that every single person in this state knows my position and the Liberal Party's position on the car park tax. We do not want to see that car park tax in this budget when it comes down on 19 June. The government first started talking about the car park tax in December 2012 in the Mid-Year Budget Review and it said that it was going to put on a transport development levy—in fact, I am not even sure if it used that term at the time, but we all know what it is: it is a car park tax. It is going to put that on from 1 July this year. Here we are, less than a month before 1 July 2014 and we have no indication of what is going to happen.

There was some draft legislation which was put out last year, but when has it been progressed? There is now zero chance that any legislation they bring to this house can be passed before 1 July so that it can be in place to effect a transport development levy or a car park tax on 1 July. Why? I think it is a very legitimate question to ask. If you have been talking about it since 2012, why have you not told us what you are going to do? Why have you not introduced legislation into this house? It is completely and utterly disrespectful. It is very difficult on the businesses, of course, which operate car parks. They have no idea of what they should be doing to plan for the introduction.

Should they put on what they think the levy will cost—the \$750 per year—making an assessment of how much it is going to cost them? Should they take it back to an hourly rate and put that on from 1 July? What if it does not come in? What if the Premier of South Australia is true to his word, saying in the house today that he needed to respond to the will of the people at the election? He made that point in his address today to the house that he wanted to respond to the will of the people at the election. Let me tell you, the will of the people at the election was very clear: they do not want a car park tax in South Australia. That is the simple fact of the matter.

I hope that the government does turn away from this tax, but what is the situation for the car park operators at the moment? They do not know whether it is going to come in or not. Do they put their prices up; do they keep them down? If they keep them down and it comes in on 1 July it is going to be a massive hit to their bottom line. If they put their prices up, they bring in that additional revenue and then the tax is not put in place, are they collecting money under false pretences? Do they have an obligation to try to return that money?

There are a lot of issues which this government has had more than ample time to address and in fact it has been helped in that task to address these issues by those members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition who sit on this side of the house who have raised questions consistently over an extended period of time, raising the concerns of people in the small business sector and people who use the car parks to come in here to shop and for those people who come in here to park and go to work. We have been raising these questions, but we have had no answers whatsoever.

The government has been out there and talked about city vibrancy. Yes, we know they have blue lines on Bank Street and they have planted a couple of trees on another street—it is all good stuff. For some reason, the Deputy Premier thinks that we should be writing letters of thanks—isn't it great? You finally caught up to what other states were doing 10, 15, 20 years ago. Well, thanks very much—thanks for catching up! But let me tell you, all of this focus on creating greater city vibrancy will come to nothing if this car park tax is implemented.

Of course, car park taxes do not come in at \$750 per year and stay there. Car park taxes that have come in around the rest of Australia have started out low and have ended up many thousands of dollars per year and the prospect of that will strangle investment in our CBD and that is why we do not support it. You need more than to just talk about city vibrancy, small bars, blue lines and trees on streets. You have to talk more than that and listen to the people who know about these things.

Well, let me tell you, the Adelaide City Council is against the car park tax. They confirmed this at the council meeting last week. The Rundle Mall Management Authority is against the car park tax. They have stayed with their position over an extended period of time. They know that it is extraordinarily bad for South Australia. The Property Council in South Australia has been vehement in its objection to this tax. They represent property owners and tenants in the CBD, and they know this is going to be extraordinarily difficult for people to cope with.

Then, of course, I thought it was particularly appropriate when the Premier said, 'Well, I know what we'll do—there's all this objection to this—what we will do is we will call a citizens' jury.' I was not familiar with outsourcing this responsibility to a citizens' jury. Anyway, we went for the citizens' jury. It was extraordinarily expensive, by the way, but it was all designed to come up and support the government's push to introduce a transport development. But, guess what? It did not. There is now nobody that I have met who actually supports a transport development levy, and we do not support it on this side of the house.

I make it very clear to those opposite that we in the Liberal Party will not be supporting the car park tax in the Appropriation Bill, or in any other format that they put it to us. If they introduce it as a separate piece of legislation, as they indicated in 2013, we will vote against it. If they put it in the Appropriation Bill, we will do everything we can to remove it from the Appropriation Bill and vote it down. Why? Because we are on the side of small business in South Australia, we are on the side of those people who are travelling in to use the CBD and use our car parks in the CBD on an ongoing basis, and we are on the side of the shoppers.

The government says, 'Well, catch a bus in.' Well, you try to do your Christmas shopping on a bus with 40 big packages either side, Deputy Speaker. I am sure you would be a frequent user of city car parks; in fact, you are probably parked in a city car park today. The Deputy Speaker is indicating that she did not drive in to work today, but I put it to you, Deputy Speaker, that most people in this house are using a car park today, and it is going to have a massive effect on all people right across the state. We will not be supporting the government's push to increase taxes in South Australia, in particular the car park tax.

More than tax reform in this budget we need capital expenditure reform. We desperately need capital expenditure reform in South Australia. What we have seen in over 12 years of Labor is a focus on spending our very finite capital in South Australia on a range of projects, often personal pet projects, around marginal seats and electoral cycles. Well, it is not a good way to spend our money in South Australia.

In the Liberal Party we have been out there saying that a better way to spend money would be to set up a separate stand-alone statutory authority, Infrastructure SA, charged with the responsibility of developing a long-range productive infrastructure plan for South Australia. We think this would be a particularly good way to go for South Australians. That way we could get them to do an independent due diligence on each of those projects, so that we can make sure that when we

spend our finite capital in South Australia we are spending it on the highest value, highest return projects for us here in South Australia. That just simply has not been the case in South Australia.

Of course, many people in the regions have completely and utterly missed out on that productive infrastructure that we so desperately need in South Australia to grow our exports out of this state. This is, again, getting back to the New Zealand example. They have prioritised their expenditure, prioritised their capital, to projects which are going to improve their productive capacity. We have not seen that in South Australia, and it is absolutely critical.

Some opposite might think, 'Well, why should we do this, why should we follow this Liberal suggestion?' I make two points: one, because I think it is an excellent suggestion and, two, it is not a Liberal suggestion. The model of a separate stand-alone statutory authority, Infrastructure Australia, was set up by the former Labor prime minister, Kevin Rudd. He is the one who wanted to put this process in place to independently assess projects and make sure that we have a long-range, productive, 25-year plan.

We know that, if we had this in South Australia, we would have done far better out of the federal budget than we did. In fact, when we look at the money that came to South Australia, out of the total of \$50 billion worth of infrastructure money that the commonwealth spent, only \$2 billion of that money came to South Australia—\$2 billion out of \$50 billion—and that is because we do not have a plan that the commonwealth can buy into. We do not have a long-range plan.

This was evident to everybody who looked at the situation when the federal Labor government were spending stimulus money right around the country. They came to South Australia and they said, 'What are your priority projects in South Australia? What are the projects that you need in South Australia to get your state going?' We did not have a project.

We did not have a project, so do you know what we said? We said we have got this O-Bahn; why don't we do an extension to the O-Bahn? Minister Albanese went up in a chopper with the former minister Conlon. They went up and they said, 'What is that down there?' 'That is the O-Bahn.' 'Do you need any money for the O-Bahn?' 'I suppose we could extend it.' 'Have you got a plan for it?' 'No, but we can do it. We can make up a plan.'

Let me tell you: by the time they got around to coming up with a plan and doing the feasibility study on it, guess what? It did not stack up. So, what did South Australia do? We returned the money to the commonwealth. We had missed out on tens and tens of millions of dollars of important infrastructure money from the commonwealth because we do not have a plan. We do not have a plan for jobs, we do not have a plan for infrastructure here in South Australia, and we have been missing out.

But it is not just commonwealth money. If you have a plan, you can take the private sector with you. The private sector needs certainty, and we have got anything but certainty after 12 years of Labor here in South Australia. If we did have infrastructure SA in place, and we did develop a long-range productive infrastructure plan with a plan for our roads, a 25-year plan for our ports, our rail, our electricity and our water, then I put it to you, Deputy Speaker, that not only would we be better at investing our own finite state government capital into projects of priority and being able to better harness federal government capital into South Australia, but also—and, I think, most importantly—the private sector capital would be coming in to look at our projects because there would be certainty, and that is what we do not have at the moment.

We have very finite private sector capital investment in South Australia, and it is shameful. It is absolutely shameful. So, we have got all of this money being spent around Adelaide. The Premier loves pointing out a crane here and a crane there, but they are all state government cranes. It is all debt that will go onto our balance sheet here in South Australia.

What about sharing it? Plenty of people wiser than I am about infrastructure investment make it very clear that there are more infrastructure dollars in Australia than there are projects at the moment, but we do not have a plan. So, I implore those opposite, in the budget which comes down on 19 June, to look very, very carefully not just at the need for taxation reform in South Australia but also at capital expenditure reform here in South Australia.

The third area that they really need to focus on in this coming budget is productivity reform here in South Australia. Our productivity in this state lags an extraordinarily long way behind the

national average, and there is absolutely no mechanism that they have in place to improve that productivity.

We have said that what we need in South Australia is to have a state-based productivity commission—independent of the ministers, independent of the government, independent of the departmental heads—that is driving a reform agenda throughout our Public Service and, indeed, throughout that relationship that exists between our Public Service and the business sector here in South Australia. It is absolutely crucial, and I want to come back to talking about that in a few minutes' time.

On the fourth issue, what we would like to see out of this budget coming down on 19 June is fiscal discipline. What I mean by that is: if you are going to set a budget, stick to it. I do not understand why other jurisdictions around Australia can come up with a budget and then spend less. In South Australia, it is not like it is a budget that you have got to keep below: it is like a target that this government tries to blow out of the water each and every year.

This is a real problem for us in the business sector, for good reason. For a very good reason, we set budgets each year so that shareholders, employees and banks know what the direction is going to be. We put a budget out each year, but I do not even know why we bother to do it sometimes. When you consider that we have had in excess of \$3.5 billion worth of unbudgeted, unplanned expenditure by this government in 12 years, what is the point of doing it?

The actual performance bears no relationship whatsoever to the budget that is presented. Quite frankly, it has not served us particularly well. There is a lot of work that needs to be done, and each department, each minister, needs to start thinking about how they can arrive at a budget, prioritise their expenditure and then stick to a budget.

Mr Griffiths: Take responsibility.

Mr MARSHALL: Take responsibility; do not be a victim. Of course, one of the things that we have been talking about over an extended period of time is the need for an organisational review within our Public Service, and that is why I am so pleased that the minister is—I know we are all always present in the chamber, Deputy Speaker, but this minister is here, present and engaged. I am a strong advocate for our public sector here in South Australia, but it is time for renewal.

It is definitely time for renewal here in South Australia. Part of that renewal is the overall structure of our government departments. Who has heard of a structure which has got one chief executive reporting to up to seven different ministers? The confusion is huge. Imagine that in the private sector. Imagine, in the private sector, you are the manager of your division of a company and you report to seven different people; you would never know what was going on, and that is exactly and precisely the situation in South Australia.

We said there needs to be simplification. There needs to be a situation where you have one minister, one chief executive and one department so that there is a logical reporting line, and people will take responsibility. When there are such confused reporting lines, nobody takes responsibility; 'Oh, well I couldn't deliver on that because somebody else impacted upon my sector,' 'I couldn't do this because he did that,' or, 'I couldn't do this because she did this.' It is completely unacceptable; it would never fly in the commercial sector and we should not put up with it here in South Australia.

Our Public Service in South Australia should be a model of organisational excellence. Let me tell you, there are plenty of people in the Public Service right across South Australia who do an outstanding job and they are frustrated. They are frustrated, every single day that they go to work, with the ineptitude of the ministers that they report to, and with the crazy organisational structure which does not deliver any logical reporting to them.

I would like to talk about a couple of these departments in particular, and I will start with Health. I will start with Health for the very good reason that it represents about one-third of our state budget—an extraordinarily large sum of money of around \$5 billion per year. Around \$5 billion per year, but it is a mess; it is an absolute, complete and utter shambles. That department is a shambles, and it has been a shambles for an extended period of time.

We had a change in ministers in recent times and we were hoping for big things; in fact, it has gone from bad to worse. First of all, let us have a look at the unbudgeted expenditure in Health. These are the blowouts year on year. Every single year, we seem to have a blowout. Last year, we

had a massive blowout of \$160 million. So, we had \$160 million worth of unbudgeted expenditure in a single year. Did heads roll? No. Did the minister resign? No, he is still there, happy as Larry.

In 2011-12—we will go back to the previous year—perhaps they achieved budget in that year. I am sorry to say that they did not: a \$235 million blow-out in that year. The year before, a \$21 million blow-out. The year before that, \$223 million. The year before that, \$174 million. It goes on and on. In fact, there is only one year in the last 12 years where we have had below \$100 million worth of blow-outs in the health budget—only one year, the 2010-11 year. If you look at the total health blow-outs in this state over that period of time, it is \$2.2 billion. You could have built a new Royal Adelaide Hospital without going into debt—no debt, none whatsoever. These are the choices that we have to make.

What are we going to do in South Australia? I will tell you, unequivocally, what the government is going to do: they are going to slash and burn. They are going to slash and burn health expenditure in South Australia. Let me tell you how they are going to do it, because it was all very nicely laid out for us in the Budget and Finance Committee. It was interesting today on the radio, when I was on FIVEaa debating—well, let's at least say chatting with—the Deputy Premier about effective committees in this parliament that, to my surprise, he had very disparaging things to say about the Budget and Finance Committee.

I think that the Budget and Finance Committee does an excellent job. Of course, it is chaired by the Hon. Rob Lucas, a former state treasurer and somebody with an outstanding financial brain. He asks a series of questions to different chief executives. Last year, in September, he had the chief executive of the Department for Health appearing before that committee. That is what they do in the Budget and Finance Committee: routinely, they bring a department before the committee and they ask a series of questions, and so it was on 30 September 2013 that Mr Swan appeared before the Budget and Finance Committee.

The question was asked by the chairperson—and I am going to go through this in some detail because I think those opposite are listening and interested and I think it is of interest to the house, because we have asked a few questions about this and the government have not given us any answers and they have disputed figures. So, I am going to lay it out, and I am happy for them to come back to this house at any point in time in the future and apologise if they have got it wrong.

I am going to lay it out for you, because we asked the question on 30 September 2013, 'Can you clarify again the required savings task for the agency for the 2013-14 financial year?' We are in the 2013-14 financial year and, just so you know, the budget for health that was brought down—we were only three months past when the budget was brought down and the government was already talking about savings measures that they had to implement. Let me tell you: the savings measure that they had to find was \$160 million—in fact, \$160.8 million this financial year. That is how much they had to find.

We went on to say, 'Can you provide the information on each of the forward estimates from 2014-15 onwards?' We know that last year was \$160 million. We know that next financial year, starting in less than a month, the chief executive has to find \$258 million—a quarter of a billion dollars next financial year in savings. The year after, the 2015-16 financial year, the chief executive is going to have to find—are you ready for this—\$339 million in a single year, and in the 2016-17 financial year \$379 million. This takes us to a total of \$1.138 billion, as outlined by the chief executive of the department to the Budget and Finance Committee on 30 September last year, of savings that would have to be found in the health budget. Now, correct me if I am wrong, but \$1.138 billion out of our health budget seems to be a lot larger than we have been hearing about from the commonwealth recently.

We have had this hysterical situation where the Premier and the minister have been running around saying, 'This is the equivalent of closing the Flinders Medical Centre.' Let me make this point: if that is the case—if \$269 million in federal government cuts to the health system is going to deliver a 600-bed cut—you have to accept that these cuts that the state government itself is embarking upon are much larger again; they are catastrophic. That is why we need an answer from the health minister as to what is the total size of these cuts.

If his chief executive was wrong on 30 September last year, the minister should come into this house, castigate his chief executive, and tell the house exactly what the cuts are going to be. He will not do that. He said, 'Well, the numbers that you put forward are wrong.' We say, 'Well, what are

the numbers?' 'Well, your numbers are wrong.' 'Okay. Well, what are your numbers?' The numbers that we are working off are the numbers that have been provided by the chief executive of the department, Mr Swan, who presented to the Budget and Finance Committee on 30 September 2013.

Of course, there was a little bit of reprofiling, and I will give that to the government. In the Mid-Year Budget Review, they said, quite rightly, that the \$1.138 billion worth of cuts they had outlined were too much. Well, hallelujah! They finally worked out that \$1.138 billion was too much, so they reduced that amount down by \$103.6 million over the forward estimates in the Mid-Year Budget Review, Deputy Speaker. So, they are much lower. Do not worry about Modbury Hospital; there is money. The total cuts the government planned to implement over the forward estimates are only \$1.34 billion, but we have not seen anything from the government, those opposite, about how this is going to affect the people of South Australia, and that is very disappointing. What we need in South Australia more than anything else is reform—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: I don't know what she's on about.

The SPEAKER: I remind everybody of standing order 142 and ask the leader to continue.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you very much. So, back to what we do need here in South Australia, and that is not a slash and burn budget on 19 June. What we need is an outline by this government of reforms. We have been calling for reforms for an extended period of time, and in health they are needed more than anywhere else. In health, we have this hopeless arrangement in terms of their organisational structure. The rest of the country moved to the arrangement of devolving into what they call the LHNs, the local health networks—devolving them down into a lower budget arrangement. So, instead of having a \$5 billion health budget, you would have a series of five LHNs in South Australia, each with their own budget of around \$1 billion.

I hasten to add and remind the house that these reforms were put in place by the federal Labor government. It was not a Liberal initiative at all; it was the federal Labor government. They did this because they believed that you want to create and sustain an economy of scale, and a billion dollars of expenditure each year gives you an economy of scale, but it does not give you a diseconomy of scale.

When you have got one massive department of \$5 billion, it creates diseconomies of scale, and that is exactly what we have got here in South Australia. Although we have created LHNs—we have got the central, northern and southern LHNs, the Women's and Children's and, of course, we have got country—it is in name only. Because, above the LHNs, we have a massive health bureaucracy. This is the problem here in South Australia.

I speak to health professionals here in South Australia—our doctors, nurses and other allied health professionals in South Australia—and they say it is a mess. They say it is a complete and utter mess. I was speaking with one doctor last year who was working in the southern system, a very senior doctor who was in charge of his unit, and he said that to put on an additional person in his unit requires seven separate levels of approval from those people in the bureaucracy. This is absolutely outrageous—seven levels of approval. Of course, it creates an enormous amount of additional paperwork, it chews up an enormous amount of time, and the bureaucracy, believe it or not, costs a lot of money.

Those public servants who are forced to administer these hopeless systems that have been put in place in South Australia think it is non value-adding time as well. They do not want to be doing it. There has to be some system improvement in South Australia. That is why we need to devolve our health system down to the LHNs. We need to have boards put in place in each of those LHNs. We need to have those boards coming up with their own budget each year, not a centralised budget, and be held responsible for their performance against those budgets.

This was the basic understanding of what came out of the Generational Health Review which was done by Mr Menadue. He said that we need to move away from a massive centralised system into a devolved, decentralised health system with a focus on primary health—and he was right. Let me tell you, at the time, the government said, 'Excellent, that's what we'll do.' Those opposite, many of whom are still here today, said, 'That's great. We will support you.' For once, in health policy, in this state we had consensus—a devolved, decentralised healthcare system focused on primary health.

But what then happened? I will tell you what happened. They did a backflip. The government did a backflip against their own review—the Menadue Generational Health Review, commissioned by this government, at huge expense and effort put in by people over an extended period of time to come up with this best practice set-up for South Australia—and it was ignored and we moved towards the most highly centralised, bureaucratised system in all of Australia.

This is why I say that we do not need cuts to expenditure in this budget. What we need is reform. That is why we spoke at length about the need for a Productivity Commission in South Australia, a state-based Productivity Commission, to work with our excellent public servants in South Australia, to come up with ideas, to provide enhanced services and offers to the people of South Australia in a constrained fiscal environment.

We want enhanced services. What have we got from those opposite? They want to slash and burn. They want to cut services to the people of South Australia at a time when they should be supporting the people of South Australia. But the only way that is going to happen is by looking at what we do in our health system in South Australia. I come from the private sector and, let me tell you, in the private sector we listen to our employees.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I need to remind all members of standing order 142 and ask the leader to continue his remarks.

Mr MARSHALL: Your day will come, 19 June.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: You listen to your employees. Why do you listen to your employees? Because they are close to the action. They have got incredible ideas of how to improve productivity, do things better, do things cheaper and enhance services to your customers.

Yes, the Public Service has customers. Let me tell you, the customers of the Public Service here in South Australia are not satisfied, and that is why we say you need a Productivity Commission in South Australia to work with employees to drive a reform agenda, not just in health but in every sector in South Australia. We are very worried about the government's focus on slashing and burning, the \$1.33 billion over the forward estimates. That is their focus—cut, cut, cutting.

We saw this first come to light in October 2012, where the government brought down the McCann report, which was done by Warren McCann, and he looked at non-hospital services. He said that if we cut out all of these services, what we would refer to on this side of the house as preventative programs, we could 'save' \$14 million per year. I put that there was never going to be any saving about cutting out preventative measures in our health system. It was always going to cost us, whether in a year, two years or three years, cutting out expenditure to preventative services will only end up costing us more down the track, and of course that is precisely what has happened.

We were meant to have this centralised health system so that we could reduce our costs in the health budget each year—they've blown out. We were meant to cut out preventative programs to save money; well, of course, our health costs increase year on year here in South Australia. We should have a focus on preventative medicine in South Australia.

To give perfect evidence to the house on why this is so ineffectual, just take a look at the massive backflip the government was forced to perform over its support for the Quit program. A year ago we were going to cut out that money because we needed to slash some money out of our budget and save money. Guess what! There was a massive increase in the incidence of people taking up smoking, and we know that so many of our health costs in South Australia can be directly related back to people smoking in South Australia. It was a complete and utter mistake. We did not hear an apology from the minister or the Premier, but we could hear the backflip, but we did not make a point of it because it was good policy to put that money back in to support Quit programs across South Australia.

I was very disappointed to read, as part of the editorial in *The Advertiser* today that the government is planning to cut expenditure to the Operation Flinders program. Again, so short-sighted. I was very privileged to travel up to the Flinders Ranges to look firsthand at what they were doing with young people who are at risk of falling off the rails. Ultimately, when somebody falls off the rails they end up costing—costing themselves and their family, often victims, state government

services, federal government services and local government services. Every time we have a failure with a young person it ends up costing us, and that is why the Operation Flinders program is such a good investment. It is not a cost, it is an investment.

I was pleased to be able to see firsthand when I travelled to the Flinders Ranges with the member for Morialta the fabulous work that John Shepherd, Jonathon Robran and their incredible team do to help young people who are at risk of falling off the rails. In fact, I was so inspired that when I came back I said that I think we should try to create a city chapter, a Norwood chapter, to raise money for Operation Flinders.

Lots of country areas have these chapters, but there were no metropolitan chapters when I looked at this project. In fact, I was inspired by the chapter in Clare in the electorate of Frome. I am sure the member for Frome is very familiar with this chapter and it was led by a wonderful person, Katherine Vincent. Katherine Vincent set up a chapter for Clare and she and her team have supported successive groups to go up on Operation Flinders. They have taken kids at risk and put them back on the rails by supporting them when they are on this trip and when they return back to their environment.

I was inspired by Katherine Vincent and by the Clare chapter and I spoke to people in my community about whether they would have an appetite for some fundraising to have our own Operation Flinders chapter in Norwood and, I must say, I am extraordinarily pleased that they decided to support that. We have sent two groups up to Operation Flinders since I came back just 18 months ago. The first group was a group of boys who went from the Norwood Morialta High School and the second group was a group of girls who went from Marryatville High School. Both of those groups when they returned did a presentation and the word 'transformation' is the word that I would best use to describe the experience that those young people had on that trip. It was absolutely fantastic.

We have raised now in excess of \$36,000 for Operation Flinders over the last 18 months and we have more money to raise to send another group this year from Marryatville High. I commend the program to anybody and I am particularly pleased to acknowledge and commend the member for Chaffey, who I know is a strong supporter of Operation Flinders. He has his own group that is forming in the Riverland.

Mr Whetstone: A chapter, yes.

Mr MARSHALL: He should be commended for that. I also commend the member for Adelaide, an outstanding member, because she has also created a chapter for Operation Flinders.

Now, some might think this is a bit of a digression, but it is not. It is an example of what we should be doing in our budget and that is spending money on programs and policies which will ultimately lead to lower expenditure for our state down the track. There is no point in cutting out these programs highlighted in the McCann report that are going to keep people out of hospitals and keep people away from utilising our services and having a short-term gain, but a long-term increase and that is exactly and precisely what we have seen over an extended period of time.

Another preventative program in the health sector which we should certainly be looking at in South Australia is the program around Parkinson's specialist nurses. I was very privileged, when I was the shadow minister for health for those four months of intense work, to travel to Western Australia. I went to Western Australia because they were doing very innovative things in terms of health care. I spoke to the minister for health who was also the deputy premier of Western Australia and, indeed, himself a GP and I said, 'What sort of programs are you getting your best return on investment on?' and he highlighted providing six Parkinson's specialist nurses in Western Australia. It was extraordinarily successful because it kept people suffering from Parkinson's out of having to go into hospital.

We know that the average admission cost is around \$5,000 per admission; it is extremely expensive. The Parkinson's specialist nurses are doing an extraordinary job for our community, and it is just one example. I know it is a small example, but it is one example of what we are talking about on this side of the house, which is spend a little bit of money, save a lot of money, and that is only going to come with a reform agenda, not a slash and burn agenda like we have seen from this government. That is why we have been talking about these programs; enhanced services in terms of mental health in South Australia.

We have not put anywhere near enough focus on mental health in our state and that is why I was very pleased and proud to lead a party to the election which said that we would reopen the 10 acute mental health beds at the Margaret Tobin Centre, which had been closed by this government; a shameful act. It was an act which, of course, has meant massive additional cost because they were closed permanently, demand was high, they had to open temporarily, and guess what? Casual wages and all the costs of opening and closing beds was hugely expensive, because they do not do the work that is necessary.

We also said that we would provide \$2.5 million per annum to increase short stay acute mental health beds at the Lyell McEwin and the Flinders Medical Centre—absolutely critical. We were the ones who went out and said, 'For God's sake put some money into Lifeline.' The government in South Australia had never provided ongoing recurrent expenditure to Lifeline, the only state in Australia. What are the good people of Lifeline, the volunteers, doing? They are helping people in crisis, they are diverting people from state government emergency services, they are reducing our costs of operating.

The very least we could be doing is support them. Have they had any support? No. We went to the election with this promise, and I was very pleased—I will be the first one to say it—that the government followed our lead and has now finally been dragged kicking and screaming to this position of providing some ongoing recurrent money for crisis support to vulnerable people in South Australia. I was also very proud of our position regarding suicide prevention. Suicide is a massive cost to our community—

Mr Knoll: Especially in the regions.

Mr MARSHALL: We do not do anything near enough in this area and, as the member for Schubert points out, this is a problem which is particularly acute in our regions in South Australia where we are not close to services like people living in metropolitan Adelaide, and that is why I was very proud to say that we would put \$350,000 into this important program.

Now, you can say, 'There are the Liberals over there saying to go and spend more money.' But again, I make this point that it is not about spending money, it is about saving money—a bit of money in, a massive return on investment will reduce expenditure down the track, and this is what would happen if the government took up our policy to establish a productivity commission.

I will repeat this point I made earlier: it is very important to look at how we can increase our services in support of the people of South Australia in a constrained fiscal environment, not slashing and burning but looking at better ways of doing it. That is not what we have been doing in South Australia in the health sector. We have had massive blowouts which I have outlined to the house previously, massive budget blowouts over an extended period of time. In fact, I made it clear to the house earlier that it was in excess of \$2.2 billion worth of unbudgeted expenditure in health since they came to power.

One of the things I am most concerned about going forward is their complete ineptitude when it comes to any form of useful reform, and I think everybody knows what I am referring to in the health department, and that is IT. The department dipped their toe in the water, let us say, with the upgrade of their financial system. They were the most hopeless payers of bills known to man, I think. They were absolutely hopeless. If you put in a bill to the health department, good luck. The health department said this is not good enough so what we are going to do is upgrade our system. Interestingly, they did not use Shared Services because they were not good enough.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, there have been rulings on laughter in the past, so let's not get to that tonight.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind everybody of standing order 142.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: I am glad the Minister for Education finds what I have to say funny. I am getting on to education.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not respond to interjections, and I remind the house that interjections are out of order. I ask the leader—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: She just thinks I am funny.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the leader—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would hate to be the one who has to draw on this piece of paper. The leader.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, I appreciate that ruling. What a complete and utter chaotic mess! Of course, they are going to upgrade the system. Did they use Shared Services? No. I mean, it begs the question why they did not want to use their own services, but they knew better. They knew better; the people in the health department knew better. They were going to put in their own system—it was called the Oracle system—and they came into this house with a flourish because they were going to have some reform; finally some reform here in the health system in South Australia, a \$20 million Oracle reform.

An honourable member: Did it work?

Mr MARSHALL: Did it work? More to the point, has it even been fully implemented yet? What we do know is that the original \$20 million budget did not quite cover the entire project; it missed it by this much. It is now up to \$62 million, so there is a small increase on \$20 million. It gives you a perfect insight into the ineptitude of this department. This is what worries me; this is exactly and precisely what worries me.

At the moment they are implementing not a \$20 million system, not a \$62 million bungle, but the \$408 million EPAS, the Electronic Patient Administration System. And what a mess this is turned out to be, let me tell you. When the former minister came into this house he sold it as a great reform, it was going to transform health care in South Australia and lead the way to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Oh dear.

As part of the due diligence for the business case the government said that this would provide a replacement for all the legacy IT systems that sat in individual hospitals around the state; it would replace them all. I must say that we were a bit shocked and surprised when we found out that instead of this EPAS being implemented in all the hospitals, it is going into only 12. What are all the other dozens of South Australia's regional hospitals going to do without the EPAS?

The EPAS was going to deliver this return on investment that I was talking about; spend some capital up front and get a return that will lower the money down below. They have just taken this to a completely new definition. Spend a shed-load up front and get nothing back in return! We still have to keep every, single one of those legacy systems because the EPAS will not be implemented as originally promised by the minister; it is not going to be implemented.

It has already had one significant blowout and we are now told that it will be \$422 million. We have never had one decent answer from the minister; he has been ducking and diving every time I have asked a question. It is meant to be finished and fully implemented this month. Give me a break; if it is implemented in my lifetime I will be surprised.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind members on this side of the house about standing order 131. I ask you to remain silent, and I ask the leader to continue.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I must say that the member for Morphett makes a very good point, as he often does. He points us to an article that was, of course, covered off in *InDaily* yesterday. This article reported on the survey that was conducted into people who were using the partially implemented EPAS in Port Augusta. *InDaily* reported that SASMOA surveyed 35 medical practitioners working in facilities where EPAS was in use; that is, 35 medical practitioners. Phew; let us hope they gave it a good rap! Let us see what they said.

- Thirty-three had experienced problems with EPAS—

that is 33 out of 35; that is not good. But wait, it gets better—

- Twenty-nine were dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied with EPAS—

so that is 29 out of 35 who were dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied—

- Twenty-eight had received inadequate training in EPAS; and
- Twenty said that their concerns weren't addressed quickly.

That is the situation we have here in South Australia. It is an absolute debacle. That is what we have come to expect from this government. One person quoted in the article said:

EPAS is enormously time-consuming, so it takes away time from patients, it takes away time from other tasks.

This was all meant to reform the situation, reduce costs, and improve professionalism. In fact, it is quite the opposite. It is really a mess, and something we are going to keep a very close eye on. I have personally been asking questions on this matter for a couple of years, as I said. We asked questions in question time. We appreciate question time, we would just like an answer time, which would be just novel in this parliament.

One of things that worry me about the EPAS system is looking at what they have done in other jurisdictions. In other jurisdictions, namely Victoria, they have gone down the road of putting an EPAS system in. After they had spent in excess of half a billion dollars, they reviewed it, and do you know what they decided? They decided to walk away. I wonder when the day will come—and I am predicting it right now—when the Treasurer (sorry, he was the treasurer but he got the flick), the Minister for Health comes in and says, 'We're not going to proceed with this', because you cannot get an EPAS system wrong; you will cost lives. This system is not up to scratch.

These are complex systems; I give you that. However, when the Victorian government reviewed the EPAS system, it walked away from it. Of course, the movement into the new teaching hospital in Western Australia has been held up not because the building was not ready, not because there were not enough stick patients in Western Australia, but for one reason: their system, like our system. I think this is an enormously complex issue for South Australia and, if we get it wrong, we are in enormous trouble. I think we are heading in that direction.

I am extraordinarily worried about the ineptitude of the government in making IT decisions here in South Australia. IT people can be extremely convincing. They come along often and say, 'Look, we've got a product. It's going to eliminate all your problems, and here is the price.' For some reason our government completely and utterly fell for it. They did not do their due diligence. They did not look at the complexities of putting in the EPAS. They probably should have taken a much harder look at the PCEHR, the personally controlled electronic health record, which is being simultaneously implemented, and might I say implemented successfully by the federal government. We should have been looking at tagging onto something like that but, no, we had to do our own program here in South Australia. We chose Allscripts.

I just made a quick due diligence of my own to see what other successful implementations of the EPAS system Allscripts have done in Australia. It is fair to say that I did not have to spend a lot of time on it because there weren't any, which was a bit disturbing in that we went for a program that was not proven in Australia. There is complexity to the system in Australia. Just because you have implemented it somewhere else does not mean it is going to necessarily transfer directly over here.

Anyway, I have spoken at length on health. Why? It is a third of our state budget. If we do not get it right, we will be in all sorts of trouble down the track. However, let me tell you: every single indicator, every single possible indicator points to the fact that there is no reform agenda in terms of health. We are going to continue having these year-on-year blowouts in our budget, and this is not going to serve the people of South Australia well.

The other big-ticket item of course in the South Australian budget is education. Again, in terms of education, the government, in their own chief executives' words, have in excess of \$230 million over the forward estimates that they have already factored in—\$230 million worth of cuts to our education system here in South Australia.

If we actually look at the difference between the federal government's MYEFO (Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook) and the budget they brought down, there was an uplift. There was not a cut in education expenditure: there was, indeed, an uplift, and that uplift was \$570 million. Forgive me for being cynical, but when the minister went out there with her comments in the media that this was an unprecedented attack from the federal government on education spending in South Australia, I thought, 'I wonder whether she's read it.' As I said, when we looked at the Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook (MYEFO) and we looked at the budget which came down a few weeks ago—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will have to call her to order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As has been the practice all this afternoon we are reminding everyone of standing order 142 and asking the leader not to be brought in by interjections and remind people that interjections are out of order. I ask the leader to continue his remarks if he really wants to.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. As I said, I must say I was shocked and amazed that the minister sitting in this chamber opposite had not taken the time to actually have a look at the difference between the MYEFO and the budget which was brought down. That would have clearly shown the minister that it was an uplift. It was an uplift in federal government education spending here in South Australia.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Continue.

Mr MARSHALL: It was \$570 million over the forward estimates, so it was not correct for the minister to go out there and create this impression across South Australia that our budget being brought down on 19 June was in absolute peril: schools would have to be closed. She should hang her head in shame. She should hang her head in shame for the consternation which she has caused people in South Australia, because there is no such impact on the budget which is going to be brought down on 19 June.

There is no such impact because, as she would know, if she spent five minutes before calling her press conference—dud press conference that it was—it was an uplift in expenditure. But it is what we have come to expect from an education minister of this government, which has had an extraordinary number of education ministers over an extended period of time. They have all been very consistent.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We have had, I think, the same number of education ministers as they have had leaders of the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If we want to go backwards and forwards in this way we will waste 15 valuable minutes before the dinner break. I just remind everybody to remain calm and remember standing order 142, and I will ask the leader to continue his remarks and refer to the minister as 'the minister' rather than 'she'.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, the minister has just—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, just continue with your remarks.

Mr MARSHALL: The minister has made a comment in the house, while you were speaking—quite disrespectfully I would have thought—that there have been five separate ministers for education in this state. Five separate ministers in the last four years—who is next?

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Nine leaders in 10 years.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are all speaking at once as well, which is a—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, let's all remember that we will not hear the leader's remarks before dinner, and I would really love to hear his remarks.

Mr MARSHALL: The government is responsible for running this state. It has had five separate ministers for education in a four-year period. I think they have had nine separate chief executives or acting chief executives in a similarly short period of time under this government. It is chaos, absolute chaos. If you do not believe that, take a look at the results. In 19 out of 20 categories on the NAPLAN test results we are below the national average. That is shameful; that is absolutely shameful. Every important reform put forward by this side of the house has been completely rejected by those opposite.

Does the minister honestly think that it is a good idea to keep the year 12 research project compulsory? Let me tell you that there are few issues in my electorate which attract as much criticism as this issue; it is absolutely a hopeless situation. The Liberal Party did not say to scrap the research project. There are some people who I think would legitimately benefit from the research project. In fact, there would be a few opposite who could do with a research project. I have read some of their travel reports and quite frankly they could have done with a research project in year 12. I am not sure many of them finished year 12, but there you go.

I think that it should clearly be made optional. This is what the people of South Australia tell us. Parents, students, teachers, principals and governing councils—everybody tells us: make it optional. What does the minister say? 'No way. We know what we're doing.'

Let me tell you, they have no idea what they are doing and the minister has not even been able to read the difference between the MYEFO and the budget and that we are going to have \$570 million of additional money coming into our education system over the forward estimates. She cannot even read that document.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We talked about 'she' a bit earlier, leader.

Mr MARSHALL: The minister cannot read that document and that is really worrying for South Australia, which is already struggling with numeracy skills as highlighted in the NAPLAN test results. I am cognisant of the time so, appealing as it would be to highlight some of the issues in the education department, I might move on.

One of the other important sectors that this government has spoken about over an extended period of time is the importance of manufacturing and innovation. I love the manufacturing sector; I come from the manufacturing sector. It is an important driver of our economy and it is disproportionately important here in South Australia, relative to many other jurisdictions in Australia. I think Victoria has around about the same percentage as us, but it is extraordinarily high and therefore I was delighted to serve as a member of the state government's manufacturing industry advisory board. I served on that body for five years.

People who are on boards get paid a certain amount of money and I proudly report to the house that I paid mine back. I said, 'Put that into a program that is useful to people in the manufacturing sector.' A lot of people would be advised to do that, quite frankly. I was very pleased that we were going to put a greater focus on manufacturing because I believe that you need to make items. You need to add value and you need to send goods and services interstate. Manufacturing is a great driver of that innovation, so I was pleased when the government said, 'We're going to have a Thinker in Residence who is going to focus on the manufacturing sector,' and Goran Roos did that important work.

I was delighted with his final report. He worked diligently, he was consultative, he spoke to many people right across the industry. He sought input from right across the state and he referenced that to benchmark sites throughout the world. 'What does best practice look like? What should we be doing here in South Australia?' He came up with a plan and, of course, we were delighted with his plan and we supported it on this side of the house.

Unfortunately, like so many reports that have been put forward by those opposite, it was never implemented. It was just never implemented, and this is the sad and sorry tale. We see the Premier jumping up ad nauseam, telling us about his report, telling us about his manufacturing ministerial task force—I mean, has that group ever met? Give me a break. Has that group ever met, and what have they done if they have met? Not much, I would put it to you.

Most informative of all is where the rubber hits the road, to use an auto expression that I am sure someone in the house would be happy with me using at this point in time. When the rubber hits the road is in the budget. We have program 3 and the Department for Manufacturing and Innovation and Trade Resources and Energy, or whatever it is called this week. This program is called 'Manufacturing and innovation' and this has really been one of the most hopeless programs of this government. They have had plenty of hopeless programs, but this is the program where they would close something down, they would open it up again, they would close it down. Have a look at Innovate SA. What a mess that has actually been!

In particular, the government speaks about this manufacturing program all the time: 'We're doing a great job!. We want to add value. We want to send products out of South Australia.' Well, what are they putting into it? Let me tell you what they put into it in 2011-12: they put \$18.5 million into it. Now after this became one of the seven key priorities of the new government—when the current Premier got his mates to knife the previous premier and he came up with these seven new priorities and one of them was manufacturing—what did it go up to? From \$18.5 million, was it doubled? Was it \$37 million? No.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Any advances on 37?

Mr Gardner: Fifty million.

Mr MARSHALL: Fifty million. Have we heard any more? Fifty million into this important program? No, and this is the sorry tale here in South Australia. Lots of talk, not much action. Lots of talk, not much action, because the budget this financial year is just a paltry \$15.3 million; it has gone down. They talk tough, they talk about the importance of the manufacturing sector and creating jobs and keeping young people here in South Australia, but what do they do, Deputy Speaker, to actually help us? I would put it to you not very much at all.

So, we are coming up to the budget on the 19th, and most importantly, some time either this week or next week, we will be coming up to a final vote on the Supply Bill. The information that we have been provided by the government to assist in our deliberations and make important decisions regarding supporting the money that they have sought in this Supply Bill is completely inadequate. However, we are going to pass it.

For the reasons I outlined earlier in my address, we on this side of the chamber will not be supporting the government's toxic car park tax. We think that we are already taxed enough in South Australia. We have been the highest business-taxed state in Australia for five years in a row, and eventually you have to say enough is enough. No other issue was canvassed for as long as the issue of the car park tax. We have been talking about that tax since 2012. We made our position extraordinarily clear in the lead-up to the election.

The government made their position extraordinarily clear, and the people of South Australia voted, and guess what? The people of South Australia voted for change. Fifty-three per cent of people said that they wanted the Liberal Party to be elected; 53 per cent of people rejected the Labor Party's toxic car park tax. In fact, if you look at their primary vote it was less than 36 per cent. One in three people said they wanted the car park tax, others did not. I make the following point to the house—and there will be a lot of blustering from the Treasurer later tonight and tomorrow that this breaks the convention. Well, I will tell you a convention that I like, and it is called the convention of democracy, and in a situation in which the majority of people in a jurisdiction vote for something they should get it.

Well, they voted not to have a car park tax, not to destroy city vibrancy. They voted for a Liberal government to move away from this high taxing, high spending government position that we have had over an extended period of time. It is with great pleasure that I announce to the house today our position, which is that when this bill comes up for decision we will be voting against it. We

will vote it down, and we will seek the support of the crossbenches in the upper house to make sure we do not inflict any further pain on the people of South Australia.

In taking that stance, we will be supporting not only the Adelaide City Council's position, the Property Council's position and the Rundle Mall Management Association's position, but, indeed, the thousands of South Australians, the extraordinarily large number of people, who signed the petition. In fact, if I brought them all down here in their bags they would fill up this entire bench. The people of South Australia did not want it, they do not want it. It is bad for jobs in South Australia, it is bad for the city vibrancy, and we will be voting against it.

[Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19:30]

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (19:30): I obviously wish to make some comments in relation to the Supply Bill. I do not think I have to outline the legislative requirement of this particular piece of legislation, and I think members on both sides of the house have spoken in relation to why it is necessary for it to be before the parliament.

I listened to the leader's remarks, and he made, I think, an outstanding speech for close to two hours leading up to the dinner break. It was a wide-ranging speech, covering a lot of very important issues and making a lot of very important points. He went to the issues in relation to the excuses this government will find when it brings down the budget in a couple of weeks' time and the blame it will lay at the feet of the federal government's budget.

I want to take some time in my remarks this evening to put on the record some facts concerning the federal budget and how it is quite a nonsense to suggest that the federal budget has caused this year's state budget crisis. As I said, we know what is going to happen. The Treasurer has basically told us all what is going to happen, that any problems with the South Australian budget and economy are a consequence of the federal budget. That is not true.

We know on this side of the house that the federal economic situation was an absolute mess. Hard decisions had to be made by the federal government. It is completely unsustainable to borrow money to pay for the interest on your borrowings. Anybody in this place knows that that is economically and financially unsustainable, and that is exactly the position the previous federal Labor government has put the current Coalition government in.

Hard decisions had to be made in Canberra, and we have seen that. Some hard decisions have been made in the federal budget but, as I said before, it is a nonsense to suggest that the federal budget has caused this year's 2014-15 budget crisis. I want to share some information with the house in relation to some facts and figures concerning the federal budget.

The total specific purpose payments for health, education, community services and GST are up significantly over the forward estimates between the MYEFO (the Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook) and the federal budget. In relation to the special purpose payments, if we go through year by year, the 2013-14 figure is \$113 million; the 2014-15 year is \$153 million (so it is an increase in revenue); the 2015-16 year is \$216 million; and then the 2016-17 year is \$113 million. So, in total, over the forward estimates it is \$595 million. For this state government to try to sheet any blame home to the federal government for the current financial situation it is in is wrong.

Let's break it down into some of the specific areas of responsibility and talk about transport and infrastructure. The commonwealth will contribute 80 per cent, or \$496 million, to the \$620 million cost of the Darlington upgrade to be completed by 2018. The \$896 million Torrens to Torrens upgrade remains unchanged, with a fifty-fifty funding split, and is also planned for completion by 2018. The Premier has only secured \$2 billion for the state out of the \$50 billion long-term national infrastructure pool. Part of this failure can be attributed to state Labor being unable to plan and deliver federally funded projects; for example, the Gawler line electrification, which was promised three times and has been scrapped twice.

We have seen increased funds to the state for Roads to Recovery and blackspot programs. They are contingent on South Australia participating in the asset recycling programs and are only for one year and two years respectively. The money for the Torrens junction road grade separation project has remained in the federal budget despite the project not being in the state transport plan, so this suggests that the tramline to Outer Harbor may be off the state Labor government's agenda. Those are some key points in relation to the federal government's continued commitment to transport and infrastructure.

Now we come to schools and the education sector. From 2013-14 to 2016-17, payments to this state for education will increase by \$570 million compared with the December MYEFO; however, the state Labor government is cutting \$230 million out of the state education budget over this period. Nearly \$244 million is going into the national school chaplaincy program (approximately \$20,000 per applying school), obviously for valuable counselling to students. Many state schools have struggled to get similar resources from the state government.

We have \$11.6 million to encourage uptake of other languages, including \$9.6 million for an early learning languages trial. There is \$6.8 million to assist non-government schools with Indigenous boarders from remote areas to boost attendance and engagement. There is also \$5 million over a four-year period for education programs encouraging students to study STEM subjects.

In relation to tertiary education at our universities, with universities setting their own fees from 2016 the government will be requiring the universities and other higher education providers to spend \$1 out of every extra \$5 in additional revenue raised on scholarships for disadvantaged schools. This is obviously addressing some social disadvantage—so much for the bleeding heart lefties who say that on this side of the political divide we do not look to people who are disadvantaged.

The federal Coalition government is also extending commonwealth funding to all Australian higher education students studying bachelor courses in non-university higher education institutions, as well as continuing with the HELP loans for up-front students on student tuition fees. Again, looking to help those who may experience social disadvantage, those in low-socioeconomic areas and regional students will have extra opportunity through a scholarship and equity initiative. There is further expansion of the demand-driven commonwealth funding for higher education diplomas, advanced diplomas and associate degrees, which is costing \$371.5 million over three years.

There is also \$139.5 million for 100 new research positions per year under the Future Fellowships scheme, and \$26 million to accelerate university research into dementia. I think that is a pretty clear indication, and one that has been stated previously, that the federal government is certainly committed to funding important projects for infrastructure, transport, schools and universities and also, in particular, health.

In relation to health, a co-payment of \$7 is being proposed for visits to GPs which will go into a medical research future fund. We have heard a lot of discussion and debate about this medical research future fund, and I think it is a good thing. There is another fact that I think the government purposely looks to misrepresent, and that is, from 2013-14 to 2016-17, payments to the state for health will continue to increase. My understanding is that it is \$1.14 billion this year, \$1.21 billion the following year, and \$1.31 billion the year after; however, the state government is cutting \$1.033 billion out of the health budget over this period.

There have been questions put to the Minister for Health on this particular issue, but he conveniently evades and avoids answering and addressing those issues. I have heard government members and ministers squealing about the cuts, particularly about the cuts to health and education, but as I have said before and as has been explained, it is my understanding that the funding for health and education will continue to increase into the forward estimates; it is only in those years beyond the forward estimates that we will see some funding cuts.

It is my understanding that, because those funds are forecast beyond the forward estimates, the government has not actually worked out where they are going to spend the money. I can guess where they will spend the money, and that will be in that black hole—that money pit—that they are building down on the end of North Terrace: the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. That is where that money will be sunk into. We know, on this side of the house, that they have put a financial noose around probably three generations of South Australians to meet those commitments.

In relation to primary industries and regions, the Regional Development Australia (RDA) committees will continue to receive federal funding support, and funding will be delivered against contract milestones. An additional \$20 million over four years will be provided to strengthen national biosecurity and quarantine arrangements.

There are a whole lot of other dot points that I can raise in relation to regional development and primary industries. There are commitments to continue funding to environment and water, justice, emergency services, community and social inclusion, disabilities, and Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation, right across the responsibilities of government. For this government, and particularly

this Treasurer when he brings down the budget, to try and blame the federal budget outcome on the budget that he is looking to bring down—for him to suggest that the federal budget is the cause of his budget pains for this year—is a complete nonsense.

I want to talk, in the few minutes I have left, on issues relating to economic management. I have stood up in this place over the past 12 years and everybody on this side of the house has continually highlighted that the government's approach and strategy to economic management is wrong.

We heard the leader highlight the fact that in pretty much every budget the government has not met its expenditure targets but has actually exceeded its expenditure targets. In the early years, the only thing that saved the government from the economic mess it has got itself into now is the windfall revenues through the GST. We all know that. Even the Auditor-General, in his reports over a number of years, highlighted the fact that it was only the windfall revenue through above GST targets that kept this state's economy cranking along.

The government states that it is the GFC that has caused a downturn in economic activity, but I have highlighted in the house previously that then prime minister Rudd had this idea of the stimulus package. That was meant to shield us from the effects of the GFC, but clearly that did not work. All that did was rack up the massive debt that we see, which the federal Abbott government has had to try to tackle in its pretty tough budget that they have brought down.

As I said, the government's economic approach and strategy is all wrong, and it has been for years. Their strategy has been to tax, borrow and spend. I have stated in this place before that it has been a hallmark of Labor governments right around the country to tax, borrow and spend. It started off with Gough Whitlam. That's pretty much as far back as I can remember, back in the 1970s. He was an incredible expender of funds, and it does not work. It is an old economic model of taxing, borrowing and spending. It does not work anymore.

I want to quote something from an article that I picked up in a newspaper report back on 1 February, before the election, and it was written by David Penberthy, a well-known newspaper journalist. It is an analysis that talks about all the problems within the ALP, but there was one sentence that caught my eye. I quote:

...the disquiet among...MPs—

he is talking about Labor Party MPs—

who regard Weatherill as a Whitlamite state socialist who somehow believes that public spending (with nothing to spend) can get our economy out of the mire.

I think that pretty much sums up how this government has run the economic and financial affairs of this state over its 12 years in government, and it is an old model. In his speech, the leader highlighted the fact that he was in New Zealand last week where he met with and spoke to the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and understands firsthand how a modern, successful and sustainable approach can be made for economic recovery and health. This government never learns and, as I said, they tax, borrow and spend.

I note in the ministerial statement that the Premier made this afternoon, where he was waxing lyrical about one thing and another, that he said, 'Another important focus for our state at this time must be the business sector.' Goodness me! It has only just dawned on them that small business is the engine room of the economy.

Dr McFetridge: Twelve years.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It has taken them 12 years to come to the realisation that they have to focus on the business sector. Goodness me! If it has taken them 12 years, heaven help this show. That is pretty much what the real situation is. The government has taxed the business sector to almost the point of extinction. We are the highest-taxed state in the country and we all know that we have record debt and deficit. The Treasurer is going to have to bring down a budget, in his way, to try to remedy it. I want to make my final point: as I started out in my contribution, this government will endeavour to lay the blame at the feet of the federal government for the state budget, but in no way can they suggest that that is the case.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Heysen, I welcome tonight in the Speaker's Gallery the boarding house prefects from Prince Alfred College, guests of the member for Flinders, who are also scholars of the school of Robert Neville Francis, broadcaster. The member for Heysen.

*Bills***SUPPLY BILL 2014***Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (19:50): And might I say, sir, also it is the alma mater of my two sons. So, welcome, boys and masters. I am very pleased to rise to speak on the Supply Bill and, as I do every time this comes up, I begin with a comment about the fact that this bill is indeed necessary only because of the mismanagement of the government over a period of years. In any other business, what you would do is bring down your budget in time for it to be approved before the commencement of the new financial year.

The purpose of the Supply Bill, of course, is to ensure that we continue to pay our public servants and all of the other bills as they come due for the next few weeks until the budget is passed. In my view, there is a very poor record of timing on the part of this government; that would be fair. I think that it is not the only government that has been guilty of that.

Over many years, the government has failed to bring down a budget in time for it to be considered, debated and in place in time for the commencement of the new financial year. But, more importantly, it is the lack of savings that gives rise to it because, after all, if we were running our economy as the New Zealand economy, to which the member for Kavel just alluded, is being run, we would be in surplus—and, indeed, in this state, we should be in surplus.

For the first seven years that it was in power, this government received every single year something in the order of \$500 million over what the government budgeted to receive. About \$3½ billion, over a period of seven years, came into the coffers. The state was flowing with money, both from the GST—the unexpected windfall that we in this state, in particular, received from the GST—and also from the fact that we had a property boom, so our enormous stamp duty and land taxes were reaping in enormous amounts of money to the tune of an average of \$500 million a year over what was anticipated in the budget.

Anyone should be able to understand that, if you are getting an extra \$500 million every year, you should have some money in the bank, even if you run over budget a bit. But instead of that, this government not only spent all of the money that came in—all of the extra money that came in—but then ran up debt, and it ran up debt to a huge degree, to the point where now we are going to be paying in excess of \$2.6 million each and every day just to pay the interest on the debt it has run up—and that is if things do not get worse, and every indicator that I can see suggests that things will indeed get worse a long time before they get better. So, \$2.6 million a day when we should, in fact, have had money in the bank.

Had we had money in the bank, we would have been in a position, presumably, for the government to simply continue paying the Public Service and paying all the other bills pending the passing of its budget because it could have used its savings. That is what most households would do.

I saw on the telly the other night a wonderful New Zealand film called *Once Were Warriors*. If anyone has not seen it, I recommend it as an exceptionally good film to see. I see one of the members on the other side nodding. It is an exceptional film, but *Once Were Warriors*, the title of it struck me as I was thinking about this speech today, which I had rather a lot of time to do, because this state was once warriors. We were once a powerhouse. I remember growing up in Sydney being told about the powerhouse of South Australia. This state was a huge manufacturing sector, not just with cars but with all sorts of other machinery. We had the Iron Triangle, which was extraordinarily successful and important for the whole of Australia. We had magnificent agriculture and fantastic seafood. This state ranked third amongst the states.

Where do we rank now? Mostly, we rank at the bottom. Under this government—for 12 years, now, and for another four years, it seems, into the future—we are going backwards at a rate of knots. In fact, most other states, even Tasmania, are now showing signs of recovery after the GFC but we continue to go backwards and buck the national trend in every possible way.

I just want to refer to some of those ways and, firstly, in relation to business investment. Our business investment in this state contracted by 8.1 per cent in the December 2013 quarter. That is the worst performance of all the states, and our business investment is at its lowest quarterly value for three years. That is not just something we have made up: that has come from the ABS as recently as December last year.

In relation to the number of businesses, South Australia had 4,744 businesses, or 3.2 per cent of all businesses, close in the year 2012-13. That is business closures. We had the lowest business start-up rate on the mainland over the last 10 consecutive years. In fact, six years ago, there were more businesses operating in this state than there are today. It is no wonder, then, that the consequence of that is that we also have the worst business confidence on the mainland. Small business is the backbone of the economy, as the member for Kavel just mentioned, yet we have done everything in this state to absolutely cripple small business.

In terms of jobs, there are 18,000 fewer full-time jobs since the 2013 state budget. It is less than a year since the budget was brought down and less than a year that it has been operating and, in that time, there are 18,000 fewer full-time jobs in this state and our jobless rate has increased by almost 50 per cent, from 4.8 per cent to 6.3 per cent, since the Labor government made its promise in 2010 that it was going to create 100,000 new jobs. Far from creating 100,000 new jobs, in the last year we have lost 18,000 full-time jobs in this state. With a rate of 6.3 per cent of jobless, that is well above the national average of 5.8 per cent. In fact, the Labor Party itself used to say any number with a 5 in front of it was pretty good. Well, I hate to tell you, but it is well past having a 5 in front of it.

Job vacancies are the same problem. Our jobless numbers increased over the last year by 33 per cent since the promise of 100,000 new jobs, and we have the worst new job performance in the nation, worse even than Tasmania. Tasmania is always considered a basket case and has a population significantly lower than this state with far fewer natural assets upon which it can call, and even Tasmania is doing better than us. In relation to job vacancies—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms REDMOND: The Treasurer says it is not true. He disagrees with the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the figures it put out in April 2014. Just in March of this year job vacancies fell by 1.1 per cent and, again, that is the worst performance of all the states. Our internet job vacancy levels are now at half the levels they were in 2006. That is the worst performance, also, of all the states during that period. One would have thought that in 2006 the internet, as the place to seek jobs, was not necessarily as prevalent as it is today.

On any measure, you would expect there would be more jobs advertised on the internet but our job vacancies are at half the level they were in 2006. That is just extraordinary. Now we know that our jobless rate is up overall by almost 28 per cent on the decade average level and, again, it is the worst performance of all the states. That figure comes from CommSec in April 2014.

So, it is no surprise then that business competitiveness is poor in this state as well. Adelaide was the eighth most expensive city in the world for manufacturing out of 131 cities—eighth worst out of 131 cities—yet this government does not believe its taxing regime is crippling business, particularly small business, in this state. Adelaide was ranked as the second most expensive city in the world in its population bracket—the second most expensive in the world in its population bracket! They are extraordinary figures.

If you did not have people who have jobs and have confidence in the future, that then impacts on retail and business, so what do we find? In the past 12 months in South Australia retail sales rose by just 1.9 per cent, which was the worst performance of all the states. National growth of retail sales was precisely double that. Nationally there was a 3.8 per cent growth in retail sales, and poor old South Australia, bottom of the barrel, 1.9 per cent.

Then, to look at the value of building work, because another good indicator of how the economy is going is whether people feel confident about the future and are buying and building

houses, and so on: in South Australia it fell 4.3 per cent in the December quarter, and again this is the worst performance of all the states.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's not true.

Ms REDMOND: Again, the Treasurer says 'It's not true', but again I point out that these figures have come directly from the ABS figures published in December 2013. Then, of course, we get to people who are prepared to invest in the state. In the last two years the number of venture capital investee companies in South Australia went down by 36 per cent—again the worst result of all the states.

The Treasurer keeps talking about it not being true, but I can tell you that in my electorate I actually had someone come into my electorate office who was an investor in this state. He loved living in South Australia, but he came in to tell me that after a whole lifetime—he is about my age and he had spent his entire working life creating a portfolio of investment properties in this state (residential properties, flats and independent houses, and so on)—of creating this portfolio that was worth about \$15 million, he said, 'I cannot stay in this state with this investment portfolio because the rates and taxes here are killing me'.

He said, 'I have to take the first six months of rent that I earn on these properties just to pay the land tax. After I pay the land tax I then have to pay the insurance, the maintenance, the council rates and all the other expenses.' He said, 'I'm lucky if I make one or two weeks profit out of the entire year's income. That is just not viable; I would be better off selling all the properties and putting the money in the bank because I would get better return on the investment'. But, he said, 'In fact, I can get an even better return by selling all the properties here and moving to another state or territory where I can expect an investment of that size to make some money.'

Of course the government wants to blame all of this on the GFC and on the federal government. I will not go over what the member for Kavel already said about the federal government and what nonsense it is for the government here to try to blame our federal colleagues for what they are doing and for what is happening in this state, but it is a nonsense to continue to blame the GFC. If the GFC was the problem, then what is the explanation for the fact that this state continues to do so poorly compared with all the other states? This state has no excuse, and the problem, as the member for Kavel mentioned, is their tax, borrow and spend mentality.

The reality is that this government's mismanagement of the economy is all down to this government. In 12 years they have wasted money, spent money they did not have, and now they are leaving it to the people of this state to pick up the pieces and pay for it all. I come back to the fact that the people of this state will be paying \$2.6 million per day, every single day—over \$1 billion a year—just to pay the interest—not to pay down the debt, but just to pay the interest.

Last night I had the pleasure of attending the Australian Society for Medical Research dinner, and heard a very interesting speaker. Every year they have wonderful people doing fantastic work in the medical research field. I was talking to the people at the table about imagining what medical research could do if, even for a week, we could say to them, 'Here, you have that \$2.6 million today and today and today', instead of having to pay interest on a debt that we simply should not have, but this government has led us into a situation where we have to focus on paying our debts.

Our budget is in a disgraceful state. Our debt is at \$14 billion by the year 2016. In fact, it is well described by saying that it increases by \$4.1 million every single day for eight years. Now, that is inconceivable, the level of debt increasing \$4.1 million every single day for eight years. What is more, there will be another \$212 million blowout in the 2017-18 budget according to the government's own figures.

As I have already mentioned, the interest on the debt is going to be a billion dollars a year and our total liabilities will soon exceed \$25 billion—\$25,000 million. We have the highest taxes in the nation and this government still fails to understand that you cannot tax your way out of trouble. You cannot keep imposing on business more and more taxes as this government wants to do at every turn. All that does is force more and more businesses out of business, more and more people out of work and that leads to an incredibly untidy and unhappy state in terms of where we can go to economically.

I have not spent very much time talking about our workers compensation system, but in addition to the taxes our workers compensation system has long been known to be the absolute

worst in the nation. We have the lowest return to work rate and we have the highest workers compensation levy rates. Indeed, the national average is 1.76 per cent; here, the highest in the nation at 2.75 per cent. The rest of the nation on average has their workers compensation system funded to 112 per cent; ours is funded to only 67 per cent.

There are dreadful problems in our economy and this government, as the member for Kavel said, simply thinks that they can tax and spend their way out of trouble and not recognise that, every time they spend more money when they have not actually got the money to spend, they are creating a debt not just for us but for our children and our grandchildren. I remember the former Treasurer, before he was tossed aside, the Hon. Jack Snelling, when he was Treasurer, I remember him saying, 'I am not going to get up—

The SPEAKER: Just the Minister for Health would be best.

Ms REDMOND: Sorry, the Minister for Health, when he was Treasurer I remember one of his first utterances was, 'I am not going to run up a credit card debt for our children and our grandchildren', but that is precisely what this government has done. Where are we going to get the income that is going to pay \$2.6 million every single day on an ongoing basis, not just for a year, not just for two years, but on an ongoing basis and that is if it does not get worse? Where are we going to get that?

I invite the members opposite to contemplate what this state would look like if instead of giving that money in an interest payment on a debt that we should not have, that we were able to say, 'Here Glenelg, have \$2.6 million today. Here Port Pirie, have \$2.6 million today. Here Riverland area, have \$2.6 million today' day upon day upon day. Imagine what this state would look like if that was what we were able to do with that money.

Instead of that we are paying interest on a debt this government has no-one but itself to thank for and it is nothing to do with the GFC, it is nothing to do with the federal politicians: it is entirely down to the way this government has mismanaged the affairs of this state. Mr Speaker, I fear that I am going to run out of time to canvass the other areas, but no doubt I will have a chance when it is time to do a grievance to come back and say a bit more about issues of education, health and a range of other issues concerned in our economy and the mismanagement by this government. Suffice to say there is—

The SPEAKER: Suffice.

Ms REDMOND: That is what I said, I thought, sir.

The SPEAKER: Good, excellent.

Ms REDMOND: I did say suffice to say. I hope that *Hansard* caught it as suffice to say. I am sorry if I mumbled. The fact is that with our debt, our interest, our total liabilities, our state taxes, the whole thing has led to an unmanageable economy and this government remains blind to the idea that we need to take all the burden off business to allow business to succeed, because only when business succeeds do we have the chance for them to be paying taxes at a reasonable rate, employing people who will again pay taxes who will spend money and get the economy going again. This state is in the malaise of a dreadful economy run by this government and one which has led to a massive loss of confidence.

Matter of Privilege

MEMBER FOR HEYSEN

The SPEAKER (20:10): Before the member for Morphett rises, and now that the member for Heyesen and I are together in the chamber for the first time today, the—

Ms Redmond: I've always been here all day, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I'm sure that's right. It would be my fault. The member for Heyesen during the Address in Reply made an allegation that the Electoral Commissioner, an independent statutory officer, was—she considered her 'utterly corrupt' which I take to be an imputation that she was guilty of an offence against part 7 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. In the fevered political atmosphere of the past 10 years it has become common in our political discourse to say of someone with whom one disagrees about a matter or matters that she or he is corrupt.

Now, I should have perhaps raised the matter with the member for Heysen when she made the remarks on the Address in Reply when I was in the chair, but I let it go under Article 9 of the Bill of Rights. It seems to me that it would be fairer if the member for Heysen were to particularise what the alleged crime was or, failing that, withdraw or apologise, so I now invite the member for Heysen to do one or the other.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (20:12): Sir, I am happy to particularise it, but I would like the chance to go and get my notes about that matter, because I have been preparing to make a speech in response to why I say that the Electoral Commissioner is in my view utterly corrupt. I had always intended to come back to the issue and provide to the house a fulsome explanation, but I will only do so in the house. I was in fact wanting to speak to a couple of other people about that before making that statement.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, it seems to me that the debate on the Supply Bill, where there are really no boundaries of relevance, would have been an ideal time to do that, and I was looking forward to you doing it in the course of your 20 minutes. Does the member for Heysen guarantee that before the house rises tonight she will come back and particularise the matter?

Ms REDMOND: To the extent that I can. I have several issues that I wanted to chase up further with various other people, but I am happy to come back and particularise so far as there are issues affecting me.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will come to order. It seems to me that, if one makes an allegation that an independent statutory officer is 'utterly corrupt', one must be prepared to particularise the indictment forthwith. One can't retrofit it or reconstruct it, so—

Ms REDMOND: I am happy to do it off the cuff at the moment if you wish me to.

The SPEAKER: I would invite you to do that.

Ms REDMOND: Okay. Well, sir, before I start could I say that I have been applying my mind to the issue of whether in fact the allegation is something that I consider to be under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act or indeed, as the Attorney sought to point out to me in his letter, under the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act, and I am not going to make a comment any further than that about that issue.

However, I have taken the view that the Electoral Commissioner, over a period of years, has made decisions which, to my mind, speak to someone who is approaching her position with a great deal of bias and favouring one side. I have long held the view that our public servants, be they statutory officers or any other minor clerk, have a duty to behave without fear or favour.

To begin with, the issue which might be the most obvious, I suppose, is that of the 'put your family first' T-shirts at the last election. I know that the Electoral Commissioner claims to have obtained legal advice that she was unable to interrupt the use of that particular charade by the Labor Party at the last election. Nevertheless, no action was taken, and that clearly fell in favour of the Labor Party at the 2010 election.

More importantly to me personally at the last election, however, were a number of things that happened. Firstly, the Labor Party registered my name, Isobel Redmond MP, as a reply paid address to the ALP, then proceeded to issue a DL which said, 'Tell Isobel what you think', or 'Let Isobel know what you think'—I am paraphrasing because I have not got it in front of me, but 'Let Isobel know what you think'—and that was directed back to that reply paid address to the ALP. I take the view—

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, just to be clear, you say the ALP registered a reply paid facility—

Ms REDMOND: Yes.

The SPEAKER: —and printed a DL addressed to Isobel Redmond care of this reply paid facility? That's what you mean by registering your name?

Ms REDMOND: Yes; just into the period of the 2010 election. So they issued that, and what is more, the Electoral Commissioner not only failed to intervene in that action, either the registering of my name or the sending of that DL, but then would not intervene to make sure that that information,

which was supposed to be 'Tell Isabel what you think', obviously intended for me, but the Electoral Commissioner failed throughout to do that.

The Electoral Commissioner failed to intervene when the ALP put out a letter to young women in a number of electorates (I am not sure how many) in which it was alleged that I was going to dismantle a program introduced by the ALP called 'Every Chance for Every Child'. Now, not only was that entirely untrue, but it was extremely offensive to me, because on a number of occasions both in this chamber and in public I had made it very clear that I congratulated the Labor Party for having introduced that particular program. So, it was complete untruth to have put out such a letter, and yet again the Electoral Commissioner failed to offer any assistance in dealing with that.

In the most recent election, of course, we had the 'Can you trust Habib' appallingly racist DL that was put out and, again, the Electoral Commissioner fails to act. I know of another member who put in an FOI and was told he could not have the information because it was trade secrets of the ALP. In the case of the member for Morphett, I know that—

The SPEAKER: A member put in an FOI to the Electoral Commissioner?

Ms REDMOND: To the Electoral Commissioner. I know that the member for Morphett also tried to raise the issue of the president of the Housing Trust Tenants Association, who was putting out absolutely false allegations about policy things which were in no way, shape or form ever part of a policy held by the Liberal Party of this state. Never, ever was a part of our policy and—

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

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: It was your policy.

Ms REDMOND: The member opposite says it was our policy, and it simply was not our policy. It was never our policy, and it was completely false.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this a very serious matter and I think it should be heard in silence.

The SPEAKER: Yes; I agree, and I call the Minister for Education to order, especially as she is out of her seat. Member for Heysen.

Ms REDMOND: Thank you, sir. So, over a period of time I watched these decisions, which seemed to go in a remarkably one-sided fashion; they were always found against the Liberal Party and in favour of the ALP. Now, I have been applying my mind as to whether that amounts to corruption in any definition—in the colloquial sense, in an ICAC sense—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will hear the member for Heysen in silence, because I have invited her to make this statement.

Ms REDMOND: —or, in a sense, under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I have not reached a concluded view on that; as I said, I was still gathering some information and there were also some things I wanted to speak to the state director about, from some difficulties that he had discussed with me during the election campaign. I will not go into details of that now because I do not have enough detail in my head about it to even canvass it, but it was to do with the fact that a complaint was made which I believe was completely legitimate on the part of the Liberal Party and it was, again, rejected by the Electoral Commissioner.

I consider that there was a considerable litany of legitimate complaints about the bias shown by the Electoral Commissioner in the way she had conducted herself. I point out, Mr Speaker, that in the case of the 'Put your family first' issue, for instance, the Electoral Commissioner in New South Wales stopped that happening in that state—at an election just later than ours—within a couple of hours of it starting.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Different act.

Ms REDMOND: It was absolutely stamped on. The Attorney calls out that it was a different act. Exactly, and that is why—

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General is called to order for interjecting out of his seat. Perhaps he could rise and allow the Minister for Education to sit in her seat and he could sit in his.

Ms REDMOND: They could sit on each other's lap, sir. It was always my intention to come back into the house with chapter, verse and detail of each of the things I considered illustrated a profound bias on the part of the Electoral Commissioner, a bias I considered so profound that it had a tinge of corruption. As I say, I was also considering the legal nicety of whether—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned a first time.

Ms REDMOND: —one can look at the term 'corrupt'—and I accept that I used 'utterly corrupt'—

The Hon. P. Caica: Utterly corrupt.

Ms REDMOND: Utterly corrupt; that is absolutely the term I used because it is utterly the term I think fits the commissioner. I do not resile from it at all. I want her to explain why it is that all these decisions have so consistently been found by her, in the face of all legitimate bases, to go against the Liberal Party. I think that can amount to corruption, but, on its best reading, I would think the corruption could only be that if a Labor government was displaced and a Liberal government got in she might not retain her position, and therefore her only offence—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms REDMOND: I have been looking into those things, Mr Speaker. As I said, I had intended to come in and provide a chapter and verse, extremely fulsome, detailed argument as to why I used that term. The one thing left out of my response to the Attorney-General was that not only did he not need to remind me of my obligations under the ICAC act but that I am very conscious of the particular provisions of section 6 of that act.

The SPEAKER: So in short, the member for Heysen maintains that she considers the Electoral Commissioner utterly corrupt, and those are the particulars?

Ms REDMOND: To the extent that I have been able to deliver them to you off the cuff, without notice, yes.

The SPEAKER: So the member for Heysen will return to the house and give us further particulars?

Ms REDMOND: In due course, sir, as I said. I had intended all along to do that, but there are some people I wish to speak to.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (20:24): Can I just make this point? I am not quite sure where we are, but you are indulging us so I am graciously accepting the opportunity. I want to make a couple of very brief points. To come into this place, where one stands clothed in the ancient powers and privileges, as a former occupant of your office used to frequently remind us—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Hang on—

The SPEAKER: The point of order is what?

Mr WILLIAMS: I am wondering what the debate is that we are having.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is a fair point. I am trying to adjudicate a matter of privilege and the member for Heysen has assisted me in doing that. Now I am indulging the Attorney-General in reply.

Mr WILLIAMS: Are you going to indulge every member, sir?

The SPEAKER: If they are pertinent to the point.

Mr WILLIAMS: Sir, on what basis are you making that judgement before they have spoken?

The SPEAKER: I am deciding whether it is relevant to the point of privilege.

Mr WILLIAMS: Is that before or after they have spoken, sir?

The SPEAKER: During. Attorney.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I simply make this point: every person in this chamber is able to say things in this place that no other citizen can say with impunity. The member for Heysen has virtually explained to you now, Mr Speaker, that (a) she does not resile from the use of 'utterly corrupt', (b) she has yet to assemble the facts upon which she will base the assertion of 'utter corruption' and (c) in terms of the particulars that have so far been provided, she has done nothing more than to raise matters which go to the interpretation and application of an act of parliament over which the Electoral Commissioner, who is a statutory officer, has no control. We do. She is but an officer discharging a statutory function.

I make this point, Mr Speaker. Earlier today I raised with you the question as to whether or not this amounted to—I cannot remember the exact formulation of my question to you, Mr Speaker, but the gist of it was whether or not this amounted to a misleading of the house. In light of the honourable member's contribution, in light of what we have heard today, this evening, right now, I would like to ask you also to address your mind as to whether or not it is a misleading of the house, whether it is in addition or in the alternative an abuse of the privilege that is granted to all of us in this place to deliberately, without evidence, defame a public statutory officer in the most vile fashion under privilege in circumstances where we have now seen there is no fundamental basis upon which such an assertion could be made.

The SPEAKER: Obviously that is your opinion.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mr Speaker, my particular point is: I ask you to broaden your inquiry.

The SPEAKER: So you are taking a second point of privilege?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (20:27): I think the first question that needs to occupy the mind of the house and the Speaker is whether the member for Heysen's comment actually falls within the matter of misleading or, indeed, a breach of privilege. This house has dealt with this issue previously, where members have come in or have threatened to come in and make particularly strong comments about individuals. During the term of this government there was an individual who held a very important place—in fact, your position, sir—who threatened to come in and name certain individuals, MPs current and past and past police officers, if my memory serves me right, who were involved in some criminal acts. The then speaker was going to allege that those MPs, former MPs and private citizens (ex police officers) had committed certain grievous crimes.

The government of the day, and indeed the Attorney-General of the day—and no disrespect, Mr Speaker, that was you—was so offended by this particular proposition the member had flagged in the *Sunday Mail*, if my memory serves me right, the weekend before, that it brought in a bill to take away on a temporary basis the privilege of members of parliament so that they could not come in and make allegations of a serious nature. The quote was that members would be able to make the accusation but they would have to stand by it.

So the government brought in a bill to take away the privilege, to stop people doing what some would say the member for Heysen has done, and that is to make serious allegations against an individual who in this case holds a high position within government. That to me signals something to the house, and it signals something to the government; that is, that at that point of time (April 2005) the government was of the view that you could use parliamentary privilege in that way. If the government was not of that view it did not have to move legislation to take away the privilege.

So, the government was of the view in 2005 that longstanding parliamentary privilege does give members the opportunity to come in and make certain statements. While they are protected within the house, they are not protected outside the house, and the media and the public will deal with them as they see fit. There was another famous case more recently of Mr Xenophon in the Senate. He made some rather strong comments but, to my memory, he was not taken to a privileges committee or called for misleading of the house about those comments.

My view is that, regardless of your view of the member for Heysen's comment, the longstanding matter of parliamentary privilege dictates—and the government held this view in 2005—that a member of parliament can do it even if it is distasteful to some members. If the government were of the view that privilege should not be used in that way, they would have continued with the bill.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Not removing privilege.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You were removing privilege.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Not now.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, but in 2005—for the benefit of members, let me just explain further. The reality is that before you establish the issue you first have to establish whether it is actually a matter of privilege. I am arguing that it is not a matter of privilege because parliamentary privilege is given to us for that exact reason. One of the first things you are taught when you come into the parliament is that you have this rather unique position within society, that by being voted into the parliament you are awarded privilege which allows you to come in and say whatever you wish, but ultimately you will be held to account for it through the fourth estate, the media.

What the government tried to do in 2005 was restrict that privilege in certain circumstances. That is an admission by the government that privilege exists and that privilege existed to the point that members could come in and make comments about serious matters and make serious allegations, and it was not going to be a breach of privilege because they were taking the privilege away. The government's own action confirms that in this chamber, unlike in some other chambers around the world, the government has decided, and the practice has always been, that it is not a breach of privilege. I know that in some other chambers they have taken it a different way, but this parliament debated the matter in 2005, and this parliament decided that we would not accept the idea that we would take away members of parliament's privilege.

I argue, without passing a view about the member for Heysen's position, on behalf of all members of parliament that this is not in fact a privilege matter. Being MPs, we are given parliamentary privilege for the exact reason that some members use it—that is, to bring up difficult issues that we can bring up in this chamber that we cannot necessarily bring up in a public arena. Not everyone supports members of parliament in having that privilege, but I think it is crystal clear that this is not a matter of privilege.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (20:33): Without wanting to prolong the debate unnecessarily, I think there is an important distinction to be made between what happened in 2005 and what has happened now. The fact is that former speaker Mr Lewis, the then member for Hammond, had made a threat to use privilege in order to, as he said, expose certain members of parliament and others, and what the government was attempting to do at that time was prevent that from happening.

In the case of the member for Heysen, she has now said those remarks and they cannot be unsaid, short of her standing in this place and withdrawing those remarks and apologising, which clearly she has said she is unwilling to do. There is a huge distinction between what happened in 2005, when the government of the day was trying to prevent an abuse of privilege, and what I would argue is an abuse of privilege that has already happened.

With regard to members abusing privilege and what the house decides to do with that, I draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to the deliberations of the Legislative Council in New South Wales on former member Franca Arena. If my recollection serves me well, Ms Arena went into the New South Wales parliament and made allegations of paedophilia (or at least the covering up of paedophilia) by very high ranking officials in New South Wales—very senior political officials. The parliament there, if my recollection serves me well, did deem that to be a matter of privilege and there was in fact, if I recall correctly, a motion to expel Ms Arena from the New South Wales Legislative Council.

It may or may not be the case that the member for Heysen's remarks are as damaging as allegations of paedophilia or covering up for it, but nonetheless the principle still stands that it is within the remit of the house to deliberate over what members have said, how they have used—or, indeed, misused—privilege and to take appropriate actions. I think it is entirely appropriate for you, sir, to

make a deliberation over whether a matter of privilege does exist and whether to give precedence to a motion.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (20:36): There are two matters I wish to raise. Sir, in your consideration of the question of whether there has been a breach of privilege and whether in fact there should be consideration to go to a committee in relation to that, I ask you to consider two matters; one is that in the envelope the privilege is actually there in the parliamentary sense for the benefit of the constituency, so that it is not something as a protective barrier for members of parliament against defamation actions, but in fact is there to ensure that we represent our constituency without fear or favour and bring those issues to the parliament.

The purpose of having a process to ensure that we can have a consideration by you as Speaker as to whether there has been a breach of privilege and a committee process to follow, I think is clear in a number of the authorities, and no doubt you will consider those. I address two aspects, and one is that the fundamental test of whether there should be consideration of a breach of privilege is to ask whether the conduct or inaction under consideration could not be dealt with in another manner or in another way—by a motion of the house or by an invitation, for example, to an aggrieved person to present to the parliament and have some right to speak in response to any matter that has been raised.

There are a number of different ways that is dealt with, including a motion, obviously, which has been referred to in the other debates. That is the first thing and, if you consider Magee's references in the New Zealand consideration of the question of privilege, I think you will find—and that has oft been quoted here in this chamber in attempts to bring matters of privilege myself against other members that have been unsuccessful—that it has been clearly identified as being a necessary threshold for that not to be able to be dealt with in another way in the chamber.

If there is a concern that is raised about information that is asserted to be incorrect, and there is a means by which that can be dealt with otherwise in the house, then that needs to be considered in the first instance. I think the Attorney-General has in whatever we are calling this—some kind of rebuttal or extra submissions to help your consideration, or whatever we are calling this bit of process we are having tonight—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: No, definitely not that—the Attorney seemed to change his case a little to being another challenge now, to belatedly pleading the alternative, to suggest that there has been, I think clearly, an attempt to mislead the house, which has been the second plank of his now alternative pleading.

The SPEAKER: No, I think you will find misleading the house was his first plank. His second plank is different.

Ms CHAPMAN: He has attempted to replace it. If his first case is thinning, then he wants to be able to rely on misleading. I make this point: there has never been a situation where it is more obvious that even the courts protect the right of privilege to make statements. The classic example that I can think of, which I hope you would have front and centre of mind at the time of your consideration, where a statement has been made, on the face of it to be quite defamatory about an individual, third-party extraneous—it does not matter whether they are important person or an average person, whether a statutory officer or a public servant or anyone. We are talking about a statement that has been made that, in the absence of further and better particulars, or some kind of submission that you have for further and better particulars of the member for Heysen, is seen to be a statement that is at best distasteful.

That example was in fact by the Minister for Health, who stood here in this house and made a very serious allegation against a number of members of the legal profession in response to their outrage, apparently over some decisions that you had made as the then attorney-general. That so outraged them that they took proceedings in the Supreme Court to—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: It is hardly defamation to criticise the Attorney-General anyway.

Ms CHAPMAN: No. You are not listening. You stood in this house as a minister—not you, Mr Speaker, of course; you were sitting over there at the time. The Minister for Health was sitting up

the back, not reading a book this time. He was sitting up the back and he stood up and read out a letter and made statements in respect of a number of lawyers. They had made certain statements—

The SPEAKER: Whether they were members of the gang of 14.

Ms CHAPMAN: That's correct. I think they were then colloquially called the 'gang of six' or 'gang of seven' as a group of lawyers. Nevertheless, they were complaining about certain government policies—I do not need to go into the detail; you remember it well, I am sure, Mr Speaker—and as a result of that statement made in the house, these members of the legal profession were sufficiently outraged to take proceedings in the Supreme Court to seek damages arising out of what they claimed to be a defamation of their good character.

The opposition actually joined in supporting the government members—including the hapless then member for Playford sitting on the back bench, who was being deluged with petitions against him for his scurrilous statements in the house—that they were defamatory and that they ought to have some compensation. We actually joined—

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: No, no; he made a statement in the house. You were busy over there reading your book.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned for the second and final time.

Ms CHAPMAN: In fact, we joined with the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am sorry; did the Minister for Education say something further?

The Hon. P. Caica: It was me sir; I said you were being unfair and I withdraw that comment.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: Whilst the now Minister for Health was being deluged with all of this legal action against him, the opposition joined in the proceedings. In fact, the parliament—I think the then speaker, Mr Lewis—took charge of the matter. He intervened, I think, on behalf of the parliament, but we certainly had counsel representing us as opposition and joined in a submission with the government counsel of the day to oppose the claim on the basis of parliamentary privilege. And we won!

I know that the member for Playford wanted us to pay all his legal fees and all sorts of other issues; we had a few issues about paying all that. I think we even helped out, to be honest, but he had to pick up a bit of it on his own. The reality is that the Supreme Court endorsed the position of this house having parliamentary privilege in a situation where a statement was made. Clearly we had multiple aggrieved parties out in the public, in that instance members of the legal profession in respect of those statements. There is—

The SPEAKER: I think it was slightly different. I hesitate to interrupt the member for Bragg, but I think the action was to compel, was it not, the—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: To disclose my source.

The SPEAKER: —to disclose the member for Playford's sources.

Ms CHAPMAN: That was canvassed at the time, but there was also the question of defamation, on my recollection.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't think it was, actually.

Ms CHAPMAN: We all knew where the statement came from that the member for Playford read out.

An honourable member: Where was that?

Ms CHAPMAN: The issue was—

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, I won't put that on the *Hansard*, but I make the point that this is a privilege, the basis upon which the application failed and of which judgement was duly presented. I just say that, for your consideration, as to the question of whether there has been a breach of privilege, you have to be satisfied that other measures in the house are not open to remedying any concern about a statement that is made, apart from elections and the like; and, secondly, the wise words of McGee on the New Zealand procedural provision in relation to privilege.

So, whatever we are calling this kind of extra contribution, I hope that helps you in your deliberations. It is not a matter, I will just say in closing, for you to determine whether you consider the statement of the member for Heysen to be with or without merit—that is actually irrelevant. I would ask you to consider on the basis of the rest of the submissions and dismiss it.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Is that for speaking Latin in the house?

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

Mrs Vlahos interjecting:

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

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (20:46): Mr Speaker, I have been in this place for—

The Hon. P. Caica: Too long.

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

Mr WILLIAMS: —a little while and I do not think that I have experienced a matter which, in my opinion, is so serious for the consideration of yourself and possibly the house. This house enjoys rights which are enjoyed by very few parliaments in the Westminster system. When we elect the Speaker, from time to time, one of the first actions of the Speaker is to, with members of the house, go across the road to Government House and claim the rights and privileges of the house and those of the members.

One of those privileges enables us to come in here and, as the deputy leader said, without fear or favour, to represent our constituents—that is a very powerful tool. It is a very powerful tool and one which I think needs to be protected with every fibre that we can muster.

This morning, I was in my office and I heard the Deputy Premier make his plea to you. I thought, 'This is an interesting thing to occur today.' The member for Heysen, by my reckoning, made a statement to the house on the last Tuesday of sitting. Did it miss the Attorney-General's notice on the Wednesday and the Thursday of that week?

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The member had the opportunity to come to the house and, as he claims, he may have done the nice thing. But, sir, it interests me, not just on that level, but on another level. In my experience, the request to the Speaker to make a ruling that there is a prima facie case to answer with regard to privilege is made from somebody who does not enjoy the confidence of the house; that is, the opposition, or somebody representing a minor party.

Sir, the effect if you found in favour of the request of the Deputy Premier that there was a prima facie case to answer would be that the matter would then take precedence over government business. The very reason for bringing to the attention of the Speaker a case such as this is such that we can bring it on as a house and do what the house might do: establish a privileges committee, etc. That is only a necessary tactic from somebody who does not control the numbers in the house.

If the Deputy Premier believed that this was a serious matter and should be looked at by a privileges committee, why did he not move so this morning? Why did he go through the charade, sir, of bringing the matter to your attention and calling for you to make a ruling? A number of very strange things have happened here today; this is but one of them. I question the motive, but, sir, I urge you to think very carefully on what the outcome might be if the house decides to go down this path to a

destination unknown, because we may very well undo something which is, at least in my opinion, very important to this house. We may very well undo—

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is warned for the first time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for the second time.

Mr WILLIAMS: I think the member for Davenport made some extremely important points. May I add to that that some years ago, this house also went to the length to establish a process and a procedure to allow, for want of a better term, a 'stranger' who believed that they were defamed in the house to bring a statement to the house and seek redress through a right of reply. Sir, I put to you: what would be the purpose of establishing that process if we were not to retain the privilege of which the Deputy Premier complains?

The SPEAKER: I would like to wind it up now and make three points in reply. The practice of upper houses was cited to me. In my view, upper houses (federal and state) have become like the Wild West, and there are just no standards anymore. One can say absolutely anything in an upper house of parliament and not be contradicted by the presiding officer or by a privileges motion. This is particularly so in select committees.

The second thing is that back in 2005 the allegations proposed to be made by the Speaker were of such a nature that once made they could never be satisfactorily withdrawn; that is not the case here. Thirdly, I think it is preferable that the member for Heysen has now particularised those matters that form the substratum of what she says is fact, of her allegation that she considers the Electoral Commissioner 'utterly corrupt'.

We have reached a better place because of the member for Heysen particularising, because I do not know where the Electoral Commissioner would have started in making a right of reply available to a stranger on the basis of the member for Heysen's original allegation. Now the Electoral Commissioner has some substratum of fact that she can reply to. I will continue my deliberations on the matter and I thank everyone for their indulgence to argue that one out.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2014

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (20:55): I have spoken on a number of budget bills and supply bills in this place over my 12 years. Yet again, we are here to debate the future supply of, in this case, \$3,941 million for the first three months of the 2014-15 financial year. The size of the state budget is such that you are talking in the thousands of millions all the time. People find that amount of money very difficult to comprehend, but each of us in this place is obliged, by being elected to this place, to examine the budget in detail, to look at the reasons for granting supply and also to ensure that the government's use of taxpayers' money is being put to the very best use.

We all remember back on 15 July 2002 when the then treasurer said to this place, 'You do not have the moral fibre to go back on your promise. I have...' The then treasurer, Kevin Foley, was talking about the taxes on gaming machines. There had been a promise made about levels of taxation before the election and then the treasurer came in and changed that whole circumstance. What we saw was the treasurer trying to justify him going back on what the expectation was before the election.

This government has raised expectations on many occasions and has failed to deliver on just about all of them. A prime example is the infrastructure around South Australia. How many times have they said, 'This is the budget we are going to allow for this particular infrastructure project,' and the budget has been blown time after time. As the member for Kavel said, the most particular example we can point to at this stage is the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, where I think the original cost was \$1.8 billion and it is now about \$2.5 billion, and the cost will keep going up, I understand.

I will give one example of one of the cost blowouts with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and that is the cost of the quadruple glazing for around the helicopter pad, which I understand is \$30 million. That is an outstanding amount for soundproofing a particular area like that. We are all obliged to make sure that we are not wasting people's money or being frivolous with taxpayers' money. We should never come into this place, having raised the expectations, and then just doing an about face. Whether it is moral fibre, courage or discipline, or whether there is an urgency to change your attitude, then that should be the very rare exception rather than the rule.

What we see now is this government saying that we are going to have a really tough budget coming up and a very, very difficult time ahead of us. It is trying to blame the federal Liberal government for its woes, but let us have a look at what has happened to the state of the state over the last 12 years under this Labor government. The classic example is WorkCover. WorkCover started out with about a \$62 million deficit when we left government in 2002 and now it is well over a billion dollars. Who knows what the unfunded superannuation liability is. When you add in the government WorkCover unfunded liabilities, you are talking about billions and billions of dollars.

On the matter of the deficit and the debt that the government has run up, as the member for Heysen said, we are paying nearly \$3 million a day in interest on that debt. I think this is about what we were paying way back in the State Bank days, not to Belgian dentists now, as it was back then—I am not sure who we are paying the \$3 million a day to, to cover the debt that this government has accrued.

I should say that I understand that the federal government's interest bill on their debt is about \$30 million a day in interest alone; it is about \$1 billion a month in round figures, they tell me—and that is not paying off the capital of that debt; that is just the interest. The state interest debt is about \$3 million a day, over and over and over again. As the member for Heysen said, imagine what we could do in this state if we had that money to give to various projects around this state rather than paying it on interest.

I do not have any problem with paying interest on debts if it is good debt, if you are building the business. I used to run on a couple of principles in my business, and you have probably heard them in here before, that turnover is vanity and profit is sanity. You need to be making some profit. It does not matter whether you are turning over millions of dollars in your business, as a relative of mine was doing. In fact, he was spending more—his costs were higher than that—he was losing money, he was not making any profit, and he could not continue on in the business.

The other saying I have is that it does not matter what it costs you, it is what it saves you or makes you. I am more than happy to have large mortgages and, by gee, I have had large mortgages. I have bitten off big chunks and chewed like hell until I had a sore jaw, but you have to have the income to pay that capital, to pay that interest.

When you start paying your recurrent debts, as we know this government has been doing for many years now—according to the former member for Napier, the then minister for finance, who told a public meeting in Mount Gambier that, if this government was a business, it would be trading insolvent. The bank would not give them an overdraft, and they were borrowing to pay the wages. When you are in that situation, you are going down the gurgler fast.

What do we see this government doing? They say that they are going to build the economy by spending more money, spending more money, spending more money. If there is a return on an investment, if you are actually building the business, if you are building the economy, I could live with it, I could understand it, but I do not see that.

When you look at the ABS stats on what is happening in South Australia, what is happening with the businesses in South Australia, what is happening with the employment rate in South Australia, where this state is going, it is just atrocious. Let us look at some of the latest facts and figures about the state of the economy. You have heard other members in this place talking about similar statistics, but I will just go over some of them that have been brought to my attention.

According to the ABS figures in April 2014—so just gone—there are 18,000 fewer full-time jobs since the 2013 state budget. South Australia's jobless rate has risen from 4.8 to 6.3 per cent. I am not quite sure exactly what it is at the moment, but this was back in April. The national rate was about 5.8 per cent. There has been some change there, a slight improvement, I think, in the national rate. There may have even been a slight improvement in the state unemployment rate, but we are

still way down the bottom on a scale of the states. I think that we might be just above Tasmania in some areas. But now, with a Liberal government in Tasmania, you watch that state turn around; that state will put South Australia's economic performance to shame.

The need to focus on where we want to be in the future for jobs, for business, for the whole of the South Australian economy is something I encourage this government to look at very seriously and not just putting the political spin on that we are the biggest, we are the best, we have built the greatest. The hospital is the largest building that has been built in Australia for many years; in fact, it may be the largest building to have been built. It is like Adelaide Oval; technically, it is a wonderful building, but there is the cost to the state, the impact it is going to have on the economy of the state. The oval may bring in more sporting events, it may encourage a lot of people to go to the oval, and I hope that it is a success.

The problem with the hospital is that I do fear that, when you add in the nonclinical support contracts (that is, the cleaners, the cooks, the bottle washers and all those ancillary staff, the lift attendants, the lift operators and the car-park attendants), it is going to cost South Australian taxpayers a serious amount of money not for the next five or 10 years but for the next 30-plus years. It is going to be a real drain on the economy, and I really do worry about that. We all want the best hospital and health services, but you have to live within your means. We all want new shiny toys to play with but, if you cannot afford to buy them, you just cannot afford to buy them.

Going back to some of these statistics, the jobless numbers in South Australia have increased by 33 per cent since Labor promised 100,000 jobs, the worst performance in the nation and worse than Tasmania. Last year, SA's jobs growth was the worst in the nation, a trend decline of 1.5 per cent.

We heard the promise of 100,000 new jobs by the various Labor governments over the years but Labor must create 4,000 jobs a month to meet its promise and, so far, there are only 2,900 more jobs since that promise was made by the then premier Mike Rann how many years ago now? As for the youth unemployment, it is just a deplorable situation.

I have heard the federal government say, 'You've got to take any job.' I can say that I have taken just about any job that was out there. Members may have read comments today in some of the media where I was raising questions about the federal government's budget and taking any jobs, and I said, 'I have taken no jobs beneath me.' I remember earning very little money for sweeping out chicken sheds and sweeping up chicken poo, and I worked at trash and treasure. I have done lots of jobs which are quite unsavoury compared to the work we do now, but it is a job, and you do those jobs if you need to do those jobs.

When you have young people out there who cannot get a job because the jobs are not available, you have to ask: how do you overcome the situation? It is easy to say that they should be in learning or earning, but I will be speaking to my federal colleagues about this and I have some concerns about it. I know they are well-intentioned, and I have great faith in their ability to achieve a much better economic future for Australia than the former Rudd-Gillard governments ever did. Internet job vacancies in South Australia fell by 1.1 per cent in March 2014, the worst performance of all states. It is just an atrocious situation to be in.

In relation to economic ranking, according to the CommSec April 2014 economic ranking, South Australia generally is sixth or seventh on most of the key indicators. South Australia's jobless rate is up almost 28 per cent on the decade average level, the worst performance of all states. There are a whole lot of indicators—economic forecast, economic growth, state final demands, small business conditions, small business confidence, business investment, business competitiveness, business counters, minerals exploration spending, capital expenditure, retail sales and building works. South Australia is right down the bottom in a lot of these, or really struggling, or investment, sales and expenditure have decreased to levels that are completely unacceptable, and we do not see the future being really rosy.

We hear the state government blaming the federal government for the massive cuts, they are saying, to the federal spending. I remember having this argument with the then minister for police about the police budget cuts. The then minister for police was saying there were no budget cuts in the police budget in the future. I said, 'Yes, there are. There are massive cuts. You told them they were getting (I forget what the exact figures were) hundreds of millions of dollars over the forward estimates,' but then when we saw the budget come out they were still getting an increase each year

but it was not what we were told, and what the police were expecting was not being achieved. That is exactly what is happening now.

We have a federal government that has come into power, and they have only been there a matter of months after the Rudd-Gillard Labor government which just spent, spent, spent and did not put money into the forward estimates for many projects (such as the homelessness program) but raised all these false expectations of the rivers of gold continuing. That was never going to happen. They set the trap for an incoming government. How they would have dealt with it, I do not know, and I do not know how this state government is going to deal with the predicament they have created.

They have created the debt and the deficit. How are they going to deal with the future? They are going to be the ones inflicting the pain on South Australian taxpayers. They did it in 1993 when the State Bank failed as a result of their inability to manage the economy and to keep their eye on the ball and where various businesses, particularly state-run businesses, were going, and we are seeing it now. They have lost their ability to manage this economy.

Whether it is utility prices, taxes, levies or stamp duties, this government has just been raking it in, at what cost—at a great expense to small and medium enterprise businesses and some of the larger businesses that are just having to think about what they are going to do in the future. We have seen Holden's announce their closure. I understand that many of the businesses that were supplying Holden's were gearing up for this change, so they will continue to go on with alternative ventures.

The end of Holden's is very sad. I remember living at Hogarth Road, Elizabeth South in a housing trust house when I was a kid and watching them build the Holden's factory, so it has been part of my life for many, many years. It will be a sad reflection on the economy of South Australia that Holden's is no longer there, but it is not the federal government's fault. It is not completely the state government's fault—there are world factors here—but the state government could have done a lot more over the last 12 years to look to the future of large companies such as Holden's.

I want to move on to another area of government expenditure that I think is very important to each and every one of us in this place. There is no conflict of interest in my speaking about this, but we see areas of government expenditure that are of particular importance for all of us to look at and say, 'Do we really need to spend that money there?' I talk about the contract issued by the Department of Treasury and Finance for the provision of a one-stop shop for all travel management services, including booking of domestic, intrastate and interstate travel, international air travel and accommodation.

That is just the booking of it and not the paying of fees. It is for the associated travel service, such as arranging visas and the management of subscriptions, arranging corporate club memberships (not paying for them but just arranging them), for assistance with group bookings and conferences, for the management of travel and financial reporting tailored to agency requirements and the government analysis and advisory services of state government, the whole-of-government travel, including the travel of members of parliament.

This is a five-year contract for the management of the whole-of-government travel. What do you think it is worth—any guesses around this chamber? I will tell the house what it is worth: \$80 million a year to manage government travel over a five-year contract—\$80 million. That is a lot of money in anybody's language. Part of that is the management of the travel for members of parliament. I have used Carlson Wagonlit, the contractors at the moment, and I understand they still have this contract. They are a very reputable travel company. They are in 157 countries around the world and they have 22,000 employees. I have no issue with Carlson Wagonlit per se.

Having said that, I would much rather see this government using South Australian companies, such as Phil Hoffmann Travel down the Bay, which was, in 2013, Australia's best retail travel agency. They have many employees and are available 24/7. I implore this government to look at the spending on government travel, do what the federal parliament and the federal remuneration tribunal has done and put the travel for members of parliament into our salary package and allow us to manage it, allow us to do our bookings and to do what many people around the world are doing now—booking online, saving the fees and certainly saving some of this \$80 million.

It may not work for all government departments, but if members of parliament are allowed to book their own travel, we will get it much cheaper, see a lot more and do a lot more. We can take

whoever we choose with us, as long as we can explain ourselves to not only the tax department but also to our constituents.

It is the same as we do with the global budgets of our offices: as long as we can explain ourselves to our constituents and we are happy about that, that is what we should be doing with our global budgets. But, more importantly, in this case, instead of spending \$80 million on managing our travel, allow the intelligent people in this place and their very hard-working staff to manage our own travel, because I can guarantee that instead of spending hundreds of dollars on an airfare you can get it much cheaper if you go online and book it yourself. It is much easier.

We will be debating travel agencies' insurance legislation in this place shortly because most people are booking online. Let us look at what we are doing with the government's travel agency and at the way we are managing that and let us, as members of parliament, be responsible for our own actions. Put that travel into our salaries as part of the salary package and let us be responsible to our constituents and to the taxation department for how we spend that. Nobody thanks you for not spending it.

I tell all the new members of parliament: use your travel allowance, use it wisely, do the reports that are expected of you, do them diligently, and take with you whoever you like. If you want to take your partner, your wife, go for it, because I guarantee that they work just as hard as you do in this place. There would not be one member in this place who would begrudge their partner's contribution to their effort in this place. So, when it comes to saying that your wife or partner should not travel with you unless he or she is invited, then that is something about which there is a real argument.

If I can justify it to my constituents, if I can justify it to the taxation department, I should be able to do it. If I can save the taxpayers of South Australia thousands and thousands of dollars, in fact, some of this \$80 million here, then I think we should be allowed to do it. It is a false premise to say that we have to keep doing it the way that we have in the past. This is just one example of how in 2014—not 1914 or 1940 or 1980, this is 2014—we are a mouse click away from the rest of the world.

We have our new tablets so we can have every file that we have got in this place available with us all around the world. We never leave our offices any more, yet we still have to go through a travel agency like this. Let us book it online. Let us save the taxpayers some of this \$80 million. Carlson Wagonlit, if they have still got the contract, great; Phil Hoffman, if they have got it down at the Bay, even better for South Australia, even better for the Bay, but let us make sure that we do it fairly. Trust members of parliament to do it correctly because we will have to answer to our voters, we will have to answer to our constituents and I have no problem with doing that at all.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (21:15): As an avowed early riser and as someone whose business normally starts at 6am I normally do my best work before midday, but I will plough on deep into the evening tonight. This is actually the first bill I have risen to speak to in this place and it is a very scary piece of paper, to my mind; a single piece of paper that appropriates from the Consolidated Account to the government \$3.941 billion worth of revenue.

I understand that I am only a humble backbench first-term MP and in trying to understand what it is that this bill says I have summed it up as the following: 'We, the government, would like the parliament to allow us to spend \$3.941 billion of state money. We will spend it on what we said we would spend it on, except where we change our mind, in which case we will spend it on what we feel like, but at least you can trust us that we will not spend more than what we did last year.'

Now, I understand that this is being used as a mechanism for the fact that the budget will not be passed before the end of the financial year but, given my opportunity in this place we will certainly be supporting the motion but also providing caution and hopefully a sense of responsibility and advice to the government on the way that this money should be spent.

This government over recent weeks and during the election campaign before has come into this place talking about governing for all South Australians. As someone who stands here representing a regional area I can say that this is simply not the case. In fact, the backflips with which I have seen members opposite come and try and explain their various agreements with Independent MPs in this place and speak about an election result that meant that they, for the first time over the

life of this government, have had to recognise regional South Australia, I find quite politically opportunistic and very disingenuous to the regional communities in South Australia.

Regional South Australia is hurting. In my electorate, the Barossa and Schubert more specifically, we are hurting. With unemployment in the Barossa/Yorke/Mid-North area increasing from 5.6 to 9 per cent over the past 12 months, we are hurting. That is the equivalent of 1,900 more unemployed people in my electorate and the neighbouring areas to my electorate. We have seen very public and very real examples of this in recent months and in the last couple of years with job losses at Angas Park, job losses at Pernod Ricard, the closure of Linke Contracting, and the question mark over the future of the Penrice quarry in light of Penrice Soda being placed into administration.

There have been many hits that my community has taken with regard to very public increases in the unemployment level in our area, and we are hurting. In South Australia, youth unemployment sits at 27 per cent and in northern Adelaide it sits at 45 per cent and these areas tend to be feeder areas either for people coming up to work in my area or for people from my area going down to the northern suburbs to work, and this is a real indictment on our economy and on the people leading our economy and managing our economy.

Often in my community I am asked, 'Where is the hope? Where is the saving grace? Where is the positive news that we can take and hold onto so that we are able to progress forward with some level of confidence?' Unfortunately there is not much positive news that I can give them. South Australia will record a jobs decline this year of 1.3 per cent, almost double the jobs decline of 0.75 per cent that was forecast in the budget update.

South Australia's economic growth forecast in the budget update is up to three times more optimistic as the DAE forecasts in the forward estimates. It was .7 compared to 2.5. South Australia's economic growth is forecast to be up to four times slower than the national growth forecast in the forward estimates (.7 to 3.1) and, in 2012-13, SA was the only state to have recorded a decline in exports, and exports will continue to decline in each of the next two years. As someone whose local economy is focused on exports, I go back to my community and unfortunately do not have much positive news that I can bring.

However, worse than that, I cannot even tell my local community that this government is trying to help them. Schubert has been ignored by this state government. The Premier and the ministers opposite are happy to come to visit. In fact, I had the Minister for Agriculture in my electorate only this week. He was happy to have a visit, to be wined and dined, and we did have a beautiful lunch out past Angaston and it was a fantastic afternoon.

The minister was welcomed openly into my community but, as soon as we were finished, he was happy to drive back to Adelaide, ignore us, ignore any of the issues we brought up and was not able to give us anything concrete that he was doing to help our local community. There was nothing that we talked about that was in either the Labor Party's election platform or anything since that talks about local upgrades, nothing for rural health, including nothing for local dialysis and chemotherapy or indeed the need for a new hospital in the Barossa in the election platform or anything since.

At this point, I say that Schubert is very important to the state economy, and one of the most significant export industries is very much centred and based around my electorate. The wine industry in the Barossa processes 80,000 tonnes of local grapes each year, exports about \$120 million of Barossa branded wine in addition to \$200 million to \$300 million a year worth of domestic sales, and most of that is interstate. My electorate also processes fruit for other regions that gets turned into wine and exported both domestically interstate and also overseas. The wine industry contributes somewhere between 25 to 40 per cent directly of my local GSP. It is a huge industry in my local area, and it is hugely important for South Australia.

The tourism industry is the second biggest game in town and contributes over \$100 million. It is also very closely linked to the wine industry. The wine and tourism industry in my electorate is one of the key industries that this government looks to when it looks to promote our state, whether it be food from our clean green environment, which would obviously encompass the wine industry. The importance this government places on my local industries, but does not give back, gives rise, I think, to a very disingenuous government when it comes to offering things to my electorate.

Schubert is a very productive region. We pull our weight, and in fact most of the time we pull well above our weight; more than that, what we have learnt, especially over the past 12 years, is that

we need to just go off and do our own thing. We cannot wait for a government to turn around and give us a hand with anything, so we go off and we do it ourselves. In some senses I am very proud of that, but in other senses, especially as someone who stands in this place, I am very disappointed by the fact that this has to be true. All we ask in Schubert is that we get investment commensurate with the productivity and with the gains that we helped to deliver for the South Australian economy.

An investigation into the Labor Party's policy platform, such as it was, does not offer much concrete for regional South Australia in general. I can update the house on the exact moment that the government realised that something existed beyond metropolitan Adelaide. It would have been at about 8.30pm on 15 March when a hung parliament was looking likely and the member for Frome turned into a kingmaker.

Evidence of this hubris and evidence of the disingenuity of the government can be seen in the Address in Reply speeches that I had to sit through from the members for Colton, Newland and West Torrens. Each one of those three stood up here and berated members of the opposition about the fact that we ran a grassroots campaign across every single electorate in the state, which I believe is part of a political party that aims to govern for all South Australians that you would seek to win the votes of all South Australians. Those three members opposite especially in their Address in Reply speeches were all too happy to point out the folly of that electoral strategy and, by inference, were very pleased and chuffed that their 'Adelaide only' strategy worked.

The blatant way in which they talked about this 'Adelaide only' marginal seats strategy confirms that they do not care about the people who do not vote for them. So, when they come into this place and talk about being here to govern for all South Australians, it is simply not the case. The words of the members opposite mean the same as what I am intending. They do not care about what is in the best interests of South Australia. What they are very clear in saying is that they will do whatever will keep the Labor Party in power, and if that is ignoring regional South Australia then so be it.

Can I say that, after the election result, I do applaud member for Frome for helping this government to see that there is a South Australia beyond the city limits, but his agreement falls short. He is very proud of the \$39 million he has been able to extract from this government for regional South Australia. I say to the member for Frome, 'I see your \$39 million and I raise you \$139 million,' commitments that the Liberal Party gave over the forward estimates in the lead-up to this last election campaign—\$139 million. That is \$100 million in excess of what he was able to secure. To the member for Frome I would say, 'Mate, I think you need to go back and renegotiate.'

Unfortunately, the deal that was done last week will see the influence the member for Frome has in this parliament diminish. The member for Waite has now essentially given the government an out. I look forward to the member for Frome actually delivering on the commitments he has been able to secure. However, what I unfortunately cannot look forward to is a situation where we can work with the member for Frome to actually deliver more for regional South Australia, which is a commitment he has given during the numerous times he has been in my electorate, and the commitment he has given to me to work together to get more things done for regional SA.

Even today, the Premier's response during question time was that they are taking heed of the election result and that the trigger, being the election result, was the reason they decided to look beyond the Adelaide metro limits into regional South Australia. However, I would contend that regional South Australia is worthwhile in its own right. Regional South Australia has 29.5 per cent of the state's population; that is over 490,000 people. Regional South Australia also has 25.4 per cent of the state's economy; that is over \$20 billion—25.4 per cent. I would have considered that normally a state government would not ignore 25 per cent of its own economy.

The regions—and this is the real kicker for me—supply over 50 per cent of the exports that come from South Australia. The regions are responsible for over 50 per cent of the state's exports. Again, we have heard much deliberation from the members opposite about the fact that in order to grow the economy we need to become more export-focused economy. I would say that the export-focused economy has always been there in regional South Australia; it just took 12 years for the members opposite to realise that it is worth investing in. If we talk about trying to find hope for the South Australian economy, much of that hope and much of that recovery can be found by investing in the regions because we are productive, we are efficient, and we can deliver good returns on investment.

The Labor Party will use the recent federal budget to deflect from the mess of its own making in South Australia. So many members opposite in their Address in Reply speech, and in other speeches to this house—in grieves and so on—I believe, show that they think they are in the federal parliament. I rise to say that you are in the state parliament of South Australia, that you are the government of South Australia. You need to start acting like it, and you need to start taking responsibility for the decisions of the government of South Australia and stop pretending that you are part of the federal Labor Party opposition in Canberra.

The Labor Party is scheduled to cut, of its own accord, \$230 million from the education budget over the forward estimates. The state Labor Party is scheduled to cut \$1.033 billion from the health budget over the forward estimates. The state Labor Party is scheduled to cut \$150 million from the police budget over the forward estimates. None of this has anything to do with the federal government. None of this has anything to do with the federal budget. This has everything to do with the South Australian government, a government that needs to take responsibility for its own decisions.

As a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition here in the state parliament, we must ensure that the people of South Australia are reminded of this, and reminded of this often, that the comments of members opposite that deflect to the federal budget cannot be left ignored. This government, in power for 12 years, is lying in bed of its own making. There have been six deficits in seven years, and in the only year that they were not in deficit, in 2010, there was a great extra GST kicker from the federal government and a record \$14 billion debt. The failure of this government has been its inability to assess the opportunity cost of its decisions. A \$14 billion debt means \$1 billion a year in interest. That is about \$3 million a day in interest, and I would like to detail to the house some things that could be done with \$3 million a day, if that debt had not been racked up over the last 12 years.

With 12 or 13 days' worth of interest payments we could have built a Barossa hospital, something that has been talked about for 20 to 25 years, that has been necessary for 20 to 25 years, to replace a facility that celebrated its 100th birthday a number of years ago. A new facility is needed, and 12 or 13 days is all we ask for. A couple of weeks' worth of interest could seal and reseal the worst roads in Schubert: the Daveyston to Freeling road, the Rosedale Road, Moculta to Keyneton, Stelzer Road, to name merely a few.

Only one to two days of the interest repayments could be used to fund the construction of the Barossa Grand Cellar that has been proposed by the Barons of Barossa. Only one or two days of interest repayments could fund a new multipurpose recreational centre for Freeling, and give the town a new space for the community to come together and engage. A mere 13 days of interest repayments could deliver the south-eastern link road that the member for Light has been championing but that he has not been able to deliver for the last decade, only 13 days. Opportunity cost is something I think members opposite need to learn about and understand so that we can actually deliver some better outcomes outside of metropolitan Adelaide.

The state of our South Australian economy has been well canvassed in this place, the superlatives used about how bad things are: the highest-taxing state in Australia, the slowest-growing state in Australia, the largest increase in jobless numbers in Australia. Quite frankly, it is depressing. Instead I would like to talk about a number of leading indicators, to talk a bit about the future and see if there is some hope, but here in South Australia we have the lowest level of internet job vacancies in the nation, population growth of only 0.9 per cent (half the national rate and the lowest on the mainland), a 36 per cent decrease in venture capital investing companies, which is the worst of all the states, and a 15 per cent increase in the number of insolvencies in 2013, again, the worst of all the states.

While the current system shows systemic signs of weakness, it is the leading indicators that worry me most. The leading indicators tell me that the issues we have are not a thing of the past; they are a thing of the present and, unfortunately I think, of our future. I ask: where is the confidence and where is the hope? Where are the indicators that the business community can cling to in order to start talking up our economy, in order to start investing in our economy and helping to create the turnaround we have now been waiting for for quite a long time?

There is much that we can do to restore confidence, and we must restore confidence if businesses are to invest. I think the first way we can give our economy—and especially our larger employing businesses—confidence is to deal with the vexed issue of WorkCover. In my maiden

speech I talked about fixing the fundamentals; it is the best way to bring confidence to our economy and give confidence to our business community. The NAB business report released in March shows that our small to medium businesses have the worst business conditions on the mainland.

We can fix this. If we are truly to get South Australia back on track, our commitment to fixing the fundamentals cannot waver, and the first cab off the rank is WorkCover. To give a bit of a lesson about where we are at the moment, our average levy rate is at 2.75 per cent. That compares with a 1.76 per cent average across the nation, and, even though our scheme is the most expensive in the nation, it is still only 67 per cent funded compared with a 112 per cent national average. WorkCover has been nominated by the government for reform to help give savings to the South Australian economy. On that score I applaud the government, and look forward to seeing the bill introduced into this place to finally start to redress some of the fundamental issues that our economy has in order to help restore confidence to South Australia and, indeed, to our business community.

In my last couple of minutes I would like to talk about education, and the fact that we have some very poor NAPLAN results here: in 19 out of the 20 categories South Australia is below the national average; there has been no progress in 18 out of the 20 categories since 2008; and the worst results in six out of the 20 categories, including years 3 and 5 numeracy and year 5 reading. On that score, I can say that the importance of improving literacy and numeracy skills here in South Australia is, again, another thing that we can do to help strengthen the South Australian economy.

From a recent Productivity Commission report into literacy and numeracy, can I say that if this government, through better education outcomes, was able to increase literacy and numeracy by one skill level, the increased likelihood of employment would be between 2.4 and 4.3 percentage points for men and women respectively.

An increase in literacy and numeracy skills is associated with a similar increase in the probability of employment, whether a person had a degree, diploma/certificate or year 12 education. An increase in literacy and numeracy by one skill level is associated with about a 10 per cent increase in wages for both men and women. Again, that is a second area that the government could look at that would help improve the fundamentals of the South Australian economy and help us to restore confidence and get us back on the right track.

In closing, I would say that I am reluctant to support the bill as it stands before us because I think it amounts to a blank cheque, which makes me very uncomfortable. Having said that, I will reserve judgement on the future of this government and on the way the budget is handed down and look forward to seeing some of these fundamentals.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (21:36): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2014 and, as has been indicated by other speakers, this is to approve the provision for funding largely to pay our hard-working public servants and to ensure that the operations of government continue pending consideration of the budget and the legislation to support that. Essentially we are being asked to provide for and give permission to the government to draw from its reserves up to nearly \$4 billion to undertake that task. I will support the bill.

There are a few matters I would like to touch on in relation to the situation that we currently face, and that is the substantial debt that this government has run up in the last 12 years, a continuing of what appears to be a fiscally irresponsible approach to the budgeting of the government and the consequences of that. My contribution tonight will address the personal and direct consequences of that behaviour, and that is that we now face a very significant exodus of the brightest, smartest, sharpest, most talented and energetic of our younger generation from the state.

Last night I gave the David Tonkin Memorial Scholarship Award to Sarah Abell. She is a 17 year old from Seymour College. She qualifies for consideration for her own academic, sporting, cultural, artistic, debating and community service achievements and being someone who either lives in or attends a school in my electorate and is aged between 16 and 18 years. She is an exceptional young woman and I think she has a huge future.

She told me that she proposes to undertake a commerce degree in the first instance at a Melbourne University next year. That is a great disappointment to me, and I think it should be to the eternal shame of those who are in office to enable a situation such as this: where one of our brightest young people—whose parents have lived in South Australia, invested in their children, made

provision for a private education for their daughter and a very significant contribution to her upbringing—leaves this state, along with many others.

In the last 12 years some 35,000 people (net migration) have left this state. Some go and some come back, but many go and do not come back, and that is that net 35,000 in the last 12 years who have left South Australia. I think that is a waste and a shocking loss of resource, of human capital, from the state.

The population growth that we have in South Australia, for a number of reasons, is about half the national average; it is less than 1 per cent. At the moment our children are having less than their replacement. We have a situation where, fortunately, we have a positive and more sympathetic consideration in migration as a place of destination so we do attract some extra allocation in that regard. However, the loss of South Australians born and bred, particularly our young, is shameful and it is a major problem.

It is particularly a problem because we have a very significant economic challenge. Many other speakers have raised these matters but it is clear to say that we have a big problem in generating overall income for South Australia. Unless we get serious about generating greater income opportunities—that is, income into our state, not what we spend on each other or not what we might circle around in South Australia—to grow our state we have to have investment from outside of the state. People do not come and just drop money into South Australia but if they buy our products and services or they invest money here in the expectation that there is a return for them we have a chance to grow that economy.

Not surprisingly, a number of speakers have spoken about the loss of talent from the state and the very parlous situation we have in respect of jobs or job security. I do not think we need to remind ourselves of the importance of the value of work. We do not need to have lectures about it. We understand the significance of this for social cohesion, financial independence, self-worth—all of those matters which are significant. However, we now have a situation where we have a very high level of unemployment, particularly with our youth. We heard from the government in 2010 a promise that within six years we would have 100,000 extra jobs—new jobs they say. We are now four years down the track and we are going to need some 4,400 jobs a month just to meet that promise. Unfortunately, there have only been 2,900 new jobs since the Premier made that promise. We know that the promises they are making are not being delivered, quite clearly.

They allocated funding in the address of the Governor for a commitment to understand the significance of increasing our export income, to make provision for these jobs, to maintain the social cohesion in our state, to maintain some economic viability for the state—all of which, unfortunately, is going to evaporate to naught if we do not actually have it applied.

We have moved in South Australia from a time when our leader was born (in the late 1960s) from being the third most significant state in the country—the third most significant state economically in the country. Brisbane in Queensland was a bit of a bush town; in Western Australia it was before they were digging up iron ore. We were a serious player. We had been significant in the last 100 years in contributing to the development of our constitutions, in the development of our economy and we were a serious player at the federal table. I am ashamed to see that South Australia is now, in an economic sense, below Tasmania. That is a situation that just cannot continue if we are to have an environment that is not going to result in even more of our children leaving. That is a very serious situation.

I can say that one of the most concerning aspects of the budget, because we have seen now so many in this parliament, is that there is going to be a failure to address the expenditure side and there will be a failure to provide a contribution sufficient to inflate the income side. I see a very disappointing aspect to that which is going to come and that is going to have some very serious human consequences. What I ask the government to do is this: in whatever time we might have in having any influence whatsoever, they address in this year's budget for once a direction of funding towards things that are going to create income and that are going to support us having some economic growth. Unless they do that, we will have a very grim future for our children.

In doing that, I ask them to address the questions when they spend very big money—usually about \$1 billion a year out of our current state government budget of around \$16 billion a year—that they ensure that what they build is going to have an economic return. It is not unreasonable to say that any piece of infrastructure—even a footbridge over the Torrens—has some benefit. It might have

some social benefit. It helps people get out of the grounds of the new stadium; they could walk down King William Street or they could walk over a footbridge. That is not to say that it is not a bad thing but there has to be some prioritising of the funds that are allocated in this year's budget.

Obviously, already, as a result of commitments of state and federal governments in announcements that have been made, the Prime Minister has maintained a commitment to the completion of the north-south corridor. That is significant. The state government has made some statements in that regard. I applaud that because we really must deal with what is clearly an area of infrastructure build which will have some productivity associated with it. The business cases are now confirming that, and we have a commitment from governments to progress it, but it does concern me that they make announcements on other projects without consideration of their having an economic value to support further productivity.

I would also ask the government to understand one fundamental area that I think they have ignored—they seemed to touch on it in this year's Address in Reply—and that is that they understand the significance of exports. I am a great believer in identifying what we do well and committing to do more of it. We do great things in South Australia and our economy is very much cemented in what we catch, what we grow and what we dig up. The recognition of those who reside in metropolitan Adelaide or major regional towns needs to be expanded further to appreciate the significance that over half our economy is generated outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide and that it is significant to understand that, in respect of our exports, that is where we have an opportunity to develop it further.

My spending more money at the Burnside shopping centre might help some retailers, but it will not generate more income for South Australia. It is very important to understand that. If the government gets that through the cabinet's collective skulls then we have some chance of ensuring that our funding from our budget as a state parliament, which we are going to be asked to approve, will be effective. If they do not do that, if they do not understand and recognise the importance of our primary agricultural and fishing industries, for example, and of course mining, then we have no hope.

I will not go into the detail of those because there is one other important matter that I want to address tonight. Today the parliament received the Ombudsman's report titled 'An audit of state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act' and it is a very concerning report. I have said in this chamber on a number of occasions that I am concerned about the government's conduct in not being responsible in ensuring that there is an open and transparent approach to the government.

I have spoken before of my concerns about ministers and particularly about the Premier who, over the different portfolios I have watched him in, has become almost a control freak in respect of the centralisation of power. There are a number of areas that I have raised in that regard. I and, I am sure, other members of the parliament receive correspondence from concerned members of the public, some of them in the employ of the government—that is, in the Public Service—who are terrified at letting anyone know that they have raised an issue of concern or that they have raised an issue of concern with members of the government and that there has been no action and they come to seek our assistance. I am sure that Labor and Liberal members of the parliament outside of the government ministers are often in this category. It is not exclusive to our side of the house. When you have a situation where the population is responding in a fearful manner to the way that the government is operating, that is of great concern to me.

No more evident of the government's dismissal of concern about the general public was when it announced that it would dismiss, or discontinue the contracts of, Mr Rod Hook and Mr Fred Hansen. I do not want to make any comment tonight about whether I think they were good employees or bad employees. They were in senior positions in the government. They held very significant areas of responsibility that they were contracted to oversee. They were both appointed by the government. They were not anywhere near the conclusion of their contracts and they were dismissed.

If the government had any respect whatsoever for South Australians, it would explain to the people of South Australia why it will put the taxpayers to hundreds of thousands of dollars of expense just to pay out these contracts. If it had good reason to dismiss them, and there was good reason to say to the public of South Australia, 'Look, we are going to pay out these contracts; we are going to put in acting personnel. It is going to be quite an expensive process, but we are justified in doing that for these reasons,' the public at least could make some assessment.

But no, it does not even tell the public why it has done that. It does not even answer to the public, the public whom it expects to pay for the termination arrangements for these people. That is the height of arrogance of a government that has no respect for the people it is supposed to be serving. I think that is a disgrace. It concerns me as I pick up today's report from the Ombudsman, who has done an audit on state government departments' implementation of FOIs.

Most members, if they have not done so already, will learn in the time that they are here that there is a Freedom of Information Act and it makes provision for ensuring that the public has access to information held by governments. That information is a resource of the public, not something to be hidden away by governments and the act protects the public's right to have access to it. That is central to the functioning of an opportunity for the public to know what its government is doing and to be able to participate in the democratic process.

This report outlines a number of recommendations as a result of interviewing a number of the personnel in each of the government departments to consider how that is being actually implemented. Members would be familiar with this process. You put in an application for a document. There are appointed freedom of information officers within each agency and within each department. They have to follow a certain process and, except for protection against statutory protected interests, that information is to be made available.

Very significantly, the Ombudsman makes the finding that the policies and statements of government about having a proactive release of documents has been timely, relevant and necessary. The Ombudsman makes a finding that in fact there is a disconnect between these initiatives and the act, and the audit generally found it to be the agency's approach to information disclosure under the act.

One of the other aspects that the audit revealed, which I think is shameful, is that in interviewing the freedom of information officers particularly, under the process where the documents are identified and sent to the minister's office for them to review whether there ought to be any other consideration for the documents not to be released, for example, for the determination of the freedom of information office to be varied or changed, and that is to be done through a timely process, this is what the Ombudsman found:

- it is common practice across all of the agencies to provide copies of FOI applications, determinations (draft or otherwise) and documents to their Minister to 'get the green light' prior to finalisation of access requests. While the Act permits a Minister to direct their agency's determination, evidence provided to the audit strongly suggests that ministerial or political influence is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers, and that FOI officers may have been pressured to change their determinations in particular instances. If a ministerial decision or direction is involved, it should be clearly set out in the agencies' determinations.

It goes on to say:

- the agencies' Chief Executives are not providing FOI or pro-information disclosure leadership.

This is not only a damning indictment of the senior leadership, but an assertion that there is political interference with the process of freedom of information, so much so that the Ombudsman recommends that there should be penalties and, under recommendation 26, that there should be offences included in the act to be created for improperly directing or influencing a decision or determination made under the act. I urge all members to read this, to appreciate how serious it is and to ensure that we have the recommendations translated into legislation so that we can have at least some opportunity to have access to secret government information.

Time expired.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (21:56): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 10pm.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that seconded?

Mr GARDNER: Ma'am, that sounds like a tremendous idea, but earlier you drew our attention to standing order 131; therefore, under 131(2), I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question before the house is that the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 10pm.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2014

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (21:58): I need to note the speech given by the leader tonight, which I thought was one of his finer moments since the house has come back after the election. He covered a multitude of issues in detail and, indeed, excelled himself on the floor of the house in his address regarding the Supply Bill.

Where this state is going, or where it is not going, to be more precise, really worries me. It has been discussed by members on this side of the house tonight; there seems to be a singular lack of effort to have government members speak on this. It is particularly interesting to me that we are now termed the 'rust bucket' mainland state in Australia.

Today, an electrical company went bust, and it just so happens that my son-in-law was employed by that electrical company, working on the Berri Hospital. I do not know where that will all end up. Fortunately, he is interstate actually, with my daughter and family, looking for work in Western Australia because they see no future in South Australia whatsoever. They just want out. They want to go somewhere where it is positive, where there is some hope for the future, where things have been put in place by the government (in this case, Western Australia) to promote growth and to actually keep that state pumping. Whereas here, it is a sad indictment on this government of 12 years that South Australia is dying—it is dying.

Members opposite can stand up and talk about, if they wish to, how well things are going here and how well things are going there; well, the reality is they are not. If I just use my electorate as an example, they are not going well in my electorate. Even in the town of Victor Harbor, a city of 14,000, there are businesses struggling to survive. They cannot afford the wage bills, even though they have a number of visitors come down from Adelaide to spend the weekend. They are still struggling, and the economy down there is not doing all that marvellously. Neither is it at Yankalilla-Normanville. They are survivors and they will keep going.

That is on the mainland side of my electorate. Kangaroo Island is a basket case—it is an absolute basket case, with something like 89 houses for sale, and very little property turning over. Once again, it is a sad indictment on what this government of 12 years has done to South Australia, and more to the point, what it has not done to foster the private sector and the small business sector.

Also, since we have been back—and we anticipated this—the South Australian government has only seen fit to bag the federal Coalition government and blame them for all their ills. At the risk of being repetitive, I have not heard the names Rudd or Gillard mentioned in here from the other side since we got back, and I am not likely to. Just bear in mind who created the mess. We have heard the Minister for Health, the Treasurer, the Premier and others criticise the current federal government for our problems here now. Well, I say: absolute rubbish.

When the state is paying over \$2 million—I think it is \$2.6 million—a day in interest, it does not augur too well for the future, does it? That is, in much greater terms, what the federal government has been landed with in Canberra. If you dissect what the federal government have done, they have not actually created all these terrible evils as some on the Labor side, the Greens side, etc., would like to have you believe. They have not done that by long stretch of the imagination, and they should be commended for taking action over the long term which will create a surplus in the federal budget and get Australia back in the position where she deserves to be, which is one of the powerhouse economies of the Western world.

Much of that is longstanding but has been progressively crippled by completely incompetent management by the former federal Labor government. It seems to me that there is a complete lack of will and a complete lack of skill by this current state government to actually grapple with the problems in the state and sort them out. We wait with bated breath for the budget to be handed down on 19 June, and we have had snippets of what may be coming, such as the cutting of hospital beds, etc. Fantastic, absolutely fantastic—what an incompetent mob of fools.

As I said, we have an inexperienced Treasurer who I believe will get caught out very badly in the long term, and I do not know what they are going to do then. Perhaps Mr Malinauskas and the member for Playford may go and tap somebody else on the shoulder and say, 'Well, this hasn't worked too well. We might have to have another experience with Don Farrell.' Perhaps they can bring Don Farrell in. Hang on, I do not think Don Farrell wants to come here, actually.

It is of enormous concern, when you look at the ministry in South Australia, of what is just not there, quite frankly. The fact that there is little or no business experience—in fact, it would be fair to say there is probably none. I enjoyed it when the former minister for finance, Michael O'Brien, was in the chair, because you could actually have a discussion with Michael O'Brien over particular issues relating to finance and he had enough business nous—

Ms Chapman: At least he could read a balance sheet.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, he didn't need an abacus like someone might. He could understand the technicalities and the finances of the departments that were under his control, and he actually used to do something about it. It is probably fair to say that not everything went his way—printing contracts and whatnot—but maybe he was scuttled from inside on a number of those things. I found with Michael O'Brien that, if there was an issue where constituents of mine were getting delayed payments from government authorities or government agencies, a quick call to Michael or a chat in the corridor and it would be fixed very quickly, but that seems to have gone by the board.

In the last couple of weeks I have had a constituent who did some work on a school down on the south coast who has been waiting weeks, if not months, to get paid. It is simply not good enough. In private industry, you have to pay wages on time, just like the Public Service has to get paid every couple of weeks or whenever it is. You have to pay all your dues and taxes, but you have to have the money coming in. I think it is absolutely unbelievable that government departments withhold payment to private companies in South Australia that are doing the right thing and just want their good honest money for a good honest day's work, a week's work or whatever.

I have mentioned before in this place about where local government is at. I do not believe that this current government has the wherewithal to do anything about the rates issue. They do not seem to want to know about it. The subject of CEO salaries and rate rises has been in *The Advertiser*. Many councils in the local government sector are still putting up their rates 5 to 6 per cent at a time when CPI is around 3 per cent or whatever it happens to be at the given time when they set their rates. I believe it is inappropriate. I completely believe that it is inappropriate and something should be done about it.

It is no good the local government sector whinging that they are having everything thrust on them from state and federal governments. They actually need to learn to live within their means, to cut their cloth to fit their suit and to get over it. They need to get over it. I believe it is entirely unfair on the ratepayers of South Australia, who are also the taxpayers, to have to go on wearing rate increases of 5 or 6 per cent year after year after year, and the minister of the day—in this case the member for Frome, who is there now—doing nothing about it.

Unfortunately, the member for Frome has been politically emasculated by the events of last week and he is no longer anywhere near as relevant as he was in the last sitting week in this place. Given that we now have a quisling in the house—for those of you who wonder what I talk about, Major Quisling was in the Norwegian army in the lead-up to World War II and he decided to side with the Nazis when they invaded Norway and was given the senior role as Prime Minister, I think it was, of Norway. He thought he had backed the right mob. He went over to them, and he was caught out badly because, as we all know, the forces of evil fell over, the forces of good prevailed, and the Norwegian people, after World War II, summarily executed Quisling. It might be a salient lesson for a couple, actually. We might have to—

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Point of order. I think that I am understanding that there is an accusation that a member of the house is essentially a Nazi. I know that it is late at night, but it is a pretty distasteful suggestion if that is the case.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a distasteful suggestion, and the Chair is listening to the debate very, very carefully.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, ma'am. To be clear, it would be a distasteful suggestion if it was the case, but I am not sure that is, in fact, what the member said.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is what I just said. So, there is no point of order. The member for Finnis.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. No, that is exactly right; it was nothing to do with that. The fact of the matter is that Major Quisling went over to the Nazis, who happened to be in charge of Germany at the time, as you may recall, although you probably don't, because you probably weren't around, and neither was I. But that is the simple fact of the matter. All traitors come to grief in good time.

I heard the member for Bragg speak a few minutes ago about exports. Exports have been the great saviour of this state and, if it was not for that sector outside the metropolitan area, I do not know where we would have been. If we had not had a couple of reasonable seasons on the land, I do not know where we would have been. Of course, mining, although somewhat embryonic, is certainly assisting South Australia in regard to those exports.

Let me say that I would like to see someone as the minister for primary industry who knew something about primary industry. I do not think that it serves our purpose any good whatsoever with the minister for primary industry standing up in this place with his mates in the Greens railing against GM crops. The GM crop issue has been debated loud and long, and it will be for some time to come. It went down like an absolute lead balloon in my electorate, I can tell you. Why the minister even chose to go there leaves me scratching my head. It did not serve any useful purpose and, as I have said, to line up with the Greens and other left-wing people out there was not all that smart.

Exports have been the great saviour of South Australia for a long, long time. Indeed, copper, early in the piece, was a great saviour of South Australia. It had its ups and downs. When we were ship building at Whyalla, for example, what a great industry that was. That has gone to the keeper; that does not happen anymore.

We have the capacity to enhance our primary production sector considerably, and let me refer again to the fishing industry. Why on earth would you want to cut off the hand that feeds you? We in Australia, this nation of just over 20 million people, produce enough food a year to feed 70 million people around the world. It is not a bad effort, yet these lunatics in the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources and those who supposedly direct them want to wipe out large sectors of the fishing industry. It is absolutely crazy. The other states must be laughing themselves sick.

At least the federal government had the nous to get in there and say, 'Right, we're going to revisit the federal marine parks, start again and get some common sense back into this argument.' It would be a great thing if the commonwealth could take over the state waters and rip this outfit into gear here as well. For the life of me, I was completely frustrated by the pitiful attempts of the Premier in the last sitting week, trying to make excuses for the marine parks in South Australia.

What an absolute load of codswallop—and then to say that John Howard was the architect. Well, the architect of the marine parks legislation, the original people who brought it into South Australia, was the Liberal Party. Indeed, I believe that it was the member for Davenport who brought forward the idea. It should have been done properly and it has not been.

We are going to do huge damage to the fishing industry. I may be wrong, but I think we have one professional fisherman in the Victor Harbor area now. They have just all gone. They have given up. Where we used to have a processing factory on Kangaroo Island under the late Nigel Buick, that is all gone. SAFCOL was fantastic: it employed people. That has all been buried. It is a tragedy for South Australia that the incumbents in government for the last 12 years have slowly buried the private sector and, for some bizarre reason, decided to push these things downhill.

I referred earlier to the member for Frome and the member for Waite, and this is what I have found in this place since we have come back. I used to get on pretty well with most people in this place. There are have been a couple on either side now and then who no-one really trusted, or whatever, but that is life. But I find now there is an absolute toxic air in the parliament building between many members. I think that is unfortunate. That is sad. It was never like that in the last parliament, but it is toxic in here now. You can feel the despising and lack of trust between members, and that is most unfortunate.

On this side of the chamber, we are actually getting on pretty well, I can tell you. We are getting on really well. That might come as a bit of a rude shock to the other side, but we are getting on particularly well. The toxic atmosphere that is now present in here—and probably in the other place as well, given the events of a couple of weeks ago, with everyone airing their dirty linen in public, so to speak, up there—I really think needs to change. I put a lot of the blame on the incumbent ministry and the Premier for that. Their scruples leave a fair bit to be desired, let me say that. It is unfortunate.

I look back to members who were in this place, even when they were at their noisiest, loudest, most belligerent selves—people like Mike Rann, Patrick Conlon and Kevin Foley. You could go and have a giggle or a laugh with them afterwards. That just does not happen any more, and that is sad. It is unfortunate. You used to be able to go out and have a cup of tea or coffee, or a beer or whatever, with them, but that has all gone.

The toxicity that exists in this place now I do not believe is going to go away for a fair while. That has been aided and abetted by events in the other place a couple of weeks ago and it has been aided and abetted by the events of the last week. I believe it is a sad indictment on where the parliament is going and it needs to be addressed. Madam Deputy Speaker, with those few words, I resume my seat.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (22:18): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. Just the other day, I came across a quote which I thought was quite appropriate for the Supply Bill, and it reads as follows:

The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled, and the assistance to foreign lands should be curtailed lest Rome become bankrupt. People must again learn to work, instead of living on public assistance. Cicero, 55 BC.

It is quite apt because over 2,069 years later we find ourselves in a very similar situation and it appears that we have learnt very little in that period of time. In terms of my region, that is, the South-East of South Australia, which is obviously a very productive region, we were faced with the forward sale of the forestry assets. I want to talk a little bit about that tonight because it is not just a bad deal for the residents and local community of the South-East. It was a terrible deal for the people of South Australia.

The reason I say it was a terrible deal is contained in the next little bit. ForestrySA was generating \$44 million a year in pure profit to the state coffers every year—so, year in, year out, \$44 million in pure profit. In selling the asset, an asset worth over \$1 billion to our state (that was its book value), the government sold it for \$670 million—just a little bit over half the book value. What it could have done, and what has been argued long and hard, was go to any commercial bank in the world and said, 'Listen, we've got an asset worth \$1 billion; it's generating \$44 million a year pure profit. We would like a loan because we want to build a stadium in Adelaide, and we want to bring football back to the CBD of Adelaide.'

If they had gone to any commercial bank in the world, they would have given you a loan based on the asset value of \$1 billion. So, you would have had your \$670 million to build Adelaide Oval and attract football back into the CBD. But, no, instead of doing that this government decided to sell the asset for 100 years. So, instead of a return to the state of \$44 million a year, we now have zero. On top of that, the state government still pumps in \$8 million to \$9 million a year to prop up the wages for ForestrySA. The turnaround for revenue for this state has not dropped by just \$44 million: it has actually dropped by \$52 million with the added input going back into it.

Any bank would have given you a loan over 30 years, and \$44 million over 30 years is \$1.3 billion, so it would have been paid off within the 30-year life span of that loan. Instead of having it back in our control within my lifetime, it is unlikely that it will be back inside our control in my grandkids' lifetime. This is a terrible deal for South Australia, a terrible deal for the people of South Australia and our state.

Not only have we lost an asset that generated pure profit for the state but we had a mechanism that, with a few financial smarts and a few people who knew what they were doing, could have achieved the same result. It could have built Adelaide Oval, because that was important to the government of the time, and paid off the asset over 30 years just based on the profit it was generating, without any further efficiencies. That is the situation we faced. Instead of that, it will be 100 years until those assets come back into our control, 100 years of lost opportunity—absolutely disgraceful!

Not only that, but we are starting to see job losses. When the forest was sold, the community was not against supporting the government in what they wanted to do. The community was concerned with three primary things: massive exports (so China inadvertently would be buying the forest via exports), massive job losses, and, of course, a reduction in fire services. Eighteen months to two years on, we are seeing the impact of this dreadful decision on the people of the South-East and the confidence that was ripped out of my community for the sake of an Adelaide Oval, which everybody in the CBD seems to enjoy and get a great deal of benefit from.

Quite rightly, there is a lot of anger in my community over this, not necessarily because it was sold, but because we had an opportunity to have it back in our control within 30 years, but, no, we decided to let it go for 100 years. I hope that my grandkids get to see the asset come back into government control; I severely doubt that, but I sincerely hope it does happen.

The other important point I want to put on the record tonight (and this has been spoken about, but nobody in the government has picked it up)—and I implore the Minister for Forests to understand this point—is that if they allow the intellectual property of ForestrySA to be transferred to OneFortyOne, the deal is over, the game is finished.

They can go to any provider and get the forests managed, and if they own that intellectual property, and not ForestrySA, it puts us in a very dangerous position. That is a critical point we need the government to understand. This intellectual property was built up over 100 years of ForestrySA. If it is given away, the deal is done. It will not be 60 job losses, as we are seeing at the moment, it will be all the jobs in the region. They will go to the lowest bidder. They have the intellectual property, they have the charts, the forward rotation estimates, and the graphs which show plantation rates, clearing rates, the whole lot. The game is over. We must ensure that ForestrySA is the owner of that intellectual property, not OneFortyOne. That is a very important point that I cannot stress strongly enough.

I can accept now that the forests are gone for 100 years; commercial deals have been done. It could have been done in 30 years and repaid and that \$44 million kept coming back into our coffers. Those 60 job losses we are seeing at the moment did not have to happen. I accept all of that is going to happen, but I implore the government to take this one note out of my speech tonight: the intellectual property has to stay with ForestrySA, otherwise we are stuffed. My community has taken a big knock in confidence. We are rebuilding, times are looking up, but the state is the loser. The state does not have that \$44 million coming back into its budget, and it could have.

In terms of manufacturing, what we are seeing at the moment obviously is that job losses are occurring. If you talk to sawmillers at the moment, and you talk to anybody in my region, you will see log truck after log truck after log truck—and I will say it one more time—after log truck driving out of Mount Gambier and into the port of Portland. Nearly every log that can be harvested and shipped over is being harvested and shipped over, so in a way the Chinese and Asian markets are buying the forest and taking it with them. This is disgraceful for our region, disgraceful for our sawmillers.

The point I want to make here is that we talk manufacturing, we talk value-adding, and they are beautiful words. We want to value-add, we want to manufacture in this state because this is where the jobs are, this is where we claim the GST, this is where we keep the revenue. Yet, here is a prime example of raw product being cut down, shipped out to Portland and we do not collect anything off it. We do not even collect the shipping rates off it because the Victorian government claims those. Here we are, we have manufacturers (we call them sawmillers, but for general terms let us call them manufacturers) wanting to produce product in my community that is starved of the raw product because the spot price is so much better over at the port of Portland.

If you think I am making this up, have a look at what is happening to New Zealand. Have a look at how their mill operators are operating over there when they are totally dependent on a spot price for the export market. Mill after mill is closing. Mill after mill is getting rid of their full-time

workforce and putting on casuals. Why? Because when the spot price is down the mill will fire up. When the spot price is up, the mill will shut down and those people are out of work. That cannot happen in my region. That cannot happen in this state, and I would think a Labor government that believes in jobs, and so do I, that believes in looking after the workforce, and so do I, will have to work together to make sure that that does not happen in our region because again the game will be over.

In terms of other products related to timber, we have an amazing opportunity. With a little bit of investment, we could be the national institute for research and development in timber products. I openly say to my timber millers that the future does not lie necessarily with them. Their technology is getting to a point where cutting timber to planks or 4x2 is reaching its optimum level. They are getting as much recovery as they can. The future of the timber industry lies in innovation and technology. The future of timber relies on nanotechnology.

I was reading a review from Finland the other day on a process over there where they can replicate polystyrene in a wood-based product. Think about how much packaging is shipped around the world at the moment in polystyrene, which is toxic to the environment, a petrochemical offshoot. If we could replace that with a wood fibre based replica that has all the properties of polystyrene that can do the job but biodegrade in our environment, that is where the future of the timber industry is in the South-East. That technology needs investment. We have the ability with some federal help to be the national centre for research and development in timber or fibre or nanotechnology, whichever you want to call it. That is where the future lies. That is what I am passionate about.

Mount Gambier is a unique place and it throws up some unique individuals as well. It is a unique place because it is not reliant on Adelaide. It has its own water supply, it has its own transport companies, it has a size about it which means that it can be self-sufficient to a degree. It does not need to be dependent on the state, it does not need to be dependent on other communities like Adelaide. It can be self-sufficient. An investment in nanotechnology or an institute down in the South-East is where our future lies. It is more likely to happen because we already have economy of scale. We have a large surrounding population with all the transport and infrastructure needed.

One issue that came up during the election campaign is an intersection on Penola Road and Wireless Road. It has been highlighted by the RAA as the most dangerous intersection in regional South Australia. If any ministers or members of the opposition want to come down, you are always welcome in my electorate.

An honourable member: The government.

Mr BELL: Yes, we are the opposition—in government, thank you. If any members who are opposite to me in government want to come down, I would welcome the opportunity and I will take you through the intersection. I will guarantee that you will hold onto the door handle like there is no tomorrow because it is out and out dangerous. I have committed to my electorate that I will do everything I can to find a solution to that intersection, whether it be traffic lights, a roundabout, I do not care.

My conscience will not rest if somebody gets killed on my watch on that intersection. I will never forgive myself because it is the most dangerous intersection in regional South Australia. It has been an ongoing sore point for 10 years, not one or two years, not a quick fix for an election, not an election promise, but for 10 years. That is disgraceful. I need help. We need to work together to make that happen and I will be doing everything in my power to do that.

In terms of our community, we have a rich and diverse community. We have characters of all sorts. We have people who just roll their sleeves up and get into it and have a go. Believe it or not, they do not want money from the government. Well, actually that is not true. Some of them want money from the government. But what they really want is for the government to get out the way so that they can get on with doing what they want to do. I will give you an example to do with the drains. I met a great farmer down there, Mr Paltridge, and his farm borders the Eight Mile Creek Drain which has not been dredged or drained in over 10 years, so at the moment his property floods from about this time—and I was down there two weeks ago and it was completely flooded—right through until about September.

We are not talking about one or two acres; we are talking about hundreds of acres—hundreds of acres of lost productivity, hundreds of acres of lost opportunity. When I go to the Minister

for Water, his response is: 'We've got \$2 million for the drains; it's going to cost \$7 million. You need to raise a levy.' I can tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that trying to impose a levy on the farmers of the South-East in these tough economic times is not going to be an easy task and it is something that, on the record, I will not support.

The drains are there for a reason. They were being maintained adequately for many years, and now they are not. The only reason that it keeps getting thrown up time and again is that there is no money. We need to work together to find a way through. Unfortunately, there was \$6 million and it has now been reduced to \$2 million, but I suggest that the money is there; it is just not a priority of this government.

I would like to spend two seconds talking about Peter's Project. Peter's Project is a project based in Warrnambool that deals with people who are suffering from cancer. It was instigated by the wife of a man who had suffered from cancer quite late in his life. Eight or nine of the last 20 weeks of his life, from when he was diagnosed, were spent in Melbourne. The impact it had on the quality of his life and the impact on his family during his last 20 weeks were quite extraordinary. From that, his wife, Vicki Jellie, organised a group and started fundraising for a cancer centre. They have received \$15 million from the state government, \$10 million from the federal government, and the community has raised \$5 million, and that was their commitment to it.

A small community like Warrnambool being able to raise \$30 million for a cancer treatment centre is to me the epitome of what true collaboration can do, and I am talking about collaboration between the federal government, the state government and the community. When a community buys into a project like that great things can happen. That is where I would like to be pitching some of my ideas and where I would like to seek support from the government in working together with the federal government, the state government and, of course, our local community.

For too long many people in the South-East have had to travel to Adelaide or Melbourne for cancer treatment, and it is a time, in a very critical part of their lives, when they are away from family and their loved ones, and in the final days, I could not imagine being in a worse place than away from your family (I am not saying the Adelaide is the worst place). They are just some ideas, and I thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for the opportunity to speak.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (22:38): What a disappointment to be speaking on the Supply Bill from this side of the house.

Mr Picton interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, one thing that has come to my attention—and I get the jibes from those on the other side, and, I must admit, if I was sitting in their shoes I would be doing the same—is that there is nothing better than to be on a sure winner, and these guys are on a sure winner. I make that comment because since 1989 there have been seven elections in South Australia, and, do you know what, Madam Deputy Speaker? The people of South Australia, in six of those seven elections, have not wanted a Labor government. They have not wanted a Labor budget, they have not wanted—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —the supply—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind all members of standing order 142, and I remind all members that interjections are out of order and responding to interjections is out of order. I ask that the member for MacKillop be able continue his comments in silence from the rest of the house.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker; a very sound ruling. The people of South Australia do not want a budget delivered by a Labor government. They did not want it in 1989, they did not want it in 1993, they did not want it in 1997, they did not want it in 2002. Lo and behold, in 2006 they accepted a Labor government, but in 2010 and 2014 they wanted to get rid of this lot, and for very, very good reason. It is interesting that the people of South Australia are of sound mind and are quite wise, and in recent history six times out of seven they have rejected the policies put forward by Labor. Yet members opposite say 'Ha ha ha aargh, and you're over there again.' Well, the reality is—

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I do a good pirate. I left my parrot at home.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not ruling on 'aargh'.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Deputy Speaker, what the members on the other side do not care about is the will of the people of South Australia; they do not care about the will of the people of South Australia. The will of the people of South Australia is that 53 per cent of the people of South Australia said 'We do not want another budget brought down by this lot.'

I was at a seminar a week and a half ago given by Associate Professor Haydon Manning on the most recent election. After he had given his address someone asked a question, and in response one of the things he said was that the Liberal Party, notwithstanding the fact that it did not increase its vote, did not increase it enough to win the election. Well, there is a door that has been opened. I happened to get the next question, and I said 'Professor Manning, I was really interested in your comment. What vote do you think the Liberal Party would have to achieve to win government, if 53 per cent is not enough? How many of the people of South Australia do you think need to reject a Labor government before we actually get a change?' There was no answer forthcoming to that particular question.

The reality is that we have a system here in South Australia that rejects the will of the people. That is a very dangerous system. It is a gerrymander. Members of this house will, I am sure, remember the situation that occurred in Queensland 20 years ago. Those opposite would say that that was an outrageous situation. Let me put to the house that the situation in South Australia today is far more outrageous than ever existed in Queensland.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: 'Ha ha' they say. Go and look at it, my friends; it is more difficult for the people of South Australia to get rid of the Labor government than it ever was for the people of Queensland to get a Labor government. Go and look at the numbers; they do not lie. Yet the Deputy Premier would say 'But that is just based on two-party preferred vote numbers, and that really does not exist. It is a mathematical construct.' Why was it that premier Frank Walsh, in 1962, was able to claim that he had a mandate—notwithstanding that he could not form government—from the people? Why was it that former Labor leader and premier Don Dunstan was able to successfully prosecute a case over many, many years to change the electoral system in South Australia?

In 1968 the Labor Party lost an election inasmuch as they did not win enough seats to form government, notwithstanding the fact that they received a two-party popular vote not dissimilar to what the Liberal Party received back on 15 March, and that infuriated the people of South Australia.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Point of order of relevance: about 1968 not really having a lot to do with what we are here to discuss.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are listening and we are hoping that it will come back to something more relevant. The supply debate is a wide-ranging debate. The member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker; another wise ruling. The reality is that the member has not been here all that long and would have us believe that he is all knowing. The relevance is that the people of South Australia had their opportunity to speak, and they have spoken, yet they are thwarted by a system which corrupts their will. That is the reality. If we had even a half decent electoral system in South Australia, you would expect a group that won 53 per cent of the vote would be in government and providing the budget for this state. That is the context in which I make those remarks.

At the election campaign the government ran the line that they were re-building South Australia and this was providing jobs. Let me look at the most recent budget, because I remember standing in this place and making the claim to former treasurer Foley, the former member for Port Adelaide. I used to say to him, 'You're just a borrow-and-spend treasurer.' Anybody can go out and borrow and spend. There is no real skill involved in that; anybody can do it. The skill comes in managing a budget in a sustainable way and spending the money on something which is going to bring benefit to the future of the state.

When I look at the budget, if I go back to the year 2008-09—and again I am delving back into history a bit, but that is the context of the situation we find ourselves in—the net borrowings or net lending, as it is called in the budget, is \$1.456 billion. So in that particular year there was a net

operating balance of minus \$207 million even after we had borrowed \$1.456 billion, and we still had a deficit of \$207 million—hardly what I would call prudent budgetary management.

The next year, 2009-10, lo and behold, was an election year. In March 2010 there was an election. Lo and behold, we had a budget credit, a budget surplus of \$636 million. How did we do that? We did not borrow \$1.4 billion. We borrowed \$1.7 billion. We borrowed \$1,725,000,000 to bring down a budget surplus of \$636 million.

The following year, 2010-11, we had a surplus of \$21 million. How did we achieve that? It must have been a good turnaround. No, no, no, we borrowed \$1.898 billion, almost \$2 billion of borrowing, and we had a surplus of \$21 million.

Mr Treloar: Smoke and mirrors.

Mr WILLIAMS: Smoke and mirrors—a hell of a lot more—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not going to respond to an interjection, are you?

Mr WILLIAMS: No, absolutely not, Madam Deputy Speaker. In 2011-12 we were back into deficit budgeting—only \$41 million. I can see why we could not balance the books that year—we only borrowed \$1.4 billion; \$1,424 million of borrowings, and we still managed to spend \$41 million more than we had in revenues. There is a pattern developing here, but it gets worse: the next year (2012-13) the financial year finished less than 12 months ago, a budget deficit of \$1.313 billion. Oh, dear, we only borrowed \$1,295 million that year. That is not much; we could have done a lot better than that.

The next year (the current financial year) we are looking at a deficit of \$1,148 million. That is on the back of a borrowing in the current financial year of \$1,771 million. It gets worse: next year (the last budget predicted) in 2014-15 we would have a deficit of \$576 million but we will only borrow \$260 million. Wow! Because the government went to the most recent election trying to say that we are on top of the problem. But the year after, 2015-16—this is getting to when the new Royal Adelaide is going to come onto the books and the government wants to show that it is on top of the game, 'Oh, we'll have a surplus of \$222 million. How fantastic will that be?' Whoops, we will have to borrow \$2,342 million to achieve that—\$2,342 million of borrowings.

The state of South Australia is rapidly going bankrupt. That is the cold, hard reality. No wonder the people of South Australia rejected this government. No wonder the people of South Australia four years ago rejected this government. The people of South Australia are quite smart; they know that this lot are useless; they know that they are hopeless and they know that they are driving them broke.

They know that those sitting opposite do not give a damn. In a couple of years' time they will swan off into retirement with their pension, and who will pick up the bill? The hardworking mums and dads of South Australia. They are the people who will pick up the bill and that is why they rejected this lot four years ago; that is why they rejected this lot a couple of months ago. That is why those very people are saying, 'What the hell can we do? What's going wrong? Why can't we get rid of this lot?' That is why they are saying that.

South Australia is in a very unfortunate position. We have been a mendicant state for far too long. We receive, and have for many years, about \$1.30 in GST payments for every dollar that is paid by citizens in South Australia to the GST, through horizontal fiscal equalisation. The Premier complains that other Premiers are saying, 'Let's change the way we redistribute the GST.' I have to say that I have some problems with the argument that we put forward.

I really have some problems, because our argument is, 'Look, we have no fiscal responsibility. We don't control our expenditure. Our revenues are falling because we've destroyed the capacity of the private sector to operate in this state, yet we want you to keep handing us money.' I can understand premiers in other states getting a little bit angry about that. I just hope that they hold off for long enough until we actually get a decent government in South Australia and we show the rest of this nation what we can do, because we can do it, but we cannot do it under a Labor government, because they have no damn idea.

I heard my colleague the member for Mount Gambier, and thank God he is in this place. We had an Independent down there a few years ago who said he was fighting for the local community and the government made him the minister for forests. He sat at the cabinet table and the cabinet

took a decision to sell the forests. That did the people of the South-East a lot of good. I invite every member of the government to drive down to Portland over the border in Victoria and have a look at the wharf and see what is there ready to be shipped out: giant stacks of timber, giant stacks of whole log, which used to be processed in South Australia.

They used to provide jobs. They used to provide value-adding in the community represented by myself and the member from Mount Gambier. They are now shipped out. Why? Because this government took a fire-sale price for a very valuable asset that had been built up over more than a hundred years. We did not owe anything on the asset. It was providing important jobs and we flogged it off at a fire-sale price and now we see the whole logs shipped out and we have the minister standing up here today saying, 'No, no the timber industry is really going gangbusters.'

It is going gangbusters. I talk to people in the logging industry and they have never had it so good. Do you know why? Because every tree that can be felled is carted down to Portland and put on a ship and shipped off to China or Korea. They are flat out carting logs out of South Australia, logs that used to be processed in and around Mount Gambier, Tarpeena and Nangwarry. It is going out of South Australia, and this lot on the other side of the house would have us believe that they are interested in jobs.

Go down to Nangwarry where there are barely any timber worker jobs left. Walk around Mount Gambier where hundreds and hundreds of people have lost their jobs in the timber industry and explain to them the sense of flogging off an asset with, as the member for Mount Gambier explained, a book value of over \$1 billion for a little over half that. Explain to them why all those logs are being carted down to Portland and shipped overseas. It is disappointing that I have run out of time because there are many more things I would like to talk about.

Time expired.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (22:58): I rise today to speak on the Supply Bill and note that we are authorising the appropriation of \$3.94 billion for the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of this state for the financial year ending 30 June 2014. We will be supporting this as a matter of course so that the state can function until the budget is brought down later this month. This allows me to outline some of the truths about the overall state of South Australia's finances and, much like the member for MacKillop, I will be running through a few numbers just to get things clear.

Under Labor, SA's debt has grown from just over \$3 billion 12 years ago to almost \$14 billion now. That is an increase of \$11 billion or \$11,000 million. It can be argued that in this state you need to carry some debt, but surely if you are going to have a debt like this, an amount like this, you want to be growing in key areas of economic prosperity, but sadly we are not here in South Australia, and that is a big concern for all South Australians. South Australia lags behind the rest of the states in Australia in so many areas. We sit fifth and sixth in so many key economic indicators released by respected institute CommSec.

I would like to use a sporting analogy here to put in context how dire the situation is for South Australia. I would like to talk about economy in football terms—why not? I would like to talk about the State of Origin scene. It was not that long ago, and I know those opposite would remember. A few of them might be too young, but I know there are a couple there who are old enough to remember State of Origin football. South Australia played against Victoria, and we would have great battles with the big V. In fact, South Australia loved nothing more than beating the big V. That was in sport, and that was across the board. It gave South Australia great pride to be able to mix it with the best, and in particular to mix it with Victoria.

Economically now it is a totally different ball game. In fact, we are not even on the same playing field as Victoria these days. We have been relegated to the second tier competition and we are playing against Tasmania—that's right, Tasmania. In economic terms, Tasmania has just taken a mark 25 metres out directly in front and they are lining up for goal. When they kick this goal, they are going to go to the front, and that is the problem we have. We used to play the big V and now we are in the second tier comp, tackling Tasmania.

That is where the Weatherill state Labor government has positioned us. The Weatherill Labor government has led our South Australian team to a position where we look likely to be beaten by Tasmania. The South Australia I remember, the South Australia I want to be, should be back in the

top division taking on the big players, and to my mind we should start knocking off Victoria again when and where we can.

The question is: why is South Australia performing so badly economically? I am getting off football now. I have mentioned the debilitating death that the Weatherill government has imposed on this state, and that is the start. The Premier and his team are not kicking any goals at all. They are not doing anything to bring sustainable growth to our economy and what is more, they are blaming everyone else, especially the federal government. They are blaming everyone else and anyone else, and they are taking no responsibility for their own poor performance.

The facts are that the state Labor government's poor management of South Australia's finances has us playing in the second division these days and it is its uncontrolled spending that has us performing so badly in so many of those key economic indicators. The state Labor government has delivered six deficit budgets in the past seven years—that's right; six deficit budgets. It promises surplus budgets every time, but only once did it deliver a surplus and that was in 2010, when it received over \$1 billion in handouts from their mates Julia Gillard and Kevin Rudd in Canberra. It was a massive gift and they still fell short of their promised budget figure.

Six deficit budgets in seven years: SA Labor just cannot balance the books and that is the worry. They have no control of spending, and it is a major concern. In 2013-14 they promised a \$480 million surplus and they actually produced a \$1 billion deficit—a \$1,000 million deficit. That is almost a \$1.5 billion miss. That is like taking a shot at goal and putting the ball out in the full and off the planet. That is not a little bit wrong; that is not a little overspend; that is alarming, and South Australia should be worried.

What happens when there is so much reckless spending, when there is so much overspend? Labor just cannot help themselves. They recklessly throw the credit card at everything and think that is the solution, but this Weatherill government continues to rack up debt, and they are thinking about how they are going to pay it back. I am not sure, but even they must understand that money goes out and money has to come in. If billions keep going out, then you have to get more coming in or you get into very big financial trouble.

That is where they have put this state in trouble. As I said, they have struggled to get the balance right. I stress again, after promising a surplus budget for the last seven years, only once have they delivered, and in 2012-13 they missed their mark by more than \$1 billion both times. They missed the mark by more than \$1 billion. It fascinates me, it staggers me and it staggers those out there in the community as well.

This is a monstrous blowout—two years in a row. If you missed your budget by that much in business, you would not last long, but we let these guys get away with it. If Labor had delivered on what they had promised, our state would be \$5.5 billion better off. Imagine what we could do with that money.

A lot could be bought in South Australia with \$5,500 million. Just imagine the projects we could be investing in. A \$5.5 billion error in seven years of budgets is inexcusable. Do not worry, though; they know. They are well aware, and that is why they pass the buck. They are doing everything they can to avoid taking responsibility for their shameful mismanagement of our economy.

You will hear them blame the federal government. In fact, you probably have over the past little while—buck passing at its best. Remember, it is the state Labor government that has produced the six deficit budgets in the past seven years—no-one else, them—and they are the ones who have racked up the state debt. The Premier cannot hide from that fact and neither can his team.

This passion for overspending by the state Labor team leads us to taxes. We know Labor are good at moving money out of the state budget coffers. I have outlined the recent multibillion dollar deficits. The Premier and his team have no worries there. They can shuffle the money out, but how will they go about bringing the money in?

That brings us to the Labor Party's love of taxes. Payroll tax is one. This is a tax that is crippling business in this state. It is killing off incentive for people looking to start or looking to grow their business in SA. It is a tax on jobs. With all the overspend by the state Labor government, they love payroll tax. That is what is crippling businesses: all the taxes here in South Australia.

Land tax is another that puts people off moving or investing in SA—another tax that Labor loves. They have got to pay for their overspend somehow. Do not start me on the proposed car park tax; that is just another money grabbing exercise for the Weatherill Labor government to try to take more money out of the pockets of South Australians to fix up their 12 years of financial mismanagement of the South Australian economy.

History shows that SA Labor has had 12 years of spending our money. Remember, the state debt has risen by almost \$11 billion in that time but, even with all the excessive spending, there has been no growth in economic prosperity. The only growth we have seen under SA Labor over 12 years has been in the cost of living that hurts families and hurts businesses. These are factors that prevent growth and economic prosperity.

Electricity prices are up more than 150 per cent after 12 years of state Labor. Gas prices are up more than 130 per cent after 12 years of state Labor. Water prices are up—wait for it—more than 225 per cent after 12 years of state Labor. State taxes are up 92 per cent—the highest in the nation. CPI is up 40 per cent. They are the cost of living factors that are hurting all South Australians. Everyone in South Australia is feeling the pain of these rises, and it all stems back to mismanagement of the state's finances by Premier Weatherill and his team.

These imposts hurting families also hurt businesses as well. Higher electricity, gas and water prices deter so many businesses from starting up or expanding here in South Australia. The member for MacKillop has just talked about it in the South-East, as did the member for Mount Gambier. Businesses are doing it tough down there, and they are doing it tough right across South Australia, because of those imposts that are slowing up opportunities, slowing up families and slowing up businesses. They want to grow and want to expand in South Australia, but they cannot. Those imposts are in place because of the overspend by this state Labor government.

At worst, we need to create a level playing field with the rest of the country. Under this state Labor government, business in South Australia has been competing with the handbrake on. Only last month, *The Advertiser* described South Australia's retail environment as 'anti-business, uncompetitive, inefficient, over-regulated, overtaxed and out of touch with economic reality'. They are words that we just cannot have associated with South Australia as we go forward.

Gilmour's Comfort Shoes reported to the Productivity Commission that, 'It is easier to start up a business in the US than it is in Adelaide.' They have businesses in other major capital cities here in Australia, but that is what they are saying. Those opposite me have to start listening to what business is saying.

It has been said before, but I have got close friends who experienced it last weekend. They were in town for the footy. The Crows beat the Suns in the early game on a Sunday afternoon. They wanted to go for a drink and a bite to eat in the city. The cafes and the restaurants were closed. I do not know what business does not want to make money when it is there to be made, but clearly the environment is not right. Even with a \$600 million investment in the new Adelaide Oval, this government has failed to create an environment that allows businesses to flourish.

Why and how do these businesses not open up on a weekend when there are people in town? The only thing you can put your finger on is the cost of doing business. That is why they do not open: there is nothing in it for them; in fact, they have a loss if they open on the weekend. That is something this government has to look at. They must create a better environment for businesses to operate here in South Australia.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: We put 50,000 people past their business every week.

Mr WINGARD: This state Labor government just does not agree. They do not get it; they do not understand. You can put them all by, but if they do not want to go in—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: If it's not worth their while opening, it is not worth their while opening.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: They have got to understand that if it is not worth their while opening, it is not worth their while opening.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind the members present that it is out of order to interject and it is out of order—I am on my feet, which means you sit down—

Mr WINGARD: Sorry.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: —to respond to interjections. I remind you all of standing order 142 and that it is getting very late at night and we only have a little while longer to go, so let's finish off on a really good note. Member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD: My apologies, Deputy Speaker, it is—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Be quiet.

Mr WINGARD: —just very obvious that if it does not stack up, it does not stack up. If it is not worth opening, if it is going to cost you money to run your business, why would you open? You cannot just keep handing it back. You cannot keep handing it back, and those opposite have got to work it out. You have—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: You've got no idea—no idea.

Mr WINGARD: —to create a business environment that people can work in. You would argue that if people do not get that—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to call the minister to order, I am afraid.

Mr WINGARD: If those opposite do not get that, they do not understand business, and it is becoming very evident right here, right now. This state Labor government has created a negative spiral for business in South Australia, and it is continuing to spiral downwards and further downwards, pushing South Australia's business confidence to some of the lowest levels in the nation.

I know when I speak to people in my electorate and we talk about South Australia's economy, it is not sexy, but the fact is that people must be made aware of what is going on. The facts are that South Australia has been held back for too long and they have to be moved forward and moved out of the second division. It is now SA versus Tasmania; no longer do we talk about us taking on the Big V.

The mismanagement of the economy by this government has also had an impact on employment. People want opportunities to help themselves, and under this Labor government these opportunities have dried up all over the state. While doorknocking and talking to people at supermarkets and around the electorate of Mitchell, that is what they tell me: they want opportunities to work and they want opportunities to grow.

It is hitting hard in Adelaide's south and in my electorate, where unemployment is steadily rising because of the lack of opportunities. Unemployment has grown from 4.2 per cent to 7.9 per cent in the past 12 months. Youth unemployment has risen to almost 15 per cent. What does the future hold for young people? What does the Weatherill Labor government offer young people of the future generation?

SA apprentice and trainee completions were the worst performing in Australia, with SA apprentice and trainee commencements slumping by 50 per cent in the past 12 months. The sum of \$15 million has been cut out of the Skills for All training budget, and a further \$15 million will come from other saving measures by the state Labor government. They will start to blame other people, but history shows that it is their debt; they have racked it up, they have to pay for it. That is a fact.

The Premier is just happy to watch on as the next generation withers on the vine. They have the debt, they are burdened with the debt, and they are going to have to pay the debt, but none of these opportunities is being presented. Again, the next generation will not even know of the rivalry we had with the Big V. They will not even know of the rivalry we had with Victoria because they will never get to play them; they will be too busy playing against Tasmania.

What you will hear over the next few weeks, if you have not already, is the state Labor team, as I said, blaming everyone for the financial mess they have put South Australia in. The Treasurer is blaming the federal government at every opportunity for South Australia's rising state debt, when

the reality is that the largest deficit budgets for SA came when the Rudd-Gillard Labor government was calling the shots in Canberra.

Labor state, Labor federal, and the deficit across two years was almost \$2 billion. Whose fault is that? I will tell you: it was the state Labor Premier's and his team. Do not be fooled by the rhetoric you will hear from the Premier and his team; they are the masters of polly tricks, not politics. They will push the blame and accept no responsibility for their 12 years of financial mismanagement.

The Weatherill Labor government is trying to hide the fact that late last year they asked the education department CEO to cut \$230 million from his budget—a fact that CEO Mr Tony Harrison admitted on FIVEaa radio late last year. That is nearly a quarter of a billion dollars that is being cut out of the education budget here in South Australia. The SA Labor Party is cutting a quarter of a billion dollars out of the education budget to cover its mismanagement, and the blame will be put on the feds. The deficit is from before.

There is also a billion dollars in cuts to health. The Premier himself confirmed this on radio just last month. The Premier and the health minister have their knives out and they are cutting the health budget by \$1 billion, again to cover their long-running mismanagement of the budget.

There is \$150 million coming out of SA Police, but watch them dodge and weave when they are confronted about this. Again, they will blame the feds because of their poor mismanagement, and it has been going on for a long time—12 years. You cannot cover up 12 years of mismanagement. They take no responsibility and they blame others.

They want to have a crack at us when the member for MacKillop talks about the Electoral Commission and perhaps some changes that could be made there. They say that we have to take responsibility for our own actions, yet when we talk about the 12 years of debt and deficit from this government they want to dodge and weave, and pass the buck to the feds. It astounds me.

They have also tried to be tricky when it comes to the Public Service and they have tried to blame everyone else, but they are planning to cut there as well. The Public Service has grown by 20,000 full-time employees over the 10 years of the state Labor government, and even the state Labor government is worried about the growth being out of control. That appeared to be backed up by the Treasurer today when he refused to rule out closing down Service SA centres across the state, so it is alarming and it is concerning.

We also look at other factors that come to bear in this: we talk about people wanting to be in this state and opportunities being here in this state. That is what people keep telling me they want. They want opportunities to be able to perform and compete on a level playing field with everyone across the nation.

When it does not stack up to open their business on a weekend, when the numbers do not stack up to be able to turn a profit because of the poor economic situation and the poor business conditions that are created by the highest state taxes and the most debilitating conditions to do business in the country, it has to be looked at by those opposite. They have to understand that businesses want to survive. They want to work. They want opportunities, but they are not being given them by the government of the day, and the state Labor government must take responsibility for that.

With that comes net interstate migration and, over the course of this Labor government, net interstate migration is at 33,000 over the 12 years of this government. People want to leave. They do not want to stay. The opportunities are not here. It is alarming. It is worrying. I have children and I deal with a lot of kids through coaching footy, young people who are now becoming adults, and you see it every day: opportunities are not there for them. It is concerning, alarming and worrying. We must go to battle for these people. We must go to battle for the younger generation. We are leaving them with debt and no opportunity.

At some stage we have to draw a line in the sand and say, 'We are giving you a fair playing field. We are giving you a level playing field. We are giving you the ability to take on the big V again, and mix it up with the Victorians, the New South Welshmen and the Queenslanders.' At the moment, as I said, Tasmania is where we are playing, and Tasmania are lining up to kick that goal and go in front of South Australia.

We cannot accept it. We have to stop it and we have to work harder to create opportunities for businesses, for people and for young people to get ahead. They want opportunities to work, to

create more for this state and move South Australia forward. In closing, while I support the Supply Bill, I do not support the waste of this state Labor government. It is hurting the state and it is hurting the future prosperity of our young people and businesses alike.

Time expired.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (23:18): I rise, too, late this evening to support the Supply Bill. I will not be using the sporting analogies that the member for Mitchell has.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: It was a very good analogy at the time though. We have had lots of contributions from this side. I would particularly like to congratulate our leader, the member for Dunstan, on his speech. He stood on his feet for two hours this afternoon and did an outstanding job highlighting the shortcomings of this government and also the problems that we are confronting with regard to the budget in this state. Of course, the Supply Bill asks for an extra \$3.94 billion to ensure that the operations of government continue. As was alluded to earlier today, a big part of that, of course, is to pay wages.

There are essentially no strings attached to this funding. Convention dictates that it is agreed to by this house and, of course, we support that convention and support the Supply Bill. What we do not support, and it was announced by our leader today, is the car park tax; we will be opposing that when it is before us in this parliament. It is yet another hit on business, yet another hit on the CBD, and I think goes against the government's stated aim of a vibrant city centre.

This is the fifth Supply Bill that I have made a contribution on, and it is always a good opportunity, I think, to outline some of the funding priorities for my electorate, the electorate of Flinders and, of course, as all of the speakers from this side have done, also to highlight the government's deficiencies, of which there are many.

Sadly, as I have gone back through my speeches on the Supply Bill 2010, when I was first elected, 2011, 2012 and 2013—of course, we have been in opposition all that time—I have realised that the funding priorities remain the same and that the government's deficiencies remain the same because, of course, it is the same Labor government that we have had to endure since 2002.

I have spoken previously in this place and will continue to speak about the lack of investment in infrastructure right across the state but also in the seat of Flinders—roads, in particular. Obviously, the RAA has identified a \$400 million road maintenance backlog. This leaves some of our country roads, some of our prime freight routes, in a desperation situation. In fact, it is holding back our industries and the efficient and safe movement of freight right across this state, right across this nation. This country rides on the back of a truck. If the freight task fails, this state's economy fails completely.

I have talked about the lack of investment into the ports on Eyre Peninsula, particularly the Port of Thevenard, where it has been highlighted for a long time the deficiency, the lack of depth and the lack of ability for that port to service effectively the grain industry, the salt industry, the gypsum industry and the mineral sands industry. We make do. We have one belt on the wharf at the Port of Thevenard, and it is simply inadequate to progress those industries any further than where they are.

The power infrastructure on Eyre Peninsula is desperately in need of investment; it is barely adequate to meet current demand. In fact, there are fish processing facilities in Port Lincoln within sight of the wind farm at Cathedral Rocks which are unable to access any greater supply of power, so much so that they are restricted in the amount of refrigeration they can run in their business. It is a ridiculous situation.

I have talked about the Tod Highway, and it has been my primary focus as far as roads go on Eyre Peninsula. It is a state road. In particular, I highlight the 100 or so kilometres between Karkoo and Kyancutta and the dangerous nature of that road due to its lack of width. The government department assures me that it meets all safety requirements, but I would suggest that they go out and have a drive on it.

In fact, a friend of mine had an accident on that road just last week, and this is a very serious situation. A friend of mine was travelling northwards towards the township of Lock. Her wheels fell off the verge of the road and into the gravel. She had the presence of mind not to over-correct, but all the same the car left the road, spun around, she went into the trees and wrote off the car.

Fortunately, she was not hurt, but this is a very serious situation, where the condition of the road puts those road users at risk of accident and in danger of their life. I do not know what is going to happen. The member for Mount Gambier made a similar assertion, that we must take some responsibility for accidents that occur when the safety of the road, the intersection or the infrastructure is inadequate.

The health budget is a third of the state's budget. It is an incredibly large burden on the state. It is also a primary responsibility of the state. For much of the life of the last parliament, I and other country members spoke about the importance of the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. The government were dragged kicking and screaming into conducting a review. Finally, they were forced to do that, ironically, after a motion by the member for Frome, who was then sitting on this side. Finally, we have seen an increase in that funding promised by the government.

Whether Labor follows through on its promises is always a question, but this scheme is of paramount importance to country people. It enables people who have a very serious long-term illness or one-off condition to travel to a specialist which is not available in their own small town. It supplements their travel costs so they can receive adequate medical treatment. It is a scheme that has been sadly underfunded for the last 14 years, in fact, so we wait with interest to see whether that increase in funding comes through.

One of the challenges we face in health in the country is the future of small country hospitals. In the seat of Flinders we have seen significant improvements and investment in the larger hospitals at Ceduna and Port Lincoln and, also, in the seat of Giles at Whyalla, and I give credit where credit is due: they are fantastic facilities. I do fear that the long-term future of the smaller country hospitals is under a bit of a cloud. Make no mistake, Deputy Speaker, that the people of those communities will fight tooth and nail to hold onto those services.

One of the real challenges—and this is a challenge for us all—is being able to access GPs who are prepared to live and work in a small country community, often on their own. I fear that the country GP really is a dying breed, and many of the doctors in that role now will tell you as much. It is really difficult for them to find locums, it is difficult for them to find partners in business and it is difficult for them to find a buyer when they want to sell their business and retire. Many of our country doctors are at the age where retirement is approaching.

It is a challenge for us all. I think we have to be a bit flexible and think laterally about how we continue to supply that. Unfortunately, it is a reality that many of our medical graduates are specialising immediately. It is not a career of choice to become a general practitioner and, even less so, a country GP.

We have heard a lot from this side about the costs of doing business in this state. I came from the private sector: I was in primary production for a long time and still have an interest in it. Time and again we see that the cost of doing business in this state really is having a direct impact on our competitiveness—our ability to compete with interstate jurisdictions and overseas jurisdictions. I will use the sector as an example because I know it best and it is one we can use. As primary producers in grains or livestock, we compete directly with interstate counterparts, we compete in a global market and we compete directly with overseas competitors.

I export wheat and I compete directly against the Canadians, the Americans, the Europeans and the Argentinians, and against the emerging agricultural powerhouse of Brazil and the old Soviet Union. All of those people, if they have a competitive advantage, are in the box seat. Unfortunately, the cost of doing business in this state, in agriculture or any other business, is such that we are becoming less and less competitive.

Regulation and red tape are things that governments talk about all the time. Governments always talk about reducing regulation and red tape, but it never seems to come to pass. In the last few weeks I have been talking to the aquaculture industry on the West Coast about the cost recovery regime that this government is implementing on that industry. This government has developed a business model whereby it creates a service and provides that service to a sector, in this case the aquaculture industry, and the government gets to a point where it believes it is an essential service and can no longer provide it free of charge, so it begins to charge the industry participants themselves to recover the cost and cover the cost of providing that service. So, we finish up with a service being supplied by the government, which the sector never asked for, does not need but has to pay for. It is a bizarre situation, but it is a business model I have seen this government implement time and again.

I will talk about marine parks, which have been topical for some years now and came up again in question time today. I cannot for the life of me understand why the government is implementing so many sanctuary zones and excluding fishing from the very productive waters of the West Coast, when a well-managed fishery is already in place and there is no identifiable risk or challenge to the integrity of that environment. It simply does not stack up. This is the biggest snow job of all time. Immense consultation was carried out—the government says that and I saw it myself.

There was an incredible amount of consultation—community members, fishing industry members, recreational fishers—all came to the table and all contributed in good faith and in the end the government did not listen. It was brutal in its cynicism. We are on the cusp of some of our most viable and profitable fisheries being excluded from their most productive fishing grounds. Despite the rhetoric we hear from this government, there seems no interest whatsoever in maintaining or growing jobs, and in fact this particular move will see jobs being reduced. It will in fact have devastating economic effects on those coastal regions.

Do members realise that 22 per cent of the land area of this state is under national park or under government control of some sort? That has increased markedly in the last 14 years of Labor. I understand it was about 8 per cent in 2002. The government is proud of this figure. I would say that this is an embarrassment. The government actively has taken land out of production. I know very well that in the seat of Stuart, in the north-east pastoral zone that I was visiting just 12 months ago, there are productive and profitable sheep stations up there that have been bought by the government and they shut the gate—lock them up, taken out of production.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Bulldozing dams.

Mr TRELOAR: Bulldozing dams. It is a ludicrous situation. When this state is crying out for economic activity they buy a property, shut the gate and close it down! Who looks after it? Who looks after the weeds, who controls the vermin? Nobody! It is a bizarre situation, and they are proud of what they are doing. I am a firm believer in our having the ability and capacity to have a productive and sustainable landscape. The days of 'shut the gate' conservation are well and truly over. This is bipartisan.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I can hear it rattling around the room.

Mr TRELOAR: Thank you, member for Newland, you are very kind. I owe you one.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: It is 11.35. To get back to marine park sanctuary zones if I can for a moment, the Premier said this week, in response to a question, that buyers of our fish and marine scale product would be prepared to pay a premium for that which has been caught or grown in a marine park environment. Now, I do not know what land the Premier is living in, but this seems to me pure fantasy. It is part of that *séance* economics that seems prevalent amongst socialist governments that they will all sit around in a circle, hold hands and think of an idea and everything will be fine.

The truth is that most of the people I know go to a farmers market a couple of times a year, buy a bottle of olive oil and a tin of pickles, go home happy and that is a wonderful thing to do, but the vast majority of people shop to a budget. Most people shop at a supermarket and they do that out of necessity. I ask you: why would anyone pay more than they ever had to for anything? It does not happen.

Our leader spoke about his visit to New Zealand last week and I will very quickly in the closing minutes reiterate some of the things he said, because I accompanied him on that visit. I am proud to say it was the first time either of us had accessed our travel budget for the 12 months, so we decided to take the opportunity to travel to New Zealand and see what a good centre-right government can do in a difficult situation.

We saw that in 2008 the National Party in New Zealand came to power and took a deliberate strategy of not cutting spending, but maintaining spending and increasing growth, and they have got to a point now where they are delivering a surplus in their budget for the first time since 2008. It took some commitment, it took some effort and it was quite deliberate. They have been focused on growth, focused on exports. They have had 4 per cent growth on an annual basis and they are working towards a point where 40 per cent of their GDP will come from exports.

Now, this is something that South Australia could do if the economic settings were right. We do not have those economic settings right at the moment. Essentially, New Zealand is a country, it has an economy about the same size as Victoria so it is larger than this state, but it is very limited in natural resources. It has good rainfall, it has reasonable soils, and its economy is based on agriculture.

They exist on the far side of the world quite some distance from markets and yet they are punching above their weight, so we have to look at what successful economies are doing and see if we can learn from that. It is a great story and it is something I am sure we will hear more about, because in so many of the economic indicators in this state we are just not ranking, and I will run through some of them in this last couple of minutes.

South Australia is generally sixth or seventh on most of the key economic indicators; that means just above or just below Tasmania. At least Tasmania has got a Liberal government now. I suspect we will probably be coming in at seventh for most of them in the next little while, particularly after the upcoming budget on June 19. South Australia's jobless rate is up almost 28 per cent on the decade average. In 2012-13 South Australia was the only state to record a decline in exports, and exports are forecast to continue to decline in each of the next two years.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Up by 12 per cent last year.

Mr TRELOAR: This is from Deloittes March 2014; that is what they are saying. South Australia's economic growth is forecast to be up to four times slower than the national growth average—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Flinders does not have to respond to the interjections. He is doing a very good job and he is going to continue his remarks—

Mr TRELOAR: I am highlighting the shortcomings of the current government's economic settings.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: —until his time expires which is now, unfortunately.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (23:38): At 20 to 12 this evening I expect I will be the last speaker tonight, and I am sure everybody will be pleased when I finish so that they can all go home. I would like to first of all congratulate some of the new Liberal MPs who have made their supply speeches. I think they have done an outstanding job and I have been very pleased to see some very genuine, very well thought out, very passionate speeches on behalf of their electorates. I take my chance now to speak on behalf of the electorate of Stuart on the Supply Bill.

As we all know, the bill is about allocating money and giving permission for the government to spend the money they need to get through. I note that it is \$3.941 billion that is being asked for, and I also note that it was \$3.205 billion that was asked for last year—a 23 per cent increase in 12 months that the government is asking the permission of this house to continue to spend. I think that is illustrative of the way the government is going about running this state and illustrative of why our finances are in such poor shape. A 23 per cent increase is significant.

Unless a family home happened to get a significant pay rise, which could happen and good luck to them if it did, it would be unlikely that they would increase their spending in that way. I think that speaks volumes about why our state is in the situation we are in at the moment. Let me be as fair as I can about this: I recognise that we are speaking in a very positive nation—Australia. We are not dealing with the types of difficulties that Russia and Ukraine are dealing with at the moment, we are not an African nation where 200 schoolgirls have been stolen essentially. We are fighting about ideas to improve where we are, but if we do not do that we will not stay good and we will not stay as fortunate as we are. We have to fight for those ideas, and we fight passionately because we believe we have a much better way of running this state both socially and financially than the government does.

The basics of budgeting cannot be avoided. You cannot spend more than you earn for very long. It comes back to bite you. That is exactly where we are at the moment. This government has promised surpluses every year for the last seven years but delivered a surplus once in the last seven years. You do not have to be Einstein or a CPA to recognise that that is just not sustainable. The issues with regard to debt, income spending, relativity to equity, interest payments, they all come

back. They are basic. It is the same thing that affects households and businesses. They all affect government as well.

This government seems intent on continuing to borrow and build until there are even fewer jobs, fewer services and fewer people living here. People are leaving this state in droves and it is a great shame. The Treasurer knows this; he is a smart guy. It is not a popular thing to say, but he is a smart guy, and he understands this. Labor keeps focussing on elections rather than what is best for our state, spending on big, impressive, glitzy, glamorous infrastructure, rather than on what is best for our state, and I understand those things because they are nice, shiny positive things that the majority of people would like to use.

I understand the appeal, but the reality is that every member of parliament, regardless of where they sit in this chamber, has to make up their own mind about how long this can go on for, about whether they think that is sustainable. If they think it is not sustainable, and I do not think it is sustainable, then it is immoral to continue to support it. I think that is a challenge that even Labor government MPs are going to have to face eventually. I think that the two Independent MPs are going to have to face that probably sooner rather than later. Our job is to do what we believe is best for the state, and I cannot accept that even members opposite believe that continuing to spend more than you earn for an extended period of time is good for the state.

The Treasurer told parliament that he will keep all of his election promises. He said that a week after the federal budget when he had enormous amounts of advice from all of his staff. He said that this Labor government would keep every single one of the promises that it took to the election. However, he has started to change his language. He is seeming to backpedal on that, and he is trying to start to blame the federal government for some of the decisions he is going to have to make.

I think that is wrong on two levels. I think it is wrong because all of the information that we had available to us before the federal budget gave us a very good indication on where this budget was going. However, I think it is also unacceptable for the government to say that they are very disappointed with the federal government for changing its commitments because it received new information when it came to government—new, more accurate and more disappointing information about the condition of the nation's economy when they replaced Labor at the federal level.

Our state government wants to say that is an unacceptable reason for the federal government to have changed its course. And, yet, when exactly the same thing happens to the state government it wants to say, 'Oh, but it's okay for us to change our course.' You just cannot have it both ways. You cannot say that the federal government should have kept all its commitments, complain that it did not, and then proceed to do exactly the same thing yourself. You cannot have it both ways.

It is also important to point out that the federal government will pass on successive increases in funding to our state over the forward estimates. We are not going backwards; we are going forwards. We will get more money from the federal government in upcoming years than we do currently. It is also important to point out that the state government, before the federal budget was announced, said it would take over \$900 million out of health, about \$230 million out of education, \$150 million out of police, and many more cuts. So it would be completely disingenuous, and the public, the media, and South Australians very broadly, will not accept the government blaming their budget situation on the federal government.

When you add to that the reality of the successive deficits, the overspending over the last 12 years that this government has undertaken, the story that the Treasurer, the Premier and the government are currently trying to paint just does not wash, and people will not buy it. The reality is that the government is having to eat its own mess at the moment.

I suspect that is largely because the government predicted that that would be our job. The government predicted that we would be the ones left in this very difficult situation after the March election and we would be the ones trying to balance the books after so many years of financial mismanagement. However, as fate would have it, they have to do it now, so that pressure is really focused on them.

The Treasurer was asked in question time today whether he agrees with the former treasurer and also with the former finance minister that the government is borrowing money to pay wages. He

replied that it was all okay because the big spending was actually on infrastructure projects. He said the new RAH is the biggest infrastructure project in the nation right now.

Bragging about that is terribly concerning to me because we could have had exactly the same hospital but could have spent \$1 billion less over the life of the project. It seems really peculiar to me that the Treasurer wants to brag about the biggest infrastructure project going on in the nation at the moment when we could have spent \$1 billion less and received exactly the same in return. It does not make sense that the government is locked into big spending commitments, so we have very little flexibility at the moment. The government's only choice now is to cut even more services that it should actually be providing to the people of South Australia.

Every time the Premier or the Treasurer, or any minister, is asked they say, 'Wait for the budget.' Now, they did say two weeks ago, 'We will fulfil all our promises,' but now they say, 'Wait for the budget.' When it really gets sticky for them they change their language again. The Minister for Correctional Services was asked in question time today about rumours that the government is looking into privatising services in prisons. He was not allowed to answer probably because they thought he would spill the beans.

Instead, the Treasurer answered, and implied that the opposition has such a policy. That is just not true. I was the shadow leading up to the election. You will find no such policy, you will find no such proposal for a policy, and you will find no minutes or notes or suggestions anywhere of such a policy; it is just not true. However, it is a very poorly kept secret that the government is looking at privatising the operation of our prisons.

The Liberal opposition is not but I am told, on good authority, that the Labor government is considering outsourcing the operation of prisons in our state, and it is worth looking at some of the detail of the question I asked the Minister for Correctional Services today in question time and the answer that the Treasurer gave on his behalf. In his answer the Treasurer talked about assets, but the question was actually about operations, about jobs, about people. The Treasurer, in his answer, said:

The government has made its views on privatisation of public assets very clear, and we stand by those pronouncements.

However, the question was about operations, the question was about jobs, and the question was about people, and the Treasurer did not address that question. The Minister for Correctional Services was not allowed to answer, and the Treasurer answered a different question.

The fact that the government is considering this at the moment is indicative of where this Labor government has taken our state's finances over the last 12 years. This government cannot blame the GFC, this government cannot blame the federal government, it cannot blame climate change, it cannot blame any excuse it might like to drag up. It cannot blame anyone else. The government has to blame itself for where we are heading.

On June 19, when the Treasurer stands up and tries to blame anyone and everyone except his team he will be flat, dead wrong and people will not believe him, because we have been heading here for several years. We have been heading to the point that we are going to reach on 19 June for a very long time, and, seemingly, we are heading towards at least some privatisation of operations in our prisons. As the shadow minister for correctional services, I think that is a great shame. It is particularly a great shame because it could have been avoided with better management of our state's economy.

With regard to regional development, let me say quite frankly that I welcome the added attention that the member for Frome has brought to this issue. I have said before, and I have said to him face-to-face—he is my friend, and I have said it to him quite directly—that I believe he has made a mistake going with the Labor government rather than potentially going with a Liberal government. However, he has made his decision, and I nonetheless appreciate the fact that he has brought attention to regional South Australia through his decision.

All South Australians should value our regions, absolutely every South Australian—regardless of where they live—should value our regions. The government is doing everything possible to make it look as if it values our regions at the moment, and let me just say that I know that some members opposite do. I know that the member for Giles does, I know that the member for

Frome does, but most do not. What concerns me is that the most senior members of the government do not value regional South Australia.

Nonetheless, I am grateful for the added focus and I am grateful that the Premier and three more ministers have put aside time to visit my electorate in the last two weeks. I very genuinely welcome ministers, members of the Labor Party, anybody from the other side, when they come to my electorate; I very genuinely welcome them to the electorate. As the member for Stuart, it is my job to achieve the very best I can from the government, regardless of who it is. It would be exactly the same if it were a Liberal government.

So I value the time and effort they put in, and I am pleased I was able to be there with the Minister for Primary Industries and Forestry and the Minister for Regional Development. I was not able to be there for the Minister for Manufacturing or the Premier, and let me say very clearly that I did not have a pizza with anyone while they were there; I did not have a pizza with any of them while they were in the electorate. However, I appreciated the visits greatly.

My real message here is that I urge them to keep it up. It cannot just be early days' business along the lines: 'The member for Frome has sort of put us all under a bit of pressure. We promised him we would look good coming in to the electorate, good ministers coming in to the electorate.' I urge them to keep it up and I urge them all to come back with positive solutions. It is okay to say, 'I've come for a look. I want to see, I want to talk to people, touch and feel the country areas and I want to find out what needs to be done.' You get full marks when you come back with answers. That is when we know that the government is genuine. We do not want to be part of a merry-go-round of key milestone visits just to say that you have been there.

Let me express my very genuine disappointment in what is likely to be the financial recording, at least in the upcoming budget, of the arrangement that the Premier and the member for Frome came to. My disappointment is not that the money that was agreed will be spent; my disappointment is that so much more should have been committed.

So much less will come to regional South Australia out of the agreement that the member for Frome has reached with the government than would have come to regional South Australia had a Liberal government been elected or had the member for Frome even just taken on board our election commitments. So much less will go to regional South Australia now.

I express my disappointment that Regional Development Australia throughout South Australia does not yet have assured funding from the government for their ongoing operations. There is lots of talk about money that will be spent here and there, but the key bodies that work in regional South Australia to support and advance regional South Australia do not have any ongoing funding. They have no ongoing security about the work that they can do.

Let me also just say that I am a bit concerned about the \$150,000 per year that was announced today by the member for Frome for regional community cabinet meetings. That all sounds good on the surface—and I am pleased that the cabinet will come and meet in regional South Australia, that is a good thing—but I am very concerned about that \$150,000 per annum to support the three communities that host country cabinet meetings over the next four years for project proposals that will assist communities meet economic and social needs. It is great to have the money. Any region will gratefully accept that money, but do you really think you have to pay \$50,000 each to get to go to a region? Regional South Australia will be pleased to have you.

I do not think this is actually the best way to choose how the grant funding is going to be spent. Three fortunate communities will get \$450,000 per year spent in their communities and every other community will not get a look at that money simply because those are the three communities that the government chose to visit that year.

Let me tell you that those choices, those locations, will be chosen based on politics, based on where they think there will be good media, based on where they think they will get bang for their buck politically. It is really concerning that the government wants to spend \$150,000 for the right to be hosted by a community for regional cabinet.

I am also very concerned about some of the issues facing regional Australia, which I am sure will not be addressed in this budget. Many of my colleagues have actually touched on these issues: health, small schools and special needs education, which are very important. While it is easy to forget, public transport in regional cities and smaller communities is very important. There are the

issues of roads and tourism. National parks and reserves are completely underfunded, putting more and more impositions on businesses and local councils. That is a great imposition on regional South Australia.

I am particularly worried about employment. It is a problem throughout our state, but particularly in regional South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sadly, the member's time has expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.E. Close.

At 23:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 4 June 2014 at 11:00.

Answers to Questions

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND RECONCILIATION DIVISION

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (6 May 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

A complaint has been received by the department and while an internal investigation is underway some duties of the staff member involved have been modified.